

also of citizens of Pittsburg, Pa.; also of Edwin Noll and numerous other citizens of Pennsylvania, in relation to the Marquette statue—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Ignatius J. Langley, of Maryland, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of A. M. Frierson and 111 other colored citizens of Columbia, Clark, Lafayette, Ouachita, and Union counties, Ark., asking for an appropriation to aid in paying their transportation to Africa—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OTEY: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Kate Wade—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Nancy Susan Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Paper to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John O'Beirne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SETTLE: Petition of the estate of Mary Smith, deceased, late of Orange County, N. C., praying reference of her war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of W. C. Staples, of Rockingham County, N. C. (formerly of Patrick County, Va.), praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Durham, N. C., in favor of adopting the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition of citizens of Bellevue, Pa., protesting against the acceptance of the Marquette statue—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Iron City Lodge, No. 36, American Protestant Association, protesting against appropriations for Indian contract schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of Dr. W. W. McIlvaine and Hon. A. K. Rarey, of Kenton, Ohio; also petition of Charles Collier, W. W. Stevenson, and Godfrey Sutermeister, asking for a pension for Jacob Sherman, late a private in Company 9, Fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TATE: Petition of Benjamin Davis in support of House bill granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNE: Remonstrance of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., against the obstruction of navigation by the building of a bridge across the Detroit River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts: Petition of C. A. Keith and others, of Webster, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 4566, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 7, 1896.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

On motion of Mr. QUAY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of District Assembly No. 9, Order of Knights of Labor, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Phillips bill, authorizing the appointment of a nonpartisan commission to collate information and to consider and recommend legislation to meet the problems presented by labor, agriculture, and capital; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a memorial of the Association of American Physicians, and also resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Medical Society of the County of New York, on the subject of vivisection in the District of Columbia. I move that the memorial and resolutions be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Vandalia, Fayette County, Ill., signed by the officers, Belle P. Whitney, president, and Cora B. Phillips, secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent from 16 to 18 years in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented resolutions adopted by the Association of the Central West Illinois Congregational churches of Peoria, Ill., expressing their indignation at the atrocious persecution of their fellow-Christians in Armenia, and especially of their suffering brethren of the American Board; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Delaware River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of American Waiters' Union, No. 20, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the Government ownership and control of telegraph lines; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ELKINS presented the memorial of R. T. Wetzel and 37 other citizens of Jackson County, W. Va.; the memorial of W. H. Ramsey and 70 other citizens of Hundley, W. Va., and the memorial of E. T. W. Hall and 57 other citizens of Freemansburg, W. Va., remonstrating against placing the statue of Père Marquette in Statuary Hall, and praying that it be immediately removed; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation of \$500,000 be made for improving the Delaware River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SPECIAL LIQUOR-TAX RECEIPTS.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I present the petition of W. O. Smith and 175 other citizens of Randolph County, Ind., praying for the passage of Senate bill 239, which proposes to prohibit the issuance of special liquor-tax receipts to persons other than those who are authorized by State laws to engage in the business of selling intoxicating liquors. The petitioners, in addition to setting forth their special request, add that they believe the enactment of such a law would aid in preserving peace and order in every community, and would greatly improve the public morals.

In connection with the petition, which I wish to have referred to the Committee on Finance, I want to call the attention of such members of the Committee on Finance as may be present to some very pertinent information on this subject.

I wrote to the probate judge in each of five different counties in Kansas, asking them to furnish me with a statement showing the number of permits to sell intoxicating liquors that had been issued in each of those counties and were in force at the date of my letter. By our law the probate judge of each county, and he alone, is authorized to issue permits to engage in the business of selling intoxicating liquors. We try to limit it as far as we can to druggists. Then I asked the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to furnish me with a statement of the number of special liquor-tax receipts that had been issued to persons who were engaged in the business of selling liquor in those same counties and at the same time. I have here his statement and the statements of the probate judges.

I observe that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is now present.

I find from the statement of the Internal Revenue Commissioner that in Leavenworth County, Kans., there were 248 special liquor-tax receipts in force on the 1st of March of this year. Then by turning to the letter from the probate judge of that county, who is authorized to issue State permits to persons to engage in the sale of intoxicating liquors under the State law, I find that there are only 2 State permits in force in that county, and as there were 248 United States special liquor-tax receipts issued, it is shown that 246 persons are selling liquor in that county in violation of the State law.

Then, in Shawnee County, in which the capital of the State is located, the Internal Revenue Commissioner informs me that 73 special liquor-tax receipts have been issued by the United States authorities, and there are only 25 State permits in force issued by the probate judge under the State law. So we have the difference between 73 and 25 as the number of persons who are engaged in the sale of liquor in that county in violation of the State law.

In Sedgwick County there were 120 special United States liquor-tax receipts issued and 12 State permits issued. The difference between 120 and 12 shows the number of persons engaged in that county in the sale of liquors in violation of the State law.

In Reno County the number of United States tax receipts was 25 and of State permits 3, showing 22 persons in that county engaged in selling liquors in violation of the State law.

In Dickinson County there are 37 special liquor-tax receipts issued and only 9 State permits, the difference between 37 and 9 showing the number of persons engaged in the liquor traffic in that county in violation of the State law. I submit the figures in tabulated form:

Special liquor-tax receipts and State permits to sell intoxicating liquors in five Kansas counties, March, 1896.

County.	State permit.	United States tax receipts.
Leavenworth	2	248
Shawnee	25	73
Sedgwick	12	120
Reno	3	25
Dickinson	9	37
Total	51	503
Average	101	503

Mr. MORRILL. Of course the Senator from Kansas has read the law of the United States on this subject. It does not shield any violation of the State laws where there are State laws upon the subject. Therefore, all the statements which are made by the Senator from Kansas merely show that the people of that State will not enforce their own laws.

Mr. PEPPER. The point I make is that if any person intending to violate the State law asks for a special liquor-tax receipt and pays for it and gets it, that proceeding will protect this man so far as the Government of the United States is concerned, and he cares less for the State law than he does for the United States law.

I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Finance specially to the point that our people make in this matter. Our position is that we can better enforce the laws of the State if there is not this apparent and real protection afforded to the illicit sale of liquors by the issuance of Government tax receipts.

Mr. ALLISON. I will ask the Senator from Kansas how there can be that real protection from the mere fact that the Government collects a tax?

Mr. PEPPER. The real protection is this way, Mr. President. I go to the internal-revenue collector and ask for a special liquor-tax receipt. He asks me no questions. I pay \$25 for my receipt and go away and set up a little gin shop in some alley or in some out-of-the-way place, and so far as the United States marshal is concerned I am absolutely protected; that is to say, he does not interfere with me. The State law is violated, but by some hook or crook, by personal acquaintance or financial or commercial acquaintance with the police officer or other local personage who is charged with looking after those things, I am permitted to go unscathed. Now, if we can limit the traffic to the State law alone, I think, just as the petitioners say, that it will aid very much in enforcing the laws of the State and in maintaining peace and good order.

Mr. QUAY. Is there anything in the laws of Kansas to prevent the prosecution and conviction of a man who has paid the United States tax for the sale of liquor?

Mr. PEPPER. No; there is no protection of that kind, but he knows he is relieved from prosecution by the United States authorities for selling. He has that advantage in his favor, to say the least; and it is a good deal.

Mr. ALLISON. But the Senator from Kansas must know that the fact that a man has paid a tax and a receipt can be produced is prima facie evidence in Kansas and other States of the violation of the State laws, and therefore it furnishes additional testimony in the States to the people who want to enforce the law.

Mr. PEPPER. That is very true; but I will state the difference, if the Senate will bear with me just a moment while this subject is up; it is very important. I had several letters from friends in New Hampshire who brought to my attention the same point that the Senator from Iowa presents. But we are altogether differently situated in the Western country from what they are in New England, where the villages are almost adjoining one another. We have some counties in Kansas as large as the entire State which the honorable Senator from Vermont so ably represents in this Chamber. We have large areas to travel over in order to reach the office of internal-revenue collector. From the southwestern portion of the State of Kansas, to reach Leavenworth, where the internal-revenue commissioner has his office, we would have to travel 450 miles in a direct line. So the collecting of information from the office of the internal-revenue collector is not a matter of ease and comfort. But the county seat is not many miles away, and under our laws the probate judge, whose office is at the county seat, and he alone, is authorized to issue permits to sell liquor. We can go to that office without much trouble. He advertises in the county papers before the permit is issued, setting forth the application of Richard Roe or John Doe for authority to sell liquors, and to any person opposed to it it is notice, and it is a public record easy of access. But it is not so in the case of the revenue collector.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire simply to ask a question. I think I am correct in stating that some persons in my State have protested against what the Senator desires to accomplish on the very ground the Senator from Iowa has raised—that the tax receipt is additional proof in the prosecution of these cases.

Mr. MORRILL. I merely desire to add that in my State the moment it is ascertained a man has taken out a license he is prosecuted by the State officers.

Mr. PEPPER. I only want to say a single word by way of addition. The nearness of the citizens of the New England States to the internal revenue office is a great point in favor of their argument, while the great distance of the office from most of our people in the West is an argument against it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHILTON. In connection with the subject to which the Senator from Kansas refers, I present the petition of W. H. Ketchum and sundry other citizens of Wichita County, Tex., and the petition of A. Tulloh and sundry other citizens of Parker County,

Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting United States revenue licenses from being issued in local-option districts. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Finance. The motion was agreed to.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT ST. LOUIS.

Mr. VEST. I ask the Senate to take up for consideration House bill 2698, a bridge bill about which I desire a conference with the House of Representatives. It is important to have an early conference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information. The Secretary read the bill (H. R. 2698) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not desire to interrupt the reading of the bill before it was concluded, so that the time of the Senate might not be again taken up in its reading; but as I was not aware that the bill had been brought in from the committee, I should like to have the Senator from Missouri let it lie upon the table until I can have time to look at it before it is passed upon by the Senate. I have no desire to delay the measure, but it is a very important bill, about which there seems to have been a good deal of controversy for some time past, and I should be glad to have an opportunity to look at the provisions of the bill before it is finally considered by the Senate. It has now been read, and if the Senator will allow it to lie on the table for the present I will see him further on the subject, and he can call it up hereafter.

Mr. VEST. Of course, I can not decline such a request. My only object is to get the bill into conference.

Mr. CULLOM. I am aware of it.

Mr. VEST. We have passed the bill through the Senate twice; it has passed through the House twice; and the two bodies have been unable to agree upon a measure.

Mr. CULLOM. As I caught the reading of the bill, I infer that this is not exactly the bill that was passed by the Senate before.

Mr. VEST. It is not the bill the Senate passed at the present session. It is the same bill that the House passed in the last Congress and sent to us. We passed a bill at the present session and sent it to the House, and they have sent back to us the bill which they passed in the last Congress.

Mr. CULLOM. So I understand.

Mr. VEST. It never can be adjusted except by a conference.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no doubt that is true, but at the same time I should like to satisfy myself that the bill is as we want it before it gets into conference at all.

Mr. VEST. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that the Committee on Commerce had a special hearing upon this bill. They notified all the parties interested to come before us, which they did, and we heard them patiently and carefully and cross-examined them; and the bill which we have reported is the best we can possibly do under the circumstances.

Mr. CULLOM. I inquire of the Senator from Missouri if it was developed after the hearing or pending it that the bill satisfies both elements that came before the committee for a hearing?

Mr. VEST. No; it is impossible to make a bill that does. The river interests want one thing and the railroad interests want another; and then the interest in which I am more interested than any other, the people of East St. Louis and the city of St. Louis, the large body of the producers, want a bill entirely different from the measure either of the other interests wants. We had the difficult task before us of making a bill which we thought would be just to all parties.

Mr. CULLOM. The interest that I represent is the people of Illinois, and I have no special interest except to deal fairly with the railroads or any other corporation.

Mr. VEST. This bill is the very best we can possibly do, and if there is no objection to it I should like—

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow it to lie on the table for a time I should be glad.

Mr. VEST. I shall call it up as soon as possible, for I want to get it into conference.

A. P. BROWN.

Mr. GEAR. I ask leave to call up the bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of A. P. Brown, late postmaster at Le Mars, Iowa.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay \$888.98 for the purpose of reimbursing A. P. Brown, late postmaster at Le Mars, Iowa, for loss sustained by reason of burglary of postage stamps and money from that post-office on January 9, 1894.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to call up for passage the bill (S. 759) granting a pension to Carrie A. Moody.

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator allow me to submit a report?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed until morning business is completed. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania upon the conclusion of the morning business.

Mr. CULLOM. I rise to make an inquiry rather than for any other purpose. I understand that yesterday evening an agreement was made by unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bond resolution immediately after the morning business today. There seems to be a disposition to call up bills, and therefore I ask leave to call up the conference report on the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, if it is in order to do so.

Mr. SHERMAN. A conference report is always in order.

Mr. BATE. I suggest that the conference report has just been laid on our tables, and we have hardly had time to investigate it. I suggest to the Senator that he had better defer it. It went over in order to be printed, and the object of the delay would be defeated if Senators are not given an opportunity to look at it before the report is called up.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to waiting, if that is the desire of the Senate, but it seems to me we ought to get along with the appropriation bills at some time or other.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 813) for the relief of Annie R. Chesley, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PASCO, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2978) to provide an American register for the steamer *Menemsha*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1623) for the relief of Cumberland Female College, of McMinnville, Tenn., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 586) to fix the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the United States Army, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1368) prescribing the qualifications of soldiers and marines of the United States, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. GALLINGER, 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. 2605) granting a pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war;

A bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John Dalton;

A bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to Williamson Durley; and

A bill (H. R. 5854) granting a pension to John Caster.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of Henry H. Schrawder, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5481) to restore the lands embraced in the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, in the State of Colorado, to the public domain, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2054) to correct the military record of Charles W. Rinehardt and to grant him an honorable discharge, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4787) to establish the port of Conneaut, in the State of Ohio, as a support of entry in the district of Cuyahoga, in said State of Ohio, reported it without amendment.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7973) to establish a railroad bridge across the Illinois River near Grafton, Ill., reported it without amendment.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2980) to provide a life-saving station at or near Point Bonita, at the Golden Gate, in the State of California, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent to call up for consideration at this time the bill (S. 1035) authorizing the Sioux City and Omaha Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Omaha and Winnebago Reservation, in Thurston County, Nebr., and for other purposes. It will not lead to any discussion. It is a mere matter of form.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest that the morning business ought to be concluded.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business has not yet been concluded. Bills and joint resolutions are next in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. When the order of resolutions is reached, I desire to submit a resolution.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TURPIE (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 3082) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Johnson Gilbert; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. VOORHEES) introduced a bill (S. 3083) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon introduced a bill (S. 3084) for the relief of Lizzie Haggy, as administratrix of the estate of Frank B. Smith, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 3085) granting a pension to Burton Packard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3086) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3087) to incorporate the National Society of Colonial Dames of America; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

DELAY IN SEED DISTRIBUTION.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be directed to immediately communicate to the Senate the reasons for the delay in supplying seeds for distribution.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1743) for the relief of the widow of Thomas L. Young. It will take but a moment to put the bill on its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. It will take but a moment.

Mr. HARRIS. A unanimous-consent agreement was made late yesterday evening that immediately after the routine business this morning the resolution proposed by the Senator from Kansas should be taken up and proceeded with and the final vote taken not later than 4 o'clock to-day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I was not present at the time the agreement was made. I am willing to abide by it, but I hope this bill will be allowed to pass. It will take but a moment. It proposes to allow the widow of a gallant soldier about four or five hundred dollars back pay.

Mr. HARRIS. I state the fact. I shall not object. I have not a word to say upon the pending resolution, but the unanimous-consent agreement requires a final vote at 4 o'clock. I give notice to the Senate that that is the agreement and it will be insisted upon.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I will not violate any agreement of the kind, although I hoped that the Senate would pass this little bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 862) for the relief of the receivers of the Towboat Association of New Orleans, La.

The message also requested the Senate to furnish the House with a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 2501) for the relief of James Sims, of Marshall County, Miss., the original having been lost or misplaced.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7395) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to reconvey to the former owners a certain tract of land in Valverde County, Tex.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3013) to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to improve the merchant-marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve; agreed to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOPKINS,

and Mr. COOPER of Florida managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7542) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BOUTELLE, Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUMMINGS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (S. 129) for the relief of Capt. George H. Perkins;
A bill (S. 661) to amend section 2880 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing a time for vessels to unlade;

A bill (S. 1846) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to donate condemned cannon to Custer Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Leavenworth, Kans., and Mathies Post, Grand Army of the Republic, at Burlington, Iowa;

A bill (S. 1872) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange in behalf of the United States the tract of land at Choc-taw Point, Mobile County, Ala., now belonging to the United States and held for light-house purposes, with the Mobile, Jackson and Kansas City Railroad Company for any other tract or parcel of land in said county equally well or better adapted to use for light-house purposes;

A bill (S. 1904) to regulate marriages in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mary Ann Tracy;
A bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Francis Walsh, of Stockham, Nebr.;

A bill (H. R. 372) for the relief of James Duke;
A bill (H. R. 577) granting a pension to Lydia A. Taft;
A bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to Caroline D. Mowatt;
A bill (H. R. 1889) granting an honorable discharge to F. L. Taylor from December 2, 1864;

A bill (H. R. 2735) for the relief of Enoch Davis;
A bill (H. R. 3018) to amend the act approved March 3, 1891, granting the right of way upon the public lands for reservoir and canal purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3544) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Navy to furnish not more than four pieces of condemned cannon to the village of New Rochelle, N. Y.;

A bill (H. R. 4456) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to donate one condemned cannon and four pyramids of condemned cannon balls to the cemetery association in the city of St. Paul, Minn., to be used at or near the foot of the soldiers' monument in said cemetery;

A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Sarah G. Ives;
A bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer G. Howell, late a private in Company F, One hundred and sixtieth New York Volunteers; and

A bill (H. R. 6505) to revive and reenact an act to authorize the construction of a free bridge across the Arkansas River, connecting Little Rock and Argenta.

JAMES SIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the request of the House of Representatives for a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 2501) for the relief of James Sims, of Marshall County, Miss.; and, by unanimous consent, the request was ordered to be complied with.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF BOND SALES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Kansas.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. PEPPER, providing for investigation generally of all the material facts and circumstances connected with the sale of United States bonds by the Secretary of the Treasury in the years 1894, 1895, and 1896.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended, on which the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from New York yield to me for a very short time to take part in the discussion of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. I have no objection, if I can have the floor when the Senator from Illinois gets through.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I was gratified yesterday after-

noon to listen to the very frank and explicit statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. He said that if the policy of the maintenance of the existing gold standard was to be maintained, then there was no room for questioning the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury. I have felt that that was the real question involved in this discussion, and that the animus of the resolution proposed by the Senator from Kansas was to affect the public mind with reference to that question.

I do not suppose that any Senator questions the integrity of the Secretary of the Treasury. His judgment may possibly be disputed or the correctness of his acts may be questioned. Perhaps I ought to except the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] from that general statement. I have opposed this resolution because I believed, as I now believe, that it is an illegitimate means of procuring the material to unfavorably affect the public mind in respect to these questions.

Mr. President, no time in the history of this country required a greater degree of frankness from representative public men than the present. The temper, the feeling, and the interests of the American people alike demand that the monetary policies of the United States should be settled in the approaching elections. There ought to be now no disguise on the part of political parties. They ought to avow themselves frankly on this question, and no incidental or improper or irrelevant influences ought to be invoked to distract the public attention from this most interesting and most important question.

I regret to say that the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties adopted by their national conventions in 1892, which were thought at the time to be sufficiently clear and comprehensive, are not so. It is now conceded by all that the Republican platform adopted at Minneapolis in 1892 under existing conditions can no longer be relied upon as a definition of the pending issue between the supporters of the existing legal and commercial standard of value and the advocates of the standard of value which would follow and be produced by the unlimited coinage of enforced legal-tender silver upon the ratio of 16 to 1. The language of the financial clause of the Republican platform adopted at Minneapolis on the 10th day of June, 1892, is as follows:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal. The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workmen, demand that every dollar, paper or coin, issued by the Government shall be as good as any other. We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure a parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

But the Senator from Montana, chairman of the Republican national committee and the official representative of that party, in his late speech on this floor, supported the unlimited coinage of silver dollars, containing 412½ grains of standard silver, with full legal-tender quality for all debts, public and private; and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who assisted in the preparation of the Republican platform, and who, like the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], strenuously supports the free coinage of silver, agree in asserting that their opinions and conduct are alike in perfect harmony with the Republican platform of 1892. And some Democrats take the same liberty with the Democratic platform adopted in Chicago on the 22d of June, 1892, which is as follows:

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman Act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters as well as its author anxious for its speedy repeal.

As an expression of opinion it may be questioned; as a prediction it is in a sense undoubtedly true.

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage; but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in payments of debts, and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

The Democratic convention did not, like the convention of the Republican party, puzzle itself nor attempt to puzzle the people of the United States by professing devotion to that equivocal and now uncertain doctrine termed "bimetalism," but proceeded at once to declare and define the Democratic doctrine as it was then understood by the party. It denounced the "Sherman Act of 1890," which provided for the unending and perpetual purchase of silver bullion at its market price, with a pledge by the Government to maintain a parity between the two metals, silver and gold, as "a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future." It then declared that "we hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, but

the dollar unit of coinage of both metals"—referring, of course, to the unit of value established by the act of 1873—"must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value."

This language was understood by the whole country to commit the Democratic party to the maintenance of the value and acceptability of the silver coin with the gold coinage under the act of 1873. If there was at any time any doubt as to the position of the Democratic party on this subject, or as to the meaning of the platform, it was removed by the emphatic language of the candidate nominated for the Presidency by the same convention.

In his letter of acceptance he said:

* * * The people are entitled to sound and honest money, abundantly sufficient in volume to supply their business needs.

But whatever may be the form of the people's currency, national or State, whether gold, silver, or paper, it should be so regulated and guarded by governmental action or by wise and careful laws that no one can be deluded as to the certainty and stability of its value. * * * Every dollar put into the hands of the people should be of the same intrinsic value or purchasing power. With this condition absolutely guaranteed, both gold and silver can be safely utilized upon equal terms in the adjustment of our currency.

In dealing with this subject no selfish scheme should be allowed to intervene, and no doubtful experiment should be attempted. The wants of our people arising from the deficiency or imperfect distribution of money circulation ought to be fully and honestly recognized and efficiently remedied.

It should, however, be constantly remembered that the inconvenience or loss that might arise from such a situation can be easier borne than the universal distress which must follow a discredited currency.

And the present distinguished Vice-President, in his letter accepting the nomination, after indorsing what had been written by Mr. Cleveland, and still speaking for the Democracy of the United States, said:

* * * The convention also declared its position on the currency question in no unmeaning words. To this plain and unequivocal declaration in favor of sound, honest money I subscribe without reservation or qualification. A safe circulating medium is absolutely essential to the protection of the business interests of our country, while to the wage earner or the farmer it is all important that every dollar, whatever its form, that finds its way into his pocket shall be of equal, unquestioned, and universal exchangeable value and of equal purchasing power.

After these resolutions adopted by the convention in favor of maintaining the equal value of every dollar coined under the authority of the United States, and with the full knowledge that the act of 1873 made the gold piece containing 25.8 grains of standard gold the unit of value, and the gold coinage of the United States, predicated upon that unit, the standard of value, the Democratic candidates, in their letters of acceptance, covered the whole ground of the resolutions, and committed themselves, in substance and effect, to that which was then and still is the Democratic doctrine—that every dollar coined or issued under the authority of the United States, whether of silver or paper, should have a value at all times equal to gold coin in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Mr. Cleveland was elected to the Presidency upon that as well as other important issues, and since his accession to that high office, aided by that distinguished Democrat and statesman, that pure and honest man, John G. Carlisle, and in spite of opposition from unexpected quarters, has steadily and conscientiously, to the full extent of his constitutional powers, adhered to and sought to maintain the doctrine of the Chicago platform as interpreted in his letter of acceptance.

But, Mr. President, the "world do move," and the meaning of words changes in their practical application to altered conditions, and it is now very certain that the American people no longer rely upon the money resolutions of the Minneapolis and Chicago conventions for an accurate definition of the issue which they intend to settle in the approaching Presidential and Congressional elections. Mr. President, our countrymen are intensely practical, and from that cause prefer to consider concrete measures proposed to them rather than to speculate upon abstract and remote results.

Those who favor the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, with enforced legal-tender quality for the payment of all debts, public and private, tender to the country a single issue which in itself is clear, and in its language plain and easily understood, and from which every man can hope for such advantages to himself as his reason or even his imagination can suggest. The operative miners want employment and wages which they promise themselves from the unlimited coinage of silver. The corporations and capitalists who own both the gold and the silver bullion anticipate from the adoption of the free-coinage measure an improved local market for their silver. They know that their gold will find a remunerative price either from the necessities of those who have incurred gold obligations or in all commercial countries where the gold standard of value is recognized. Some want and promise themselves cheaper money and higher prices; others, reckless of consequences, desire place, and still others hope for personal advantages growing out of the confusion which will attend the disturbance of values and depreciation in the standard of value as a consequence of the free coinage of silver.

The advocates of free coinage are bold leaders and expect, not altogether without reason, to control the national conventions of both political parties; but, doubtful of success, some of them are willing to offer to manufacturers protection by tariffs in exchange

for advantages for silver bullion. No danger now more seriously threatens the American people than does a probable and possibly successful combination between two powerful and corrupt property interests, the one demanding that the consumers of the necessities and conveniences of life shall be taxed to pay profits to the manufacturers and the other anxious to expel gold coin from use in the United States, where it obstructs the use and depresses the price of silver in the local market.

That the apprehensions I have expressed are not wholly without foundation, I need only remind the Senate of a scene which occurred here lately in which the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Connecticut were actors, and to the speeches of the chairman of the Republican national committee and the Republican Senators from the silver States, who, in avowing their devotion to the doctrine of protection, said nothing "unmanly," but still held out hopes of an ultimate treaty for the advantage of both contracting parties.

I also send to the Secretary and ask him to read a clipping from one of the newspapers of this city, which affords an intimation touching the same point.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

"The Pennsylvania manufacturers who were in Washington Thursday in conference with the silver Senators represented at least \$150,000,000 of capital," said Mr. W. T. Prince, of Philadelphia, at the Normandie. "They are the men who furnished 'the fat' that John Wanamaker collected in the Harrison campaign of 1888. They are willing to put up again, but they must have the strongest assurance that they will get a quid pro quo before any Presidential ticket gets a dollar of their money. Their business is stagnant, and the immediate future holds no promise. If they can make terms with the silver people whereby protection will be given them, they are willing, yes, anxious, to strike an agreement. They understand fully that no tariff bill can pass both Houses of Congress unless concessions are made to the white metal, for the champions of silver in the Senate are masters of the situation. It is a cold matter of business with these textile millionaires, and they are eager to give and take. They do not think free silver is an unmitigated evil, and something must be done to start the wheels of commerce once more."

"I look on this conference as likely to prove of far-reaching importance. It may mean the putting out of an independent silver ticket, with a platform of one plank—silver and protection. Such a ticket will prove vastly attractive to thousands of voters, and if headed by such a man as DON CAMERON would be dangerous to any regular partisan ticket that could be put out."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, the existing standard of value in the United States is American gold coinage, of which the one-dollar gold piece of the weight of 25.8 grains of standard gold is the unit. This asserted fact will not be denied. It was established by the act of 1873, and has been maintained by the policy pursued by the Treasury Department under all Administrations since that act and by the course of business throughout the United States.

It was confirmed by the act of February 28, 1878, which, under the deceptive title of "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore the legal-tender character thereof," provided "that there shall be coined at the mints of the United States silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains of standard silver, which coin, together with all silver dollars heretofore coined by the United States of like weight and fineness, shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract." And it was further directed by the act that the Secretary of the Treasury should purchase from time to time silver bullion at the market price thereof, not less than \$2,000,000 worth per month nor more than \$4,000,000 worth per month, and cause the same to be coined monthly, as fast as so purchased, into such dollars. This act recognized the standard of value established by the act of 1873 by referring to the market value of silver bullion, which could, of course, be expressed only in terms of gold. The same is true of the act of July 14, 1890. That act, in addition to authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver bullion at the market price thereof, which must, of course, have reference to the gold price of silver bullion, treating it as a mere commodity, authorized the issue of Treasury notes in payment for purchases of silver bullion to the amount of the cost of the silver bullion, and the Treasury notes issued in pursuance of the act were given only limited legal-tender qualities. This act contains a provision that—

Upon the demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion.

And then follows, in the same connection, and as a part of the same sentence, the controlling mandatory declaration:

It being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law.

The act of November 1, 1893, which repeals so much of the act of July 14, 1890, as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to "purchase from time to time silver bullion and issue in payment of such purchases Treasury notes," again asserts the policy of the United States to continue the use of gold and silver as standard money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value; and it asserts that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism "as will

maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts."

The policy of the Secretary of the Treasury in the administration of the laws providing for the payment of the public debts and obligations has been based upon the idea and intended to promote the policy of the maintenance of the standard of value established by the act of 1873.

It is asserted that the public debt, including what are termed "greenbacks," and the Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, "are by their terms payable in coin." The Secretaries of the Treasury under all Administrations have, in order to maintain the standard of values established by the act of 1873 and to maintain the parity between the two metals, and in that way keep the pledge given to the public, allowed creditors the option of payment in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the creditor. My object thus far has been to prove that there exists in the United States a "legal and commercial standard of value."

The second point I present for the consideration of the Senate and the country is that the "unlimited coinage" by the United States of silver dollars of 412½ grains of standard silver with forced legal-tender quality for all debts, public and private, would subvert the existing legal and commercial standard of value by establishing a standard of value based upon silver coinage only. The truth of this can not truthfully and will not, as I suppose, be denied. It has not been denied on this floor. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who is one of the ablest and most earnest of the friends of the unlimited coinage of silver dollars containing 412½ grains of standard silver with legal-tender quality, in his exhaustive speech in the Senate on the 13th of March admits as much, for he expressly declared that one of the desirable objects expected to be accomplished by the free coinage of silver by the United States alone is to destroy the gold standard of value and substitute another standard in its place. He did not claim that free coinage would enhance the value of the silver dollar proposed to be coined to an equal commercial value and acceptability with the gold dollar of American coinage, for that would be to maintain the gold standard, but his insistence was that free coinage would enhance the value of the silver dollar "some" and depreciate the value of the gold dollar "some," so that by the enhancement of the value of the one and a reduction of the value of the other the two would reach a point of value common to both. It seems a logical conclusion from the opinion thus expressed by the Senator from Missouri that the point at which the coins of the two metals would become equal in value would necessarily thereafter be the standard of value.

Without availing myself of the admission of the Senator from Missouri, I maintain that the unlimited coinage of silver dollars containing 412½ grains of standard silver with forced legal-tender quality for all debts, public and private, would subvert the existing legal and commercial standard of value, not in the manner the distinguished Senator supposes, but by causing the disuse of gold coin in all ordinary legal and commercial transactions.

Congressional legislation with respect to the coinage of silver must of necessity be local in its direct effect upon the value of silver bullion. It may be admitted that legislation may add "some" to its commercial value by conferring upon silver coin the full legal-tender quality, but it is impossible, as is conceded by him, by an act of Congress alone to make silver dollars equal in commercial value or acceptability to the dollar of gold. Therefore under the operation of unlimited-coinage laws upon the proposed ratio gold would become a commodity, and like all commodities it would seek the best market, and that best market would be found, not in the United States, but in commercial countries where silver is not favored by partial local laws. The Senator from Missouri, like all other advocates of the free coinage of silver upon the ratio of 16 to 1, denounces and condemns what they accurately enough call the gold standard of value, which, by the way, is the existing standard, and advocates another or some other standard of value which would be determined by money more easily obtained than gold coin, and therefore of less commercial value than gold.

The Senator proposes to reach the future standard of value by a policy which would lessen or depreciate gold in the United States to a point at which it would meet the enhanced price which would be given to silver coin by an act of the American Congress, and when the coins of the two metals became or reached a common value the country would have the bimetallic standard.

I will not at present attempt to show the vanity of this hope of the Senator, or in what respects it runs counter to all that is known of the science of money or the experience of the world, but will now attend to the single consideration of the fact that this most favorable view of the effect of the free and unlimited coinage of legal-tender silver would result in the disturbance of all values, produce infinite confusion, and practically revolutionize not only the business relations of the people of the United States with each other but with all foreign countries.

I do not wish to treat the theory advanced by the Senator from

Missouri and others who agree with him in favoring the free coinage of legal-tender silver on the proposed ratio too seriously, for gold would disappear from circulation and would in that way and no other contribute to an increase in the value of silver coin.

The unlimited coinage of silver, with legal-tender quality, on the ratio of 16 to 1 would operate precisely as would a law prohibiting the coinage or use of gold coin in the United States, and give to silver the monopoly of American coinage.

I return to the proposition that silver coin would rise in value by the depreciation or disappearance of gold coin. It will be observed that no one of the advocates of free coinage professes to know or predict what would be the exact relation between the standard of value now existing and the standard which would be produced by the policy they propose.

I ask, Will free coinage produce a silver dollar worth 50, 60, 70, 80, or 90 cents as compared with the gold dollar? Will the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator tell me? Will the Senator from Nevada give the country the benefit of his opinion upon this most important point?

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator want an answer now?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; at this moment. I should be gratified to have it now.

Mr. STEWART. I should hope that the relative value of the coins of both gold and silver would be less than the present value of gold; that is, I should hope that the addition of silver coin as standard money would increase the volume of standard money—which controls the volume of all other moneys and of credit—to such an extent as would stop the fall in prices and make it profitable again to enter into business. To just what extent it would do that is, of course, uncertain. It would take a very large amount of silver to largely advance prices. We had some experience in that line when we had a money famine by reason of the Spanish-American wars for nearly half a century, and prices had fallen in consequence thereof about 50 per cent; in other words, coin had advanced 100 per cent, had doubled in its purchasing power, and had advanced almost as much as gold has advanced since the demonetization of silver during that half a century. It was a sore trial to the Old World. We stood it better than they did on account of the new lands in the Mississippi Valley, which were being settled at that time; but the annual product which was being received amounted, on the average, during that period, from 1810 to 1850, to about \$40,000,000 per annum of the two metals. There was a little more than that between 1845 and 1850, in consequence of some discoveries in Russia. In two years from the discoveries the annual product of the two metals rose to over \$200,000,000. The product of gold alone rose to about \$190,000,000 or \$196,000,000, so that the product of both metals was over \$200,000,000. That increase of supply went on. It kept up during the first decade, and, in fact, kept up for twenty years. This vast increase, which almost quadrupled the output, and in twenty years doubled the standard coin of the world practically, did not raise prices more than from 18 to 24 per cent. The new activities absorbed them rapidly. There was a great boom in property, the world was set to creating property, and more prosperity was occasioned than had been the case in any century.

The question as to how great an extent the silver we could obtain would advance prices it is impossible to determine. It would not advance them so much, I am afraid, as we hope, for the reason that all the silver—

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator is not answering the question. The Senator from Illinois wants to know what the relative value of silver and gold would be if the mints were opened to the free coinage of both—what would be the commercial value?

Mr. STEWART. I thought the Senator from Illinois wanted to know what would be the relative value of our present standard with the standard we should have by adopting the two.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Nevada permit me?

Mr. STEWART. I want to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. VEST. I want to understand the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Do the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PALMER. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. STEWART. I will also yield to the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I simply want to ask the Senator from Illinois, in order to understand him, Does he refer to what is called the commercial value of silver and gold, or does he refer to the legal-tender value?

Mr. PALMER. The commercial value.

Mr. VEST. Then the Senator's question is, What would be the effect of opening the mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver on the commercial value of the two coins, the gold dollar and the silver dollar?

Mr. DUBOIS. In other words, the Senator from Illinois wants to have stated whether silver would be worth 50, 60, 70, or 80 cents in gold.

Mr. STEWART. I will address myself to that point. I did not

so understand the question. I understood it to refer to another point.

The relative commercial value of the two metals, I think, would be equalized at the ratio of 16 to 1 by opening the United States mints. I have several reasons for that. In the first place, there are now no bimetallic countries of any importance, if there are any. France for seventy years maintained the equilibrium of exchange between the two metals by keeping her mints open. Not that France was able to take or that she did take of either of the metals any considerable quantity, but the fact that she was a bimetallic country and that any person in the world could obtain a given price for his gold or his silver as fixed by the French ratio regulated the relative value of the metals throughout the world.

Now, if the United States, which relatively is quite as great as France was during that time, should undertake to pay a given and fixed price for gold and another fixed and given price for silver, it would necessarily fix that price all over the world, for no one would sell silver for less than the United States price. That is the way it operated before. Knowing that the United States would be able to take it all, that would satisfy everybody, and create an equilibrium between the two. I have no doubt. And I have no doubt of that because the silver is now all absorbed. There is not so large a quantity to be absorbed by the United States as many suppose. It is all taken now and used. There is no silver bullion in the world of any consequence, and the additional demand in the United States would take it to par. When it was thought the United States was going to open its mints silver came very near going to par. On the mere idea that we were to open our mints silver went to \$1.21; but when it was ascertained that our mints were not to be opened, that there was to be a limitation upon silver, and when a combination was formed between the Director of the Mint and foreign bankers that there should be no purchasers in the market except the United States and certain syndicates of foreign bankers, that fixed the price, and they put it down where they pleased; but if the price had been fixed by the opening of our mints silver would have gone to par, because nobody would have had any object in bringing silver here except to buy our commodities, and silver, therefore, would have been at the same price everywhere else as here, and it would not be brought here. There is no doubt in my mind but that the opening of our mints to the free coinage of silver would create a parity between the two metals at the ratio of 16 to 1.

But I will say to my friend while I am on the floor that, if it did not, we have the concurrent opinion of every bimetallic and economist in Europe that it would be disastrous to Europe and to our great advantage. They say that if we should open our mints before an international agreement is secured Europe will be more in danger from that than from anything else. A German writer, in an article recently published advocating bimetallicism and showing the danger that Europe was in from the invasion of Asia by having the manufacturing of the Western World transferred to the Orient, stated that he looked upon that as a great calamity. He says, "If the United States should act without us, ruin absolute would come." So there is no possible danger of injury to the United States from opening our mints. It is the concurrent opinion of every bimetallicist in Europe that we should be benefited. They say we should all be benefited by an international agreement, but if the United States alone should adopt the free-coinage policy, the United States would receive the special benefit and Europe would receive great injury. That is their concurrent opinion. Whether it would equalize the commercial value of the two metals or not is immaterial. It would operate to our advantage and its results must necessarily be good to this country.

Mr. PALMER. I asked a question—

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator desires to answer my question I do.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish, if the Senator will allow me, to suggest that the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has given a very apt and appropriate answer to that question in his Elmira speech of December 4, 1892, and inasmuch as this question is now up, if the Senator from Illinois will allow me, I will have an extract read from that speech.

Mr. PALMER. If the extract is an answer to my question I have no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. It is directly an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator will listen to my question, it is this: Will free coinage produce a silver dollar worth 50, 60, 70, 80, or 90 cents as compared with the gold dollar?

If the extract the Senator wishes to read is an answer to my question, I shall be very glad to hear it.

Mr. BUTLER. Do I understand the Senator's question to be, Will the free coinage of silver bring the bullion price of 412½ grains of standard silver equal to 25.8 grains of standard gold?

Mr. PALMER. That is the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the question. The Senator wants to know if it will do it.

Mr. PALMER. No, I do not ask that. I ask what would be the difference in the relative value of the two?

Mr. BUTLER. After we have free coinage?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from New York in his Elmira speech—

Mr. PALMER. The Senator might just as well answer me himself.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to quote a most eminent authority.

Mr. PALMER. I had asked the question, and if the Senator has an answer to the question, I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I will give the answer in the language of the Senator from New York instead of my own.

Mr. PALMER. I can read the answer of the Senator from New York myself if the Senator from North Carolina will furnish it to me.

Mr. BUTLER. In what the Senator from New York said in that speech I fully concur, and therefore I can state it as my opinion. In a very able argument reviewing the Republican position, showing that they had promised to make the intrinsic value of the two metals equal and had failed, after criticising the Republican methods, the Senator from New York said—

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from North Carolina will permit me to say—I am not sure whether he is a lawyer or not; I hope he is—

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to read what the Senator from New York said.

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

Mr. PALMER. I am endeavoring—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to know whether the Senator yields.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, yes; I yield for an answer to my question.

Mr. BUTLER. I will read this answer made by the Senator from New York, in which I concur:

Did ever anything but free bimetallic coinage, down to 1873, make our gold and silver dollars equal by every test? Did ever free bimetallic coinage, down to 1873, for one hour fail to make the silver dollar equal to the gold dollar, whether at mint or crucible, or at any market in the wide world?

Then a little further on he says:

But to maintain a parity implies the existence of a parity. No parity exists between the two. Melt the gold coin and it can be recoined again and again, a gold dollar, for its private owner, because gold has free coinage, and 25.8 troy grains are the fixed weight of the gold dollar. Melt the silver coin and it can not be recoined for its private owner. It can be sold to the Treasury, but for 75 cents or less, because silver has not free coinage, though 412½ troy grains of silver are indeed the present weight of the silver dollar.

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator understands himself to be answering my question I state to him that, in my judgment, he is not, and I decline to yield further. I ask this question because I want a direct answer to it.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, here is something, if the Senator will allow me, which bears directly on that question.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator will pardon me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield further. The Senator from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. PALMER. I have asked a plain, direct question, to which I have received an immense amount of wind in answer, not pertinent, and I decline to yield further.

The country should know what the expectations of the leaders of the free-silver movement are on this subject. The Senator from North Carolina gives me the views of the Senator from New York. I asked a specific and precise answer, and that ought to be an end to the matter, because this question is a vital one, and gentlemen who favor the free coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 to 1, if they mean anything else, if they mean that the free coinage of silver is a mere experiment, ought to say so. The interests involved are too great to allow of a mere experiment. The advocates of free coinage will not venture to say to the people of the United States, who are now considering this question so earnestly, that they have no certain views upon the subject or that they merely propose the unlimited coinage of silver as an experiment. The interests involved are too great to allow of a mere experiment. But, Mr. President, I venture the assertion that no leader of the free-coinage movement will undertake to give a plain, precise answer to the question: "What will be the commercial value of the silver dollar of 412½ grains under unlimited coinage compared with the present value of the dollar of gold?"

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, for fear the Senator should think that we acquiesce in that statement, I say emphatically the silver dollar will be the equal of the gold dollar.

Mr. PALMER. What, then, did the Senator mean the other day when he said that free coinage would increase the value of silver some and depreciate the value of gold some?

Mr. COCKRELL. And bring them to an equality.

Mr. PALMER. An equality? Then I suppose the Senator will agree with me that the point at which they become equal will be the standard of value, and not the existing standard of value. Still there is that indefiniteness about what point they will unite.

The importance of an answer to this question is found in the fact that all values in the United States are now based upon and are determined by American gold coin, and the further fact that in the event of the enactment of a law authorizing the unlimited coinage of silver dollars of 412½ grains of standard silver with full legal-tender quality that dollar will be the standard of value.

The silver dollar will rise in value until it meets the descending value of gold coin is the theory of the Senator from Missouri. What will be the exact relative value of the silver dollar when the two coins become of equal value? What will be the exact point of relative value when the silver dollar advances some and the gold dollar recedes some? Where will they unite, and what will be the standard of value when that point of union is reached? I have said that all values are now determined by gold coin. Then all values will be determined by silver coin; that is, as much as silver will rise, because gold will not remain to abide the competition.

Let me assume that the value of the local American silver dollar after free coinage will be 60 cents as compared with the gold dollar—the present standard. I will accept any other comparative value for the silver dollar which the Senator from Missouri will distinctly name, though I have already offered to advance beyond the 50-cent dollar, which it is thought by many will be its actual commercial comparative value after free coinage of the silver dollar. Upon the comparative basis of the 60-cent dollar the public obligations of the United States of all kinds, including contracts already made for the building of ships, the construction of harbor defenses, the improvements of rivers and harbors, and for all other public purposes, the bonds, the greenback circulation, the silver certificates, and the Sherman notes would at once lose 40 per cent of their present value. The invested educational funds of the States, counties, cities, and school districts of the several States, and the contributions of liberal persons, which now exceed \$200,000,000, would at once depreciate 40 per cent, involving a loss of eighty millions to that invaluable fund, most of which would fall upon that most useful and ill-paid class, the teachers in the public schools. The pensions given by a grateful country to the wounded, maimed, and disabled soldiers and their widows and orphans, and now amounting to about one hundred and forty millions, would be lessened in purchasing power some \$56,000,000. The funds in the hands of trustees and guardians, the deposits by the industrious in the savings banks, amounting to many hundreds of millions, would shrink in the same proportion. The wages of labor would be shorn of nearly half their purchasing power; the hundreds of millions invested by provident persons in life and property insurance would be enormously lessened, defeating the sagacity of the prudent, and the systems of national, State, and local revenue and taxation would require readjustment to meet altered conditions.

Mr. President, what are the advantages offered to the country as an equivalent for adopting this startling alteration in the monetary situation—an alteration which will affect and disturb the social and business affairs of every person in the United States and the political and commercial relations of the United States with all other countries?

One of the results promised the people by the adoption of the unlimited coinage of silver with forced legal-tender quality for all debts, public and private, is "more money," "higher prices."

Mr. President, the effect of the free coinage of silver on the ratio of "16 to 1" will be the disappearance of gold coin from the channels of circulation. It never has been proved—at least, no instance can be found in the commercial history of any country—where two coins differing in commercial value, as the dollar of gold and the dollar of silver, were in use at the same time. It is not possible. The commercial instincts of men induce them to go to the best market for their products; and the Senator from Nevada yesterday, or on a former day, made the just remark that, notwithstanding free coinage, the value of silver all over the world would be the same. If the proposition of the Senator from Missouri is correct and if the Senator from Nevada is sound in his views, the whole volume of silver money throughout the world would be lifted up to that plane to which the Senator from Missouri looked with so much confidence.

The pledge of the Government to maintain the parity between the coins of gold and silver will of necessity be abandoned, for no gold coin will be collected, either at the ports or for internal-revenue taxes, nor can gold be borrowed to sustain the credit of the Government.

The 426,289,916 silver dollars in the Treasury and in the hands of the people, which now have the commercial value of gold, will, upon the hypothesis of 60 cents as the commercial value of the "new dollar," unsupported by gold, have only the same value,

and all credit money and all credits will shrink in commercial value in the same proportion.

It is true as a general proposition that an increase in the quantity of money of final redemption favorably affects prices, but the necessary result of the unlimited coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold would be to expel gold coin from general circulation in the United States and leave the country dependent upon silver coin alone. The disappearance of gold coin and gold credits would be immediate. It would anticipate the free coinage of silver, which would be gradual.

It is probable, therefore, that the full effect of a law providing for the free coinage of silver would be a scarcity of even the relatively cheaper money. The "dollar" coined under the measures proposed would, in fact, be a new coin, heretofore a stranger to our monetary system. It would be known in legislation as a dollar; but the dollar coined under the act of 1857 had the commercial value of the gold coin, and the American dollar was worth nearly 3 per cent more than the gold-dollar unit of value fixed by the act of 1873. Here the proposition is made to establish a monetary system upon the basis of a metal which has but little more than half the commercial value of the coin it proposes to supersede.

I repeat that the passage of a law which would authorize the free coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 to 1 would not be followed by an increased quantity of money, but its enactment would produce an unexampled stringency like that which followed the collapse of all the State and local banks in 1857 to 1861. There is no fact which should be more distinctly brought to the attention of the country, pending this discussion, than that the immediate effect of a clear determination by the American people to adopt a law providing for the free coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 to 1 would, in advance of the passage of such a law, overthrow public and private credit, and produce a severe money stringency which would provide ample employment and rich returns to the usurer and the sheriff. It is also true that the unlimited coinage of silver on the ratio of 16 to 1 would alter the commercial and political relations of the United States to all other nations and organized peoples of the world.

It would erect a commercial wall between the United States and all the gold-standard nations, the height and strength of which would be determined by the rate of exchange, and the rate of exchange would mark the difference between the value of the local silver money of the United States and the gold coin of commerce.

Our large foreign debt, which is mainly payable in gold coin, would of necessity be partially or wholly repudiated.

The railroads of the country and the States and municipalities who owe gold debts would be compelled to advance their rates and increase their taxes or submit to bankruptcy or repudiation. I do not believe in case of the adoption by Congress of the measure of the free and unlimited coinage of silver on the proposed ratio that the people will be able or willing to pay increased railroad rates or higher taxes, and such legislation would make the payment of debts by railroads and municipalities impossible.

Another compensation proposed by some of the advocates of free coinage is that, as one standard of values would be identical with that of the Asiatic countries and the South American States, we would be better able to compete with them in the cheapness of production. In other words, it is said that in the silver-using countries, like Mexico, Japan, China, and India, the silver dollar, or a silver coinage of equivalent value, will buy as much domestic productions of those countries, including labor, as the dollar of gold will in any of the so-called gold-standard countries. If this is so, it is an invitation to the American farmer and the American wage earner to adopt the habits and accept the prices for their products and their labor which are paid to the peons of Mexico and the ill-fed serfs of Asiatic countries, whose wages are a pittance, and who subsist upon insufficient food.

Mr. President, impressed by these considerations, it seems to me that it is the duty of every representative citizen to insist that the question of maintaining and adhering to the existing standard of value, to which all property in the United States and our systems of revenue and taxation for national, State, municipal, and educational purposes, our pensions, funds organized and invested for benevolent and charitable purposes, contracts on behalf of the nation and the State, the municipal, corporate contracts and obligations, the contracts between citizens, and, in short, all values are adjusted, and that of adopting by a law of Congress the uncertain and dangerous experiment of authorizing the unlimited coinage of legal-tender silver on the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold, when the actual commercial ratio between the two exceeds 80 of silver to 1 of gold, an experiment which can have but one result, that of establishing a standard of value based upon doubly overvalued silver coin alone, should be clearly and distinctly brought to the attention of the American people. The movement favorable to the free and unlimited coinage of silver is supported by much of the speculative capital of the country, for it will be observed that miners and capitalists interested in gold bullion, confident in their ability to find a market for their gold, are anxious that silver

alone shall be the money metal of the United States; and these powerful interests are seeking for allies in many quarters, and are offering to them solid inducements that will, to some extent, find acceptance.

This interest has, by snap conventions, captured some of the States and may control national conventions.

In the face of this strong, vigorous, aggressive element its opponents falter and hesitate. Candidates for the Presidency and for seats in Congress take refuge in silence the most profound, and leaders refuse to lead, or if they speak or prepare platforms for the acceptance of their friends they indulge in language which justly provokes criticism, an example of which I will ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The severest Republican condemnation of the Ohio Republican financial plank comes from the Philadelphia Ledger, in whose words it is "a shuffling, evasive, complex, confusing, double-faced, insincere, and inconclusive statement; a mere trap for the catching of the votes of men of all sorts of financial opinions; a transparent bribe offered to the obtuse advocates of unsound, dishonest currency, as well as to those of sound, honest money; deceptive, misleading, a trick, a snare, and a lie, and meant to be so; the device of cunning, unscrupulous politicians, not of wise, honest statesmen." It is "in precise accord with Mr. McKinley's own financial declaration made in his recent Chicago address," the Ledger continues, and therefore it believes that "in view of Mr. McKinley's double dealing with regard to the financial question he should not be nominated at St. Louis. No one who in the South bids for the dishonest-money vote, and in the North the honest-money vote—Jannis-like, facing both ways—is fit to be the standard bearer of the Republican party in the coming Presidential campaign."

Mr. PALMER. All the indications point to the fact that the subject of that criticism will be the Republican candidate for the Presidency; indeed, I understand that the opposition has practically failed. I only protest that there shall be in this contest distinct, clear, precise platforms adopted by both political parties; and I have sought this morning to endeavor to clear away something of the confusion that attends this discussion. I have eagerly sought to know what will be the condition of the country or of its finances and its currency if the free-silver men succeed in the next election.

Mr. STEWART. We can answer that in a word. It will be prosperous.

Mr. PALMER. There is a sort of gratuitous promptness about that remark which lacks only one single element of usefulness, and that is precision. Will the Senator from Nevada tell me how we are to be made prosperous? I do not ask for a declamation, because when I feel well I am able to do all I want of that myself; but I ask Senators what will be the relative value of the new standard of value and of the existing standard? I have said that all values are now fixed by gold, and it seems to me that statesmen and financiers ought to be able to indicate with something like precision what will be the standard of value after they succeed in the policy they advocate.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President—

Mr. PALMER. In Mexico—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. VEST. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator in the middle of a sentence. He was about speaking of Mexico.

Mr. PALMER. I will conclude the sentence. In Mexico no gold circulates. I know of no silver country where gold is used. I know of no reason why the silver dollar of the United States, after free coinage on the ratio of 16 to 1, should be worth more than the silver dollar of Mexico is now worth in comparison with gold values.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. PALMER. With great pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. Japan is on a silver basis, and the Bank of Japan has \$31,000,000 in gold.

Mr. PALMER. How much of that circulates with the people?

Mr. STEWART. None of it.

Mr. TELLER. How much gold circulates here?

Mr. STEWART. None at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not a dollar.

Mr. PALMER. The Bank of Japan is said to have \$31,000,000 of gold, and yet, as compared with gold, the silver is of very much less value. What it is I do not know. I have endeavored to get the rate of exchange of silver between Japan and the United States and Great Britain. I have failed; but at the same time I do assert, with the most absolute confidence, based upon a most careful investigation, that in no silver country is gold either the standard of value or is it used in the ordinary affairs of life.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator from Illinois mean to say that gold does not circulate in Mexico and in India? It circulates in small quantities, it is true, but the gold dollar represents the legal-tender functions which the silver dollar has in both India and Mexico. It is very true that after you leave the territorial limits

of Mexico the commercial value of the Mexican dollar is some 52 or 53 cents, but the reason of that is on account of the limited export of Mexico. Mexico exports principally silver, a small amount of coffee, and a small amount of hides. But on the continent of Europe, where the Mexican dollar is worth 52 or 53 cents, the American dollar is worth 100 cents and exchangeable for gold.

Mr. PALMER. Why?

Mr. VEST. Because we export over \$800,000,000 of products every year; because our agricultural exports are \$505,000,000. As a banker told me at Carlsbad when he gave me gold for silver certificates, "That paper is just as good to me as gold, because with it I can buy anything that your country raises and pay any debt that is due to any American citizen." And yet this is always ignored by our gold friends; and we are told repeatedly that even in the event of free coinage the commercial value of silver must remain as it is or only a little better than it is to-day.

Mr. PALMER. Whatever may be the accident that determined the local value or the use of a silver dollar, so far as the United States is concerned, our silver dollar is of less commercial value than the Mexican dollar, treating it as a mere substance composed of standard silver. Whatever the accidents of business may determine, the great fact remains that in no case has it ever been found possible to maintain the free use of coin composed of metals so widely different in value.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator pardon me? I want to ask him a question. His original proposition, as I understand it, is that we are not warranted in the assumption that the free and unlimited coinage of silver would increase its commercial value. That is what I understand the Senator to claim.

Mr. PALMER. I have not said so.

Mr. VEST. Well, that is the tendency of his argument.

Mr. PALMER. I have asked the question with the greatest pertinacity, how much will it increase it?

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest doubt that it would put the two coins on a parity; that the silver dollar would be worth 100 cents as the gold dollar to-day is worth 100 cents, no more and no less. I can give the Senator my reason, but I do not choose to interrupt him now.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator will pardon me. I understand that his answer to me is that the dollar of 16 to 1, or 412½ grains of silver, will, in his judgment, be equal in commercial acceptability and value to the gold dollar of 25.8 grains.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest doubt about it. The single fact that it is so in the United States will control its value with civilized nations. Now, let me ask the Senator—we ought to be entirely frank about this matter; it is a very great question—how does he explain, if we are not correct in this assumption, that in 1873, when the silver dollar was demonetized and the unit of value changed from a silver dollar to a gold dollar, the commercial value of silver immediately fell? Up to the day when that act was passed silver was at 3 per cent premium over gold. The day after it was passed the commercial value immediately went down in the United States and over the world.

In 1878, five years later, we restored the free coinage of silver to a limited extent. We provided by act of Congress in the Bland-Allison Act that there should be coined not less than two nor more than four million ounces a month. The statistics show (I have produced them here and they can be produced again in five minutes) that from the very moment when that act was passed the commercial value of silver went up. After the Sherman law repealed the Bland-Allison Act the price of silver commercially went down. We then passed a law for the purchase of four and a half million ounces of silver a month, but not to be coined. The result was a speculative advance in silver for about a week or ten days, and then, as every intelligent man knew, not giving it the right to coinage, silver immediately relapsed and went down, as it has continued to go down ever since.

Now, if that is not a mathematical demonstration that opening the mints to silver will increase its commercial value it is absolutely impossible to make it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, what might be the effect of opening the mints of all commercial countries upon the value of silver I do not know. I know as little as my friends seem to know as to what effect upon the value of silver will be produced by free coinage. But I do know this. I say I know it, because I have the authority of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] for the statement I make. A difference of less than 3 per cent, as was the difference between gold and silver prior to the act of 1873, led to the exportation of substantially all the silver dollars. I make that statement upon the authority of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think I have stated it in that shape. There was very little silver coined into dollars prior to that act; only about \$8,000,000, while about \$150,000,000 in round numbers of silver was coined altogether. The main part of our coinage was foreign coin, made legal tender up to 1857. We were coining

about two million a year in 1861 and in 1862. At the time of the passage of the mint act we were coining at the rate of \$3,000,000 a year. But I should like to correct another error, if the Senator will allow me right here.

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator will pardon me, I will submit to any correction, but at present I am interested in this particular point. I have quoted him as authority for two statements on the floor. One is that the difference between the value of gold and silver before the act of 1873 led to the exportation of silver dollars, and the second proposition, for which I quote him as authority (and I am exceedingly glad to be able to furnish authority from such a distinguished, influential source), is that notwithstanding the passage of a free-coinage law by the United States the value of silver will be the same throughout the world. I think I quote the Senator exactly.

Mr. STEWART. No; I say that whether you pass a free-coinage law or not, silver being internationally dealt with, there will be an equilibrium in the price of silver bullion all over the world, less the accidents of exchange.

Mr. PALMER. That proposition is one which I desire to make so distinct that it can not be misunderstood. The undertaking on the part of those who favor the free coinage of silver—I say the undertaking, the thing which they promise themselves—is that the silver of the whole world will be advanced by the passage of an act of Congress directing the free coinage of silver and will all be brought up to the value of gold; not the silver of the United States coined in the United States alone; not the silver coined in Mexico alone; not the silver coined in all countries where coinage laws exist; but if the proposition is true that notwithstanding the passage of a free-coinage law silver will have the same substantial value throughout the world, it follows that the Senator expects that the passage of a free-coinage law will lift all the silver in the world up to the parity with gold.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; and for obvious reasons. We have had object lessons to that effect very frequently. Whenever there has been a movement in this country toward free coinage it has raised the price of silver, and it raised the price of silver in India just as well as it did here. In 1890, when silver went up to 121 here, it went up to 121 on the same day in India and Japan and London and everywhere else. When it falls here, it falls there. There can not be a difference of price with regard to silver no more than there can be a difference in the level of the water of Lake Erie.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, if that proposition is sound, it will make no difference that in England, Germany, and France free coinage is not known, and that silver is not coined in those countries as in any other. I accept the theory that the use of silver will have some influence upon its commercial value.

Mr. STEWART. Also in this connection let me state what the Royal Commission said. It said the fact that the mints of the Latin Union of Europe were open—the French mints, for the others did not amount to very much—kept an equilibrium of exchange throughout the world and made gold and silver throughout the world practically one money for commercial purposes.

Mr. PALMER. Now, does the Senator say that is true?

Mr. STEWART. That what is true? The only difference that ever occurred between the price of silver in London and Paris was the difference in exchange between the two places. As long as the French mints were open there was an equilibrium of exchange throughout the world. The Royal Commission attribute the divergence between the values of the two metals to the breaking of the bimetallic tie, the closing of the French mints. There is no doubt if the price of silver in this country is 129 it would be so all over the world. That is perfectly obvious.

Mr. PALMER. And if the price of silver is 68 here it will be so all over the world?

Mr. STEWART. It will.

Mr. PALMER. That much, now, seems to be settled; and it is claimed by the Senator from Nevada that the unlimited coinage of legal-tender silver in the United States would advance silver bullion, not only in the United States, but all over the world, to 129.

Mr. STEWART. That is what we claim. I want to state further in this connection, that we may not be misunderstood, that bimetalism does not depend upon parity at all. Bimetalism is the double standard. It is the right of the owner of silver bullion and of gold bullion to have it coined into money. The opening of the mints and the right of the debtor to pay in the cheaper metal is all there is in bimetalism. The operation of bimetalism is to throw the entire demand upon the cheaper metal until it brings it up to a parity with the other. That is the way it operated for four thousand years. If silver was more convenient to get when the mints were open everybody would use silver, and the demand being thrown upon that, it would raise the parity.

But it is a mistake to suppose that the silver-standard countries can not obtain gold as easily as the gold-standard countries, and much more so. Russia is a silver-standard country. She accumulated in the last twenty years about \$500,000,000 of gold because

she had plenty of money and business was stimulated so that she had something to export. Now, the Argentine Republic owes large gold obligations. I am told that they can pay them as well as we can, but they will pay them with exports, and they can get as much for their wheat as we can. Mexico has gold obligations to pay, and she can get the gold to pay them with much easier than we can. They do not trouble her at all, because she has something to export. The trouble with us is that at the present price for our commodities, the gold price, we can not export and make a living out of it. Consequently we can not buy gold without a great sacrifice. We are becoming bankrupt because we can not buy gold. Now, see what our fixed charges are, which are—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. I will refrain.

Mr. PALMER. I have listened to the Senator with great pleasure, but I propose to leave the floor in a moment, being indebted entirely to the Senator from New York for the time I have occupied. I wish to state in conclusion that mere conjecture and speculation furnish no sufficient ground for legislative action. I refer to the Senator from Nevada, because he represents more distinctly than anyone else the free-silver party of the Senate, unless it may happen to be the chairman of the Republican national committee, who speaks, I have no doubt, not only for himself, but for his party. I said that I have sought to get clear and precise information upon certain important points, because I wish the country to understand them.

I know that the free coinage of silver will lead to the disuse of gold. It may be temporary, as Senators seem to think. I know that the result of free coinage will be to establish a standard of value different from that which now exists. I have sought to know from Senators who ought to know what that difference would be. It is very important to the debtor and creditor classes in Illinois that they shall know to what extent their values will be affected by this new standard of measurement. They feel the burdens of existing conditions. They are anxious to know if any better condition can be pointed out to them. They want certainty, clearness, all reasonable precision, and in this effort of mine to obtain clear and definite information as to what the expectations of free-coinage men are as to the relation between the two standards I can not get a word. We have this hope, this vain and illusory hope—a hope contradicted by all human experience—that by mere legislation you can bring up an ounce of silver, now worth 68 cents, to \$1.29, which covers the comparative difference of the two dollars.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question.

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. Desiring to reach a conclusion as to certainty in the measure of value, I ask the Senator from Illinois to state whether or not he agrees with the British Royal Commission that the purchasing power of gold has constantly appreciated since 1873?

Mr. PALMER. No; I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. CARTER. I ask the Senator whether he agrees with the further proposition that the prices of products of human toil and of the soil itself as measured in gold have depreciated in value since 1873?

Mr. PALMER. I agree with that.

Mr. CARTER. I will ask the Senator from Illinois then—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana will pardon me.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to present the full question.

Mr. PALMER. I am asking questions now for the time being, and when the Senator gets through with my question it will afford me great satisfaction to answer his.

Mr. CARTER. I am endeavoring, if the Senator will allow me to conclude my question—

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the Senator if he will answer my question. I want to know what will be the comparative difference between the standard of value the Senator proposes and the standard of value which now exists.

Mr. CARTER. I have been endeavoring to answer that question by asking the Senator from Illinois questions which in and of themselves will answer it.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, of course the Senator has.

Mr. CARTER. It is merely—

Mr. PALMER. And when I consent to that mode of interrogation the Senator can indulge in it.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator from Illinois, conceding the fact to be that prices of all the products of human toil, the products of land, whether in town lots or broad acres—

Mr. PALMER. I have not conceded that.

Mr. CARTER. Have been constantly decreasing in value since 1873—

Mr. PALMER. I do not want the Senator from Montana to make me responsible for the poetry of his speech.

Mr. CARTER. And that the purchasing power of the gold

dollar has therefore increased, I ask whether or not the Senator, since certainty is desired, has any substantial hope to offer to the people of the country to expect a change in the current of perpetual and universal depreciation of prices under the gold standard?

Mr. PALMER. Now, I submit to the Senator from Montana whether he himself will say that that is an answer to my question. I asked him a distinct and plain question. I have given him an opportunity to answer it. Will he say to me frankly that he has told me what would be the difference by the standard of value produced by free coinage and the existing standard of value? That is the question I asked.

Mr. CARTER. My question was predicated upon the proposition presented by the Senator that certainty in the transaction of business is a necessity.

Mr. PALMER. I have never said that.

Mr. CARTER. I understood that to be one of the propositions presented.

Mr. PALMER. I am not responsible for anything the Senator has understood.

Mr. CARTER. Does the Senator now deny that certainty as to valuation of products by the measure or standard of value is essential to a fair and just line of transactions among men?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; I deny it.

Mr. CARTER. That is the only ground of contention between the friends of the gold standard and the friends of the bimetallic standard.

Mr. PALMER. I have often known ingenious gentlemen to seek to get an admission of their premises and then to suggest their own conclusion. I have been taught that in an argument no gentleman has a right to take anything for granted. Therefore, when the Senator asks me if I grant certain things I say I do not. The Senator must build up his own argument, based upon his own premises, and when he demonstrates his premises, to do which I will give him an opportunity in a moment, he can draw his conclusion.

I wish to say that I have lived in Illinois for sixty years. I have seen the time when lands—good tracts of land—were worth four or five dollars an acre. I have seen corn worth 10 cents a bushel. If the Senator will allow me just one moment I can perhaps state a significant fact in this connection. A neighbor of mine owed me \$34. I was about leaving home for court, and he wanted to pay the debt in corn. I told him I would take it. I had one horse and very little idea of what the horse would need. He asked me where to put it, and I said in a little crib that stood back of my house. I was absent several days. When I got to town a number of fellows were waiting for me and they followed me, and when I got to my house I found that the 334 bushels of corn had not only filled the crib, but had actually covered it all over. Corn was worth 10 cents a bushel. Corn was burned in the field because it had no marketable value.

I have known pork, dressed hogs, at St. Louis to sell for \$1.50 net. I have seen prices in that condition. I do realize the fact that there has been a decline of prices within a comparatively late period. Last year corn in Illinois, in my county, was worth 45 cents. But these were accidents.

This country, notwithstanding all that is said, is a flourishing one. There are changes in business. New machinery comes into use and takes the place of men. Employment is difficult to be found, especially in the lines that are termed skilled employment. This great social and economic change is going on. How it will result I do not know, but I will say that, in my judgment, whenever any party in this country succeeds in obtaining control of the Government and coins silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and makes that silver a legal tender for all debts, public and private, we will witness—not I, because I do not think that party will come into power in my brief day, but those who live then will witness—conditions of a character that will be so far beyond anything we witness now that they will sigh for the return of the good times of 1896.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe I will ask the Senator from Illinois a question, if he will allow me. The Senator is eagerly anxious to know what effect the free coinage of silver will have upon what he chooses to call the commercial value of silver bullion.

Mr. PALMER. I ask what will be the commercial value?

Mr. HARRIS. Now, the question I want to ask the Senator from Illinois is this: If he were the owner of silver bullion and had the right to carry it to the mint and have each 412½ grains of that bullion coined into a legal-tender dollar which would pay as much debt and buy as much property as any other legal-tender dollar that exists within the limits of the United States, would he take less than a dollar for each 412½ grains of that silver bullion, or would any sane man who owns silver bullion, when he had the right to have it coined into a legal-tender dollar which would perform every function that any other legal-tender dollar can perform, take less than a dollar for each 412½ grains of silver?

Mr. PALMER. I have been lucky in getting every sort of an

answer by my friends who favor the free coinage of silver except a direct answer.

Mr. HARRIS. My answer is that it will bring silver up to par value, to \$1.29.

Mr. PALMER. The answer to that is that it would bring up the value of the silver of all the world, according to the theory of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. I would be glad to see it so.

Mr. PALMER. I do not believe it. It is contrary to all human experience. I grant that giving an additional use to silver may advance it probably to some extent, as the Senator from Missouri says; but I do not believe that the mere action of the American Congress in giving to silver all the powers that can be given to it will establish a parity between a dollar of gold and a dollar of silver.

Mr. President, I have occupied a good deal of time, and I beg pardon.

Mr. VEST. Let me ask the Senator from Illinois one question in regard to a statement he made. The Senator used the expression in his speech, in a very aggressive way, that the silver Democrats had made some progress through snap conventions. Will the Senator from Illinois explain to what convention he alludes?

Mr. PALMER. I will. I allude to the conventions held last year in Missouri and Illinois.

Mr. VEST. Missouri?

Mr. PALMER. Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. Last year?

Mr. PALMER. Last year.

Mr. COCKRELL. In 1895?

Mr. PALMER. In 1895.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was advertised for six months.

Mr. PALMER. The convention called in June, 1895, at Springfield.

Mr. VEST. Very good. What was there in the nature of a snap convention about the Missouri convention?

Mr. PALMER. An unnecessary convention must necessarily be a snap convention. It was called for the purpose of committing the Democratic party to free silver.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was called to give expression to the opinion of nine-tenths of those in the Democratic ranks of Missouri.

Mr. PALMER. Why give expression if the party was so united?

Mr. COCKRELL. Because a few men were trying to misrepresent us by telling the Administration that we were in favor of the gold standard.

Mr. PALMER. If the term "snap convention" shall be at all offensive I will withdraw it, but I will say that I know of no better term by which to describe it. The Senator will have to supply me with one. It was a convention called for the deliberate purpose of committing the Democratic party of Missouri, in advance of any actual necessity, to the free-silver dogma.

Mr. VEST. In other words, the Senator from Illinois is kind enough to suggest that the Democrats of Missouri could be brought up against their consent and made to utter declarations that they did not believe. Now, what power could make them do that?

Mr. PALMER. I have not said that.

Mr. VEST. That is the meaning of the Senator's statement, because the Senator says it was to commit them. Of course if it did commit them in obedience to their own wishes and opinions it was not a snap convention, but a perfectly fair and deliberate convention.

Mr. PALMER. They were convened by their managers.

Mr. VEST. They were convened by their own will. The Senator from Illinois can speak for his own people, but he can not speak for mine.

The Democrats of Missouri, nine hundred and ninety out of every one thousand are in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and at every opportunity they have so expressed themselves. In the last convention held in Missouri, after due and deliberate notice, out of the whole State there were some dozen gentlemen who represented what they call the sound-money dogma, a catchword which is so false as to be almost infamous. It is an intimation that we who favor the free coinage of silver are in favor of unsound money, when the Senator has been combating here the idea that we can possibly be correct in saying that free coinage will make a silver dollar equal to a gold dollar. How can it be unsound money if the silver dollar will buy as much and pay as much debt?

Mr. PALMER. It will not.

Mr. VEST. We believe it will. The Senator answers it by saying he does not believe it.

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. If that is logic, I am perfectly willing to leave it there.

Mr. PALMER. I say it is contradicted by all human experience.

Mr. VEST. I say it is not contradicted by all human experience. I say that prior to 1873 for eighty years in this country we

had the aggregate of both metals, as Rothschild called it, gold and silver, for standard money, and we maintained them both, except that the white metal in 1873 was at 3 per cent premium over gold. For two hundred years in Europe gold and silver were maintained standard money. The Senator tells us human experience contradicts it. Never until 1873 in this country and until the coinage law demonetizing silver was passed was it supposed by the people of the United States that they would be called upon to do business with one metal as the standard money of redemption.

Mr. PUGH. The best way to settle it is to try free coinage.

Mr. PALMER. Free coinage has no attraction for me, even as described by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. That is not the question.

Mr. PALMER. The devising of a new dollar which has never existed in this country before or a coin that never existed in this country before—

Mr. VEST. The silver dollar?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; the silver dollar. I mean a silver dollar of 412½ grains of silver when the ounce of silver is worth but 68 cents.

Mr. VEST. What made it worth 68 cents? That is the question.

Mr. PALMER. The people did not want it.

Mr. VEST. It was made worth 68 cents, according to the Senator's statement, by closing the mints and taking away from silver its principal element of intrinsic or commercial value, which was the money element. After closing the mints and perpetrating this outrage upon the people of the United States, then they take advantage of their own wrong and say that the commercial value of silver has been lessened.

Mr. PALMER. In 1873 Congress passed a law for which I am not responsible. I believe there are Senators present who did vote for the law. But since that time legislation has been against silver, and you might as well attempt to resurrect a dead body and say that that body once lived and moved with all the energy and power of a perfect young life as to say that you can now, because it once lived, reinvigorate a metal and make it as valuable as it once was. The work is done. I did not do it. The world did it. It is done. Silver is worth 68 cents an ounce now to-day.

Mr. ALLEN. Measured by what standard?

Mr. PALMER. Gold is worth about \$20.64 an ounce to-day, and the idea that you can make them of equal value involves an absurdity that appears to me incomprehensible.

Mr. VEST. Now I will proceed with what I have to say in regard to the statement of the Senator from Illinois about the snap conventions. As to the Senator's last remark, I have simply to make this assertion: If, as I have shown and as the Senator can not deny, prior to 1873, when the mints were open to both metals, silver was not only equal to gold but at 3 per cent premium over it, why is it not perfectly logical and rational to assume that if you undo that legislation the result will be what we contend it will be, that the parity between the two coins will be restored?

Mr. PALMER. Because, if the Senator will allow me, the business of the world is adjusted with respect to the new relations, and therefore we can not do that.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon. That is not true either, with great deference to him. The world is divided between the use of silver and the use of gold and the use of both.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Missouri tell me any country where both metals are used for coins except the United States?

Mr. VEST. They are both used in Mexico, in India, and in Japan, where \$31,000,000 of gold is in the bank.

Mr. PALMER. For what purpose is it kept there?

Mr. VEST. It is kept there for all the purposes of gold anywhere, as a bank reserve, as money in circulation, as standard money of redemption; and yet no country in the world has advanced in civilization so rapidly as Japan. Almost unknown a few years ago, to-day Japan is in the front rank of Eastern nations and almost in the front rank of nations throughout the world. There is an evidence of the use of both metals, or of the use, if the Senator will have it, of silver alone. Yet we are told that nothing but disaster can come to the people of the United States if we now restore the old functions of silver, those which it had prior to 1873.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say one word in regard to the Senator's allegation about the Missouri convention having been a snap convention. I want to say now—and there is not a gold man in Missouri who will deny it, unless he is a lunatic—that the last convention in Missouri, deliberately called, upon full notice, after earnest and acrimonious discussion, was the most representative and the largest convention ever held in the State, every county and every township being represented. The Senator says men who were not leaders were at the head of the movement.

Mr. PALMER. I did not make that remark. I said leaders—

Mr. VEST. The Senator said the leaders did not lead.

Mr. PALMER. I said that.

Mr. VEST. Could the people of Missouri, the fifth State in the Union, have been brought into such a convention against their own consent and their own intellectual convictions? The people lead in this country, and the man who thinks he can lead them against their will ought to be put into a lunatic asylum and kept there for life. The people make the issue; the people assemble the convention, and a public man in the State of Missouri who would undertake to lead them against the free coinage of silver would be crushed so effectually that his remains would be unrecognizable.

Mr. PALMER. I am through, but I should like to say one word in reply to the Senator from Missouri. The Senator knows the extent to which leadership exists in Missouri as well as in other States, and his compliment to the people for their spontaneous movement has not about it the merit of any very great originality.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator from Illinois mean to say that all he has said to-day has been original? I think I have heard it in this Hall for the last eighteen years ad nauseam. If he has advanced a single original idea I should like to see it in print.

Mr. PALMER. That looks a little bit as if it were unkind.

Mr. VEST. I did not so mean it. The Senator said to me that what I said had no originality in it.

Mr. PALMER. No; I did not say—

Mr. VEST. The question is whether it is true or not.

Mr. PALMER. I did not use the expression in that form. There was nothing to justify the retort, which might provoke another retort of equal severity.

Mr. President, I am through. I yield the floor to the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL].

Mr. VEST. Of course I did not mean to say to my friend the Senator from Illinois anything personally disagreeable. If in the heat of debate I did so, I am sorry for it. But he certainly stated that what I said did not have the merit of originality. I was compelled to say that nothing upon the silver question is original. If there is an original idea upon it, the man who has discovered it is entitled to a patent beyond any question.

I was proceeding to say that if ever a convention of the people represented popular sentiment fairly, earnestly, and fully it was the convention held in Missouri to which the Senator has applied the epithet of being a snap convention.

I have—and it is all I shall say in connection with my personal history—struggled to the full extent of my limited ability to prevent the unfortunate condition of affairs in the Democratic party to-day upon this currency question. I stood here at the risk of severe criticism from men who agree with me in regard to the free and unlimited coinage of silver and begged the Democrats in this Senate not to thrust this issue upon us, if possible, but to hold the party together upon some conservative basis.

I went to the President of the United States in person, and to the Secretary of the Treasury, and undertook to show them what would result if it was attempted to force the Democratic party to the single gold standard. I told them that it was impossible to hold us together, whatever might happen to the Republican party, in which equal dissensions existed, but which had the cohesive power coming from being a minority party and which might cause them to survive this struggle for a short time, at least, in face of the great issue of protection to which that party is pledged. I stood here, as I have said, upon this floor, and was alienated by personal and political friends upon this side of the Chamber because I begged my party associates, if possible, to postpone at least this question in regard to the free coinage of silver until we could adjust other matters and crystallize the power of the party upon what I conceived to be its fundamental principles; but I also said, and say now, that if forced to the issue, I never would consent to monometallism, either of gold or silver.

That opinion is based upon my absolute conviction that there is not enough of either metal in the world to transact the business of mankind without oppression to a large majority. I believe that monometallism either of gold or silver is a dastard monopoly, which gives into the hands of the few the power to control the interests and the products of the many. But we have come now to that position when against all protest, all supplication even, the Administration has forced this issue upon us. We attempted when the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was before the Senate to effect a compromise with the Administration upon this subject, and offered to support that repeal against our convictions, provided they would make some concession to silver as a money metal.

That compromise was rejected, and we were then compelled either to follow the money ideas of Mr. Cleveland, the President of the United States, and of the Secretary of the Treasury, who gave his adhesion to him, either to follow their lead in regard to this matter and separate ourselves absolutely from our own convictions and those of our people, or to follow the manly and honest dictates of our own judgment. In such a contingency no self-respecting

public man could hesitate for an instant. I am, therefore, not responsible for this discussion or for similar discussions before the people of the United States.

Mr. President, this thing has come to that pass when manhood and decency will not permit us to stand here and be told that we are in favor of unsound money, that we are advocating snap conventions, and that we are attempting to lead the people in the direction of great disaster.

This morning I saw in the papers that our President had extended the civil service to something like 30,000 more employees of this Government. This Administration, therefore, has pledged the people of the United States, so far as it was possible, to the civil service reform, of which we have heard so much. One of the first elements of that reform is a divorce between the patronage of the Government and its political action. One of the burning tenets of this school is that the patronage of the Government should not be indirectly used for the purpose of influencing the political convictions or declarations of the people.

Some years ago a very dear friend of mine at my instance was made United States district attorney for the western district of Missouri; a man of eminent ability, of spotless character, who stands as high in the estimation of the people of Missouri as any man within its broad domain. When Mr. Cleveland was a candidate the second time for President, this gentleman, a Democrat belonging to the same school with myself, during the session of the United States Federal court at Kansas City, went at night to the adjacent villages within easy access of the place where the court was held and plead with the people to vote the Democratic ticket, which he believed represented the welfare of the country. I was astounded on picking up the St. Louis papers upon a certain fateful morning to find that my friend had been removed from office, without a hearing, simply because while United States attorney he had gone out and spoken for the party to which he and the President and myself belonged.

I took the train within ten minutes for Washington, arrived here, went to His Excellency, and asked him respectfully upon what ground he had perpetrated what I considered an outrage upon my friend, an eminent Democrat. He brought out a newspaper paragraph from a paper which had bolted the Democratic ticket the preceding summer, and also helped to beat the Democratic nominee for Congress. This paper had charged that Colonel Benton, my friend, while holding the office of United States attorney had been guilty of pernicious partisanship by advocating the cause of his party.

I knew the facts and had telegraphed to the judge of the court for a statement in regard to the way Colonel Benton had discharged the duties of his office and whether he had neglected them in order to give his attention to politics. Upon the next day the answer from the judge by telegraph reached me. I carried it to the President and said to him that I personally knew the incumbent had not been guilty of any dereliction or neglect of his duty in order to make speeches for the party to which he and I belonged. When the President discovered that there was no basis for his action, that this newspaper paragraph was simply groundless and dictated by personal or political motives, I will do him the justice to say that he immediately revoked the order; but, not satisfied with revoking it, he addressed a letter—published first in the press of the country—to Colonel Benton, in which he read him a lecture and said he revoked the order because he found Colonel Benton had not neglected his duties, but he wished it distinctly understood that while any man held office under his Administration he did not approve of his dabbling in political canvasses or endeavoring to put his opinions before the people of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will my colleague permit me to read what occurred at the Michigan convention recently?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Where does New York come in here? This is Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. One moment. I only wish to read a paragraph:

Tuscaloosa County sent 10 postmasters and 1 internal-revenue collector, and instructed them for silver, but they bolted instructions and voted against silver.

Mr. VEST. Let me understand of the Senator from New York whether I am taking his time?

Mr. HILL. I understood I had the floor.

Mr. VEST. I was not aware of it.

Mr. HILL. I had the floor and yielded to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. If the Senator from Missouri is nearly through, I will wait.

Mr. VEST. I am not disposed to raise the point of order, but I understood, with great deference to the Senator from New York, that the Senate had determined that no Senator could farm out the time here.

Mr. HILL. I did not farm out the time. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois, and I asked if I could be recognized after he was through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). The Chair will state that under the order adopted yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] was entitled to the floor this morning at the conclusion of the routine morning business.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from New York was distinctly entitled to the floor this morning; but the Senator had no right, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to give the floor to somebody else and then come in and claim it later.

Mr. VEST. I understand that to be the rule of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The Senator does not wish to do me injustice? At the time I yielded I asked the Chair if I could be recognized after the Senator from Illinois had concluded, and the Chair expressly stated that he so understood.

Mr. TELLER. Of course the Senator could be recognized if nobody else wanted the floor, but he has no right to farm out the floor all the time.

Mr. HILL. I did not assume to farm it out.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] is in perfect order.

Mr. HILL. I made the reservation which I have stated, and any Senator could have objected at the time if he desired to do so, but I did not assume to farm out the floor.

Mr. VEST. I was not in the Senate when it adjourned yesterday evening; I was called out by committee business; but I was under the impression that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] was proceeding in his own right, in his own time, and I am simply replying to some observations he made.

As I have said, the President of the United States, while he revoked this unjust order, accompanied it with the declaration that under his administration of the Government public officials whilst holding office should not dabble, as he expressed it, in political matters.

Now, what is the conduct of the Administration in regard to this money question before the people of this country? Mr. President, I say it with deep regret that this Administration has given its whole influence, all its patronage, all the power of eloquence and of logic on the part of its Cabinet officers to influence the opinions of the people of the United States and to influence the snap conventions of which the Senator from Illinois has spoken. There was not long ago—a year ago—a Democratic convention in Nebraska, and the next day it was flashed across the country that the people of Nebraska had decided for honest money, sound money—this being the cant falsehood that is used to entrap the innocent and ignorant voters. When the truth was known it was found the convention was made up of officeholders—postmasters, marshals, collectors of internal revenue—men who are living upon the patronage of the Federal Government, and whose lungs were filled with the air that came from the Treasury of the United States. This was a triumph of sound money! Where, then, was the civil-service reform that gives us to-day 30,000 new incumbents of offices who can only be removed for cause?

Why, Mr. President, there has not been a week when there was more than barely a majority of Cabinet ministers present in Washington to discharge the duties for which they are paid by the people of this country. They have been traversing their respective States, and even other States, haranguing the people in joint and single debate, denouncing the "silver lunatics," and talking about "unsound and depreciated money." Have we heard a single whisper of censure from His Excellency in regard to these proceedings? Have we heard any lecture from him such as was given to my friend when he dared to advocate the cause, the unbroken cause, of the Democratic party at that time?

But more than that. I do not read, as a rule, from newspapers, but I happen to have this statement, fortified by private letters, from the Adrian (Mich.) Press, whose editor is a man of high personal character and unquestioned veracity, and who was a delegate to the late convention in that State. The Senator from Illinois talked of snap conventions. Let the Secretary read that from an eyewitness who participated in that convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

DELEGATES WHO BROKE AWAY FROM INSTRUCTIONS.

Of the 823 delegates elected to the convention, 723 were present either in person or by substitute, as shown by the first ballot. Four hundred and ninety-seven were elected under instructions from their county conventions to vote as a unit for a 16 to 1 silver resolution. Granting that the 45 absentees were all silver men, the silver cause ought still to have 452 votes in the convention.

As the vote for Judge McGrath (310) was a fair test of the relative strength of the first candidate of the Administration gold crowd and the first candidate of the silver, it follows that there were 142 silver backsliders in the convention.

Every mother's son of the 142 is presumed to have acquiesced to instructions of their home conventions to stand by the silver standard to the last ditch, yet they came to Detroit and bolted at the start into the camp of the gold-bug Administrationists, where they were received with open arms.

Here is where the backsliders came from, together with the number from each county: Barry County, entire delegation of 11 instructed for 16 to 1 and all deserted and went over to the gold-bug Administrationists. Calhoun, 14 instructed for silver; 13 turned traitors and voted with the gold bugs. St. Joseph, entire 11 delegates instructed for silver; 9 were backsliders.

Muskegon, 7 instructed for silver; all proved to be traitors. Oceana, all 7 instructed for the white metal, 4 deserted to the gold bugs. Iosco, all 5 instructed, 4 deserted. Lenawee, 23 instructed, 5 deserted. Hillsdale, 13 instructed, 3 deserted. Cass, 10 instructed, 1 deserted. Clinton, 11 instructed, 9 deserted. Newaygo, 4 instructed, 2 deserted. Menominee, 7 instructed, all backsliders.

In other counties where no instructions were given, silver men deserted as follows: Alpena, 1; Bay, 7; Berrien, 5; Charlevoix, 3; Cheboygan, 2; Crawford, 2; Grand Traverse, 2; Gratiot, 11; Jackson, 10; Lake, 1; Lapeer, 2; Marquette, 1; Midland, 1; Monroe, 1; Saginaw, 12; Shiawassee, 2; Van Buren, 3; Washtenaw, 4.

The silver men had a list compiled from the returns of county conventions showing that had every county sent the full number of delegates, and had there been no backsliding, they would have had, counting only instructed delegates, a majority of 161.

Chairman Stevenson's private figures yesterday morning—not the figures that were given out for publication—showed a majority of 88 for the Administration.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I caused that statement to be read instead of reading a much more lengthy one from the Detroit Tribune and another from the Cincinnati Enquirer, giving the details more in extenso; but I should not have had any newspaper articles read except for corroborating private letters on my desk, which any Senator is at liberty to examine. I have not telegraphed to the authors for permission to read them in the Senate, and therefore shall not do so; but they are here. They come from men for whose integrity and veracity I am willing to vouch; men who have held high positions, who were delegates in that convention, and who are now delegates to the national convention to be held at Chicago, and who depict a state of facts which are disgraceful to American public life. It is stated by one of those gentlemen that two-thirds—I learn from another source that all except one—of the postmasters of Michigan were on the floor of the State convention.

I am prepared for the facetious remark that the material for delegates must have been very poor if they could have been bought or seduced after they arrived in the great city of Detroit. Mr. President, those of us who know anything about conventions know how this proxy system can be used to trample upon the will of the people. We know that when money even for travel cannot be obtained by the agricultural classes of the country there are men holding public office under the Government of the United States ready to pay their own way with proxies in their pockets to represent upon the floor of the convention a constituency by whom they would be repudiated. This convention in Michigan no more represented the will of the Democratic party of that State than I represent the will of an English constituency to-day upon this floor. The statement that the Democrats of Michigan are not for the free coinage of silver is, in my judgment, as false as to say that the Democrats of the State of Missouri are opposed to it.

It was stated in Missouri prior to the last convention that the gold men or sound-money men would control the convention. Out of 800 delegates there were not one dozen sent there who did not favor the free coinage of silver. Even from the great commercial centers like St. Louis and Kansas City the delegates from every ward except one were in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of the white metal.

I am a delegate to the Chicago convention against my wish, sent there by my people to discharge a duty. I have stated, under much criticism in Missouri, that I was a Democrat under all conditions and intended to abide by the action of my party; that I was too old to hunt for a new political home; that I should die, as I have lived, in the party of Jefferson, devoted to his teachings and principles. But I serve notice now that if this convention at Chicago is to be made up of Federal officeholders, brought there to overawe and override the wishes of the honest majority of the Democratic party throughout the United States, it is no Democratic convention with me. I shall abide the will of the majority of my party, honestly and fairly expressed. I make no threat, but I want no misunderstanding. The Democratic party is a party of the people, controlled by an honest expression of their will, and not by Federal patronage.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am rather surprised to observe that this is somewhat of a prelude to the national Democratic convention at Chicago. The date of that convention has been fixed for the 7th day of July, and I do not propose to anticipate any of the difficulties which will confront the Democracy at that time. While discussing the question of a snap convention between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Missouri it was appropriate, I think, that they should both allow me to speak upon that question as an expert. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, in order to avoid having any snap convention in New York the Democracy of that State, I think, propose to have the latest convention of any that shall be held this summer. I did complain a little of Missouri Democrats in 1892 that, notwithstanding all the alleged wrongs which had been perpetrated against the Democracy of that State by Mr. Cleveland during his prior Administration, they made haste pretty early to declare in 1892 in favor of "free coinage and Grover Cleveland." I am not going to discuss those questions here now. Neither am I to be

betrayed into a defense of the civil-service policy of the present Administration. At some other time I may have something to say upon that question. Neither am I going to discuss the question of the Michigan Democracy nor anticipate the result of the Chicago convention. As the vote on the pending question is to be taken within an hour, and I think it is understood that I shall occupy the time, I shall proceed immediately to discuss the real question involved here.

I take pleasure in saying that I do not concur in all which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has said. I do not understand that a snap convention can be one duly called by the regular officials of one's party upon ample notice. I do not agree with my venerable friend from Illinois [Mr. PALMER], who styled the convention of last year in Missouri a snap convention. I do not agree with the epithet used toward the convention in Illinois that was held last year. The convention in Missouri and the convention in Illinois held last year were both conventions called by the regular officials of the party, namely, by the State committee, after due notice, of which everybody was notified, and subsequently the conventions were held, after reasonable notice. A political party has a right, in my judgment, to meet at any time, upon due notice of its central committee, to discuss any question, to take any position upon the silver question or the gold question, or any other question involved; and those who disagree with the controlling powers of the party have no right to refuse to attend the primaries, but they should be ready always to attend the primaries, and attend the conventions, and then abide by the result.

I take but little stock myself in the clamors which are raised against so-called "snap conventions." They are usually simply the clamors of the defeated minority. The minority should attend the conventions, having ample notice, and should abide by the result.

I see that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] is in the Chamber, and before I proceed with my regular argument I wish to quote from a portion of his speech delivered the day before yesterday. The Senator said:

Here is a telegram from the Morgan syndicate sent on the 21st day of December to the President and Secretary of the Treasury, telling the Government officials that the gold can not be procured in Europe because the credit of the United States is so bad, and that if their bid of 104 is not accepted at once they will withdraw the bid and refuse to furnish the gold in the United States, knowing as they did, and as the Secretary knew, that all the gold not already in the Treasury had been thoroughly cornered by Morgan and the banks associated with him.

I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who, I assume, honors me with hearing me, to what telegram did he refer?

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator will find in another portion of my speech an allusion to that same telegram, in which I state the facts. I simply alluded to it there, and the remark was brought out by a question of the Senator from New York. I referred to the telegram in the body of my speech.

Mr. HILL. I am reading from the body of the speech.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator is reading from a portion of the speech which was in response to his questions. Nearly everything in the speech of which the Senator complains was drawn out by himself.

Mr. HILL. I am not complaining of the speech. If the Senator is satisfied with it I am. I simply ask the Senator to what telegram he refers? He said, "Here is a telegram." The Senator had papers before him. Will he be kind enough to produce that telegram? [A pause.] Mr. President, I desired to know something in regard to this, and I addressed an inquiry to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and asked him to explain in regard to that telegram. With the kind permission of the Senate, I ask leave to insert the reply in my remarks. I seem to have mislaid it. The information, permit me to state for the benefit of the Senator from South Dakota, received in answer to my inquiry of the Treasury Department, which I supposed I had here at my disposal, is that neither the Department nor any of the officials connected with this matter ever heard of such a telegram; they know nothing in regard to it, and the first knowledge that they had of it was when their attention was called to the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PETTIGREW. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Then that will be one of the facts to be established by the investigation; and it makes it all the more pertinent and important.

Mr. HILL. Is that all the answer the Senator can make to my inquiry? No, Mr. President; that will not do. I pass it. Yes; that will be one of the facts to investigate in this proposed investigation, if it shall be undertaken, and I shall await, and ask the Senate to await, with much interest, as to whether that allegation of the Senator from South Dakota will be sustained. There I leave it, with the privilege of putting in the communication from the Department, to which I have referred.

The letter referred to is as follows:

[Personal.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, May 7, 1879.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry regarding the statement of Senator PETTIGREW, on page 4835 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that he had a telegram from the Morgan syndicate (so-called) sent on the 21st of last December to the President and Secretary of the Treasury in regard to a bid for bonds, I desire to say that no such telegram or letter from Mr. Morgan or any person representing or represented by him, and no such bid was ever received by or brought to the attention of the President or Secretary of the Treasury or any of the officials of this Department.

Yours, truly,

HON. DAVID B. HILL,
United States Senate.

W. E. CURTIS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the line of the argument which I have marked out, I wish to read a complaint addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury from the Chase National Bank of New York, of January 16, 1879. I ask leave to incorporate the letter in my remarks, and I shall not detain the Senate by reading it.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CHASE NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK, TO MR. SHERMAN.

CHASE NATIONAL BANK, New York, January 16, 1879.

SIR: In responding to your favor of the 13th instant I beg to say that in discriminating on commissions in favor of a very few and against the many is a political mistake.

That the Treasury circular of the 1st instant does make such discriminations is quite apparent.

Prior to the 1st instant you gave one-quarter of 1 per cent to all subscribers without respect to amount.

Now you give as follows: Nothing on an amount under \$100,000; one-eighth per cent on an amount of \$100,000 to \$1,000,000; one-fourth per cent on an amount of \$1,000,000 to \$10,000,000; and an extra one-tenth per cent on any excess over \$10,000,000.

This practically and effectually excludes all banks that will not undertake to carry out one million subscriptions in six months, commencing January 1; and the banks that work up one million in the six months are placed at a disadvantage, for the three or four banks who subscribe for the 4 percents with a perfect abandon can and do give better terms by reason of the extra one-tenth which they reach out for, and which your revised scale of commissions gives them.

From your standpoint it is proper that you should exult over the enormous subscriptions obtained during the first two weeks after the resumption.

Pardon me for expecting that this apparent extraordinary success will in a few months be pronounced a misfortune.

My fifty years of observation in this financial bedlam justifies me in looking doubtfully on this overdoing, I fear, of a good thing.

Another point I desire to make: I decidedly dissent to the practice of leaving such enormous amounts of money in a few banks.

Your Department of the Government has a controlling power over the national banks, and no others can be depositaries of United States money.

It is true these deposits are amply, yes, doubly, secured; first, by bonds; and second, by a preferred claim on the banks' assets, a fact not generally understood.

As a matter of public interest, no bank should be intrusted with an amount of public funds so vastly disproportionate to its capital as is tolerated, and seemingly encouraged, in a few instances.

I am aware that some of the depositaries claim that their "surplus" is available as capital.

The bank department and you, as the supervisor of that department, should bear in mind that "surplus" can be divided among the stockholders, lawfully, without notice to depositors.

Capital is the only fixed security.

You will excuse me for taking an interest in the national banks as a whole rather than in less than half a dozen of them.

Hoping you will see propriety and justice in falling back on the popular scale of commissions adopted in your August appeal to the banks and the public.

I remain, very respectfully, yours,

JOHN THOMPSON.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HILL. I simply cite this letter for the purpose of showing that there were complaints then, as now, in regard to the distribution of the various bonds of the Government.

I also will introduce another telegram from Mr. SHERMAN to the First National Bank of New York, dated January 18, 1879, which I shall not trouble the Senate with reading, but ask to incorporate in my remarks.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

MR. SHERMAN TO FIRST NATIONAL BANK, NEW YORK.

[Telegram.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, January 18, 1879.

H. C. FAHNESTOCK,
Vice-President First National Bank, New York:

Can not vary from agreement stated in letter yesterday. See Morgan at his house to-morrow. He will arrange with you.

JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary.

Mr. HILL. I also wish to have incorporated in my remarks a resolution passed on January 24, 1879, by the United States Senate, not a resolution of investigation, but a resolution of inquiry of the Secretary of the Treasury, asking all information in regard to bonds, compensation, services to brokers, and in reference to all the alleged scandals which were said then to pertain to that matter. I do not think that there were any scandals in fact. The point I am making is that former Secretaries of the Treasury have been subjected to the same suspicions, to the same charges. They have been refuted, and so, I say, the present Secretary of the Treasury will amply refute these charges and time will vindicate him.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, January 24, 1879.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the amount of commissions or other compensation paid to bankers, brokers, firms, companies, syndicates, and individuals for services in negotiating the sale of bonds and other obligations of the United States, from the year 1862 until the present time; when and to whom such commissions or compensation was paid, and when paid to syndicates, firms, corporations, or companies, to state the names of the persons composing the same.

And also to inform the Senate whether any, and, if any, what amount of commissions or other compensation has been paid to bankers, brokers, firms, companies, syndicates, and individuals for services rendered in refunding any of the bonds of the United States; and if any such payments have been made, to state when and to whom made; and also whether interest has been paid on called bonds at the same time that interest was accruing on the bonds sold to redeem the same, and whether such double interest has been uniformly paid while the refunding operation has been in progress, or on bonds sold for redemption purposes, specifying whether there has been any exception to such payments of double interest, and who was Secretary of the Treasury at the time of such exception, and how much double interest has been paid on each class of bonds, and the total amount thereof, and whether the money received for bonds sold by any bank or syndicate has, in all cases, been allowed to remain on deposit with the national banks acting as Government depositories pending the call of bonds, specifying the names of the banks and the length of time during which the proceeds of the bonds sold have been left on deposit with each bank; and whether at any time any gold coin has been delivered by the Treasury to any parties concerned in the negotiation of United States bonds or otherwise in exchange for or upon the security of United States bonds or in advance of the payment thereof, pending any call of bonds on which interest was allowed or paid up to the date of maturity of the call; and also whether any money in the Treasury held for the payment of overdue called bonds has been left on deposit, without interest, in any Government depository, and what was the largest amount thereof at any one time, stating the names of the banks in which such money was deposited, and what security the Treasury held for the payment thereof when demanded.

"Provided, That information heretofore communicated to either House of Congress shall not be repeated, but references to the documents where the same is to be found shall be made, and names of subscribers to popular loans since June, 1877, to whom no commissions have been paid or allowed, may be omitted."

Attest:

GEO. C. GORHAM, Secretary.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, considerable was said in a recent discussion which was had about the necessity for a popular loan. The difficulty in awarding bonds to investors is very great. It is appreciated. Contained in the correspondence on page 618 of the book which I hold in my hand is a newspaper item, which I also ask permission to publish in my remarks, showing that the same tactics by bidders were resorted to then as now and that the same clamor of men who wanted to advertise themselves as disappointed bidders took place then. This is the item to which I refer:

After the 4 percents that have been offered were all sold, many large subscriptions were received, particularly from New York banks. These were not, of course, accepted. Some of them were forwarded to the Secretary after he had left the Department for the day. He is in doubt to-night whether these are all bona fide subscriptions, or whether those who sent them were not already aware that no more 4 percents were just now for sale, and whether they did not therefore make their offers for fame and not for the purpose of obtaining the bonds.

Mr. President, that is always the difficulty. When your loans are made in the Government there are men at the last moment making their bids when they know the Department is closed and the bids can not be accepted, and they do it simply for the purpose of advertising themselves. That was something like the situation with the Graves bid, and the situation with some other bids in this instance. This newspaper item simply corroborates that fact.

I also desire to have read a letter to Mr. SHERMAN from the Continental National Bank of New York, on page 623, and another from the National Bank of the State of New York to the Secretary, making complaints of unfair treatment, making complaints of favoritism, making against the distinguished Senator from Ohio the same charges that we have heard ringing in our ears for the last six months against the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury. He certainly will understand me. I am simply pointing to these things to show that they were unfair then, as they are unfair now—not worthy of investigation then, as they are not worthy of investigation now. They were not investigated then, but the Senator from Ohio, the then Secretary of the Treasury, was asked to explain in regard to them, to which I will allude later.

The letters referred to are as follows:

CONTINENTAL NATIONAL BANK OF NEW YORK TO MR. SHERMAN.

CONTINENTAL NATIONAL BANK,
New York, April 7, 1879.

DEAR SIR: Since our Mr. Randolph's letter of Saturday, the parties from whom we received the \$3,000,000 subscription, of 4th of April, have made formal demand upon us for the bonds. We supposed that your telegram declining to receive the same had set all question at rest. The parties now enforce their claim with the statement that others who subscribed similarly within the business hours of that day have been awarded their bonds.

The subscription in question is the one to which we referred in our first telegram, when we stated that there were "more to follow"; but as the particulars could not be made up until the day's work was over, they did not reach us until shortly after 3 o'clock, as has been the practice of the same parties with all the subscriptions they have made through us. They seem to think, therefore, that as their subscription was made entirely in the regular

and established order in which their preceding ones had been made, they can hold us to the delivery.

We should, perhaps, add that the parties in question were not members of the syndicate whose bid we afterwards forwarded, nor had they any knowledge of its existence.

Respectfully,

HON. JOHN SHERMAN,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington

FRED. TAYLOR, Cashier.

NATIONAL BANK OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK, TO MR. SHERMAN.

THE NATIONAL BANK OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
New York, April 7, 1879.

SIR: We telegraphed you to-day, as follows:

"Your letter of 5th received. One million seven hundred of our subscriptions were received by us about 12 o'clock. About one million three hundred were received between the hours of 12 and 2.30. Balance of subscription received after 3 o'clock.

"Our customers complain of serious loss, having made large sales same day against their subscriptions, presuming that the same would be accepted.

"If possible for you to accept the three million, or any part, please telegraph."

Confirming the above, we beg to add that the subscriptions comprising the amount, \$1,700,000, were received about 12 o'clock in the day, and the certificates issued and letters written and both duly signed before 2 p. m. Having been notified in the meantime that additional subscriptions to a large amount would be sent in shortly, we thought to inclose the whole in one letter to you, knowing that there was ample time, the Washington mail closing at 7.30 p. m.; and, in consequence of the large amount, we took the precaution to telegraph as soon as our total for the day was ascertained, say 3.30 p. m., and requested an early shipment.

The subscriptions were made in every way in accordance with our usual custom; and, in consequence of your declining to receive them, our customers, who have long been prominent dealers in United States bonds and subscribers to large amounts through us, have been subjected to great disappointment and loss. We knew of no reason for any unusual haste in dispatching our letters, and deviated in no respect from our usual custom.

The subscriptions and the order of their receipt were as follows: \$200,000, \$1,500,000, \$500,000, \$250,000, \$500,000; total, \$2,500,000, received prior to 3 p. m. We beg to hand you herewith a letter just received from Messrs. Speyer & Co., for whose account the subscription first in order, \$200,000, was received, which will serve to show our position in the matter and the view which is generally taken of the matter by all of our customers interested.

We beg to say, in conclusion, that we shall be greatly accommodated if the subscriptions, as stated, can be accepted; and we await your reply, hoping that the matter will be adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties. Your reply at the earliest possible moment will oblige,

Yours, very respectfully,

R. L. EDWARDS, Cashier.

To the honorable SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Mr. Carlisle will survive these attacks; history will vindicate him as history vindicated the Senator from Ohio. The names of the critics and fault-finders who found fault with the Senator from Ohio are almost unknown, while the name of the Secretary will live in the future history of our country.

In the famous book written by the Senator from Ohio, which I presume every member of the Senate has, the Senator himself speaks of the difficulties in the way of resumption which he encountered. He speaks of the difficulties which encountered him in the great refunding period wherein he administered the office of Secretary of the Treasury. He gives in full in his book one of the contracts which I have already incorporated in my remarks. He thought the contract was for the best interests of the country. He speaks of it in this form in the book entitled John Sherman's Recollections of Forty Years in the House, Senate, and Cabinet, page 642:

The importance of this contract and the open publicity of the negotiation created quite a sensation in the newspaper press, which presented a medley of praise and censure. All varieties of opinion, from extravagant flattery to extreme denunciation, were visited upon me by the editors of papers according to their preconceived opinions. I made no effort at secrecy and no answer to either praise or blame, but freely contributed any information in respect to the matter to anyone, whether friendly or otherwise, who applied to me. Perhaps as accurate a statement as any of my opinions was made by George Alfred Townsend, over his nom de plume of "Gath," in the New York Graphic of April 12, 1878. He said, etc.

Then he said further, and I quote from the book, on page 646:

The Eastern press, almost without exception, gave its hearty approval of the contract made and the mode and manner of the negotiation. The leading papers in New York, including the Herald, Tribune, and Times, gave full accounts. In the West, however, where the greenback craze, or "heresy," as it was commonly called, prevailed, the press was either indifferent or opposed to the contract and to the object sought. It is singular how strong the feeling in favor of an irredeemable paper currency was in many of the Western towns and among the farming people. United States notes, universally called greenbacks, were so much better as money than the bank notes were before the war that the people were entirely content with them, even if they were quoted at a discount in coin. They were good enough for them. Any movement tending to reduce their number was eagerly denounced.

At the very time when the negotiation was being made the Senate Finance Committee was discussing the expediency of agreeing to the bill repealing the resumption act which had passed the House. The indications were that the committee had agreed upon a time when a final vote should be taken upon this bill, and that it would be favorably reported by a majority of 1.

Subsequently a committee was appointed, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, and, under and in pursuance of a resolution which was passed, it proceeded to take up the matter. Then the charges poured in against Secretary Sherman. He says:

While I was congratulating myself upon accomplishing an important work for the people, I had aroused an animosity more bitter and violent than any I ever encountered before or since. I was charged, directly, by a correspondent of the National Republican, published in Washington, with corruption—

So is John G. Carlisle now charged with corruption—and that I was interested in and would make money through the syndicate.

Was I not right in saying yesterday that history is repeating itself?

It was said that I "came to the United States Senate several years ago a poor and perhaps an honest man. To-day he pays taxes on a computed property of over half a million, all made during his Senatorial term, on a salary of \$6,000 a year and perquisites." My property at home and in Washington was discussed in this letter and the inference was drawn that in some way, by corrupt methods, I had made what I possessed. It is true that I found many ready defenders, but I took no notice of these imputations, knowing that they were entirely unfounded, for I never, directly or indirectly, derived any advantage or profit from my public life except the salary.

At one time it was alleged that a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. Ewing, Hartzell, and Crittenden had been in correspondence with leading bankers, financiers, and capitalists, and that information had been obtained which led to the conclusion that I had derived profit from the negotiation. It was said that the committee proposed to interview me upon the subject of my recent syndicate operations; that the syndicate would get about \$750,000 commission, which could have been saved had outsiders been permitted to buy the bonds; that the committee had summoned members of the syndicate and bankers who were not admitted into the syndicate, but who wanted to be allowed to buy bonds without any commission; that the allegation was so well supported that a resolution was prepared authorizing the committee to investigate, but that this was unnecessary, as the resolution authorizing the Banking and Currency Committee to make inquiries concerning resumption conferred authority to inquire into this matter. The only sign of the alleged investigation was an inquiry from Mr. Ewing, which was answered by me, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 19, 1878.

SIR: In compliance with your request of the 18th instant, I inclose herewith a copy of the contract recently made with a syndicate of New York bankers for the sale of 4½ per cent bonds. The only previous correspondence on this subject was a letter sent to said bankers and one to the presidents of certain national banks, copies of which are inclosed.

In response to your question as to the amount of accrued interest that will be allowed to the syndicate at each payment on account of such sales, I have to reply that no accrued interest is paid to them; but, as you will see by the fourth paragraph of said contract, they are to pay the United States the amount of interest accrued on the bond up to the time of payment for it in addition to the premium of 1½ per cent. The interest on the 4½ per cent bonds accrued on the 1st of March, and therefore the interest is added from that date to the date of payment for the bonds.

The amount of commission to be paid is fixed by the law at one-half of 1 per cent, but out of this the associates are to pay all expenses incurred by them in the sale, and reimburse the United States all expenses incurred by it as stated by said contract in paragraph 5.

Very respectfully,

JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary.

HON. THOMAS EWING,
Acting Chairman Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives.

Mr. President, unquestionably all that is true. The point for which I read from this book that will live in history when the men who traduced SHERMAN are forgotten is to show that his worthy successor has been subjected to the same mean, vile, contemptible criticism, that the same charge is made against him of complicity with syndicates, of accepting commissions from syndicates, and so on.

The Democratic committee of the House of Representatives did not rush in to have an investigation. Oh, no, Mr. President; they did not propose to adopt a resolution offensive in its terms, as this was when it was first proposed. They sent a letter. They asked the Secretary's appearance at one time. Then subsequently he himself wrote the following letter:

MAY 21, 1878.

DEAR SIR: I notice the crazy barkings of Buell in the Post about the syndicate, and favors granted to it by me.

I wish to say to you that nothing would please me better than to have the Banking and Currency Committee examine into this matter, and I am quite sure you will be gratified that the result will be to my credit.

Now, mark these words—

I have no desire to dignify this by asking an investigation, but only to say to you privately, as a personal friend, that I court, rather than fear, such an inquiry.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

HON. THOMAS EWING,
House of Representatives.

So, Secretary Carlisle to-day did not wish to dignify the whole matter by asking for an investigation. He was willing to bide his time. As I said four or five weeks ago, when this discussion first began, I was not authorized to speak for the Secretary when opposing the proposed investigation.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator if Mr. Carlisle has written a letter similar to the one he has just read.

Mr. HILL. I will come to that in a few moments; I am glad the Senator has asked the question. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio took the correct position at that time when he said he did not wish to dignify the proceeding by asking an investigation, but he was willing at all times to appear before a committee of either House to answer any question. That is the way, sir, that Secretary Carlisle should have been treated by the Senate. Its Committee on Finance should have invited him to come before them and explain any transaction about which they had any doubt. That is the correct, that is the manly course. The Democrats on the committee, in my humble judgment, should have seen fit if they had any doubt—Mr. President, they did not have any doubt about it—

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to add a word or two to the remarks already made.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is at liberty to do so.

Mr. SHERMAN. Of that committee Mr. Buckner, of Missouri, I believe, was then chairman. Mr. Ewing was the most active member. They all asked me to come before the committee of the House, and I was examined there for days. A book of probably 100 or 150 pages gave all the details of the examination. I feel bound to say that they treated me very kindly, as I have no doubt Mr. Carlisle will be treated kindly by any committee. They asked all sorts of questions, and they received answers so fully that at the close Mr. Buckner was very complimentary to me; and that was the end of it. There were no further remarks made about it, so far as I know. That was in regard to resumption in 1878.

If the Senator from New York will allow me, I will state that I think myself whenever the slightest insinuation or doubt or charge is made against an officer, especially of the Treasury Department, about which there will be naturally a great deal of feeling, because there is a great deal of responsibility, the best way is for him to come before the two bodies of Congress and there give all the information he possibly can. I did that before a committee of the Senate and a committee of the House of Representatives, both of which were strongly Democratic at the time. I was fairly treated by them and very justly in their report.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator also says in the letter which I read that he would not dignify the proceeding by asking for an investigation, which was true, and that is what Mr. Carlisle has done. He submitted to the newspaper attacks; he submitted to the attacks in the Senate.

Now, Mr. Boutwell did not escape either. In 1872, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, a proceeding was instituted rather offensive in its character, and it was started by a resolution. I read from the Congressional Globe:

NEGOTIATION OF LOAN.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, recommending the adoption of the following resolution: "Resolved, That in the opinion of this House the Secretary of the Treasury, in negotiating the loan authorized by the act of July 14, 1870, has neither increased the bonded debt nor incurred an expenditure contrary to law."

Mr. DAWES. I now enter a motion to recommit this resolution to the committee.

Mr. COX. I desire to offer a substitute for the resolution reported.

Mr. DAWES. I will hear it read.

The Clerk read the proposed substitute, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee of Ways and Means be instructed to report the bill before them prohibiting all commissions, deductions, or compensation of any kind to any person for the sale, negotiation, and exchange of United States securities, and prohibiting the employment of any agent except a proper officer of the Treasury Department for such sale, negotiation, and exchange."

Mr. DAWES. I can not admit that now. On the 4th of December last the gentleman from New York who has just taken his seat [Mr. Cox] offered a preamble and resolution, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Whereas it is alleged that the Secretary of the Treasury, in placing the newly authorized 5 per cent bonds upon the market, has, in defiance of the law creating them, increased the public bonded debt, and has exceeded the one-half of 1 per cent allowed by the funding act for all expenses in placing said loan: Therefore

"Resolved, That the Committee of Ways and Means be directed to investigate the said transaction and have power to send for persons and papers, and to report the amount of such increase of the bonded debt, if any, the agents employed and paid by him for the services rendered, all contracts pertaining to the same, and the sums paid to said agents."

Mr. DAWES. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was not adopted by the House, but was referred to the Committee of Ways and Means for consideration. The committee invited the Secretary of the Treasury and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] before them, and heard both so far as they desired to be heard.

There was complaint made that too much money was paid in commissions for financial negotiations which were had. The resolution was not adopted by the House, as Mr. Dawes says in his speech, but was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration. That is what I think should have been done with the pending resolution, but I am not now going to discuss that question, because yesterday the Senate refused to refer the resolution in the first instance to the committee.

The committee invited the Secretary of the Treasury and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] before them, and heard both so far as they desired to be heard.

Here was a resolution complaining of the fees and commissions paid to various parties on the sale of these bonds upon which there was a lengthy and elaborate and caustic debate. It was not passed but simply referred to the committee, and the committee invited the Secretary of the Treasury before them, and then he explained.

Now, I want to put in, with the kind permission of the Senate, a few extracts from these speeches, which I do not intend now to detain the Senate with reading. Here will be found denunciations of the syndicate, denunciations of Secretary Boutwell, complaints of all kinds and character, in which the fiscal affairs were denominated fiscal failures and scandals, in which members of the House congratulated themselves that, although they had not obtained any particular advantage by this discussion, as one of them says, "It has developed enough; it has killed the syndicate. The cry is, 'No more syndicates.'" They flattered themselves that

their very vigorous and eloquent speeches had killed the syndicates. They imagined that no more in the history of the country would capitalists be appealed to to supply money to purchase Government bonds:

Mr. Speaker, as I was unable to agree with the majority of the Committee of Ways and Means in the report submitted by the chairman last week relative to the legality of the arrangement entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury with Jay Cooke & Co. and their associates, known as the syndicate, in the refunding of a portion of the first \$300,000,000 of the bonded debt of the United States, under the act of July 14, 1870, I have thought it best to state the reasons for my dissent to the House, as the action taken on the report and resolution submitted will doubtless govern the action of the Secretary in the disposition of the remaining \$1,300,000,000 which by that act he is authorized to put upon the market, so that our determination of the question has a far greater significance than the mere vindication of the past action of the Secretary, however desirable that may be regarded. I do not desire in this matter to seek any party advantage; I certainly would not knowingly do the Secretary injustice; indeed, I regret that it became my duty to investigate the matter, as it was a subject entirely new to me, and one to which I had not given as much consideration heretofore as perhaps I ought.

The resolution submitted by the House to the committee is as follows: "Whereas it is alleged that the Secretary of the Treasury, in placing the newly authorized 5 per cent bonds upon the market, has, in defiance of the law creating them, increased the public bonded debt and has exceeded the one-half of 1 per cent allowed by the funding act for all expenses in placing said loan: Therefore

"Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be directed to investigate the said transactions, and have power to send for persons and papers, and to report the amount of such increase of the bonded debt, if any, the agents employed and paid by him for the services rendered, all contracts pertaining to the same, and the sums paid to said agents."

The only evidence taken by the committee was that of the Secretary and Jay Cooke, whose statements are attached to the report of the majority, and the only sections of existing laws which it is necessary to consider specially are the following.

But I do not agree that the increase of \$135,000,000 in the bonded debt of the country, which did take place in the transaction which we are considering—a considerable portion of which increase still continues—was either necessary or proper; and I am further of opinion that the contract entered into by the Secretary with Jay Cooke & Co. (for the syndicate) was not authorized by law, and gave these gentlemen an unnecessary and improper control of the funds of the Government for the purpose of private gain, which Congress ought not to sanction or establish as a precedent, which will authorize the present or any future Secretary to adopt it in the disposition of the remaining \$1,300,000,000 of the bonds directed to be sold. I propose as briefly as I can to state the facts which, under the laws I have stated, have led me to these conclusions.

I understand the meaning of that and the other sections of the act of July 14, 1870, to be to make all the surplus gold in the Treasury equally applicable to the payment and cancellation of the 5-20 bonds which have become redeemable as the proceeds of the sale of the new 5 per cent bonds are; and I suppose there never was a day since the 14th of July, 1870, when there was not from fifty to seventy-five million dollars of gold in the Treasury, or in the several depositories, subject to the order of the Secretary. I am, therefore, utterly unable to see, when there were many hundred millions of the 5-20 bonds redeemable at the option of the Secretary, why, with \$135,000,000 of new 5 per cent bonds sold, as he states in his report, before September 1, and with over \$50,000,000 of other gold lying idle in the Treasury, he only called in and stopped interest upon \$100,000,000 by his notice of September 17, 1871, unless it was, as I said before, to allow the syndicate to hold and use the money for their personal benefit, while the people were paying interest on both sets of bonds.

Thus Jay Cooke & Co. received as commission on a subscription for, say, \$85,000,000, over \$773,000, less expenses, etc., while the banks received \$226,938 on their subscription for \$115,775,500. But the great profit to Messrs. Jay Cooke & Co. in this contract with the Secretary, in the way it has been managed, consisted in the loan to or retention by them of the Government money, while they were drawing interest on the bonds which they had purchased with it. Nobody doubts that it was worth to them at least 6 per cent, which on \$135,000,000 for the three months is \$2,025,000, from September 1 to December 1, while held under contract. But that is not all. They had it, on an average, say, from the 20th of August, or one-third of a month before the notice of September 1 was given. The interest for that time (\$225,000) must be added. The Secretary says in his report of December 4 that more than \$80,000,000 had then been received under the notice and call of September 1. If it had then reached \$81,000,000 he would have said so.

The amount the syndicate has received or will necessarily make by the transaction may be stated thus:

Commissions (less expenses, amount unknown).....	\$773,000
Interest before September 1.....	225,000
Interest under contract from September 1 to December 1.....	2,025,000
Interest after December 1 on \$85,000,000, called for under notice of December 7 and December 20.....	506,250
Interest after December 1, on \$13,000,000 of first \$100,000,000, till now.....	130,000
Total.....	3,659,250

This is but the beginning of the refunding system under the law of July, 1870. Thirteen hundred million dollars are yet behind, if these contracts and arrangements entered into so far are now indorsed and declared valid by Congress, when the \$300,000,000 to be refunded at 4 1/2 per cent interest and the \$1,000,000,000 at 4 per cent are put upon the market, loans to syndicates for six, nine, and twelve months may be made after the new bonds bearing interest are issued, notices of redemption of the outstanding bonds may be withheld as long as it is necessary, and when complaint is made that the law has been violated, the action of this Congress on the report of the majority of the Committee of Ways and Means, if it is adopted, will be relied on as a precedent, giving authority for whatever any Secretary may see fit to do. Your present Secretary may be removed or resign to-morrow; a less trustworthy man may take his place. Men entertaining other views may be in power long before the \$1,300,000,000 of bonds are refunded. In short, whenever violations of law are sanctioned on any pretext whatever, the Government is at sea without a compass and without a rudder.

Then there was a flurry and a fight! The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Maynard], of the Ways and Means, fiercely called my colleague to order.

He was in such high dudgeon at this truthful and prophetic remark that my colleague barely missed being honored by a second censure. Still he reiterated that there were tricks to be guarded against from a class of selfish and adventurous bankers. This was before the "syndicate" had been baptized, though it was doubtless born and active at that time. On the 1st of July, 1870, that bill passed the House. I was one of those who did not vote for it nor against it; I feared the Greeks. As my colleague's amendment against employing agents had been voted down, I was apprehensive that such corrupt agencies would be used, as it were, constructively; for the very voting down of the amendment would have been made, as we can now see, a pretext for the employment of suspicious agencies outside of the Treasury. The bill, however, was not a bad one. It was rightly called a bill for "refunding and consolidating" the debt. If squarely executed, it would have avoided the late questionable transactions as to the syndicate; and it would have enabled the taxpayer to save the 2 per cent which it was claimed would have been saved by the issuance of an untaxed long bond of 4 per cent.

In a time like this, when scientific and mechanical agencies are cumulating means; when the gold and silver of the mountains are being delved after with such skill, persistency, and reward; when only since 1880 the English home debt has diminished one hundred millions, and when, as we have boasted, we pay the same on our debt per year; when money is so plentiful that in seven years, up to 1887, the world's national debt has increased \$5,000,000,000, not counting the enormous railway debts of the world—\$1,500,000,000 more—at such an epoch of the world; when credit, once a pigmy, has become a gigantic wonder, our nation, under its boasted rule of men "entirely great," goes around the world dickering with parvenu bankers and sordid syndicates at the rate of seven and a half millions as commissions on fifteen hundred millions only, and that, too, at an interest or premium 1 per cent greater than the average rate of all other nations!

I speak in no party sense when I say that we are humiliated by such fiscal failures and scandals.

Although my resolution is ignored by the Ways and Means Committee it has been productive of good. It has developed enough. It has killed the syndicate. The cry is, "No more syndicates."

I have proposed a bill similar to that of the Secretary, which will crystallize my ideas into a repealing law. If my resolution has done no other good, it has at least proclaimed the glaring defects of the law, so loosely construed, even if for good purposes. The country should be thankful that the attention of Congress is called, not only to the exceptional and juggling legislation of the last Congress, with a view to its remedy, but called also to the fact that one of the best members of the Cabinet has fallen into the practice of the head of the Government, and has assumed authority never conferred.

Besides, it became indispensable, under the light of free journalism and Congressional criticism, that our credit should not be further tampered with and dishonored by such a system of private greed and favoritism. We do not want to grant an exclusive monopoly to dicker in the public securities. Truly, we have had enough of these manipulations and mutations of our investments. Their effect reaches every element of our wealth, every industry of our land, and every dollar of our capital. I have an extract here which illustrates what I say in a remarkable way:

"Extent of the ring operations.—Though the Treasury ring rarely uses a dollar of its own money, its financial operations count up among the thousands of millions. The contents of our National Treasury is ever at its command, and at times it controls and manipulates for its own benefit the entire bonded debt of the nation. Able at any time to secretly lock up or unlock one or more hundred million dollars of the people's money, it controls the value of the merchants' wares and the products of our manufacturers, farmers, mechanics, and day laborers throughout the length and breadth of the land. Having the power to manipulate our national debt by withdrawing bonds from the market and secretly or openly putting them aloft again, always at Government expense, the ring has our money market almost, if not wholly, in its control. Counting Mr. Boutwell's syndicate operation, a large portion of our national debt has been manipulated into and out of the market not less than thirteen times during the last ten years. Anyone at all familiar with the ring's operations can trace these astounding financial jobs for himself. Take a portion of the \$200,000,000 of the new 5 percents recently put upon the market, for example. This is the way it was manipulated:

"1. It was put in the market ten years ago by the Treasury Department in the form of Treasury warrants, certificates of indebtedness, quartermaster's vouchers, etc.

"2. Next withdrawn or purchased in by ring brokers at a heavy discount.

"3. It then appeared in the market in the form of greenbacks.

"4. Greenbacks drawn out by secret sale of Treasury ring commission brokers.

"5. The 7.30 Treasury note makes its appearance.

"6. The 7.30 note is withdrawn by ring brokers.

"7. Finds the honest greenback again in its place.

"8. The greenback is again withdrawn by the ring.

"9. Shows the 5.20 bonds to have taken up a position.

"10. The five-twenties, or a small portion of them, disappear syndicateward.

"11. The long-lost gold coin appears again.

"12. Gold coin disappears—what little there is of it.

"13. After a sojourn of ninety days in the syndicate, the new 5 percents make their appearance in the market.

"A portion of the 5 percents were exchanged directly for five-twenties, thus reducing slightly the number of manipulations of the portion directly converted; the balance was managed as above stated, making thirteen manipulations in all."

This may or may not be exactly the manner in which this remarkable syndicate performs; but it is by no means distant from the truth. Talk about Biddle and the United States bank! Talk about the pet bank system of thirty years ago. They were as molehills to this mountain of fiscal favoritism.

And all these remarkable transmutations, which have no parallel in the sleights of the oriental juggler, are done by what? A syndicate! And what, in the name of the common people, is a syndicate?

Mr. President, one has only to read this extensive debate to see how senseless were some of these accusations, how unfounded they were, how it was simply an effort to assail men who had in an emergency of the country loaned money to the Government upon bonds; and I put in a little statement from a speech showing how much the syndicate received or necessarily made by the transaction, and some figures of about \$4,000,000—some \$4,000,000 charged as commissions. There were the same charges made against Jay Cooke & Co. during the war.

Mr. President, this present proceeding is nothing new. It is an attempt simply to dignify the proceeding because we are approaching a Presidential campaign, and that is all there is of it. There

is nothing whatever to investigate. I said the other day, and I do not care now about repeating it, I am opposed to the principle that every time a charge is made against an official of the Government it must be investigated and dignified by a formal investigating committee. I suppose I will be charged now with being the champion of Jay Cooke & Co., and the champion of all the syndicates, because I am simply referring to what history shows us.

So much in regard to Secretary Boutwell. Another attack was instituted on Mr. Sherman in an elaborate article published in the New York newspapers. I have it here, but will not ask permission to insert it. I do not take any stock in the article, but newspapers influence public opinion; newspapers create scandal at times; newspapers sometimes stir up such demonstrations as are witnessed here when men, as I think, from moral cowardice, are afraid to oppose an investigation because somebody thinks that something is wrong.

Mr. President, I am not going to be led at this late hour into a discussion of the silver question proper. I had intended a week or two ago to take this opportunity to express some views upon the subject. I have not now time. I simply call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the so-called Bland dollar was never a full legal tender; it was only a legal tender for debts wherein some other form of currency was not expressly provided for in payment. Not being a full legal tender, a question of propriety arises as to whether the Government should compel a person at this late day to accept silver dollars in payment of his obligations against the Government. Should a holder of securities be compelled to accept in payment a silver dollar which itself is not a full legal tender, not a legal tender when he proposes to pay off his railroad mortgages payable in gold, not a legal tender when he proposes to liquidate any contract the terms of which are payable in gold? Need I say to you, sir, that nearly all the railroad bonds of this country are payable in gold? Need I tell the Senate that nearly all the contracts that are now made are made in gold? You may say it is not right, it ought not to have been; but it has been done. The history of the last thirty years shows it. And now we are asked that the holders of these securities shall be compelled to accept a Bland dollar authorized in 1878, which itself is not a legal tender, and which itself will not pay any of the securities payable in gold.

Mr. President, it is true that it was a mistake on the part of the true friends of silver coinage to consent to any such provision being placed in the coinage act authorizing the Bland dollar. I am one of those who believe that the currency, or rather money, created by the country, coined by the country, should be itself a legal tender for every debt, so that it could be paid upon every railroad security, paid to every debtor. Instead of that we have the Bland dollar, which of itself necessarily becomes a depreciated currency.

Mr. President, a word more about popular subscriptions. The February syndicate of 1895 represented banks all over the country, and those banks in turn represented individual interests. There may be a few persons so credulous as to believe that the syndicate in the purchase of the bonds represented no one but themselves. That is not true. The syndicate embraced banks in different parts of the country, and those banks embraced individuals. A syndicate is simply the representative or the agent of all those who desire to invest in common. Individual bidders usually obtain gold from the Treasury. That has been demonstrated over and over again. The value of dealing with the syndicate arises from the fact that the syndicate usually procures its gold from abroad, and that is for the benefit of the country and relieves the Treasury. Individual subscribers usually do not. If we are to have free coinage of silver every dollar should be made a full legal tender. No one will question that. Parties should not be obliged to accept a depreciated dollar. Parties should not be obliged to accept a Bland dollar, which of itself does not purport to be a full legal tender.

I do not propose at this time to discuss the provisions of the Chicago platform of 1892. It has been commented upon in the Senate over and over again. It is sufficiently elastic for almost every Democrat to stand upon. It favors an international agreement on the subject of gold and silver, and if that can not be had it expresses the sentiment that silver should not be coined except under such safeguards of legislation as will absolutely produce a parity of the two metals. That is all that any silver man in the country can possibly want.

I heard the most interesting discussion this morning, fair and candid, between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER]. Both of them claim that they want to maintain the parity of the two metals. One of them insisted that the bare fact of opening our mints to silver would create the parity. Both desire to secure the same result. What the effect would be of such opening is, of course, largely a matter of speculation. It does not seem as though it could safely be done under existing conditions. I have not time to enter into a discussion of that question.

The question of a special committee was disposed of by a vote of the Senate yesterday. I voted against a special committee, because I always vote that way. Upon principle I have uniformly opposed the creation of special committees for purposes of investigation. I believe they are unnecessary. They unnecessarily dignify the proceeding. They are not warranted by the traditions of the Senate. Yet I am disposed to state that my esteemed friend the Senator from Kansas in proposing a special committee possibly had in mind this fact, and I attribute his suggestion to his own sense of fairness. He probably thought that it was not fair or wise to have a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury investigated by a Finance Committee consisting of Republicans, one Republican-Populist, and the rest silver Democrats. Probably he thought in his kindness of heart that it was better that there should be a special committee.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON], in his few vigorous and eloquent remarks last evening, pictured the Finance Committee as a most perfectly fair committee. Senators recollect his idea of fairness. It was that the Secretary of the Treasury should be investigated by a committee upon which there is not a single party friend who agrees with him on the financial question, and the rest of whom are Republicans, and a Populist. Mr. Carlisle, if the resolution is to be passed, will be turned over to the kind mercies of those who, as Democrats, disagree with him within party lines on the silver question. I wish to read the names of the members of the Committee on Finance. Messrs. MORRILL, SHERMAN, ALLISON, ALDRICH, PLATT, WOLCOTT, Republicans; JONES of Nevada, Populist-Republican; VOORHEES, HARRIS, VEST, JONES of Arkansas, WHITE, WALTHALL, silver Democrats.

The Secretary of the Treasury is believed to be what is called a gold-money Democrat. It is the sense of fairness of the Senate that he should be investigated by Republicans, who are opposed to him politically, by a Populist, who is opposed to him politically, and by a committee on which all the Democrats are free-silver Democrats. I simply point out this fact to account for the first suggestion upon the part of my friend the Senator from Kansas for the appointment of a special committee, and it was undoubtedly the high sense of fairness which he usually exhibits in the Senate that prompted him to make the suggestion for a special committee instead of the Finance Committee as at present constituted.

I think the Finance Committee is a fair committee. I believe it to be. I voted to refer the matter to the Finance Committee because I have always heretofore opposed the appointment of special committees. The committee, if the investigation is authorized, will take up this subject and investigate it most fairly and thoroughly. In the end, if Secretary Carlisle shall be vindicated from these newspaper attacks and these loose charges which have been uttered in the Senate Chamber, how much will it be to his gratification and to his credit if it shall come from the Finance Committee, composed of his political adversaries and those who differ with him on the financial question.

I have already commented on the proper course which I think should have been pursued by the Senate, but the Senate has decreed otherwise, and I respectfully bow to its wisdom. That course was that the resolution should have been referred to the Committee on Finance. The Committee on Finance should have respectfully invited the Secretary of the Treasury to come before it. In January, 1894, a question arose in regard to the action of the Treasury Department, and what was done? A resolution was offered in the House of Representatives in regard to the issue of bonds and the use of the gold reserve. It did not provide for a committee of investigation. It was a resolution making inquiry. It was a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives. The resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee. What did the committee do? It sent a respectful letter to the Secretary of the Treasury in January, 1894, and asked the Secretary to appear before it. He did so on January 25. There he made his statement; there the members of the committee questioned him fully for several hours. He answered. He gave them all the information desired pertaining to the finances of the country. His answers were frank; they were able. He showed great familiarity with the subject involved, and at the conclusion the chairman asked him if he would be kind enough to look over the notes of his remarks. Mr. Carlisle, in conclusion, said:

Yes, sir; I would be glad to do so, and if any gentleman desires or if the committee desires any other question answered I will be glad to do it at any time by appearing here or sending it in writing. I will be glad to furnish any information the committee desires in regard to this matter.

The chairman said:

The committee feels very much obliged to you.

And Mr. Carlisle departed. That is the way to conduct public business courteously. That is what the Democratic House did. There was no difficulty about appearing; there was no reluctance in appearing. He stated the situation frankly, and it is a part of the records of the House.

The present Committee on Ways and Means of the other House have already had the bond question under consideration under a resolution of investigation not passed, but referred to them for preliminary inquiry. The present Republican Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives not long ago sent a courteous letter to Mr. Carlisle, and he replied. That letter has not been published, so far as I am aware. I desire, with the kind permission of the Senate, to incorporate it in my remarks. It is dated March 7, 1896, and is addressed to Hon. NELSON DINGLEY, Jr., chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in which the Secretary acknowledges the receipt of his favor, speaking of the reference of the resolution to the committee, and asking him to make such response as to the allegations contained in the resolution as he saw fit. Then the Secretary of the Treasury proceeds to elucidate the bond question and all the complaints that had then been made. At the conclusion of the letter is the following language, to which I invite attention:

If, notwithstanding this brief statement of the facts, the committee and the House of Representatives consider the allegations contained in the newspaper clippings which were included in your letter, and which appear to have been adopted as the basis of the resolution, of sufficient importance to demand or justify an investigation, the Treasury Department will cheerfully do all in its power to facilitate the inquiry and promptly furnish all papers, records, and other evidence in its possession or under its control relating in any manner to the transaction in question.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, Secretary.

The Committee on Ways and Means were evidently satisfied with the statement. They have asked for no further information. They have not gone further with the resolution. They have not ordered an investigation, but this body, which can not so appropriately investigate alleged wrongdoing as can the House of Representatives, substantially usurps the functions of the House, which is solely given the power of impeachment. The letter explains the whole transaction. There is no real necessity for any further steps being taken.

Here is the letter:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1896.

Hon. NELSON DINGLEY, Jr.,

Chairman Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of February 26, inclosing a copy of a preamble and resolution providing for the appointment of a committee by the House of Representatives to investigate the alleged conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury in refusing to deliver to one William Graves \$4,500,000 in the bonds of the United States and awarding said bonds to J. P. Morgan & Co., notwithstanding the said Graves is alleged to have "tendered the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of said bid for said bonds in gold at the subtreasury in the city of New York," and inviting from me such response to the allegations as I may be pleased to make.

I have the honor to say that on the 6th day of January, 1896, a circular was issued inviting sealed proposals until 12 o'clock m. on Wednesday, February 5, 1896, for the purchase of \$100,000,000 of United States 4 per cent coupon or registered bonds in denominations of \$50 or multiples of that sum, as might be desired by bidders, and it was stated that "purchasers will be required to pay in United States gold coin or gold certificates for the bonds awarded to them, and the interest accrued thereon after the 1st day of February, 1896, up to the time of payment for the bonds." Payments for the bonds were required to be made at the various subtreasuries of the United States by installments, as follows: Twenty per cent and accrued interest upon receipt of notice of acceptance of bids, and 20 per cent and accrued interest at the end of each ten days thereafter; that all accepted bidders were given the privilege of paying the whole amount at the date of the first installment, and those who had paid all installments previously maturing were allowed to pay the whole amount of their bids at any time not later than the maturity of the last installment.

On the 15th day of January, 1896, an additional circular was issued, notifying bidders that after the payment of the first installment of 20 per cent with accrued interest, the remainder of the amounts bid might be paid in installments of 10 per cent each and accrued interest at the end of each fifteen days thereafter; but all accepted bidders were allowed to pay the whole amount of their bid at the time of the first installment, and all accepted bidders who had paid all installments previously maturing were allowed to pay the whole of their bids at any time not later than the maturity of the last installment.

Among the proposals received under these circulars was one from "William Graves and associates," in the words and figures following:

"NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., February 4, 1896.

"We hereby propose, under the terms of your circular of January 6, 1896, to purchase United States 4 per cent thirty-year bonds, described in said circular, of the face value of \$4,500,000, and we agree to pay therefor at the rate of 115.3391 and accrued interest per \$100. We further agree, upon due notice of the acceptance of this subscription, to deposit the amount thereof in gold coin or in gold certificates with the United States assistant treasurer at New York City in accordance with the terms of said circular.

"We desire (registered or coupon) bonds in denominations as stated below, and we wish them to be delivered to us at office of I. B. Newcombe, Mills Building, New York City, or Bank of California, San Francisco.

"WILLIAM GRAVES AND ASSOCIATES.

"To the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY."

Coupon.	Registered.
\$50	\$50
100	100
500	500
1,000	1,000
	5,000
	10,000

Mr. Graves was wholly unknown to the Department, and the facts that he failed to give his street or office address, that the names of his associates were not disclosed, and that the price he proposed to pay for the bonds was considerably higher than responsible and bona fide bidders were offering were sufficient, in my opinion, to justify an inquiry concerning his financial character and standing before disposing of his proposal. I accordingly caused inquiries to be made at once in the city of New York, but no definite

or satisfactory information concerning his business or financial standing was obtained, and on the 7th day of February, 1896, I caused the following confidential telegram to be sent to the assistant treasurer of the United States at San Francisco, to wit:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1896.

"ASSISTANT TREASURER UNITED STATES, San Francisco, Cal.:

"Can you ascertain from the Bank of California or others as to the financial standing and responsibility of William Graves, a large bidder for bonds. It is important. Do not neglect to answer promptly by wire. Confidential."

"J. F. MELINE, Assistant Treasurer."

On the same day the following response was received:

"FEBRUARY 7, 1896.

"TREASURER UNITED STATES, Washington, D. C.:

"Party referred to in yours of to-day, from what is learned from Bank of California and from others, was known very slightly as promoter or financial agent, but not capitalist. Can not give his whereabouts."

"C. P. BERRY, Assistant Treasurer."

Although the information thus secured was not considered sufficient to show to my entire satisfaction the ability of the bidder to pay for such a large amount of bonds, yet as he appeared to have been "very slightly" known as a financial agent, and as he professed to have others associated with him in making his bid, it was deemed better not to reject his offer without first giving him an opportunity to comply with the terms of the circular and his bid. Out of abundant caution, therefore, and in order to avoid a possible mistake in a matter of such importance to the bidder and to the Government, a notice of acceptance was mailed to "William Graves and associates, New York, N. Y.," on the evening of February 9, 1896, being the same day on which other notices to accepted bidders were mailed. The notice was as follows:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1896.

"SIRS: You are hereby notified that your subscription under the terms of the Department circulars of January 6, January 9, and January 15, 1896, for \$4,500,000 of the 4 per cent bonds of the United States for which you have agreed to pay in United States gold coin or gold certificates, at the office of the assistant treasurer in the city of New York, at the rate of \$115.3391 and accrued interest per \$100 face value of said bonds, has been accepted."

"You are therefore requested to deposit with the United States assistant treasurer at New York on or before the 15th day of February, 1896, the sum of \$1,038,051.90, which is 20 per cent of the amount of your subscription at the price above named. The accrued interest from February 1, 1896, to date of the payment hereby requested should also be paid at the rate of 4 per cent on the amount of the bonds paid for by said deposit. At the expiration of fifteen days from the date of this first payment an additional payment of 10 per cent must be made, and such payments must be continued at intervals of fifteen days until the whole amount is paid. The accrued interest accompanying each payment must be computed from February 1, 1896, to date of such payment. If you desire to pay the entire amount of your subscription at once you may do so, or you may anticipate the total payment of your subscription at any time prior to the maturing of the last installment. In the former case the amount to be deposited is \$5,190,259.50, with accrued interest at 4 per cent on \$4,500,000 from February 1, 1896, to date of deposit."

"The Secretary of the Treasury should be promptly advised of the character of the bonds desired (whether registered or coupon), and the denominations thereof. If this information has already been furnished, please confirm it."

"The bonds will be issued only upon receipt by the Secretary of the original certificate of deposit of the assistant treasurer receiving the payments. The Department is prepared to begin the delivery of the bonds at once, and deliveries will be continued as rapidly as the facilities of the Department will permit."

"Respectfully, yours,

"J. G. CARLISLE, Secretary."

"WILLIAM GRAVES AND ASSOCIATES,
New York, N. Y."

A list of the accepted bidders was published in the principal newspapers of the country, including the New York City papers, on the morning of February 9, which Mr. Graves doubtless saw. But, however that may be, it is certain that he knew of the acceptance of his bid as early as noon, February 10, as is shown by the following telegrams:

"[Telegram.]

"NEW YORK, February 10, 1896—12.23 p. m.

"Hon. J. G. CARLISLE,

"Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.:

"Bank of California received their bond allotment. Have ours been forwarded? Wire."

"WILLIAM GRAVES AND ASSOCIATES."

"[Telegram.]

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1896.

"WILLIAM GRAVES AND ASSOCIATES,
New York, N. Y.:

"Your notification was duly forwarded."

"W. E. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary."

"Collect."

Immediately upon the receipt of the above telegram from Mr. Graves, a duplicate notification of acceptance was mailed to him, addressed to the Mills Building, New York, and nothing further was heard from him until February 13, at 12 o'clock m., when Mr. Allison Nailor, of the city of Washington, delivered to the Secretary in person a letter without date, from Graves to him (Nailor) requesting the latter to call on the Secretary and ask for an extension of time until the Wednesday following, February 19, to pay the first installment of 20 per cent on his bid. This letter was left at the Department, and a copy is appended hereto.

In a letter to the Secretary dated February 13, 1896, a copy of which is appended, Mr. Graves stated that he had that day received the "original notice of acceptance" of his bid and claimed that it had been erroneously addressed, although his own quotation of the address in his letter shows that it was in exact accord with the information given on the face of his bid. He fails to mention the fact that he had previously received a duplicate notice and had also been notified by wire that the original had been sent. In this letter he asked to be informed by wire or mail whether the bonds could be delivered to the subtreasury to be given to him "upon anticipated payments," and he was at once advised by a telegram, a copy of which is attached, that the bonds could be issued only upon receipt at the Secretary's office of the original certificate showing that they had been paid for. This

was the course pursued in all cases, and Mr. Graves had been advised in his notice of acceptance that the original certificate of deposit would be required.

On the day the first installment of 20 per cent was due, February 15, 1896, Mr. Graves made another application by telephonic message for an extension of the time, and in response he was informed by wire that no extension could be given, as will be seen from the copy of the telegraphic dispatch to him which is attached hereto.

The statement in the preamble to the resolution inclosed in your letter that Mr. Graves had tendered the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of his bid for bonds in gold at the subtreasury in the city of New York is wholly incorrect. Neither he nor anyone for him tendered any gold whatever in payment for the bonds, or any part of them, at the subtreasury at New York, or elsewhere. On the contrary, on the morning of the 15th day of February, 1896, the day on which payments were required to be made, Mr. Graves sent to the Secretary of the Treasury a telegram, in which he abandoned his original bid of \$115.3391, and proposed to take the bonds at \$113.50, and stated that he would give satisfactory financial indorsements by Wednesday, February 19th, showing his ability to fulfill such an agreement. A copy of this telegram is appended. And on the same day, and other days up to and including the 19th day of February, he wrote and sent various letters and telegrams to the Secretary, copies of all which are appended hereto. No notice was taken of these telegrams and letters for the reason that, according to the terms of the circular under which the bonds were offered to the public, the time for receiving bids had expired on the 5th day of February, 1896, at 12 o'clock m., and no bids made or received after that time had been or could properly be considered. Bids had been made in good faith by responsible parties within the designated time and in accordance with the terms of the circular for the whole of the proposed loan, and the Department has in every case declined to consider any bid which was not so made.

So far as this Department has been able to ascertain, Mr. Graves had no associates in his bid, and was wholly unable to comply with its terms. It was not a bona fide bid, but was purely speculative, and subsequent developments showed that it ought to have been rejected at the beginning along with two other bids of the same character, amounting to \$129,000,000, which were in fact rejected, and about which no complaint has been made by the pretended bidders, or anybody else. His complaint that he had been embarrassed or obstructed by errors or delays on the part of the Treasury Department is not sustained by the facts. There were no errors or delays on the part of the Department. According to the terms of the circular under which his bid was made, the first installment, 20 per cent and accrued interest, was required to be paid "upon receipt of notice of acceptance of bids," and if his bid was in fact made in good faith he of course expected to comply with that requirement. By the terms of the notice of acceptance sent to him, however, the time of payment was extended until and including the 15th of February, 1896, notwithstanding which he failed to make any deposit whatever on account of his offer.

If this bid had been rejected at the beginning, the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to award the \$4,500,000 in bonds to the next highest responsible bidder would have been perfectly clear, and it is difficult to see how the fact that its fictitious character was not fully discovered until a later date can in any way affect either the duty of the Secretary or the rights of other bona fide bidders. Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co. had, within the time prescribed by the circular, and in accordance with the terms of the proposal, put in a bid for the whole \$100,000,000 at a price of \$110.6877, and all bona fide bids above that price having been accepted, they were entitled to have awarded to them the remainder of the loan. On and before February 15, 1896, that firm deposited the sum of \$36,520,018 in gold coin and certificates, and on that day they notified the Treasury Department by wire that they had deposited gold with the subtreasurer and Government depositories largely in excess of 20 per cent on any possible amount that could be awarded to them.

After a careful consideration of the subject they were notified on February 19, 1896, that they would be required to receive and pay for all the bonds which Graves and a few other smaller bidders had failed to take, and the firm has already paid in gold and gold certificates the sum of \$37,493,100, leaving unpaid only about \$430,000 on the entire amount awarded to it. Ordinary good faith on the part of the Government demanded that bona fide bidders who had strictly complied with all the requirements of the proposal under which their offers were made should not be excluded from consideration by the wrongful interposition of fictitious or purely speculative bids, and in my opinion the only legal and honorable course that could be pursued in this matter was to award the bonds upon which defaults were made to the parties who had in good faith, and within the time prescribed, submitted the next highest offer.

If, notwithstanding this brief statement of the facts, the committee and the House of Representatives consider the allegations contained in the newspaper clippings which were inclosed in your letter and which appear to have been adopted as the basis of the resolution of sufficient importance to demand or justify an investigation, the Treasury Department will cheerfully do all in its power to facilitate the inquiry and promptly furnish all papers, records, and other evidence in its possession or under its control relating in any manner to the transaction in question.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, yours,

J. G. CARLISLE, Secretary."

Mr. President, I oppose the investigation now even though the terms of the resolution have been modified and its offensive features eliminated and the regular committee substituted for a special committee. I confess I do not approve of the precedent which will be created. The Senate has already been satiated with resolutions for the investigation of Florida matters, and it referred them notwithstanding every consideration of courtesy which was urged. Yet when we refuse to one of our own Democratic associates upon this side of the Chamber the opportunity he wanted to investigate affairs in Florida, we must hasten to give the other side—to our Populist friend, the Senator from Kansas—this resolution of investigation as a matter of courtesy.

Next will come the Alabama resolution for an investigation, and the Senators from that State as well as from the South generally will expect the New York Senators to stand by them in opposition to the investigation. I warn them of the precedent which they are establishing by adopting this resolution. There is no necessity for this resolution. There is no necessity for the Alabama resolution. There is no necessity for the Florida resolution. The Florida resolution was referred to the committee two or three times, but this resolution, it seems, is to be pressed to passage. Louisiana will come next in the list of States whose proceedings are proposed to be inquired into. It is the age of investigation.

There is a mania for investigation. I have read here letters and petitions from all parts of the country asking that everything be investigated.

I agree with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] when, at the conclusion of his remarks yesterday, he said that he had seen no good reason for this investigation. No one else has seen a good reason for the investigation. Democrats, be not deceived. It is a useless, an unnecessary, a causeless proceeding. It is an attack upon your Democratic Secretary of the Treasury. It is putting him to annoyance and trouble unreasonably and improperly. You are playing into the hands of your opponents, the Republicans and Populists. You do not object to the investigation simply for fear somebody will say there is something wrong. The Secretary of the Treasury himself has not objected. No one is authorized to object to it in his behalf. I disclaim all responsibility of speaking for him. He has tendered the Ways and Means Committee any information in his power, and yet, sir, for some reason which it seems to me can only be attributed to jealousy, to malice, or to differences over the great gold and silver question, or to something else, the resolution is to be offensively pressed.

I have no personal interest in this matter. I care nothing for these New York syndicates, of which I am said to be the champion. I do not deceive myself. The votes already given indicate the temper of the Senate. I expect to be overruled. I am used to it. I can wait my vindication. I will patiently abide events. I disclaim all personal feeling. I am actuated simply by a desire to discharge my duty which I think I owe to the country, my duty to these high officials, the President and Secretary of the Treasury, for whose appointment or nomination I was not responsible. I have asked no Senator around this circle to vote with me in opposition to the resolution. I have made no personal appeal to any Senator. I have only presented my arguments, and each Senator may vote as seems to him best. I do not think this is a wise proceeding. I do not think it a politic proceeding. I know not what course the committee will adopt. Undoubtedly, sir—appreciating its fairness, its impartiality, which I cheerfully concede—it will endeavor to do its duty; but the silver question warps men's judgments; it affects their opinions; it stirs up their prejudices. It makes members of the same party distrust each other. We have had an exhibition of this feeling on the floor this morning, and although the committee may strive to be fair, you know, Senators, what the result of such investigations has been in the past. There will be difficulties; there will be bickerings; there will be contentions; there will be unpleasant misunderstandings; there is likely to be clamor and unpleasantness. These things should have been avoided.

The resolution is now in the hands of the Senate. I shall vote against the resolution if I am the only man here who does so. I have stood alone in the past in matters to which I need not now allude, and I can afford to stand alone again. I do not care even whether the yeas and nays are called upon the passage of the resolution. That is a matter for the Senate to determine. I have discharged my duty, Mr. President, as I understand it, and with that I am content.

Mr. LINDSAY. I desire to offer an amendment, to strike out all of the third clause of the resolution after the words "in relation thereto," in line 15, page 2.

The Senator who offered the resolution said that the first clause of the resolution covers all of the legitimate subjects of investigation, but that he desires the other clauses to be retained because they particularize. I submit that that portion of the third paragraph which I move to strike out does not particularize, does not enlarge, is not germane to the investigation directed by the first paragraph. It is framed so as insidiously to intimate that the Secretary of the Treasury may have had some share in the profits supposed to have been realized from the bond sales. If it is intended that such a charge shall be investigated it would be fair and manly to say so in terms that can not be mistaken. If it is not intended to intimate that such a charge may be looked into, then I say it would be generous to strike out those misleading words to be found in the lines I have moved to strike out.

I submit to the Senator who offered the resolution that justice on his part ought to induce him to consent to the amendment I propose.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. GALLINGER. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "thereto," in line 15, paragraph 3, it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the resolution, in the following words:

What agreements or contracts, and whether oral or in writing, and whether publicly or privately, were entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury and any syndicate or person or persons with respect to the sale and purchase of the bonds, and the profits made or to be made by such syndicate or any person or persons connected with such syndicate, directly or indirectly; whether such contract or agreement had any and what effect on the prices offered for the bonds, what the effect was, and who, if any person, profited by it, and to what extent.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the vote is to be taken upon the resolution. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. As the Senator from Kansas does not seem to be inclined to withdraw those words, and as the motion upon my part to that effect might be mistaken, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say that that is the very meat of the whole resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. No debate is in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] as amended.

Mr. PETTIGREW and Mr. WOLCOTT called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I announce the pair of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], with whom I am usually paired, with the Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON]. If the Senator from Utah [Mr. CANNON] were present, he would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with my colleague [Mr. ELKINS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay" on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. GEAR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], but he authorized me to vote as I choose on this question. I vote "yea."

Mr. KYLE (when his name was called). I was requested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] to arrange a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. If that is the understanding, I will pair myself with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I understand that if the Senator from Connecticut were present, he would vote "nay." I should vote "yea" upon this proposition.

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. Not being aware how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL (when Mr. VOORHEES's name was called). The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] is paired on this question with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JONES] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO. My colleague [Mr. CALL] is absent from the city. He would vote "yea," if he were present. He is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE].

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS]. He is not present, and I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] that we transfer our pairs so that the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] will stand paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and we will both vote.

Mr. FAULKNER. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. GALLINGER. I vote "yea."

Mr. FAULKNER. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN. I desire to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. CLARK], who is absent from the city, with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GIBSON]. My colleague would vote "yea" if he were here.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted, but I have since ascertained that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. VILAS], with whom I am generally paired, is absent. I suggest to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], who I understand is paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], that we transfer our pairs.

Mr. HARRIS. I am perfectly willing to exchange pairs, although I have the permission of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to vote. But I will exchange pairs with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Thank you.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. My colleague is absent from the city.

Mr. HAWLEY. Both my colleague [Mr. PLATT] and I were in

Connecticut yesterday. We both started for Washington. I do not see him present, however. I should like to know from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] if he is sure that my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. KYLE. I was so informed by the clerk of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. HAWLEY. I have serious doubt—

Mr. KYLE. If there is doubt in regard to the matter—

Mr. LODGE. I will state that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who was called away from Washington, left with me a letter from the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], in which he says:

I would vote against the bond resolution. I suppose Mr. MURPHY would. Therefore on that I ought to be paired with some one else. I believe that I agreed with Mr. ALLEN when it was last up to pair with Mr. KYLE. So perhaps Mr. KYLE would pair with me now that I am away.

Mr. HILL. I desire to inquire whether the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He is recorded in the affirmative.

Mr. FRYE. My vote is recorded.

Mr. HILL. I simply make the inquiry, because I understood the Senator from Maine had a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. FRYE. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HILL. I call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that in a speech made the other day the senior Senator from Maryland said he was opposed to the resolution. That is all.

Mr. FRYE. I did not notice the absence of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. HILL. I make the suggestion, as the vote is so close. [Laughter.]

Mr. FRYE (after having voted in the affirmative). I did not notice the absence of the senior Senator from Maryland. I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 6; as follows:

YEAS—51.

Allen,	Cullom,	McBride,	Shoup,
Allison,	Daniel,	McMillan,	Squire,
Bacon,	Davis,	Mantle,	Stewart,
Baker,	Dubois,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Teller,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Berry,	George,	Pasco,	Vest,
Blackburn,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	Walshall,
Brown,	Harris,	Perkins,	Warren,
Burrows,	Hawley,	Pettigrew,	Westmore,
Butler,	Irby,	Pugh,	White,
Carter,	Jones, Nev.	Roach,	Wilson,
Chilton,	Lindsay,	Sewell,	Wolcott.
Cockrell,	Lodge,	Sherman,	

NAYS—6.

Caffery,	Gray,	Mitchell, Wis.	Palmer.
Faulkner,	Hill,		

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich,	Elkins,	Jones, Ark.	Pritchard,
Blanchard,	Frye,	Kyle,	Proctor,
Brice,	Gear,	Martin,	Quay,
Call,	Gibson,	Mills,	Smith,
Cameron,	Gordon,	Morgan,	Thurston,
Cannon,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Tillman,
Chandler,	Hale,	Murphy,	Vilas,
Clark,	Hoar,	Platt,	Voorhees.

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

WIDOW OF THOMAS L. YOUNG.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to call up the conference report on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for disposition at this time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he will allow me to call up for passage a little bill which will take but a moment?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield for that purpose, upon the Senator's assurance that it will take no time and that there will be no discussion about it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1743) for the relief of the widow of Thomas L. Young.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which proposes to pay the claim of the widow of the late Thomas L. Young, who served as an enlisted man and officer of the Regular Army of the United States, and afterwards as captain of Benton Cadets, Missouri Volunteers, and as major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel of the One hundred and eighteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion, and appropriates not exceeding \$478 as a balance or balances of wages earned by him and not heretofore paid to him or to his legal representatives.

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

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHILTON. I hope the Senator from Illinois will allow me to have a bill put on its passage which is of considerable importance.

Mr. CULLOM. I am inclined to think the conference report, which will take but a few minutes, should be adopted. It has been lying on the tables of Senators all day, and, so far as I know, it is in the main satisfactory. I hope that I may be allowed to have it disposed of now. The Senator from Texas will have time afterwards for the consideration of his bill. I hope that we shall have immediate action on the conference report. I move that the Senate concur in the report of the committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 6248) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to concur in the report of the committee of conference, which has been heretofore read.

The report was concurred in.

Mr. CULLOM. I now move that the Senate insist upon its amendments not yet agreed to by the House of Representatives and ask for a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference; and Mr. CULLOM, Mr. TELLER, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

DENISON AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2488) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Denison and Northern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes." This bill has received the favorable report of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I am sure there is no opposition to it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHILTON. I move that the bill be amended by striking out, in line 8 of section 1, the words "three years" and inserting "two years from the approval of this act."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, line 8, before the word "years," it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert "two"; and after the word "years" to insert "from the approval of this act"; so as to make the section read:

That the provisions of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Denison and Northern Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved July 30, 1892, be, and the same hereby are, extended for a further period of two years from the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that we may now proceed with the Calendar for the remainder of this evening, considering unobjected House bills which have been favorably reported, and dispose of them, so that they may become laws.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. STEWART. Let us go to the Calendar regularly.

Mr. FRYE. The river and harbor bill ought to be proceeded with, for it is very important to get it passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri restate his request?

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may now proceed, commencing where we last left off, with the consideration of unobjected House bills for the remainder of this evening.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Missouri not consent to going to the Calendar in regular order, and not simply proceeding with the consideration of House bills?

Mr. FRYE. I shall object to either request. I regard it as my duty to this great river and harbor appropriation bill to go on with it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is interposed.

Mr. FRYE. There will be time enough for the consideration of bills on the Calendar after the appropriation bills are disposed of. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of

the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7977) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 17, on page 46. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 46, after the word "improvement," at the end of line 20, to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty"; so as to read:

Improving Delaware River, from Trenton to its mouth, Pennsylvania and New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$250,000.

Mr. FRYE. That matter was particularly referred yesterday to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I would inquire whether or not anything was agreed to in relation to it?

Mr. VEST. Yes, Mr. President. The amendment of the committee which has just been read will not be agreed to, so as to allow the amount to remain at \$500,000.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in line 23, on page 46, after the word "Perriwig Bar," to insert:

And \$3,000 shall be expended in rebuilding and enlarging the dike on Government reservation at the junction of the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers, at Fort Mifflin: *Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or of any appropriations heretofore made shall be expended upon the building of a dike between Reedy Island and Listons Point until a board of three engineer officers, to be appointed by the Secretary of War, shall consider the project of said dike with reference to preserving and improving the navigation of the Appoquinimink River and Black Bird Creek, and the riparian rights and facilities of the Delaware shore.

Mr. VEST. In line 1 of the amendment, on page 47, after the words "Fort Mifflin," I move to insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "Fort Mifflin," in line 1, on page 47, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That so much of said sum of \$500,000 as shall be necessary may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in dredging the channel through Dam Baker Shoal to the depth of 25 feet at low water.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

Mr. VEST. The Senator will permit me to get through with the amendments which I wish to propose.

Mr. QUAY. Very well.

Mr. VEST. After the amendment to the amendment which has just been adopted, before the word "*Provided*," I move to insert the word "*And*"; and after the word "*Provided*" to insert "*further*."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 47, line 1, before the word "*Provided*," it is proposed to insert the word "*And*"; and after the word "*Provided*" to insert "*further*"; so as to read:

And provided further, That no part of said appropriation, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. I now move the amendment which I send to the desk in the subsequent part of the clause.

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

The SECRETARY. In line 4, on page 47, after the word "point," it is proposed to strike out "until" and insert "but"; after the word "consider," in line 6, to insert "and report through the Secretary of War to next session of Congress as to"; and in line 9, after the word "shore," to insert "as well as to deepening the main channel of said river."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President, the understanding is that if that amendment is adopted the original provision as it came from the House shall be restored.

Mr. FRYE. That has been done.

Mr. QUAY. Was that done by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FRYE. Yes; that was done.

Mr. QUAY. It is all right then.

Mr. FRYE. Now, let the Secretary read the amendment as amended.

Mr. QUAY. I should like to hear the clause read as it stands.

Mr. FRYE. That is what I ask; that the whole clause about the Delaware River be read as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested. The Secretary read as follows:

Improving Delaware River, from Trenton to its mouth, Pennsylvania and New Jersey: Continuing improvement, \$500,000, of which \$5,000 shall be expended in the improvement of the channel over Perriwig Bar, and \$3,000 shall be expended in rebuilding and enlarging the dike, on Government reserva-

tion, at the junction of the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers, at Fort Mifflin: *Provided*, That so much of said sum of \$500,000 as shall be necessary may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be expended in dredging the channel through Dam Baker shoal to the depth of 25 feet at low water; *And provided further*, That no part of said appropriation or of any appropriations heretofore made shall be expended upon the building of a dike between Reedy Island and Listons Point, but a board of three engineer officers, to be appointed by the Secretary of War, shall consider and report through the Secretary of War to next session of Congress as to the project of said dike with reference to preserving and improving the navigation of the Appoquinimink River and Black Bird Creek, and the riparian rights and facilities of the Delaware shore, as well as to deepening the main channel of said river.

Mr. FRYE. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 48, line 18, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That the additional sum of \$25,000 may be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of War for such dredging as may be necessary for the maintenance of channels from the mouths of the Appoquinimink River and Blackbird Creek to the channel of the Delaware River through the dike now being constructed from Reedy Island to Liston Point for the improvement of the Delaware.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Appoquinimink River, Delaware: Continuing improvement, \$5,000: *Provided*, That the additional sum of \$25,000 may be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of War for such dredging as may be necessary for the maintenance of channels from the mouths of the Appoquinimink River and Blackbird Creek to the channel of the Delaware River through the dike now being constructed from Reedy Island to Liston Point for the improvement of the Delaware.

Mr. VEST. I suggest to the chairman of the committee that, in view of the amendments which have been made on pages 46 and 47, the amendment printed in italics on page 48, beginning in line 18 and ending with line 25, which has just been read, is unnecessary and should be disagreed to.

Mr. FRYE. Yes, that amendment should be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 49, line 10, after the words "United States," to insert:

But the right of way over any railroad or through any railroad or county bridge shall not be subject to this proviso, and may be secured by condemnation proceedings.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving the inland waterway from Chincoteague Bay, Virginia, to Delaware Bay, at or near Lewes, Del., to be used from Delaware Bay to Indian River: Continuing improvement, \$25,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended until the right of way is secured without cost to the United States, but the right of way over any railroad or through any railroad or county bridge shall not be subject to this proviso, and may be secured by condemnation proceedings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 3, after the words "Pocomoke River," to strike out "Continuing improvement" and insert "Maryland, below Snow Hill, in accordance with report submitted February 25, 1895, five thousand"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Pocomoke River, Maryland, below Snow Hill, in accordance with report submitted February 25, 1895, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 10, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "from main ship channel to Curtis Bay"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Patapsco River and channel to Baltimore: For maintenance, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 14, after the word "submitted," to strike out "by Maj. William F. Smith, in House Executive Document No. 323, Fifty-third Congress, third session," and insert "February 14, 1895"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Nanticoke River, Delaware and Maryland: Continuing improvement, in accordance with report and plan submitted February 14, 1895, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 20, before the word "thousand," to insert "and twenty-five"; and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That for carrying on said improvement the rental of an office in the city of Washington, D. C., at a rate not to exceed \$85 per month, is hereby authorized when no public building is available, to be paid for pro rata from the appropriations made for works of improvement in the local charge of the engineer officer having charge of the improvement of the Potomac River.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Potomac River, Washington, D. C.: Continuing improvement, \$125,000: *Provided*, That for carrying on said improvement the rental of an office in the city of Washington, D. C., at a rate not to exceed \$85 per month, is hereby authorized when no public building is available, to be paid for pro rata from the appropriations made for works of improvement in the local charge of the engineer officer having charge of the improvement of the Potomac River.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine what necessity there is for this proviso?

Mr. FRYE. A room is absolutely necessary for the use of the engineer who is in charge of the work, and by the act of March, 1877, the renting of any building in the District of Columbia for Government purposes was forbidden unless expressly authorized by Congress. The renting of an office by the officer in charge of the Potomac River improvement and other river and harbor work is absolutely necessary, as there is no room for that purpose in any Government building.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to see a bill pass Congress that did not in some manner carry some benefit to the Washington real estate syndicate. This engineer, or the engineers, as the case may be, must have some habitation at the present time, some place to transact the public business. What is there in the discharge of the duties under this law that they can not discharge those duties as well in the offices they now occupy, or the rooms they now occupy, as to rent additional quarters in this city at the expense of the Government at \$85 a month?

Mr. FRYE. I will simply say that the Engineer Department reported to the committee that there was no room for this purpose at all, and that it was absolutely necessary to have one, and the best they could do was probably to rent quarters at \$85 a month. The committee accepted their judgment in relation to it and inserted the item in the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know that I ought to antagonize this any further or consume any time in antagonizing it further. I should antagonize it and vote against it if my vote were of any avail; but we have an engineer corps here, and the expenditure of this money and this work is to be done under the supervision of the Secretary of War. The officers who will have charge of this work have quarters in the city now, where they have their plans, their papers, their instruments, and whatever may be necessary in the discharge of their duties. Why does it become necessary under these circumstances, when this bill does not impose upon them extraordinary duties, that the hands of the owners of private property in this city should be shoved into the Treasury, and \$85 a month of the people's money taken to rent a room, or a few rooms, for the accommodation of these engineers? Certainly it is the part of wisdom, if we have not public buildings enough here to build them, and to build them without delay, so that we shall not be compelled to go from time to time throughout this entire city and rent buildings and pay out the public money in that way whenever there is an appropriation bill which may pass Congress, and by that means give the syndicate which controls prices here a percentage of the appropriations made.

I appeal to the honorable Senator from Maine, who I know to be a just and honorable man, not to insist upon this provision. Let the duties that may be imposed upon these engineers be discharged from the rooms they now occupy or from other rooms that may be furnished them without charge to the Government in some one of the numerous public buildings in this city.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator himself must understand that in this matter of improving the Potomac River it is absolutely necessary for the engineer in charge to have rooms. All of the various small machinery that he is obliged to use, the tools the men are obliged to use, and everything of that kind, must be housed somewhere. That can not be done up in the War Department; they can not give way up there. General Craigill said this was an absolute necessity for the service and to take care of the property which would be used, and I have no doubt it is so. I think it is entirely fair that the provision should be in the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. The trouble with the position of the Senator from Maine is simply this: The engineer or engineers, as the case may be, who are to take charge of this work have rooms somewhere to-day, have they not?

Mr. FRYE. No.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly they are not out in tents or in pasture.

Mr. FRYE. The engineer has a house.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; and he has an office where he discharges the duties which are imposed upon him by virtue of his relations to the Government.

Mr. FRYE. No; I do not think he has any place now.

Mr. ALLEN. Does the Senator from Maine mean to say that there are public officers in the service of this Government who are running around upon the streets, without offices where they can discharge the duties imposed upon them, or like Arabs, living in tents, or who are turned out to grass? Certainly there must be some place, and is some place of this kind, some rooms that these officers occupy. There must be some place or some rooms where their instruments and papers are stored. Why can not those rooms be used to-day? Why can not they be used when this engineer and his men go to work under the requirements of this bill just as well as they can be used to-day?

Of course, it is popular to squander the public money. This is simply a little item of \$80 a month, but it is one of the items which, when added to the other hundreds of thousands of dollars that are expended in this way, increase the burdens materially upon the people in the form of taxation.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, the statement made to our committee was that this officer carries his papers up to his dwelling house or boarding house (I do not know whether he has any family or not), and the necessary machinery, etc., has been kept down at the wharf under a shed. He is on a small salary, and it is not worthy of the Government to leave its officers in such a position. I am very sorry my friend has seized upon this particular point to make an attack.

Mr. ALLEN. I can find numerous points of attack. The truth is they are so numerous that no man can attack them. That is the trouble. If any half dozen men in the Senate Chamber would devote their entire time to looking up leakages, great and small, that occur here from session to session, they could not keep track of all of them. I speak of this item because it is apparent upon the face of the bill, and because it is apparent to me, at least, that it is one of the items that should not pass here.

Mr. SEWELL. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. SEWELL. I suggest to the Senator that there is an office, a house, that has been rented for years for the use of this officer, and it is put in the appropriation bill every year in order to distinguish the rent of the office from the dredging on the river, and he is given authority in this way to charge up his account under different appropriations.

Mr. ALLEN. I did not hear the Senator from New Jersey, but I infer that he said there was an office provided for this officer.

Mr. FRYE. Which has to be hired every year.

Mr. ALLEN. Which has to be hired every year?

Mr. FRYE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. Then I infer that every time an appropriation is made by Congress to improve the Potomac River that moment we begin renting quarters for the engineer and his instruments and his men at \$80 per month or more, and the moment the money has been expended that moment he is either turned out-of-doors and required to find quarters for himself for the transaction of business or to carry his office around in his hat, as has been suggested by the Senator from Missouri. I do not believe in this appropriation. It is true it is a small amount, only \$900, it is said; but if you will take the numerous sums of \$900 and \$1,000 of the people's money that are appropriated in this form and absolutely wasted you will find that they amount to hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars in the course of a Congress, and where there is an opportunity to lop off these little unnecessary expenses, why not do it?

Mr. President, no business man in this country could conduct his business successfully two years upon the principles upon which this Government is being run. Any business man upon the face of the earth, starting with a capital of \$1,000,000, would become absolutely bankrupt and a subject of public charity within two years if he conducted his business upon the principles on which we conduct the public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 24, on page 51.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to propose an amendment to come in after line 24, on page 51.

Mr. FRYE. The committee amendments are to be first acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the committee amendments are to be first acted on.

Mr. DANIEL. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 52, line 8, after the word "with," to strike out "approved project for the improvement thereof" and insert "report submitted in the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1895"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Nandua (historically known as Andura) Creek, Virginia, in accordance with report submitted in the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers for 1895, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 13, to increase the appropriation for protecting Jamestown Island from the encroachments of James River from \$6,000 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 21, to strike out: Improving Cheat River, West Virginia: Continuing improvement in accordance with recommendations of Maj. R. L. Hoxie, submitted July 10, 1895, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty"; in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "\$10,000 of which may be used for the location and purchase of sites for the dams

within said improvement"; in line 7, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out:

At such time as the United States shall become the owner, by condemnation or otherwise, of the dams on the Monongahela River belonging to the Monongahela River Navigation Company, in Pennsylvania.

And in line 15, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred thousand"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving the upper Monongahela River, West Virginia: Continuing improvements, \$30,000, \$10,000 of which may be used for the location and purchase of sites for the dams within said improvement; and the Secretary of War may place the construction of the six dams heretofore recommended and reported by the United States engineers on the Monongahela River, in the State of West Virginia, under contract at a sum not exceeding \$1,200,000, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 21, to increase the appropriation for improving Cape Fear River, North Carolina, above Wilmington, from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 21, to increase the appropriation for improving Cape Fear River, North Carolina, at and below Wilmington, from \$100,000 to \$195,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 2, to increase the appropriation for improving Neuse River, North Carolina, from \$5,000 to \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 4, to increase the appropriation for improving Pamlico and Tar rivers, North Carolina, from \$2,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 9, to insert:

Improving Roanoke River, North Carolina: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 19, after the word "River," to strike out "For completion" and insert "Continuing improvement"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Apalachicola River, Florida, including the cut-off and Lower Chipola River: Continuing improvement, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 11, before the words "Terraceia Bay," to strike out "in" and insert "into."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 18, before the word "bay," to strike out "Sarasoto" and insert "Sarasota"; and in line 19, before the word "Florida," to insert "from Tampa Bay to Caseys Pass"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Sarasota Bay, from Tampa Bay to Caseys Pass, Florida: Continuing improvement, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 1, after the word "with," to strike out "latest approved project for its improvement, twenty-five" and insert "project submitted February 27, 1895, two hundred"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving St. Johns River, Florida, from Jacksonville to the ocean, in accordance with project submitted February 27, 1895, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 18, on page 58.

Mr. PUGH. I desire to offer several amendments to the bill on page 58, relative to the improvements on the Warrior and Tombigbee rivers. Is it proper for me now to offer the amendments?

Mr. FRYE. Is it in relation to a diversion of a part of the appropriation?

Mr. PUGH. Yes; merely the distribution. Here are the amendments. They do not increase the appropriation.

Mr. VEST. It is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the chairman of the Committee on Commerce agree that the amendments shall be offered now?

Mr. FRYE. I think they might as well come in now. It is merely a change in the language making the distribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be accepted by unanimous consent.

Mr. PUGH. They will be accepted by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, page 58, before the word "thousand," strike out "forty" and insert "ten"; so as to read:

Improving Black Warrior River, Alabama, from Tuscaloosa to Daniels Creek: Continuing improvement, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 12, after the words "one hundred and," strike out "fifteen" and insert "forty-five," so as to read:

Improving Warrior and Tombigbee rivers, Alabama, from mouth of Tombigbee River to Tuscaloosa: Continuing improvement, \$145,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, before the word "thousand," strike out "forty" and insert "seventy"; so as to make the clause read:

Of which \$75,000 are to be expended on the Tombigbee River and \$70,000 on the Warrior River, and so much of said sums as may be necessary is authorized to be expended in acquiring, by purchase or condemnation, under the laws of Alabama, the lands needed in making such improvements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. That leaves the amount as originally appropriated.

Mr. PUGH. It is the same.

Mr. FRYE. It is only a change in its application.

Mr. PUGH. It distributes it below Tuscaloosa, on the same river.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 3, on page 60.

Mr. WALTHALL. I ask the chairman of the committee whether it would be agreeable to him to have an amendment inserted at this point, or shall I wait? I want to change the name of Shubuta.

Mr. FRYE. Let it be made now. It is only a change of title.

Mr. WALTHALL. On page 60, line 2, I move to strike out "Shubuta" and insert "Bucatana"; so as to read:

Improving Chickasaw River, Mississippi, from the mouth up to railroad bridge near Bucatana: Continuing improvement, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 60, line 8, after the word "of," to strike out "completing" and insert "continuing"; and in line 10, after the word "upon," to strike out:

In addition to expending the balance on hand, contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the same, or said materials may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$800,000, exclusive of the amount heretofore appropriated.

And insert "the balance on hand may be expended"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving mouth of Yazoo River and harbor of Vicksburg, Miss.: For the purpose of continuing the project of improvement as heretofore adopted and entered upon, the balance on hand may be expended.

Mr. WALTHALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will disagree to the amendment reported by the committee. Day before yesterday the chairman of the committee informed us that there were about thirty continuing contract clauses in the bill as it came to us from the other House. The report of the committee shows that of these three were stricken out by the Senate committee. One is Savannah Harbor, Georgia, \$1,093,950; another Sabine Pass, Texas, \$1,403,856, and another Yazoo River and harbor at Vicksburg, \$860,000. The last named carries the smallest appropriation of the three. Day before yesterday the other two were restored by a vote of the Senate, and I trust that this one will now be restored. It is substantially upon the same footing, and is, I believe, a project about as meritorious as there is in the bill.

I will submit a brief statement of the objects of the project and the reason why I do not think the Senate should sustain the committee in striking out the provision. The objects are twofold, both extremely important, one affecting the city of Vicksburg, which is the principal city in my State, the other affecting the great Yazoo delta, which is, I believe, about the richest spot of earth to be found upon the globe.

The city of Vicksburg, upon the east bank of the Mississippi River, stands on the first highlands below the Chickasaw Bluffs at Memphis, a distance of about 400 miles as the river runs. Up to 1876 the river in front of the city of Vicksburg turned abruptly northward and then southward, making a loop of about 8 miles around, with a narrow strip of land at the neck of the loop not more than half a mile in width. In 1876 the Mississippi River, which is always capricious, and very often unmanageable, forced its way through that narrow neck of land, destroyed the great interior harbor at Vicksburg, and left the city standing on a body of sluggish water, to which the name of Lake Centennial has since been given.

The object of this provision is to restore that harbor in connection with another purpose, which I will undertake briefly to explain. The Yazoo delta comprises about 6,000 square miles.

Mr. GEORGE. Six thousand eight hundred.

Mr. WALTHALL. Six thousand eight hundred, my colleague says, including about 2,000,000 acres of the very finest land in the world. It includes all the territory between Vicksburg and Memphis, between the Mississippi River on the west and the range of highlands that makes a great curve out eastward in the vicinity of Memphis and then, returning toward the river, reaches the river at Vicksburg. That very fertile section is drained by the Yazoo River and a number of tributaries, I think about 800 miles of navigable waters, if I mistake not.

Mr. GEORGE. Eight hundred miles now absolutely navigable.

Mr. WALTHALL. This river and its tributaries afford the

only protection that the people have in that part of the country against the exorbitant demands for freight, which are exacted by the railroad companies. The freights for that section amount to millions in money and hundreds of thousands in tons. It happens that at low water, at the point where the Yazoo River runs into the Mississippi River, just above Vicksburg, the stream is so shallow that boats can not enter, whereas if they could enter they would find abundant water navigable for hundreds of miles up toward the source of that stream.

The object of the provision in addition to what I have already stated with reference to Vicksburg Harbor is to divert the Yazoo River near its mouth southward and conduct it into Lake Centennial by natural means supplemented by artificial means and thus at once to restore that great harbor and afford navigation on the Yazoo at all stages of water.

The engineer officers of the Government have pronounced the scheme entirely feasible. The Government is committed to it. The work is now progressing. The engineer officers say that the work can be completed at a cost of \$1,200,000 provided the work be continuous, but if the appropriations are small and fragmentary it will very largely increase the cost. The work is now progressing and a very considerable sum of money has already been expended upon it. Eight hundred and sixty thousand dollars is necessary to complete the work entirely. The House provided for that, and the Senate committee propose to strike out the provision. I trust it may not be done. I think it ought not to be done upon every consideration of economy and justice.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I am compelled to admit that there is no more reason for repealing the continuing contract clause in this case than there was in the case of Sabine Pass and Savannah Harbor. The Senate restored the House provisions in those two cases, and I certainly am not in condition to contest the case which has just been presented.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to supplement the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. WALTHALL] except to say that the chairman of the committee was generous enough to about admit that the committee is out of court. Therefore I hope that the bill will be allowed to stand as it came from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRYE. The Senate now having restored these continuing contract clauses, we shall be in the happy condition of conferring in relation to Senate amendments alone.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 60, after line 18, to insert:

Improving Bayou Lafourche, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 4, to insert:

Improving Bayou Courtableau, by removing raft in same, \$2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 10, after the word "improvement," to strike out "according to the plan of Capt. J. H. Willard, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, seventy-five" and insert "one hundred"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Red River, Louisiana and Arkansas, from Fulton, Ark., to the Atchafalaya River: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 16, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred and ten" and insert "seventy-five"; and in line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Of which amount \$10,000 may be applied to the improvement of Pigeon Bayous and Grand River: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,173,250, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana: Continuing improvement, \$75,000, of which amount \$10,000 may be applied to the improvement of Pigeon Bayous and Grand River, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 8, to increase the appropriation for improving Bayou Teche, Louisiana, from \$6,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 16, to insert:

Improving Brazos River, Texas, from Richmond southerly, by removal of snags and overhanging trees, as recommended by report of February 14, 1895, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 22, to strike out:

Improving Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Continuing improvement, between the State of Tennessee and the town of Burnside, \$20,000, to be expended in purchasing sites for locks and dams 21 and 22, and in laying masonry for dams 21 and 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 7, after the word "for," to strike out "the completion of" and insert "continuing work on"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Cumberland River below Nashville, Tenn.: Continuing improvement, \$80,000, of which sum shall be expended as much as may be necessary for continuing work on the lock and dam near the mouth of Harpeth River.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 12, after the word "Nashville," to insert "or the necessary material may be purchased and the work done otherwise than by contract"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Cumberland River above Nashville, Tenn.: Continuing improvement: The Secretary of War may enter into contracts for the completion of the whole or any part of locks Nos. 5, 6, and 7, above Nashville, or the necessary material may be purchased and the work done otherwise than by contract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 21, to increase the appropriation for improving Tennessee River below Chattanooga, Tenn., from \$50,000 to \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATE. On page 66, after line 6, I move to insert—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Tennessee aware of the order that individual amendments are not to be considered on this reading of the bill except by unanimous consent? Committee amendments are first to be disposed of.

Mr. BATE. I do not ask unanimous consent, but I presented the amendment to the committee, and it took no action upon it.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Tennessee will have an opportunity later.

Mr. FRYE. There will be ample time, after we have gone through with the reading of the bill, for the Senator from Tennessee to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will have an opportunity to offer the amendment after the committee amendments are disposed of.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 66, line 16, after the word "appropriated," to insert:

Provided, That of the amount authorized to be expended \$83,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be expended, in addition to the \$50,000 herein appropriated, in continuing construction and completion of Lock and Dam No. 7, by contract or otherwise.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Kentucky River, Kentucky: Continuing improvement, \$50,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of improvement, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$1,349,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided*, That of the amount authorized to be expended, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 13, after the word "improvement," to strike out:

For Lock No. 5, according to report and recommendation of Maj. D. W. Lockwood, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, submitted August 11, 1891.

And insert "of Lock No. 5"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Green River, Kentucky, about the mouth of Big Barren River: Continuing improvement of Lock No. 5, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 7, after the word "the," to strike out "approved project for the completion thereof, \$10,000," and insert:

Project submitted February 3, 1896, \$30,000, \$20,000 of which, or so much thereof as may be necessary, may be used for the purchase of the sites for Dams Nos. 3, 4, and 5; and if said sum shall not be sufficient, then the Secretary of War may use so much of the moneys heretofore appropriated for Dam No. 6 as shall be requisite.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Ohio River, by the construction of Dams Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5, between Davis Island Dam and Dam No. 6, in accordance with the project submitted February 3, 1896, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, under the heading for improving the Ohio River, Ohio and West Virginia, to increase the appropriation for the improvement and continuance of the work on the harbor at Brooklyn, Ill., from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 4, after the word "submitted," to strike out "by Col. G. J. Lydecker, November 30," and insert "December 7"; and in line 5, after the word "ninety-five," to strike out "in House Document No. 72, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Belle River, Michigan, in accordance with plans submitted December 7, 1895, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 9, after the word "submitted," to strike out "by Col. G. J. Lydecker, November 30," and insert "December 7"; and in line 10, after the word "ninety-five," to strike out "in House Document No. 71, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Sebawaing River, Michigan, in accordance with plans submitted December 7, 1895, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 14, after the word "submitted," to strike out "by Col. G. J. Lydecker"; and in line 15, after the word "ninety-five," to strike out "in House Document No. 73, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Pine River, Michigan, in accordance with report submitted December 7, 1895, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 23, after the word "with," to strike out:

Plans submitted by Col. G. J. Lydecker in House Document No. 192, Fifty-fourth Congress, first session.

And insert "the alternative project submitted January 28, 1896"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Kalamazoo River, Michigan, from Lake Michigan to Saugatuck, in accordance with the alternative project submitted January 28, 1896, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 18, after the word "sufficient," to strike out "is hereby appropriated and"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Menominee River, Wisconsin and Michigan: Continuing improvement, \$15,000, of which said sum an amount sufficient shall be used.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen"; and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Of which sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used in improving the harbor and water front of Stillwater, Minn., so as to render it accessible to steamboats and other craft navigating said river.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving St. Croix River, Wisconsin and Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$15,000, of which sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used in improving the harbor and water front of Stillwater, Minn., so as to render it accessible to steamboats and other craft navigating said river.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 11, to strike out:

Improving Red River of the North, Minnesota: Continuing improvement, \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 13, to insert:

Improving Red River of the North, Minnesota, and its tributaries: Continuing improvement, \$20,000, of which sum \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used in improving the navigation of the Red Lake River, between Thief River Falls and Red Lake, according to the plan of Maj. W. A. Jones in his report of February 26, 1895.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 6, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

Provided, That the expenditure of said money shall be made upon said river, from the mouth thereof to the forks in said river.

And insert:

And so much thereof as may be necessary may be used for dredging to a depth of 20 feet between the mouth of the river and a point 2 miles southward.

So as to make the clause read:

Improving Calumet River, Illinois: Continuing improvement, \$50,000, and so much thereof as may be necessary may be used for dredging to a depth of 20 feet between the mouth of the river and a point 2 miles southward.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert "and for acquiring right of way, including necessary surveys, \$20,000"; in line 18, after the word "for," to insert "the whole or any part of"; in line 21, after the word "Canal," to insert "or the said materials may be purchased and

the work done otherwise than by contract"; and in line 23, after the word "necessary," to strike out "therefor" and insert "for the said canal"; so as to make the clause read:

For the construction of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal: Continuing construction, \$25,000, and for acquiring right of way, including necessary surveys, \$20,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into contracts for the whole or any part of such material and work as may be necessary to complete the present project of said Illinois and Mississippi Canal, or the said materials may be purchased and the work done otherwise than by contract; and to acquire such further right of way as may be necessary for the said canal, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$3,710,960, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 24, on page 77.

Mr. NELSON. I move to strike out the word "to," in line 23, and insert the word "and." It is to correct a mistake.

The SECRETARY. In line 23, page 77, it is proposed to strike out the word "to" and insert "and"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving the Mississippi River between the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad bridge at St. Paul, and the Washington avenue bridge at Minneapolis: Continuing improvement, \$100,000.

Mr. FRYE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 78, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "three" and insert "four"; in line 5, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "two"; in line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert "exclusive of the amount herein appropriated"; in line 25, before the word "cents," to strike out "sixty-six" and insert "sixty-seven"; on page 79, line 11, after the word "That," to insert "any balance of former appropriations now available and"; in line 13, after the word "expended," to strike out "in pursuance of said contracts"; in line 19, after the word "of," to insert "ultimately"; in the same line, after the word "obtaining," to insert "and maintaining"; and in line 22, after the word "depth," to insert "at all periods of the year except when navigation of the river is closed by ice"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to St. Paul, Minn.: Continuing improvement, \$475,000, of which amount \$200,000 shall be expended on that portion of said river from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River, and \$275,000 from the mouth of the Missouri River to the mouth of the Ohio River: *Provided*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the systematic improvement of the Mississippi River between the points mentioned, or said materials may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$5,025,000, exclusive of the amount herein appropriated: *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, said contracts and materials purchased and work done otherwise than by contract for the section of said river between St. Paul and the mouth of the Missouri River shall not exceed \$200,000, and thereafter shall not exceed for the three years beginning July 1, 1897, the sum of \$826,666.67 annually: *Provided further*, That such contracts and materials purchased and work done otherwise than by contract for that section of the said river between the mouth of the Missouri and the mouth of the Ohio River for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, shall not exceed the sum of \$325,000, and thereafter for the three years commencing July 1, 1897, shall not exceed the sum of \$673,333.33 annually: *And provided further*, That any balance of former appropriations now available and the money hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended for the said section of said river between the mouth of the Missouri River and the mouth of the Ohio River, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended in the construction of suitable dredge boats, portable jetties, and other suitable appliances, and in the maintenance and operation of the same, with the view of ultimately obtaining and maintaining a navigable channel from St. Louis to Cairo not less than 250 feet in width and 9 feet in depth at all periods of the year except when navigation of the river is closed by ice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 23, to strike out:

That \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the money herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River between Cairo and the mouth of the Missouri River shall be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to protect the east bank of the Mississippi River from caving in and being washed away at or near a point opposite the mouth of the Missouri River and extending south along said east bank as far as may be necessary to effect the purpose above mentioned.

That of the money herein appropriated for use on the Mississippi River from Cairo to the mouth of the Missouri River the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is directed to be expended in removing the bar in front of Chester, Ill., and protecting the west bank of the Mississippi River opposite Chester, Ill.

And insert:

That of the money herein appropriated for the improvement of the Mississippi River between Cairo and the mouth of the Missouri River there may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in order to improve the channel of the river, such amounts as may be necessary to protect the east bank of the Mississippi River from caving in and being washed away at or near a point opposite the mouth of the Missouri River and extending south along said east bank, and in removing the bar in front of Chester, Ill., and protecting the west bank of the Mississippi River opposite Chester.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 1, after the word

"appropriated," to insert "and authorized to be expended"; so as to make the clause read:

That of the money herein appropriated and authorized to be expended for the improvement of the Mississippi River from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River there shall be expended the following respective amounts, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. The item between lines 8 and 14 on page 81, may be passed over for the present at the request of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The item within the lines indicated will be passed over.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 81, after line 14, to strike out:

For the removal of the bar in the Mississippi River, on the east side thereof, opposite the city of Dubuque, in the State of Iowa, \$5,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that this amendment—

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the lines just read will be retained.

Mr. ALLISON. That is what I want.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that this amendment and the amendment in lines 23, 24, and 25, on the same page, may be disagreed to. I have a letter in reference to the latter amendment, pertaining to Quincy, Ill., and the Senator himself has quite a number of letters with reference to the first, which seem to make it absolutely necessary that the two provisions shall be left in the bill as the House had it.

Mr. ALLISON. I was about to make the same suggestion. I know personally as respects the first amendment that it ought to be disagreed to.

Mr. VEST. I want to say frankly to the Senate that I suppose the people of Missouri have as much interest as the people of Illinois and Iowa in these improvements, but the trouble comes—and both Senators will recognize it—from the fact that there is no recommendation or estimate from the engineers in regard to these improvements. In other words, in order to put these appropriations back as they came from the other House, we are asked to take the verbal statements of members of Congress or letters and telegrams from citizens; and I have received a number of them. It must be evident to these Senators and to everybody that if you make up the river and harbor bill in that way the amount appropriated will be indefinite, and there is no telling what sort of improvements will be made. There is no estimate, there is no recommendation, there is no survey for these improvements.

Mr. CULLOM. As to the Dubuque item, we have improved the river on one side and not on the other. I do not know whether or not the item is in the estimates, but I do know that the merchants on the opposite side of the river, at East Dubuque, are absolutely cut off by a sand bar there, so that they can not get boats up to the shore at all. That is entirely unfair. There are a number of merchants there; and the chairman of the committee has received quite a number of letters from the Representative of that district [Mr. HITT], showing the urgent necessity for an appropriation. I have been there myself, and have seen exactly the situation in reference to it.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Illinois allow me to say a word?

Mr. CULLOM. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Iowa give us his views.

Mr. ALLISON. I am perfectly familiar with the situation and location there at Dubuque. It does not need an engineer to know what ought to be done there. This item does not increase the appropriation a single dollar. It merely takes from the general appropriation the sum named to preserve the channel at this particular point. It is the city in which I live, the commerce of my city crosses at that point, and I am perfectly familiar with it. The reason the local engineer does not make the improvement is that under the terms of a general appropriation he can not apply the money locally without authority from Congress. I think that where we have this absolute knowledge it does not require an engineer to know that if a sand bar accumulates at a point where commerce is constant it is an obstruction. There are two or three elevators at this point, and because of the sand bar they can not be reached. But for the technical situation as to this appropriation this sand bar would be removed.

I hope the amendment will be disagreed to, and I suggest to my friend from Missouri that this is not an unusual thing in these appropriation bills where the necessities seem to require it.

Mr. VEST. There are a large number of these appropriations here, put in at the request of members of both Houses simply upon their own statement, without any estimate, without a survey, or any recommendation.

Mr. CULLOM. I want to say, furthermore, that when I discovered that those two items and another one in the bill had been stricken out I at once undertook to find out the reason for that action. As to the two, I find that it is exceedingly important to the business of those localities that they should be reinstated. As

to the third, I am not satisfied, and therefore am not asking that anything be done in relation to it.

Mr. VEST. What does the Senator mean by the third?

Mr. CULLOM. There is still another item, that at Rock Island, in regard to which I have no information which justifies me in insisting upon its being put back, and therefore I do not intend to do so.

Mr. VEST. In regard to Sny Island?

Mr. CULLOM. That is not in dispute.

Mr. FRYE. That was passed over. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] who is absent desired it passed over.

Mr. VEST. I did not understand that.

Mr. CULLOM. The two items to which I refer are the Dubuque item, stricken out, and the bar in front of the steamboat landing at Quincy. Quincy is a city of 40,000 people. Since there has been a railroad bridge built across the river there, a little above the city, a sand bar has begun to form, and steamboats—of which there a dozen a day coming up and going down that river—if they are going down, have to go down the main channel by the city and then back up on the inside of that bar in order to get in at all. That is the literal fact of the case; and for the Senate to hesitate to restore those items on such a state of facts would be, I think, very singular. I do not care what the War Department has done about it. I think it is unfair to the people of those localities that those items should be stricken out, and I hope that there will be no hesitation about restoring them.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, all these statements come to us for the first time. No such statements were made in committee, and we must look to the Book of Estimates and to the reports of the Engineer Corps.

Mr. CULLOM. I understand that is so as a general proposition.

Mr. VEST. And when we looked, we could not find any estimates nor any survey nor any recommendation, yet these rivers and harbors are under the control and supervision of officers sent from the Corps of Engineers to each river and harbor in the United States.

Mr. CULLOM. There are sand bars in both places, patent and open to the world, and boats plying up and down the river can not land where they ought to land so as to accommodate the people.

Mr. VEST. That may be and doubtless is true, but it is a singular fact that the engineer in charge of the river, with those bars right before him and knowing their injurious effect upon navigation, did not refer to them in his general estimate for the river, and though he has given very fully the details of the improvements to be made, he has said nothing about these improvements.

Mr. CULLOM. I know the facts as to both cases, because I have been at both places within the year. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] lives directly opposite one of them, and there is no question whatever about the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce, striking out the words from line 15 to line 17, inclusive, on page 81.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 81, after line 23, to strike out:

For removing the sand bar in front of the steamboat landing at Quincy, in the State of Illinois, \$10,000.

Mr. CULLOM. That is the other place I referred to, and I hope that appropriation will be retained in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on striking out the clause which has been read.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, at the top of page 82, to strike out:

For maintaining the harbor at Rock Island, Ill., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, after line 2, to strike out:

For maintaining the harbor at La Crosse, Wis., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 13, to increase the appropriation for "continuing the work of constructing artificial banks between the mouth of Flint River, in Des Moines County, Iowa, and running along the west bank of the Mississippi River to the mouth of the Iowa River," from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 15, after the word "appropriated," to insert "and authorized to be expended"; and in line 17, after the word "made," to insert "and cost of improvements to be estimated"; so as to make the clause read:

And the Secretary of War, out of the money herein appropriated and authorized to be expended for the improvement of the Mississippi River from St. Paul to the mouth of the Missouri River, shall cause surveys to be made and cost of improvements to be estimated as follows, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 20, before the word "County," to strike out "Mercer" and insert "Rock Island"; and on page 83, line 3, after the word "channel," to strike out "with an estimate of the cost thereof"; so as to make the clause read:

On the east side of the Mississippi River, commencing at Drury's Landing, in Rock Island County, State of Illinois, and running along the east bank of said river to New Boston, with a view to the improvement of navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks, and by deepening the channel; also along the east bank of said river, from at or near the city of Oquawka, Ill., to at or near Dallas City, in the said State, with a view to the improvement of navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks and by deepening the channel; also on the west side of said river from the bluff above the city of Madison, Lee County, in the State of Iowa, along the west bank of said river to the mouth of Skunk River, in said Lee County, and along the west bank of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Iowa River, in Louisa County, to the city of Muscatine, in Muscatine County, Iowa, with a view of improving the navigation by preventing the overflow of the natural and artificial banks and by deepening the channel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 4, to strike out:

Also commencing at Drury's Landing in Rock Island County, Ill., and running along the east bank of said river to New Boston, Ill., with a view to improving the navigation by preventing the water from overflowing the natural and artificial banks along those parts of the river and deepening the channel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 20, after the word "building," to insert "and repairing"; in line 22, after the word "river," to insert "such improvement, surveys, building and repairs of levees to be made and carried on"; on page 85, line 24, after the word "obtaining," to insert "and maintaining"; and on page 86, line 1, after the word "depth," to insert "at all periods of the year except when navigation is closed by ice"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Mississippi River from Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Mississippi River Commission: Continuing improvement, \$625,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building and repairing of levees, and for surveys, including the continuation of the survey between Head of Passes and the head waters of the river, such improvement, surveys, building and repairs of levees to be made and carried on in such manner as in their opinion shall best improve navigation and promote the interests of commerce at all stages of the river: *Provided*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the plans of the Mississippi River Commission as aforesaid, or said materials may be purchased and work done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$8,375,000: *Provided further*, That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, said contracts and materials purchased and work done otherwise than by contract shall not exceed the sum of \$625,000, and thereafter shall not exceed the sum of \$2,583,333 annually for the three years beginning July 1, 1897: *Provided further*, That the money hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended in pursuance of said contracts, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be expended in the construction of suitable dredge boats and other devices and appliances, and in the maintenance and operation of the same, with the view of obtaining and maintaining a navigable channel from Cairo down not less than 250 feet in width and 9 feet in depth at all periods of the year except when navigation is closed by ice: *Provided further*, That of the sum hereby appropriated and authorized to be expended the sum of \$64,000 shall be expended in the rectification of the banks at Greenville, Miss., and \$64,000 in the rectification of the banks at Helena, Ark., according to late plans submitted by Capt. Graham D. Fitch, Corps of Engineers, and \$16,000 in the rectification of the banks at New Madrid, Mo.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "three hundred"; and in line 10, after the word "*Provided*," to strike out "that in the discretion of said Commission a portion of such sum may be expended in protection of harbors and localities on said river: *And provided also*"; and in line 21, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "three hundred"; so as to make the clause read:

Improving Missouri River, including salaries, clerical, office, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses of the Missouri River Commission, survey, permanent bench marks, and gauges: Continuing improvement, \$300,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in the systematic improvement of the river according to the plans and specifications of the Missouri River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That on and after the passage of this act additional contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such material and work as may be necessary to carry on continuously the plans of the Missouri River Commission for the improvement of said river, or said material may be purchased and work may be done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$300,000 per annum for three years, commencing July 1, 1897.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 25, to strike out:

Contracted for, \$80,000 may be expended at Omaha and Council Bluffs; at Rocheport \$20,000, at Glasgow \$20,000, at Miami \$75,000, and at St. Charles, Mo., \$50,000.

And insert:

Expended, there may be expended, in the discretion of said Commission, such amounts at Omaha, Council Bluffs, Leavenworth, Atchison, Rocheport, Glasgow, Miami, St. Charles, and at the mouth of the Little Blue, in Jack-

son County, Mo.; also for protecting the shore line of the Missouri River above Glasgow, from the foot of Bowling Green Bend to the head of Harrisons Island, and at other harbors and localities on said river as may be necessary to improve the channel by preventing erosion of the banks.

So as to make the clause read:

Of the money hereby appropriated and hereby authorized to be expended, there may be expended, in the discretion of said Commission, such amounts at Omaha, Council Bluffs, Leavenworth, Atchison, Rocheport, Glasgow, Miami, St. Charles, and at the mouth of the Little Blue, in Jackson County, Mo.; also for protecting the shore line of the Missouri River above Glasgow, from the foot of Bowling Green Bend to the head of Harrisons Island, and at other harbors and localities on said river as may be necessary to improve the channel by preventing erosion of the banks.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CULLOM in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska rise to move to amend the amendment?

Mr. THURSTON. I rise to suggest, Mr. President, that my people are very solicitous to have the clause stand in the bill as it came from the other House. I think myself that they have been laboring under some misapprehension as to the real character of the House provision. I believe that they have thought that the bill as it came from the House carried an absolute appropriation of \$80,000 for the first year's improvement at Omaha and Council Bluffs, whereas, as a matter of fact, if I read the bill correctly as it came from the House, it only provides that out of the annual appropriation and out of the three additional years provided for by continuing contracts there may be expended at Omaha and Council Bluffs \$80,000. Therefore the House provision is really an appropriation of \$20,000 per annum specifically for the work at Omaha and Council Bluffs. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if that is his understanding of that appropriation?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I am responsible, I suppose, more than any one else on the committee for this amendment. My construction of that appropriation is that the \$80,000 is to come out of the aggregate amount appropriated for the first year, the next fiscal year; and then, under the continuing contract, it will depend upon the Missouri River Commission, in their discretion, to take all the \$80,000 in any one year or to take it out at fifteen or twenty thousand dollars a year, or in any other amount annually. That would be my construction, and was at the time the amendment was inserted. I do not think they will get \$80,000 a year. That is very evident. They get \$80,000, but whether they would get all of that in one year or two years or three years is a matter within the discretion of the Missouri River Commission.

Mr. ALLISON. Then, may I ask the Senator from Missouri, if he so construes it because of the words in line 25 "of the money hereby appropriated and hereby authorized to be contracted for"?

Mr. VEST. Yes; that is the amount of the continuing contract.

Mr. ALLISON. If those words "contracted for" were out of the bill I think the \$80,000 could be taken out of the appropriation immediately preceding.

Mr. VEST. Yes; but the words are "to be contracted for." That is the amount of the continuing contract.

Mr. THURSTON. There is another reason, which will be seen by an examination of the several specific appropriations, why that construction must be the true one. It will be seen that the bill as it came from the House appropriated only \$250,000 for the first year, and that these specific appropriations, all under this same clause, amount in the aggregate to \$325,000.

Mr. VEST. That is true.

Mr. THURSTON. It is therefore perfectly evident that these specific allotments of money to localities are to cover the entire period of the present appropriation and the additional three years' contracts. Such being the construction of the bill as it came from the House, I am myself inclined to believe that the amendment as reported by the committee would give to my locality, in all human probability, as great, or greater, an expenditure of money in the matter of their local improvements than would the bill as it came from the House; and yet I see no particular reason why the bill as it came from the House may not as well be left as it came here as to amend it as proposed. There is in the bill as it came from the House no absolute command upon the Missouri River Commission to expend this money at these particular points, and as the general appropriation is amended by the Senate already, it would only specifically provide for the local expenditure at the specified points of \$325,000 out of four years' appropriation; and four years at \$300,000 per year is \$1,200,000. Therefore nearly three-fourths of the entire sum would be left at the disposition of the Missouri River Commission for expenditure at such other points on the river as might be deemed expedient.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Nebraska will permit me to call his attention to what seems to me, at least, to be unreasonable in the mentioning of Omaha and Council Bluffs and Rocheport and Glasgow and St. Charles, without mentioning a number of other places which are situate along the river, such as Leavenworth and Atchison. The people of our State are very much interested in taking care of the river at those places. My colleague is better able to describe the situation at both those places than I

am. I do, however, know personally that there is need of a great deal of work to be done at Leavenworth and Atchison, more particularly at Atchison. The river has changed its channel so as to interfere materially with the movement of the city and the management of the railways and the bridge companies, and it is a matter of very serious concern to our people. It is a question in my mind whether it would not be better to leave the paragraphs just as they are now, as the Senate committee have made them, and trust to the friction that may yet be aroused in conference for final adjustment.

Mr. THURSTON. As I have stated, if I were left to my own individual judgment in this matter I should certainly be quite as content with the provisions of the bill as amended by the committee as I should with the provisions of the bill as it comes from the other House. I have therefore brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, and asked nonconcurrence in the amendment reported by the committee more particularly for the purpose of having the true character of the House provision understood and placed upon the record here, in order that my people may no longer understand that the House of Representatives appropriated \$80,000 per annum for expenditure at Omaha and Council Bluffs, when, in fact, the appropriation is \$80,000, covering a period of four years' work, and which, if expended equally during that time, would simply be an appropriation of \$20,000 annually for our local improvement of the river.

With this statement of the case, I leave it to the Senate to say whether it will stand by the amendment as proposed by the committee or leave the bill as it came from the other House.

Mr. BAKER. I desire an amendment also to this clause. I notice that there are a number of places grouped together on page 88.

Mr. THURSTON. Let me suggest to the Senator—I presume I know what amendment or about what amendment he would propose—that I also have an amendment to propose if the Senate committee provision is left. I should like to first take the sense of the Senate as to whether or not it will adopt the amendment as reported by the committee. If it does, then I should like to join the Senator from Kansas in having inserted one other name from Nebraska, as I presume he desires to insert one or more from Kansas.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad to hear the suggested amendment before I vote for the amendment proposed by the committee, so as to know what is the whole scheme.

Mr. BAKER. The amendment I desire is in reference to Leavenworth and Atchison. The amendment I propose would be at the end of line 13, on page 88, to insert:

Provided, That on the Missouri River, opposite Leavenworth, Kans., there shall be expended the sum of \$15,000, and on the Missouri River, opposite Atchison, Kans., there shall be expended the sum of \$15,000.

These are very important places, and it is necessary to protect the Missouri River at these particular points. I believe, as nothing has been given to our locality, particularly our State, it would be but right and proper that these specific appropriations should be made for these two points. It is absolutely necessary to complete the improvements heretofore made at these two points that these sums of money should be expended and that there should be specific appropriations. We fear if we are left here with these large cities in a lump, without any distribution, that we shall not be able to obtain any part of this appropriation whatever. I notice that at other points and in other places it is usual and customary to designate the particular amount which they desire, and which is desired to be there expended. Therefore I ask that the amendment I propose be inserted so that we may have a specific appropriation amounting to \$15,000 for each of these places.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I have not heretofore had an opportunity of examining the amendment. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senate committee, with a friendly commission, or perhaps without, will better accomplish the purposes in view than the provision as it came from the House. Under the House provision I think the Missouri River Commission would feel itself constrained to expend only \$80,000 for a period of four years, no matter what might be the condition of the river at Council Bluffs and Omaha. The erosion of that river between those two points often requires a very large expenditure in a single year.

Under the Senate provision the Commission is authorized in its discretion to expend such amounts at Omaha and Council Bluffs, Leavenworth, Atchison, and at other points, naming a number of points, and then at the end of the provision "and at other harbors and localities on said river as may be necessary to improve the channel by preventing the erosion of the banks." So it seems to me even without the amendment of the Senator from Kansas, if there is a condition of the channel opposite either Atchison or any of these other points, the Missouri Commission would be directed under the last clause to make such expenditures as may be necessary to prevent the erosion of the banks at that point. I

understand that is the object of these improvements at the points named.

So while I have no special objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas, it strikes me that, looking at these two provisions, the Senate committee's provision will accomplish more easily and more directly and more effectively what is necessary at these several places.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Kansas inform the Chair whether he desires to offer his amendment?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, sir; I want to state further, in reply to the Senator from Iowa, one main objection to the provision in its present shape. It provides that a commission shall expend this money.

Now, we all know, without reflecting upon the commission, that it requires a great deal of logrolling to get the commission to improve at particular places and points. I notice that in the East and in the West in particular localities specific appropriations are made. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that Kansas is not good at logrolling. Kansas does not want to humiliate herself by going before a commission and demanding this or demanding that. Here is the proper place to fix it, and that is the reason why I desire to have it fixed here, so that we shall know what we are to have, and that afterwards champagne suppers, dances, and seances shall not be necessary in order to obtain appropriations or parts of appropriations at any particular place or locality.

I notice, Mr. President, that New England is not put in such a humiliating position. I do not think the West ought to be put in such a humiliating position. I simply ask justice. Improvements have been made at these points, and they were important improvements; it was important to the people of Missouri and Kansas that they should be made. Those improvements are not yet complete. I understand from the mayor of the city and others who are competent to judge that these specific sums are necessary and proper to complete the improvements. Now, as we have been generous in this bill, I ask simply as a matter of justice to the State of Missouri at these points and to the State of Kansas at these points that we may have specific appropriations, so that we shall know what we are to depend upon, and that we shall not be subject to the whims or caprices of any board or any body or any tribunal.

My desire would be first to offer the following amendment, to come in after the word "banks," at the end of line 13:

Improving the Missouri River opposite Leavenworth, Kans., the sum of \$15,000; on the Missouri River opposite Atchison, Kans., the sum of \$15,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, in those two cases there is this difference, and there was this trouble before the committee. In some cases there had been estimates made of the amount of money required to take care of a certain improvement at a certain locality, and in other cases the only estimates we had were from members of Congress. In this case there were estimates both at Leavenworth and at Atchison, and I think that I may say the committee justify me in agreeing to accept these two amendments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the question of improving the Mississippi and the Missouri rivers is full of difficulties, and it is almost impossible to meet all the demands that are made either upon the Board of Engineers or upon the commission in charge of those rivers. I have very decided views in regard to these improvements on the Missouri River, on the banks of which I have lived for fifty years. It is the most erratic stream in the United States and the most difficult to improve. It is now in such a condition that no insurance can be had upon a boat or cargo that goes up that river, and yet it drains one of the most fertile regions in the West and ought to be covered with steamboats carrying freight and passengers.

The Missouri River Commission (and I drew the bill which organized that Commission) is made up of three engineer officers from the Corps of Engineers and two civilians, one of whom is from the State of Missouri and one from the State of Nebraska. It is safe to assume, then, that Missouri and Nebraska represented upon that board would have the proper improvements made.

It must be stated frankly that one objection which is made to all these plans for specific improvements does not apply to Leavenworth and Atchison. The Missouri River Commission, in their estimates and recommendations, state that the improvements at Leavenworth and at Atchison upon the oppositeside of the river should be continued. But there are no estimates and no recommendations as to these other specific improvements or appropriations in the bill as passed by the House. For instance, at Omaha the Commission do not recommend any improvement, but they state substantially that the necessary amount has been expended there, and that

all that is necessary is to maintain the works as they have been done, and they ask for no money.

Three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars was put in the State of Missouri, and, as a matter of course, if I were actuated by selfish purposes or personal ends I would stand here and demand these specific appropriations, for I am assailed almost hourly by my constituents from these different localities, these little towns on the river, to save our specific appropriations. The money is to be spent there, the material is to be bought there, and, as a matter of course, they are not to be condemned or criticised for it. They are like the rest of the world; they are looking to their immediate purposes and to the expenditures to be made right about them.

Now, I have not the slightest doubt but what the Missouri River can be improved and navigation brought back to it, and it can be made a portion of the great waterway to the Gulf, for it is really the Mississippi River. It gives color to it, and it ought to have given name to the whole river. But this improvement can be done in only one way, and I speak from the closest observation and experience. It can be done only by improving the river by reaches, going down the river 25 and 30 and 40 miles and systematically improving it.

We have appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars (and I have been as much responsible for it as any Senator, possibly more so, under the demands of my constituents) at different localities to prevent erosion of the banks, to save walls, to save farms, and the money has been expended and the work washed away in the freshet that came down from the Rocky Mountains, from Montana and the Dakotas, in the next year. What we suffer from there is what has endangered the Lower Mississippi—immense fires upon the head waters of the Missouri, that destroy the undergrowth and the mosses and the herbage that would absorb the water, and it runs as it would over the top of this desk when the snows break up in the spring and pours a flood down the Missouri and Mississippi, resulting in immense erosion and destruction of lands and even of towns.

The river can only be improved like the Mississippi River, by reaches systematically. We have had this practically demonstrated. The Missouri River Commission commenced at Jefferson City and improved for 45 miles down the river systematically, one improvement supporting the other, one curve in the banks being destroyed by putting the proper improvements on the opposite side, always throwing the river against the bluff, the rocky side, and protecting the alluvial lands. What is the result? There is not a finer piece of riparian engineering in the world than on the 45 miles below Jefferson City. It stood three freshets, and you can not see where the river has made any impression upon it. Nothing else was ever known like it before. That was done by following the recommendations of the Missouri River Commission.

I have stood here year after year battling for the support of the Commission, as long as we have one. We have five officers there, three of them from the Corps of Engineers; we are paying them salaries; they are conducting the improvement according to their own way, and they could do it in no other. As long as we have a Commission we ought to support them in that work.

The pressure brought upon other members of the Senate is nothing compared to that upon me. Here is \$325,000 that is washing away in specific appropriations in my own State. To support the plan of the Commission is, I believe, the best thing for the people there, and I think they will see it in the end. There will be some temporary and local irritation and great criticism of me in the county newspapers, but the end will justify it, as it did in the reach below Jefferson City. That Commission can be trusted. My friend from Kansas is mistaken in thinking that you must go there and logroll with them. They are not able to meet the demands of all localities and therefore there are always people dissatisfied. I have myself thought at times that they ought to interfere with the course of the river when these ravages were being made upon magnificent land worth fifty and seventy-five dollars an acre and that would produce anything in the world. But I have been satisfied, after I watched their work and inspected it in person, as my colleague has done with me, that they were right and that they understood how to bridle that river and to keep it in its channel, if human ingenuity and talent could do it.

Captain Eads, the greatest riparian engineer who ever lived in this country, and I think in any other—not the greatest fortifications engineer, but riparian engineer—told me once that the Mississippi River could be improved with \$100,000,000 and with nothing less. But he said, "You must put a bridle upon it like you do upon an unbroken horse; and it will take years to do it, and a hundred million dollars to do it." And yet every year we appropriate two or three million dollars and the freshets come and the works are washed away.

I appeal to the Senate to sustain the committee in doing what they have thought to be right. It is all that they could do. All these towns in Missouri, my own constituents, my personal and political friends, are to-day writing and telegraphing me to keep

the House bill as it was, because these fifty or sixty thousand dollars of appropriations for localities are contained in it. My personal and political friends, if I consulted them, would have the bill as passed by the House; but I am satisfied that it is simply throwing away that much money. There are no recommendations for such appropriations. There are no estimates. When I saw these appropriations in the bill I communicated with my colleagues in the other House and invited them to show me where the commission had recommended any such appropriations or stated any estimates as to the amount. I was informed that one of the board had verbally told a member of the House that he thought there ought to be money expended at these points.

I submit to the Senate, can we appropriate \$325,000 on oral statements of that kind when a board is composed of five members, three of them belonging to the Engineer Corps? I make, I was about to say, from a political standpoint, a greater sacrifice than any other Senator, than all others put together, and yet I am absolutely certain that I am right in regard to it and that the committee were right in sustaining the provision as it is found reported in the bill.

Omaha will receive all the money that is necessary if there is an erosion of the banks there. If the Senator from Kansas wants \$15,000 at Leavenworth and at Atchison, he is supported by an estimate and a recommendation, but that is not the case as to these other places. Unquestionably that is so, and I shall make no resistance if he insists upon it, though I believe that he will fare better to let the improvements opposite those two cities remain in the bill as we have it proposed by the committee. Those improvements are on the Missouri side of the river, in one of the wealthiest counties in the State, not in Kansas, but in Platte County, Mo.

Mr. BAKER. I appreciate what the Senator from Missouri says, but still I think I ought to insist upon \$15,000 at Atchison and \$15,000 at Leavenworth.

Mr. VEST. Very good; I am perfectly willing to go back to the people of Platte County, where I have as good friends as any in the world, who have always supported me in every ambition of my life, and defend the amendment as we have put it in the bill. I think I can satisfy them that it is the best for them. But if the Senator from Kansas, who has, as I say, recommendations and estimates for these places, and the other places have not, insists upon the \$30,000, it is all that the State of Kansas has asked from the committee, and I am perfectly willing to concede it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BAKER] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I wish to move an adjournment.

Mr. VEST. Let us get through with this item.

Mr. FRYE. Yes, let us get through with it.

Mr. BAKER. Let us vote on my amendment.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to offer another amendment to the amendment of the committee. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "expended" where it occurs in line 4, and inserting "contracted for," so that the latter provision may share the same fate as the general provision.

Mr. VEST. How would it read then?

Mr. ALLISON. It would then read:

Of the money hereby appropriated and hereby authorized to be contracted for there may be expended, in the discretion of said Commission, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. VEST. No; not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THURSTON. In line 6, after the words "Council Bluffs," I move to insert "Nebraska City."

Mr. VEST. That is right.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the Senator from New York moves to adjourn I hope the Senate will conclude to consider the next amendment.

Mr. VEST. We have not yet disposed of the committee amendment.

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

Mr. FRYE. Let me inquire, where do Leavenworth and Atchison now come in—at the end?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the end of line 13.

Mr. FRYE. Then those words must be stricken out in line 6.

Mr. VEST. I was about to make the suggestion that they be stricken out of the body of the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In line 6, after the words "Nebraska City," just inserted, strike out "Leavenworth, Atchison."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be agreed to unless objection is made. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. Now, I think I have kept the Senate here as late as I am justified in doing.

BOOK AGENTS OF METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH.

Mr. BATE. The Senator from New York is kind enough to suspend the motion to adjourn until I can ask for the consideration of Senate bill 2962. It asks for no money. It simply sends a case to the Court of Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is putting all the Senators to a great deal of annoyance in having to ask unanimous consent when there are not half a dozen present, and at a time when we ought to adjourn. It is not the way to transact business. I am not going to object to the bill called up by the Senator from Tennessee, but I am going to object to any other request of the kind until we have some agreement by which we shall transact the business of the Senate in a proper and decent way, giving every Senator a chance and not having a regular scramble, as we have every day after 6 o'clock, when there is not a quorum here and when business ought not to be transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill indicated by the Senator from Tennessee will be read for information.

Mr. COCKRELL. I simply want to give notice now, so that there will be no personal feeling in regard to the matter.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Missouri does not intend his notice to apply to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not to apply to this case, as I said.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2962) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in the case "The Book Agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church" against The United States, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed. The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 8, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6, 1896.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles F. Terhune, to be postmaster at Binghamton, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

James Tiernan, to be postmaster at Fort Howard, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 7, 1896.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will cause the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday to be read.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER (having counted the House). Ninety-five gentlemen are present; not a quorum.

After an interval of eighteen minutes,

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, is a quorum not now present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there is a quorum present, and the Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. PICKLER. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal.

When the Clerk had reached that part of the Journal reciting the names of the absentees on the call of the committee and the names of those voting on the several roll calls,

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the Journal in full. Let us have the names.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the list of names in full.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will be approved.

Mr. PICKLER. I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the approval of the Journal, and on that demand the previous question.

The question was taken on the approval of the Journal; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKLER) there were—ayes 174, noes 0.

Mr. PICKLER. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. There is evidently a quorum present. If those gentlemen who did not rise in response to the vote will announce their presence the Chair will count those present and not voting.

Nine gentlemen having risen,

The SPEAKER. One hundred and seventy-four in the affirmative and nine gentlemen present and not voting. A quorum is present, and the Journal is approved.

PRINTING AND BINDING PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Printing, I desire to report a bill (H. R. 8237) to improve the printing and binding methods of the public documents, and ask its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annual reports of the heads of the Executive Departments and of the chiefs of bureaus, commissions, and offices shall not hereafter be numbered and printed as Congressional documents. Periodicals issued weekly, monthly, yearly, or at other regular intervals shall not be numbered and printed as Congressional documents. Special publications extending over a series of months or years and issued at irregular intervals shall not be numbered and printed as Congressional documents. The general rule and procedure shall be that the Congressional number shall be given only to those documents which emanate directly from Congress or are furnished in response to the call of Congress, or either House thereof, upon an Executive Department for information.

SEC. 2. That whenever any document not bearing a Congressional number is furnished for the use of Congress 500 additional copies thereof shall at the same time be furnished to the Superintendent of Documents for the supply of the designated depository libraries, and there shall also be furnished 15 copies for the Senate library and 15 copies for the House library, and to the Congressional Library 2 copies for its own use and 50 copies for its foreign exchanges. Of all such documents not bearing a Congressional number and ordered to be printed for the use of Congress the "usual number," which shall also be printed, shall be 1,100 copies, of which there shall be sent, in the unbound form, 170 copies to the Senate document room, 400 copies to the House document room, 10 copies to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and 20 copies to the office of the Clerk of the House, and 500 copies shall be reserved by the Public Printer in unstitched form, to be specially bound to the order of members and officers of Congress, as provided by law.

SEC. 3. That documents not bearing a Congressional number shall be bound as follows: If emanating from the Department of State, in scarlet cloth; if from the Department of the Treasury, in dark-blue cloth; if from the Department of War, in black cloth; if from the Department of the Navy, in dark-green cloth; if from the Department of Justice, in dark-brown cloth; if from the Post-Office Department, in drab cloth; if from the Department of the Interior, in maroon cloth; if from the Department of Agriculture, in light-brown cloth; if from the Department of Labor, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Fish Commission, the Smithsonian Institution, or other publishing office not connected with one of the Executive Departments, then in such colored cloth not used on the books of another bureau as such office and the Public Printer may agree upon; but when once adopted such color shall be continued from year to year in the binding of the same reports or other volumes from the same bureau, office, or commission. In providing cloth for binding the public documents the Public Printer shall not provide a second-rate and low grade, but shall provide either cotton or linen cloth of those first-class grades and qualities which promise to give the volumes the most attractive appearance and the greatest durability. In lettering or embossing books the Public Printer shall use gold leaf of the best and most suitable quality that is furnished for binders' use, and he shall not use "Dutch metal" or any other imitation of gold leaf. The Senate documents shall be bound in dark-brown cloth and the Senate reports in light-brown cloth. The House documents shall be bound in dark-drab cloth and the House reports in light-drab cloth: *Provided*, That the Revised Statutes, Statutes at Large, decisions of the Interior Department in land cases and in pension cases, opinions of the Attorney-General, or other publications of like character, properly designated as law books, may, within the discretion of the heads of Departments issuing the same, be bound in sheep.

SEC. 4. That in placing the titles on the backs or sides of books (not pamphlets) the following general rules shall govern: The fewest suitable number of words shall be used, and attempts to carry the whole title-page, or any considerable part of it, on the covers shall not be made. The largest and clearest type permitted by the space and by the rules of good taste shall be used, the purpose of making the titles readable at a distance being kept in view. The title placed near the top on the backs of books shall be the one indicating the subject-matter of the volume. The title placed in the middle panel shall be the one indicating the year or other date, the whole number of volumes in the series, and the special number of the particular volume on which the title is placed. The title near the bottom of the back of each book shall show the Department, Bureau, Office, or Commission from which it issues. Every cloth-bound book shall have on the back of its cover a title and a date, which on very thin books may be printed lengthwise of the volume. In expressing dates and other numbers on the backs of books Arabic numerals shall be used.

SEC. 5. That in making up the binder's titles for the House and Senate documents and reports when binding the "reserve," any document or report which fills more than one-third part of the volume in which it is contained shall be mentioned in the title on the back of the cover of such volume. The title near the top of the back of the cover on each of the reserve volumes shall be "House Documents," "House Reports," "Senate Documents," or "Senate Reports," according to the contents of the volumes. On the middle panel shall appear the number or numbers of the documents or reports contained in the volume, and also the name (or an abbreviation of the name) of any document or report contained therein which may separately fill one-third or more of the volume. When there is not in the volume any document or report making one-third the bulk of said volume, then the word "Miscellaneous" shall be placed on the middle back panel in addition to the numbers of the documents or reports therein contained. On the back of each volume of documents or reports, near the bottom, shall be placed the number and the years of the Congress in which such documents or reports originated.

SEC. 6. That the color, lettering, etc., of the binding and the phraseology, typography, etc., of the title-page of every public document shall be the same on and in all copies of such document, and there shall be but one