

By Mr. RAY: Petition of citizens of New Woodstock, N. Y., against any legislation prohibiting the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Eight petitions of the following granges: Quinnetaset, No. 65, of Connecticut, and Colchester, No. 78; two, one to each grange, for legislation to prevent gambling in farm products; two, one to each, for legislation to prevent the adulteration of foods and drugs; two, one to each, for legislation to encourage silk culture; and two, one to each, for the immediate passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two petitions of the same granges, one to each grange, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of citizens of Colchester, in favor of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of the same place, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Norwich, Conn., favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall prohibit State legislation for sectarian or ecclesiastical purposes or control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, five petitions of Senexet Grange, Connecticut, as follows: one to define lard and impose a tax thereon, the second for the encouragement of silk culture, the fourth to prevent gambling in farm products, and the fifth to prevent the adulteration of foods and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same grange, for prohibiting the discrediting of legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition by the same grange, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Connecticut, one of Scotland and the other of Thompson, in favor of free delivery of mails in rural districts; in favor of more frequent mails in country districts; in favor of two classes of mail matter, one for correspondence and one for printed matter and merchandise, and in favor of a parcel post and a postal currency—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHIVELY: Petition of Anthrem Metheny, to remove the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Resolutions of the Cairo Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, protesting against any appropriation for the Columbian Exposition unless the gates of said Exposition shall be closed on the Sabbath days—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SPERRY: Six petitions of granges, as follows: two of Connecticut; one of Somers, No. 105, of Connecticut; of Bolton, No. 47; of Newton, No. 44, and of Markapang Lake, No. 101, to prohibit contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, twelve petitions of granges, as follows: of Union, No. 25, of Connecticut; of Markapang Lake, No. 101; of Berlin, No. 24; of Suffield, No. 27; of Percival, No. 95; of Bolton, No. 47; of Somers, No. 105; of Bristol, No. 116; of Newtown, No. 44, of East Wordson, No. 94; and of Farmington, No. 49, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, nine petitions of granges, as follows: Suffield, East Walson, Farmington, State of Connecticut, Newington, Somers, Bolton, Union, and Bestine, for the encouragement of silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions by the same granges, with the addition of Maskapang, Percival, and State of Connecticut Granges, all to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, eleven petitions by the same granges, for the passage of a law to prevent the adulteration of foods and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, ten petitions of the same granges, for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, 6 petitions of members of various churches of Southington, Conn., against the opening on Sunday of any exposition where United States funds are expended—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR: Petition of Sarah H. Carr, in support of bill granting an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Elisabeth Parry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): Petition of W. R. Robinson and 6 members of Seventh-Day Adventists and 24 others, of Peoria, Sebastian County, Ark., against closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WEVER: Petition of Seventh-Day Adventists of Elbow Post-Office, Warren County, N. Y.—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WHITE: Three petitions of Success Grange, No. 720, of Iowa, praying for the passage of bill No. 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the same body, praying for the passage of a law preventing the adulteration of food and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the same body, praying for the passage of a law preventing gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLCOX: Petition of citizens of Durham, Conn., relating to restriction of foreign immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of H. A. Newlon, and others, regarding the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILSON of Missouri: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the heirs of Phillip Lutes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: Petition of 1,148 citizens and voters of Milton, Northumberland County, Pa., in favor of the passage of Senate bill 254, extending the privileges of free delivery of mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 113 citizens of Mount Carmel, Northumberland County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the act extending the privileges of free mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of State Board of Charities of New York, against immigration of undesirable persons within counties—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 60 citizens of Bradford County, Pa., in favor of House bill 401, to regulate and restrict immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 93 citizens of Susquehanna County, Pa., against any legislation by Congress requiring the World's Fair to be closed on Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, four petitions of Keiserville Grange, Pennsylvania, No. 508, Patrons of Husbandry, one in favor of pure foods and drugs, the second against contracts discrediting legal-tender currency, and the third in favor of pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial by the same grange, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, four memorials of Utility Grange, No. 873, of Pennsylvania, Patrons of Husbandry, as follows: One against gambling in farm products, the second in favor of silk culture, the third in favor of pure food, and the fourth against gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the same body, in favor of free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the same body, in favor of a pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania, one of 63 citizens of Troy, Bradford County, and the other of 58 citizens, in favor of House bill 401 to regulate and restrict immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 26, 1892.

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

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

EMPLOYÉS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 24th ultimo, a list of the employés of that Commission; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SAWYER presented sundry petitions collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wisconsin, containing thirty-three individual signatures, praying that no exposition or exhibition for which appropriations are made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PLATT presented a memorial of citizens of Sussex County, Del.; a memorial of citizens of Erie County, Pa.; a memorial

of citizens of Cook County, Ill.; a memorial of citizens of Bedford County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Chester County, Pa.; a memorial of citizens of Delaware County, Pa.; and a memorial of citizens of Germantown, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the Faulkner, Caine, and Teller bills providing home rule for Utah Territory; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Middlesex County, Conn., praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment forbidding any State to grant the right of suffrage to any person not a citizen of the United States; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the memorial of Charles F. Geer and 40 other citizens of Norwich, Conn., remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Ellington and Holenbeck Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Connecticut:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCMILLAN presented the memorial of E. P. Sheergood and 24 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Saginaw, Mich.; the memorial of H. A. Fenner and 28 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Judds Corners, Mich.; the memorial of L. Brown and 14 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Clio, Mich.; the memorial of W. C. Hebner and 6 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Cedar Lake, Mich.; the memorial of R. D. Dean and 9 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Clyde, Mich.; the memorial of J. M. Baker and 93 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Allegan, Mich.; the memorial of B. Salisbury and 167 other citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., and the memorial of B. A. Rogers and 124 citizens of Coopersville, Mich., remonstrating against the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PADDOCK presented the petition of George W. Martin, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Missouri; the petition of D. E. Smith, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Connecticut; the petition of R. A. Donnelly, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Jersey; the petition of J. A. Walker, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Indiana; the petition of Judson Spofford, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, and 4 other citizens, of Idaho; the petition of Thomas L. Gleason, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Georgia; the petition of L. M. Lange, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minnesota; the petition of Mrs. L. L. Hoffman and 6 other citizens of Salt Lake City, Utah Territory; the petition of Jennie L. Jones and 22 other citizens of Salt Lake City, Utah Territory; and the petition of C. N. Dilworth, department commander, Grand Army of the Republic, of Nebraska, praying that if any disposition is to be made of the Industrial Home property at Salt Lake City, Utah, the same be set aside for the use of a soldiers' home for disabled and needy soldiers and sailors; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented the petition of Eureka Alliance, No. 1659, of Indianola, Ind., and the petition of L. F. Millery and sundry other citizens of Red Willow County, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of the Civil Service Association of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an increase of the appropriations for the Civil Service Commission be made in order that the President of the United States may be justified in extending the system of competitive examinations; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of York, Pa., praying for the passage of the Torrey bankruptcy bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented two petitions collected by the National

Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pennsylvania, containing 105 and 175 signatures, respectively, praying that no exposition or exhibition for which appropriations are made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. COKE presented a memorial of many citizens of Texas, remonstrating against Congress committing the Government to a union of religion and the state by the passage of any legislation to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way to commit the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of citizens of McLennan County, Tex., praying that a pension be granted to Mrs. Mary J. Young, widow of William A. Young, late captain Dodd's company of Arkansas Independent Scouts; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the Bureau of American Republics be continued, and that adequate appropriations be made for its maintenance; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the passage of legislation compelling railroad companies to adopt safety appliances for coupling and braking cars; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Robert Taylor Post, No. 463, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri; Col. Cobham Post, No. 90, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota; Thaddeus Stevens Post, No. 390, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, and Kitching Post, No. 60, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, praying for the passage of legislation providing for the proper marking and preserving the battle lines at Gettysburg, Pa.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of citizens of Pittsburg and Western, in the State of Pennsylvania, and petitions of citizens of Memphis, Tenn., Cincinnati, Ohio, Evansville, Ind., Louisville, Ky., Vicksburg, Miss., and Baton Rouge, La., praying that the navigation of the Monongahela River be made free; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented sundry petitions, signed by 1,093 citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the passage of any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion, or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Big Run, Pa.; a petition of the New Salem Presbyterian Church of Delmont, Pa.; a petition of the Chartiers (Pa.) United Presbyterian Congregation; a petition of the North Washington Presbyterian Church of North Hope, Pa.; a petition of the New Salem Church of Shira, Pa.; a petition of Allegheny Presbyterian Church of Allegheny, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of West Glade Run, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Unionville, Pa.; a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Brownsdale, Pa.; a petition of St. Paul's Reformed Church of Adams, Pa.; a petition of the Grace Lutheran Mission of Butler, Pa.; a petition of the St. Paul's Reformed Church of Butler, Pa.; a petition of the Presbytery of Kittanning, Pa.; a petition of North Buffalo Congregation of Washington, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Burgetstown, Pa.; a petition of church members of Irwin, Pa., and a petition of the Eighth United Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited on the grounds, and that the art department be conducted in accordance with the American standard of purity in art; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. BATE presented a petition of citizens of the township of Greenfield, Weakley County, Tenn., praying for the passage of what are known as the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills, to impose a tax upon all transactions whereby parties contract or agree to sell and deliver at a future time any agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of citizens of Osceola County, Iowa, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Wilson Township Farmers' Alliance of Iowa; a petition of citizens of Ringgold County, Iowa; a petition of citizens of Osceola County, Iowa, and a petition of Paradise Alliance, No. 1481, of Iowa, praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-option bills; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Journeymen Stonemasons'

Association, of Davenport, Iowa, praying that in all contracts for public works the employment of convicts be prohibited, and that contractors for such work be compelled to abide by the eight-hour law; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PEPPER presented a communication from W. L. Squier, of Pleasanton, Kans., transmitting a memorial adopted by the Neosho (Kans.) Presbytery, remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, and the sale of intoxicating liquors thereat; which was referred, with the accompanying memorial, to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a memorial of the Society of Christian Endeavor, of Ottawa, Kans., remonstrating against the sale of liquor on the World's Fair grounds; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of citizens of Cowley County, Kans., praying for the free delivery of rural mails; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Gillespie County, Tex., praying for the regulation of speculation in fictitious farm products; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Foreign Missionary Society of the Friends' Church of Cottonwood Falls, Kans., remonstrating against the sale of intoxicating liquors to natives of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. ALLEN presented the memorial of Daniel Winter and 75 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Sprague County, Wash., remonstrating against Congress committing the United States Government to a union of religion and the state in the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waitsburg, Wash., signed by Mrs. M. C. Stewart, president, and Mrs. Nellie A. Pugh, secretary, remonstrating against the passage of the Dolph bill regulating the sale of spirituous liquors in Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DAWES presented the petition of Ormond F. Nims and other citizens of Boston, Mass., praying that an additional pension be granted Adelaide E. Palmer, whose husband served in the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Congregational ministers of Boston, Mass., and vicinity, remonstrating against the passage of the Chinese exclusion act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the executive committee of the Congregational ministers of Boston, Mass., and vicinity, remonstrating against any appropriation being made by Congress for the World's Columbian Exposition except on condition that it be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Sutton Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Massachusetts:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Petitions praying for the passage of a bill making certain issues of money full legal tender in payment of all debts—to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the city council of Minneapolis, Minn., signed by E. G. Potter, president of the council, and a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., praying that adequate provision be made for carrying on the improvement of the Mississippi River between Minneapolis and St. Paul; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of Gustaf Freeman and sundry other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Lake City, Minn., remonstrating against Congress committing the Government to a union of religion and the state in the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance of Washington County, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation preventing the sale of fictitious farm products; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., at a meeting held April 4, 1892, favoring the establishment of a public telegraph system under Government control; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the following petitions of Bloomington Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Minnesota:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition praying for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the adulteration of foods and drugs—ordered to lie on the table.

Petition praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts—referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition adopted by the Presbytery of Nebraska City, in session at Hebron, Nebr., April 12, 1892, and the petition of H. D. Gordon, pastor, and 100 members of the United Presbyterian Church of Edgerton, Kans., praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat, and that the art department be managed according to the American standard of purity in art; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. BUTLER presented the memorial of Rev. Benjamin Allston, George C. Hodges, and 100 other citizens of Union, S. C., remonstrating against the passage of any legislation providing for the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from their present reservation in Colorado; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of E. C. Millard and 4 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Windham County, Vt., remonstrating against a commitment of the Government to a union of religion and the state in the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of Frontier Post, No. 353, Grand Army of the Republic, of Speareville, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of any legislation for the free coinage of silver; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FELTON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of California, remonstrating against the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from their present fertile reservation in Colorado to Utah Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented the memorial of E. J. Church and 68 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Napa County, Cal., remonstrating against committing the Government to a union of religion and state by the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Dixon Grange, No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of California, praying for the passage of the bill to prevent gambling in farm products; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Dixon Grange, No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of California, praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of citizens of Dallas, Polk County, Oregon, praying for the passage of the bills known as the Washburn-Hatch antioption bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Workingmen's Mutual Association of Pendleton, Oregon, praying for the passage of the bill known as the Geary bill, providing for the total exclusion of Chinese from the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7818) to provide for certain of the most urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference

asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SAYERS, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. DINGLEY managers of 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 joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 3927) to amend "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice-President," approved January 19, 1886.

A bill (H. R. 720) to create a third division of the district of Kansas for judicial purposes, and to fix the time for holding court therein; and

A joint resolution (H. Res. 10) for the release of all claim of the United States to lot 18, section 2, governor and judges' plan, Detroit.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2985) granting an increase of pension to John Kinney, reported it without amendment.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at McKeesport, in the State of Pennsylvania, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1916) to provide for the erection of a public building at Washington, Pa., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2007) for a public building at Altoona, Pa., and appropriating money therefor, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2981) for the relief of the Citadel Academy of Charleston, S. C., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 566) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Maginnis military reservation in Montana, under the homestead and mining laws, for educational and other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to present the views of the minority of the Committee on Finance on this bill (S. 2133) to repeal the internal-revenue tax on the circulation of bank notes issued under State authority, which was reported adversely by the majority of the committee on the 1st of March. I ask that the views of the minority may be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That order will be made in the absence of objection.

BRANCH BANK AT WORLD'S FAIR.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8001) to authorize a national bank at Chicago, Ill., to establish a branch office upon the grounds of the World's Columbian Exposition, to report it favorably, without amendment. As this is a House bill, there is some urgency in the matter, and as the Committee on Finance can see no objection to it, I ask for its present consideration.

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

Mr. PLATT. I thought, as I listened to the reading of the bill, that it provided that any bank might have this privilege.

Mr. SHERMAN. Any bank designated by the Exposition. Only one bank can have the privilege, and it must be a bank in Chicago.

Mr. PLATT. Let the first part of the bill be read again. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That any national bank located in the city of Chicago and State of Illinois which may be designated by the World's Columbian Exposition to conduct a banking office upon the exposition grounds is hereby authorized to open and conduct such office as a branch of the bank, subject to the same restrictions and having the same rights as the bank to which it belongs.

Mr. PLATT. It is all right.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I am also directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2898) to authorize a national bank at Chicago, Ill., to establish a branch office upon the grounds of the World's Columbian Exposition, to report it adversely. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MILLS introduced a bill (S. 3000) granting a pension to Mary J. Young; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 3001) for the relief of Howard Lodge, No. 13, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Gallatin, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DAWES (for Mr. HOAR) introduced a bill (S. 3002) granting a pension to John Cairo; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. HOAR) introduced a bill (S. 3003) granting a pension to Adelaide E. Palmer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. HOAR) introduced a bill (S. 3004) granting a pension to Melinda C. Howe; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 3005) granting a pension to James Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 3006) granting an honorable discharge to Stephen S. Dolson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3007) for the relief of Patrick Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

MONUMENT TO GEN. GRANT.

Mr. SANDERS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 78) making an appropriation to the Grant Monument Association; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be read three times and passed.

Mr. PADDOCK. Let it be read for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Montana asks for the present consideration of the joint resolution which he has introduced.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it be read for information.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when the President shall be satisfied that the Grant Monument Association of the city of New York shall have such sum of money in its treasury as, with what has been expended therefor, will amount to \$500,000 for the erection in said city of a monument over the remains of Ulysses S. Grant, in commemoration of his services and as an expression of the affection for his memory borne by all classes of our citizens, it shall be lawful for the President, for and in behalf of all the people of the United States of America, to subscribe in their name to such fund the sum of \$250,000, which shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the treasurer of such association from time to time, in his discretion, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

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

COLUMBIA RIVER BOAT RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the river and harbor bill. The amendment is the bill proposing to appropriate "the sum of \$2,860,356.35, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in the construction of a boat railway, and of the necessary marine apparatus and appliances in connection therewith, for the purpose of transferring boats and their cargoes over and across the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls and Ten Mile Rapids on the Columbia River, either in the State of Oregon or the State of Washington, as may be determined most expedient by the Secretary of War."

This bill has heretofore been reported three several times from the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, without any objection from any member of that committee, and it has also passed the Senate on three several occasions at as many different sessions. It seems that whenever this subject has been carefully investigated by any committee it has been the unani-

mous conclusion that it is a public improvement of the very greatest importance, and one that ought to be entered upon by the Government at the very earliest possible moment.

In view of the action that has been taken heretofore in reference to this measure, I desire to express the sincere hope that the Committee on Commerce may see its way clear to inaugurate this improvement, if not by the appropriation of the whole amount, of such amount as will enable the work to be commenced and prosecuted with vigor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed.

STATE TAXATION OF NATIONAL NOTES, ETC.

Mr. HARRIS. On the 2d of March Senate bill 1699 was adversely reported and indefinitely postponed. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the vote by which it was indefinitely postponed may be reconsidered, and the bill placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that the vote by which the bill (S. 1699) to subject to State taxation national-bank notes and United States Treasury notes was indefinitely postponed be reconsidered, and that the bill with the adverse report be placed upon the Calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

Mr. COKE. I ask that the resolutions of the Senator from Alabama on the subject of silver coinage now on the table be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Resolutions by Mr. MORGAN, directing the Committee on Finance to make examination and report to the Senate certain information in relation to currency and coinage.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, the restoration of silver to the right of free coinage in the mints of the United States on an exact equality and the same terms and conditions with gold and its use as full legal-tender money by the Government and people of the United States is, and has been since 1877, demanded by a vast majority of the people of the United States in every form in which their desires and wishes can find expression. Bills for this purpose have repeatedly been passed through both Houses of Congress, against all the power of the executive branch of the Government exerted to suppress them; and the Executive veto, when all other methods of opposition and obstruction have failed, has been unhesitatingly interposed.

The Democratic party of this country is especially committed to the support of this great measure through the action of the State conventions in more than thirty of the States of the Union, containing nearly two-thirds of the entire population of the country, and by the votes and advocacy of from three-fourths to nine-tenths of the Democrats in the two Houses of Congress whenever, until this session of Congress, free-coinage bills have been before them. In addition, there has always been a considerable and respectable minority of the Republicans who have earnestly cooperated and voted with the Democrats in behalf of the measure. This great preponderance of public opinion, desire, and sentiment has up to this time been defeated and held in check by the combined money power of Europe and America, which finds in both countries the surest method of holding in servitude the masses of the people and appropriating the avails of their labor to be through a contraction of the volume of the circulating medium in which values must be measured.

Since 1873, when Mr. Ernest Seyd, a German-English banker and an alleged agent of foreign bankers and bondholders in aiding to effect the demonetization of silver, was in this country, and when Mr. Hooper, of Massachusetts, who had the bill for this purpose in charge in the House, said: "Ernest Seyd, of London, a distinguished writer and bullionist who has given great attention to the subject of mints and coinage, is now here, and after examining the first drafts of this bill made various sensible suggestions which the committee accepted and embodied in the bill," the efforts of that class, then so efficiently served in this country by Mr. Seyd, have been constant, unremitting, and zealous in cooperation with the same class in the United States in resisting, obstructing, and up to this time defeating the remonetization and free coinage of silver so urgently demanded by the great body of the American people. The leading papers of this country for months past have teemed with all sorts of articles and arguments in opposition to free coinage.

Extracts from foreign papers against silver remonetization, evidently printed in Europe to influence public sentiment in this country, have been published and republished broadcast throughout the United States by our papers. The wires of all the telegraph lines have been burdened with every conceivable sort of

literature, without reference to its truth or falsity, in the same interest. The mails have been loaded with printed and written matter of both foreign and domestic production in the same line of opposition to silver coinage. In short, Mr. President, we have in the last twelve months witnessed the most powerful, exhaustive, and vindictive assault, becoming more intense every day as this session of Congress has been approached, and made regardless of expense or truth by the concentrated capital of Europe and America on the free-coinage sentiment of our people.

The great mass of the plain people of this country, whose labor creates its wealth, whose valor sustains its flag, and whose patriotism preserves and perpetuates its institutions, dispersed in the pursuit of their avocations over a continent, without organization or concentration, either of which in the very nature of their surroundings seems impossible, are the victims of this unholy and wicked conspiracy to prevent the restoration of silver to its ancient full money power; because to do this would break the great gold monopoly, which gives to the comparatively insignificant number in possession of that metal absolute control on their own terms over all the products of labor. Our people vote right. They make good county and district and State platforms declaratory of their will, and elect State and Federal officials pledged to carry them out in administering their governments. They demand in every way they know how, and have done so for fifteen years, the free and unlimited coinage of silver; yet through parliamentary legerdemain, legislative hocus-pocus, and "ways that are dark and tricks that are (not) vain," they are defrauded of their rights, cheated out of the fruits of their victories at the polls, and left naked in the hands of their oppressors, until the time rolls around for another canvass and election, when the same performance has been repeated and the farce of "How not to do it" has been reenacted.

Mr. President, this thing has gone on until it has become decidedly monotonous. The people are not going to stand it always without calling to an account not only individual legislators, but the political party which, with a majority sent here charged with the duty of passing a free-coinage bill, lacks either the wit or the will to pass one. There are times when it is said "patience ceases to be a virtue," and that time may be unfortunately nearer at hand than some seem to suppose. Certain it is that for fifteen years the great majority of the people of this country, with the most zealous and strenuous efforts they could make for the passage of a free-coinage bill, have been repeatedly balked and defeated by a combination small in numbers but powerful in wealth and resources and influence.

The executive department of the Government, in all its branches, from Hayes's Administration to Harrison's, including Cleveland's, has been most thoroughly and completely under the control and influence and dictation of the great capitalistic combination which has just scored another victory against the people on the silver issue. All these administrations made bitter, savage war on silver, and left no means untried to discredit and break it down and debase it. Nobody knew how Mr. Cleveland stood on the silver question until after he was elected, and he commenced to war on it before his inauguration in a letter addressed to a committee of members of the House of Representatives (one hundred of them) who were deputed to confer with him on the subject.

All of these administrations, from the President down to the lowest reporting official of the Treasury Department, in messages and reports denounced silver coinage, urged its abandonment, denounced the \$346,000,000 of legal-tender notes as a debt of the Government which should be paid and the notes taken out of circulation, retired and cancelled, although not a cent of interest runs on them; advising the country that gold and national bank notes should be our only circulating medium, with subsidiary silver coin for purposes of change. This is the feast to which our people were invited in response to their oft-repeated demand for free silver coinage, for a perpetuation of the legal-tender note issue, and such other increase of circulation as could be made in view of the money famine under which they were suffering.

No bolder or more audacious defiance of the popular will has ever occurred in the history of any government, whether Republican or monarchical, than for nearly fifteen years has marked the course of the executive department of this Government in its dealings with the silver question. The power of the British-American syndicate of bankers and bondholders, which in 1873 accomplished the demonetization of silver, and since that time has fought its restoration with all its tremendous resources, has proved stronger than the people. Secure in the renomination of President Harrison by the Republican party, and of his hostility to the free coinage of silver, if he should perchance be re-elected, this combination is now giving its undivided attention to placing at the head of the Democratic ticket a name which, like that of President Harrison, is backed by a record which of

itself is a guaranty that free silver coinage will be an impossibility if he should become President.

All the powers and resources of this great combination are being strained to their utmost tension for the accomplishment of this great purpose. Democrat, Mugwump, and Republican in this combination meet and cooperate with the utmost heartiness on common ground for the attainment of this end. It would seem that Republicans ought to be content with dictating the nomination of their own party; and when they insist on participating in the selection of a Democratic candidate that Democrats should remember that the rule is good in politics as in war, that what their adversaries desire them to do is exactly what they should not do.

With the moral force inherent in the Presidential office, the veto power and that which comes from executive patronage, all secured against free coinage of silver, whether the President to be elected in November next be Democrat or Republican, the work commenced in the demonetization of silver in 1873 will be secure at least for four years more from the 4th of March next. This accomplished, the victory of the banking and bondholding syndicate of Europe and America will have been won, and these underground workers and manipulators of our politics will be content, with their grip tightened on the throats of the agricultural people of the country, to rest from their political labors utterly indifferent as to whether a Democratic or Republican President is elected, to give to each party a liberal campaign fund, and to retire to Europe and enjoy their vacation. Those Democrats (and it is to be hoped there are but few) who propose to seek relief through the organization of a third party are pursuing an *ignis fatuus*.

I can imagine no worse or poorer disposition a Democrat can make of himself than to abandon his party to go into such an organization. There is no room and never has been room in this country for but two great political parties. All efforts (and there have been many) to organize third parties have been miserable failures. Whenever they have attempted to be anything more than mere political guerrillas, hanging on the flanks of the two great contending parties which have controlled this Government since its foundation, they have been crushed out of existence in the shock of battle between the two; not one has ever survived a brief and profitless and troubled existence; their membership has disbanded and been absorbed in one or both of the two great parties. There has not in the history of the country been but one solitary exception.

All have gone that way, leaving no monument in the institutions or policies of their time, and are remembered only as temporary and evanescent disturbers of normal political conditions. The Democrat who leaves his own to join a third party because silver has not been remonetized and financial stringency has not been relieved, neutralizes and destroys himself as a political factor; and, to the extent that his action can do it, weakens and breaks down the only party capable of resisting the Republican policy of perpetuating the single gold standard, destroying silver as money, and investing national banks with the power and privilege of furnishing the country with its paper currency subject to expansion or contraction at their will.

A Democrat who desires to accomplish these results by strengthening and building up the Republican party can not do so better than by making a political nonentity of himself in the so-called third party. The American farmer, of all the men in this country, has the most direct and vital interest in the free coinage of silver and the expansion of the volume of our circulating medium. They of all living men are the greatest sufferers from the Republican financial policy of contraction. Western and Southern Democratic representatives in the two Houses of Congress are now and have always been practically a unit in favor of the free coinage of silver. To give free coinage and full money power to silver means to double the metallic basis for paper and all credit money, to double the coin basis for all banking purposes, and make possible double our note and paper circulation, every dollar of it redeemable in coin at the will of the holder. It means to make silver float all paper and as much of it as gold floats, whether Treasury and bank notes, or checks, drafts, or promissory notes. It means a per capita circulation of money equal to all the requirements of this country, its business, and commerce. And these results mean a return of prosperity to the country, good prices for crops, good wages for labor, and a fair valuation for all the products of labor.

One hundred millions of dollars of gold are stored in the national Treasury as a redemption fund for \$346,681,016 of legal-tender greenback notes, and has proved ample for the purpose. Speaking in round numbers, \$1 in gold thus floats \$3.50 of legal-tender paper money. On the 1st day of April there was in the Treasury \$354,063,617 of standard silver dollars, standing as a redemption fund for \$325,141,186 silver certificates in circulation, being more than \$1 in silver for every dollar of outstanding pa-

per. Every dollar of this silver is full legal tender. It will pay debts, buy property, and perform all the money functions performed by gold.

Silver certificates are preferred to gold coin because more convenient to carry and equally acceptable in business transactions; yet the policy of our Government, forced upon the country and maintained by the Republican party, makes the gold dollar float more than three and a half times as much paper as the silver dollar is permitted to float. When silver was demonetized in 1873 it outvalued gold 3 cents on the dollar—it took 103 cents of gold to buy 100 cents of silver. With free coinage we will have no more of the much derided "70-cent dollar." Silver bullion will become exclusively a money metal, will be no longer a mere commodity, and will go to the mints and be coined into legal-tender dollars. The gold monopoly will be broken.

Gold, now increased in value 33 per cent by legislation against silver, will by the undoing of that legislation fall, and for the same reason silver will rise, and the two metals will come together in substantial parity. These are the results which Western and Southern Democrats are endeavoring to achieve, and which will be imperilled to the extent they can do it by such Democrats as leave their ranks to go into a third party. If Western and Southern Democrats and the minority of the Republicans who are laboring with them for the accomplishment of these great ends, will stand firm and continue to wage an aggressive and energetic war on this line against the domination of the British-American syndicate which through the power of money and overshadowing wealth is aiming for their own aggrandizement to reduce our agricultural people to the level of European serfs, victory will crown their efforts.

Pertinacity, constancy, and courage are always necessary to the accomplishment of great reforms. Faint-heartedness, indecision, factional divisions, and impatience never yet won a victory; while determined purpose and unity of action in pursuit of the right never fails. Our achievements since 1878 give assurance of ultimate success. Over the most determined resistance of the executive branch of the Government, and in spite of the utmost efforts to prevent it of the same class of people who are opposing us now, we arrested the cancellation, retirement, and destruction of the greenback notes and saved to the country \$346,681,016 of that currency, which is admitted to be the best paper money in the world.

We have now in the Treasury and in circulation or represented by silver certificates \$412,535,360 of coined standard silver dollars, issued under the Bland act of 1878 and the act of 1890, with a monthly addition under the latter act of 4,500,000 ounces of silver of the coinage value of nearly \$6,000,000, represented by Treasury notes which go into circulation. The greenback notes and the silver thus saved to the circulation of this country, together constitute a full half of all the money in circulation on the first day of this month (April), as shown by the Treasury report of that date. The Bland act of 1878 was passed over the President's veto, and the act of 1890 was thrown as a tub to the whale by the opponents of free coinage in order to appease popular clamor when hotly pressed by the advocates of that measure. They would gladly have escaped without making any concession at all.

With a President friendly to free silver coinage, or, if not friendly, who would not have used the power of that great office to suppress and defeat the will of the people, there has not been a session of Congress since 1877 which would not promptly have passed a free-coinage bill. The Western and Southern Democrats, with a patriotic band of Republicans (the same who saved the South from the odious and infamous force bill), have moved and engineered this progress toward the restoration of silver and the expansion of the volume of our circulation. No other or greater difficulties or obstructions can confront us in the future in advancing on the same line than have been overcome in the past in securing what we now have.

What must the people of the South and West do? Must they sit supinely and see all the products of agriculture falling every day when they are already below the cost of production, without making some effort to save themselves from ruin and bankruptcy? In 1872 cotton was worth 19 cents; to-day it is worth only 6 cents. Wheat was worth \$1.47 per bushel; to-day it is worth 85 cents, notwithstanding crop failures throughout Europe and famine in Russia. Corn was worth 70 cents per bushel, and to-day is worth 41 cents; these great staples having fallen regularly with silver since its demonetization in 1873.

I read here a short table prepared from official statistics of foreign commerce for 1891, and the report of the Director of the Mint for 1890 on Production of Metals, by Hon. JO ABBOTT, of Texas, and used by him in an able speech on the silver question delivered in the House a few weeks ago, which shows beyond doubt or controversy the relation between the fall of silver and the fall in the prices of our great agricultural staples, and will

add that I have verified the figures and find them absolutely correct:

Fiscal year ending June 30—	In the home markets.			Silver per fine ounce (calendar year).*
	Cotton per pound.	Corn per bushel.	Wheat per bushel.	
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>		
1872	19.3	70	\$1.47	\$1.32
1873	18.8	62	1.31	1.29
1874	15.4	72	1.43	1.27
1875	15.0	85	1.12	1.24
1876	12.9	67	1.24	1.15
1877	11.8	54	1.17	1.20
1878	11.1	56	1.34	1.15
1879	9.9	47	1.07	1.12
1880	11.5	54	1.25	1.14
1881	11.4	55	1.11	1.13
1882	11.4	67	1.19	1.13
1883	10.8	68	1.13	1.11
1884	10.5	61	1.07	1.11
1885	10.6	54	.86	1.06
1886	9.9	50	.87	.97
1887	9.5	48	.89	.97
1888	9.8	55	.85	.93
1889	9.9	47	.90	.93
1890	10.2	49	.83	1.04
1891 (at close of)	6.0	41	.85	.90

*The coining value of an ounce of pure silver is \$1.29.

There is no controverting figures like these. Since 1873 the circulating money of this country has been based on the single gold standard, while prior to that time it was based on both gold and silver, these two money metals being practically equal in volume. All paper money, notes, checks, drafts, bills of exchange, in a word all forms of paper representing credit, having been ultimately redeemable in gold and silver, and the values of all property, labor, and the products of labor having been measured by the combined volume of the two metals and the paper and credit superstructure they would maintain; when silver (constituting one half of the metallic basis on which this great paper and credit system was built) was demonetized and the whole system was left standing on gold alone, the paper money and all the forms of paper representing credit, the values of all property, of labor and the products of labor, naturally and necessarily had to undergo a process of contraction in order to be adjusted to the new and narrower basis of credit and the new and shrunken measure of value.

Silver deprived of money functions and debased to a mere commodity, fell in value, and with it went down all other commodities, while gold went rapidly up, so that 66 cents of gold will now buy as much of anything, especially of agricultural products, as 100 cents of that metal would have bought before silver was demonetized. The holders of gold and bonds, whether national, State, railroad, or municipal, and those having fixed incomes, thus reaped enormous profits in the increased value conferred on gold; while debtors who had to pay in gold, and owners of all other property values, were correspondingly oppressed. This is the work of the European bond and gold holders and bankers, aided by their American allies, who prate and talk and bellow in chorus about the dishonest silver dollar, about inflation and repudiation, and characterize as revolutionary and communistic the honest efforts of the people to undo, as far as it now can be done, the robbery which has been perpetrated on them.

I read here from the Economic Crisis, an able work on economic subjects, by Mr. Morton Frewen, of London. He says:

It may indeed be affirmed without fear of contradiction, the legislation arranged in the interest of a certain class, first by Lord Liverpool in this country, and again by Sir Robert Peel at the instigation of Mr. Jones Loyd and other wealthy bankers, which was supplemented recently by simultaneous antisilver legislation in Berlin and Washington at the instance of the great financial houses. This legislation has about doubled the burden of all national debts by an artificial enhancement of the value of money.

The fall of all prices induced by this cause has been on such a scale that while in twenty years the national debt of the United States quoted in dollars has been reduced by nearly two-thirds, yet the value of the remaining one-third, measured in wheat, in bar iron, or bales of cotton, is considerably greater; is a greater demand draft on the labor and industry of the nation than was the whole debt at the time it was contracted.

The aggravation of the burdens of taxation induced by this so-called "appreciation of gold," which is no natural appreciation, but has been brought about by class legislation to increase the value of gold which is in few hands, requires but to be explained to an enfranchised Democracy, which will know how to protect itself against further attempts to contract the currency and to force down prices to the confusion of every existing contract.

Of all classes of middlemen, bankers have been by far the most successful in intercepting and appropriating an undue share of produced wealth. While the modern system of banking and credit may be said to be even yet in its infancy, that portion of the assets of the community which is to-day in the strong boxes of the bankers would, if declared, be an astounding revelation of the recent profits of this particular business; and not only has the business itself become a most profitable monopoly, but its interests in a very few hands are diametrically opposed to the interests of the majority. By legislation intended to contract the currency and force down all prices, including wages, the price paid for labor, the money owner has been able to increase the purchase power of his sovereign or dollar by the direct diminution of the price of every kind of property measured in money.

For twelve years the prophecies of the authors of silver demonetization, that ruin and disaster would follow a renewal of silver coinage, prophecies reiterated time and again by our Presidents, their Cabinet officers, and especially the Secretaries and other officials of the Treasury Department, have been falsified and disproved; yet these same people continue to croak them in as dismal a key as ever. They predicted that \$50,000,000 was all the country would absorb, and we have now \$412,535,360, either in certificates or actual silver coin in circulation. Silver, they said, would drive gold from the country, and we have by official estimate \$500,000,000 more gold in the country than we had when coinage of our silver dollars commenced in 1878.

If any other experience is needed, France with her \$700,000,000 of silver and \$900,000,000 of gold, the two interchangeable and circulating without friction at parity, presents a conclusive refutation of the argument that free coinage would drive gold out of the country or raise it to a premium. And it will be remembered that the relation of silver to gold coin in France is that 15¢ of the former to 1 of the latter, while in this country it is 16 to 1—a difference of 3 cents more silver in our dollar than that of France. The nations of the earth which use concurrently gold and silver money, according to Mr. Edward Atkinson's report to the State Department in 1887, had in circulation in 1885 \$2,463,002,000 of gold, and by the side of and at parity with it, \$1,738,114,000 of silver. British India and the Asiatic countries using silver alone are not included in the estimate.

In these facts is found a complete answer to the argument that with free coinage our country would become the "dumping ground" for all the silver in the world. The ratio between silver and gold in France is the same as throughout Europe, and the silver coin throughout Europe passes interchangeably and at par with gold. European silver coin could not be brought to this country except at a heavy per cent of loss in addition to the 3 per cent discount it would meet here in competition with our own silver coin. Why bring it here to be discounted when it is as good as gold at home in Europe and doing duty and needed there as money?

The alleged overproduction of silver is purely imaginary. The silver production of the world is estimated to be annually from \$135,000,000 to \$150,000,000, and of gold from \$90,000,000 to \$110,000,000. The Director of the Mint estimates that \$18,105,901 of gold and \$9,231,178 of silver, went into the industrial arts in the United States alone during the year 1890, and reports that the amount of these metals going into the arts is increasing rapidly every year. According to this statement, the aggregate of gold and silver going into the arts annually and increasing each year is \$27,337,079 in this country.

I have no estimate as to the consumption of these metals in the balance of the world in the industrial arts, but of course it must be very much greater in the aggregate, possibly many times as much as that used in our country. Some idea may be found from these facts of the annual addition to the world's stock of money after the demand of the industrial arts for gold and silver has been supplied. It was estimated in 1886 by the Director of the Mint that \$46,000,000 of gold were consumed in the arts, leaving only fifty or sixty millions for money purposes to meet the increasing annual demands of the business of the world. And it may be added that by common consent and admission the gold production of the world is now and has been diminishing for some time.

Secretary Windom, in his report to the Fifty-first Congress, stated that there is no known accumulation of silver bullion anywhere in the world, and that all the silver coin in Europe is needed and employed there for money purposes. Our own country produces more than 40 per cent of all the silver mined in the world. This great product has been deliberately sacrificed, and the interest of the mass of our people, in opposition to their repeated and almost earnest protest, subordinated to a European policy, which was adopted for the purpose of maintaining there an aristocracy in the power to hold in subjection the common people through the influence of wealth in the hands of a few. Republican France, of all the European powers, stands most firmly by silver, and gives the most splendid illustration of its virtues as the money of the common people.

Like the other arguments against free coinage, the charge of overproduction falls to the ground when confronted with the facts of silver production and consumption in the world, the necessity for it in view of the dwindling and decreasing production of gold, and the increasing necessity of the world for money. Instead of the ruin and disaster so confidently predicted as a consequence of the partial coinage of silver we now have, only the most beneficent results have followed; and it is frankly and freely admitted by some of the ablest opponents of silver coinage in the United States that our silver saved us in the recent perilous crisis from which we are just emerging, arising from scarcity of gold and an enforced contraction of the volume of money.

When gold left the country silver remained with us. And it is always true when we have both metals in circulation that one of them always remains; both never leave. When one flows out the other comes in to take its place and fill the vacuum. The two metals are the complement of each other. Neither performs its proper functions except when the other is also ready to perform its part. Either one of these metals enthroned alone as money becomes a despot—an instrument of monopoly. The other is needed to hold it in check and reduce what otherwise would be a destructive power to a condition of conservative beneficence.

These two metals during all the ages have been joined together in the service of civilization, commerce, and progress, and have never been divorced, except when greed for gain and lust for power by the few over the great mass of the people has prompted it. The production of these metals from the earliest times of which we have records has been varying, silver sometimes predominating and at other periods gold. Tables of the Director of the United States Mint show that from 1801 to 1820 the average yearly yield was 4 of silver to 1 of gold; from 1821 to 1840 the average annual yield was 2 of silver to 1 of gold; from 1841 to 1860 the annual average was 2½ of gold to 1 of silver; from 1861 to 1880 the average was nearly 2 of gold to 1 of silver; from 1881 to 1889 the average was one-sixth more of silver than of gold.

The most remarkable fact in the history of these metals is that an excessive production of either one of them has, in due time, invariably been corrected by an enlarged production of the other, so that, as stated in the speech of Senator JONES of Nevada, delivered in this body May 12, 1890, "the stock of both existing in the world (the product of all time) is estimated to be about equal, the production of the past five hundred years being set down as—gold, \$7,240,000,000; silver, \$7,455,000,000." If we accept the experience of the world from the beginning of time as the test of truth on this subject, we need not fear for the maintenance of the desired equality in the production of the two precious metals.

England found her great opportunity, and with the sagacious and far-reaching statesmanship for which her rulers are more distinguished than those of any other country on earth, seized and improved it, in the great crime of silver demonetization by the United States, the leading silver-producing country in the world. Her great dependency, British India, containing more than one-seventh of the entire population of the globe, of which by the recent census more than 40 per cent are engaged in agriculture, uses silver almost exclusively. Silver is the sole metallic money of India, and is unaffected in value by the fluctuations of the prices elsewhere of silver bullion; and it is the current money, at its face value, in all business and commerce throughout that great and enormously populated empire.

British India produces largely both cotton and wheat. The cost of labor wages is lower in India than in any other country of the world, amounting to only a few cents per day, so that the two great staples named are produced at much smaller cost than in any other country. London is the great silver market of the world, as it is the world's market for wheat and as Liverpool is for cotton. Our own Government makes its monthly purchases of silver under the act of 1890, as it did those under the Bland act of 1878 until its repeal, by London quotations.

Silver, debased and cheapened by American legislation, flowing into the great London market, where it is the policy of the English Government to depress its price to the lowest possible point for the benefit of India, whither it goes and is absorbed in that great population within a small fraction of being four times as numerous as that of the United States, has given tremendous development to the production of wheat and cotton and the manufacture of the latter, indeed to all the business and commerce of India. The Suez Canal, shortening and cheapening the export route to the markets of the world, has also been a factor of importance in this advancement and progress of India.

Our great war tariff, superseded in 1890 by the still greater and almost prohibitory McKinley tariff law, being regarded as a declaration of commercial war against all the nations of the earth, they have banded against us and in a spirit of retaliation have for twenty years been striving in every possible way to render themselves independent of us. Of our exports to foreign markets 76 per cent are agricultural products, and it is upon these that this war of retaliation has been made with most crushing effect. Our cotton, wheat, corn, beef, pork, and all other products of the farm, are now met in the markets of the world with similar products from other countries raised by the cheapest labor in the world, with which they must compete, because the nations of the world have been compelled to foster these productions in other countries which will exchange and trade products with them rather than with the United States, which, by a prohibitory tariff, excludes foreign goods from our markets.

Thus our farmers, while being robbed in all they buy at home, at the same time are having the foreign market for their sur-

plus well nigh destroyed by the tariff. Hear the advice given the wheat-raisers of the Northwest by the Finance Committee of the United States Senate. I read from Part I, Tariff Testimony Finance Committee, United States Senate, page 21, as follows:

The competition in wheat-growing which has been developed in India, South America, Australia, and in the British Possessions in North America is likely to make unprofitable the production of this cereal for exportation by our people, and to cause the wheat-grower of the Northwest to look to an enlargement of the certain and remunerative home market. This enlarged and profitable market can only be secured by increasing the number of people engaged in other than agricultural pursuits, and by furnishing to all increased employment without diminution of wages. To cripple our manufacturing interests and reduce the purchasing power of our workmen will result in augmenting the number of competitors in the field of agricultural production, and the increased supply could, in that event, only find a market in Europe by enforced competition with India at ruinous prices. Wheat can now be laid down in Liverpool from the central provinces of India at as low a cost for transportation as from Chicago, and Indian wheat can be delivered in New York at less cost for transportation than from the wheat fields of Dakota.

It is for the highest interest of the American farmer that the number of our food consumers rather than of food producers should be increased, and that the general prosperity of all should be secured. It is true that the decline in prices of agricultural products has been very great, but the value of these when measured by the value of clothing, farming utensils, or other necessities of a farmer's life, is much greater now than in any of the years preceding 1860.

Our tariff legislation furnished the incentive, indeed the compulsion, for the great development of wheat-growing in the countries named, and the demonetization of silver under the inspiration and manipulation of the British-American combination of bond and gold owners, furnished to India and South America, which use only silver money, cheap silver to infuse life and energy and enterprise into the business and agriculture of those countries by giving them an abundant money circulation. Wheat, says this committee, can be laid down in Liverpool from India at as low a cost of transportation as from Chicago, and can be delivered in New York from the same country at a less cost of transportation than from the wheat fields of Dakota.

Wheat is raised in India with labor costing only 7 or 8 cents per day; and if the cost of transportation is no greater from India to Liverpool than from Chicago to that point, and is less from India to New York than it is from Dakota to New York, it is very plain that the Finance Committee, if correct, has shown that we have not only lost our great foreign market for wheat, but are in danger of having our home market invaded; for we all know that our wheat-growers have to pay many times 7 cents per day for the labor which produces it. Cotton stands on precisely the same footing with wheat in respect to its production in and transportation from India and South America. That wheat is not so low as cotton in proportion is due entirely to the accident of short crops throughout Europe and famine in Russia, which usually is the source of large wheat supplies for Europe.

Before the demonetization of silver the wheat and cotton growers of the United States met no competition in European markets with India. India had never exported one bushel of wheat to England prior to 1874. The United States was at that time exporting to England 150,000,000 bushels yearly, and receiving for it usually \$1.20 per bushel. In 1889 the wheat exports of the United States to England had fallen to about 45,000,000 bushels, and the price to 90 cents, while those of India had risen from less than 200,000 bushels in 1874 to 50,000,000 bushels.

An authority now before me states that while it had taken England fifteen years to increase her spindles from 150,000,000 to 250,000,000, India, with the aid of cheap American silver, has added 100,000,000 spindles in ten years. This of course was to spin India cotton, to the displacement of the same amount of American cotton. Sir R. N. Fowler is represented by the same authority to have said in a speech before the Colonial Board of Trade in London, in speaking of the British India silver policy:

If we continue this policy a few years longer we can ruin the wheat and cotton industry of the United States and build up India as the chief exporter of these staples.

Cheap breadstuffs and cheap cotton is what England above all else desires. Our farmers and planters have heretofore furnished English markets with these indispensable products; but our own Government has in its antisilver policy surrendered our high vantage ground to England and enabled her to hand over to her great dependency, British India, the export market for cotton and wheat, which under all the laws of trade, should have remained ours.

Mr. President, British India pays annually to the British Government a little more than \$72,000,000 on account of the expenses of the British Government in India. This is a debt which must be paid in gold or its equivalent in silver. It is always paid in silver, and is increased from 30 to 40 per cent by reason of the discount on silver when valued in gold; making the debt, when liquidated, amount to the neighborhood of 105,000,000 silver dollars. The greater the discount on silver, the larger the amount paid to the British Government every year in liquidation of it.

British merchants every week and month make payments of millions of dollars in India for purchases there, all in silver, and the cheapest silver brings to them, as it does to the British Government, the largest profits. British interests, which control the great London silver market, and the commerce as well of all the silver-using countries of the world, all find their most lucrative business with India in the cheapest silver; because when sent to that country and coined the money is of full face or coinage value and is the current money of the country. Besides, to cheapen silver cripples the productive power of the United States, the great rival of England, while building up and increasing the capacity of British India for the production of cotton and wheat for English consumption.

England will never surrender her power or her advantages in respect to this silver question voluntarily or unless forced to do it. She refuses now and has always refused to treat with other powers for a basis for bimetallic coinage. She knows her advantages and proposes to hold them. The other powers of Europe decline peremptorily all propositions looking to an international agreement for bimetallic coinage unless England joins, which it is admitted on all sides she will not do. So, Mr. President, the man who tells the country he favors free coinage of silver under an international agreement simply adopts a circuitous method of declaring that he favors the single gold standard and is opposed to silver coinage, because he knows that an international agreement is an impossibility.

Confined to the narrow and, as we have seen, diminishing margin of gold for the measurement of values since the destruction of silver money in 1873, the fall of prices which then commenced has been going on ever since, and continues yet day after day, and month after month. In many sections of the country, desperate efforts have been made to arrest this fall by means of "booms," which have always ultimately reacted with the most destructive effect. Our only hope of extrication from this condition (and nobody has proposed any other) is to reform the tariff, reduce it to a strictly revenue basis, and establish the freest trade possible between our country and the other nations of the earth, consistent with the collection of a sufficient revenue for the support of the Government; and to retrace our steps on the silver question, undo as far as can now be done the crime of its demonetization, and restore silver to free coinage and full money power, making it the equal before the law in all respects with gold.

These two great policies go hand in hand, are inseparably connected and bound together, and the success of both is indispensable to the national prosperity. We can expect no aid from Europe in restoring silver except from republican France. Aristocratic and kingly power, with the aid of its American dupes and allies, decreed for its own aggrandisement the destruction of silver money both in Europe and America, and will never voluntarily surrender what it has gained. The United States, when not half the power among the nations of the earth they now are, struck the blow which demonetized silver, and, if silver is to be restored, must lead the way with a bold and aggressive free-silver policy. This will accomplish what we desire, and nothing else will. If this Government will adopt free coinage, and boldly and honestly enforce it, Europe instead of ourselves will be begging for an international bimetallic agreement.

The solicitude of European gold and bond owners and brokers, which prompted them to send Mr. Seyd over here to aid in procuring the demonetization of silver when our unsuspecting people knew nothing about what was going on, and the fight they and their capitalistic brethren on this side of the ocean have been making ever since to retain the power then obtained, is conclusive proof of their opinion that this Government can control the silver question. No man has ever doubted this who is not an advocate of the single gold standard *per se*, and opposed on any terms to silver coinage. The power of this Government is fully equal to the greatest requirements of the occasion, and the highest and best interests of the people demand that it be exerted. Let our people be but true to themselves, continue without ceasing the agitation of this question, and exact the most rigid responsibility from all their representatives, State and national, for their action on this subject, and success is assured.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, there are rocks ahead. We are drifting upon them. Presently the ship of state will strike them. No master of finance appears to save ship, crew, or cargo. Gold is the cry; gold, gold, gold, nothing but gold, although this is the greatest silver-producing nation in the world, and although if we had financiers equal to our opportunities we might dominate the financial markets of the world. The silver men alone seem to have any appreciation or even recognition of our situation.

WHAT REMEDY IF NOT FREE-SILVER COINAGE IS PROPOSED?

They offer the only remedy that is offered to rescue us from financial depression and threatened financial ruin. If you do not

like their remedy, the first step in which is the free coinage of silver, what do you propose?

Their agitation of the silver question has so far been of incalculable benefit to the country.

As a matter of education it has taught the people that the least reliable of all their teachers are those professional financiers who, having succeeded in the art of money-getting, have imagined themselves wise in monetary science. Their discredited prophecies bestrew the history of twenty years as the bones of the camel bestrew the pathway of a caravansary through the desert. It has taught the people also that the political leaders who have depreciated our power to sustain an increasing volume of silver money at par with gold little apprehend the needs and capacities of this nation, with its abounding energies and its vast progressive movements.

SILVER HAS SAVED US FROM PANIC.

But more than this, the work of the silver men has saved us from impending panic and bankruptcy. When the South American troubles came in 1890, and the great financial houses of England trembled to their foundations; when American securities held in England and on the continent of Europe were thrown suddenly upon the market, and the gold derived from their sale here was hurried abroad to prop the shaking fortunes of foreign magnates, it was our silver that preserved us from bankruptcy and ruin. Halfway and halting friend of silver as is our present Executive, he has made his acknowledgments to its beneficent service in a message to Congress, and bold implacable enemy of silver as was his competitor for the Presidential chair, the course of events has extorted even from him the concession that he was mistaken in his vaticinations against it.

THE COUNTRY UNDULY ALARMED RESPECTING SILVER.

The truth is that the country has been unduly and unwisely alarmed and disturbed respecting the issues involved in free silver coinage. With the report of Secretary Windom in 1889 that "there is no known accumulated stock of silver in the world," that "Germany has long since disposed of her stock of minted silver coins by recoinage into her own subsidiary coins and by use in coining for Egypt," and with his positive declaration "that it is plain that there is no danger that the silver product of past years will be poured into our mints"—with this knowledge imparted to the country all apprehensions of silver avalanches, deluges, freshets, and the like should long since have vanished.

I have expressed the opinion elsewhere, and I here repeat it, that "the free coinage of silver would disappoint a majority of its advocates and opponents." Those who expect from the mere enfranchisement of silver a great abundance of money would not realize their hopes, and those who apprehend that it would dislocate our finances and wither enterprise would be appeased in their fears.

FREE-SILVER COINAGE NECESSARY TO ENLARGE AND FIX OUR METAL BASE OF CREDIT.

The importance of the silver question does not lie in the supposititious fact that it would vastly enhance the volume of our metal circulation. Such is not the case.

If we may believe the financial experts, the officers of our own Government who have wandered over the world in gathering facts from which they make deductions, it would enhance that volume in some degree; it would stimulate enterprise in some degree, as increasing currency always does; it would enhance the prices of products in some degree, and the prices of labor; it would facilitate debt and tax payment; it would operate as a hearty meal operates upon a hungry man. But its chief importance lies in the fact that free coinage of silver is necessary to enlarge and fix the metal base of our currency and credit system. It is estimated that a small percentage of business, some say 3 or 5 per cent, is done on cash payments. The rest is credit.

Behind this credit is currency which must be used in liquidation, and behind all our volume of currency, which is itself for the most part Government credit, is the metal money held for its redemption. That metal money of redemption is claimed to be gold only. Now, the gold base of this vast superstructure of currency and bond credit, Government credit and individual credit, is too narrow to sustain it, too narrow to admit of the increase in size and weight of the superstructure. If we continue to build up business on this narrow gold foundation, we will build to our ruin. The foundation will soon crumble under the overwhelming burden imposed upon it, and when the fall of the superstructure comes, as come it must, great will be the fall thereof. Today we are piling up wrath against the day of wrath. We are sowing the wind, and the whirlwind will be the harvest.

GOLD AS SOLE STANDARD OVERBURDENED.

Look at our currency. It is reported to be as follows:

Gold and gold certificates.....	8784,567,309
Silver.....	687,832,930
Treasury notes of 1890.....	89,602,198

United States notes	\$346,681,016
National-bank notes	172,529,451
Currency certificates of 1892	31,220,000
	2,243,702,757

If gold only is used as money of redemption here we have \$1 in gold only wherewithal to redeem over \$3 in silver, in Treasury notes and in national-bank notes. If there were no other debts for gold to pay these would suffice to employ all we have. But we have behind these currencies, which it is maintained must be redeemable in gold, a national debt of a billion and a half of dollars; we have behind it also State debts, county debts, city debts, debts of railway corporations, and of a myriad of corporations and individuals, which are beyond the power of calculation.

If all this immensity of credit rests only on the gold-dollar standard an inverted pyramid is the only physical figure that can typify our situation. And when the pyramid is standing on its apex a very slight jostling of its balance may tumble it over.

CONTRACTED AND CHEAP CURRENCY PARADOXICAL.

Mr. President, I do not propose to-day to go into any general and enlarged discussion of the silver question. I propose to meet but one of the objections of the many sophistries which are urged against it, and to speak of it with reference to the allegation that the free coinage of silver would drive gold to a premium.

It is a common saying amongst those who advocate the single gold standard that the free coinage of silver would instantly put gold to a premium. They maintain also that when this is done, the currency will be contracted by the abstraction of the entire volume of gold from circulation, and at the same time maintain that we shall have a cheap silver dollar.

I will not pause to do more than notice a fallacy and a sophistry which are so palpable upon their face. It is impossible to have a contracted currency in which the demand for money will surpass the supply, and at the same time a cheap currency.

WHAT IS MEANT BY GOLD GOING TO A PREMIUM?

But I propose now to analyze this assertion that the free coinage of silver will drive gold to a premium. What do these prophets mean when they make this assertion? They may mean one of four things. Which one do they mean? If they mean that gold bullion would be driven to a premium over silver bullion, we answer that the gold bullion that forms the physical structure of a dollar is and has been at a premium over the silver bullion that forms a silver dollar for well nigh twenty years—that is, ever since the free coinage of silver bullion into dollars was discontinued in 1873.

THE DEGRADATION BY LAW AND THE DEPRECIATION OF VALUE OF SILVER BULLION CONTEMPORANEOUS.

The instant that the United States was known to have discontinued free-silver coinage gold bullion went to a premium over silver bullion. In short, the degradation of the silver metal by law, and its depreciation in value were contemporaneous. It is evident, too, that it was not a mere coincidence. It was the natural and inevitable operation of cause and effect. Silver bullion went down because struck down by law, and gold bullion stayed up because kept up by law. Thus, then, the truth is made patent to him that hath eyes to see that it was not by virtue of the free coinage of the two metals that they were parted in value, but by the discontinuance of free coinage as to silver, and the continuance of free coinage as to gold.

We can only argue and prophesy as to the unknown by taking our projections from the known.

We know that as long as there was free coinage of both gold and silver at their legal ratio of 15.98 of silver to 1 of gold, gold bullion did not go to a premium.

We know that when free coinage of silver was discontinued, while free coinage of gold remained, the favored gold bullion was instantly appreciated with relation to the disfavored silver bullion.

What more logical and natural, what more consistent with common sense than to believe that if you restore conditions that kept silver bullion equal in value to gold bullion, you will restore that equality? If experience be a lamp to guide our footsteps, this is the pathway that its light shines on.

GOLD BULLION CAN NOT GO TO PREMIUM OVER GOLD DOLLARS.

1. Do these prophets mean that gold bullion would go to a premium over the gold dollar? This they can hardly mean.

The gold dollar consists of so many grains of fine gold, and so much of alloy. The gold bullion would not go to a premium over the gold dollar. As there is nothing in it that is not in the gold dollar, of course it would not go to a premium over it.

2. Do the prophets mean that the gold bullion that composes a gold dollar would go to a premium over the silver dollar; or that the gold dollar would be worth more than a silver dollar? We put this inquiry in double form, because gold bullion and the dollar made out of it are under the law the same thing in

value, as the law turns the gold bullion into the gold dollar without cost by free coinage.

WHAT IF GOLD DOLLARS GO TO PREMIUM OVER SILVER DOLLARS?

This is doubtless what the prophets mean, to wit, that the gold dollar will cost in silver to him that seeks it a silver dollar and a premium thereon. And we answer:

First. It is by no means certain that gold dollars would be made to cost a premium in silver dollars if silver bullion were freely coined like gold bullion.

Second. That if a gold dollar did cost more than 100 cents in silver dollars it would cost less in the products of labor to get the gold dollar and pay the premium for it than it costs now to get the gold dollar or a silver dollar.

Third. That the premium on the gold dollar if created by free coinage of silver would be but a transient incident of change.

Fourth. That the two dollars, that of gold and that of silver, would soon settle down to parity.

Fifth. That the transient disturbance would be less hurtful than the permanent disturbance and depression to which non-acceptance subjects our finances and our industrial interests.

WHY SHOULD A GOLD DOLLAR COST OVER 100 CENTS IN SILVER DOLLARS?

Why should a gold dollar cost more than 100 cents in silver dollars if the silver dollars were freely coined? Gold dollars and silver dollars are now at par. You can buy as much of any commodity now with the one as the other, pay as much taxes with the one as the other, buy as much gold bullion or silver bullion with the one as the other, buy as much foreign exchange on London, Paris, or Berlin with the one as the other, travel to Europe as cheaply with the one as the other.

If the silver dollar equals the gold dollar in purchasing power and tax-paying power and debt-paying power, while the right to free coinage is denied it, how is it that they would not equal each other when free-coinage right is given it?

HOW THE LAW FAVORS GOLD AND DEGRADES SILVER IN THE MELTING POT

Take your two dollars, the one of gold, and the one of silver now, and as long as they remain dollars with the mint stamp upon them and the law of legal tender behind them, and they are matches in value just as a pound of lead and a pound of feathers are matches in weight, just as a yard of calico and a yard of silk are matches in length, just as a gallon of milk and a gallon of water are matches in quantity.

But beat the gold dollar with a hammer into a shapeless mass, or melt it in a pot, and the mint will turn it back into a brand new gold dollar for you, without cost to you, but at my cost, and your cost, and the cost of all the people of the country alike.

Beat up or melt down the silver dollar into a shapeless mass. Why should not the Government restore it, just as it will restore the gold dollar? Why will it not give you a brand new silver dollar as it gives the gold owner a brand new gold dollar? And if it did treat the silver dollar like the gold dollar, would it not plainly enhance the value of the silver dollar instead of enhancing the value of the gold dollar? As the law now stands, giving gold only the right of free coinage, it insures the value of it against all accidents. Let the merchant's pot of gold be reduced by fire, let a railroad accident crush it in transportation into a lump, the law puts it back into dollars for him. But let the old lady's stocking of silver dollars, let the silver dollars in the workman's wallet be mutilated, crushed, or melted, and no more dollars are concocted for her or him out of the silver bullion; and away it goes to the junkshop.

EQUALITY OF FUNCTION MAKES EQUALITY OF VALUE.

Equality of right, equality of privilege, equality of function is what creates equality of value.

It is absurd to say that by giving privilege to the silver you will detract from the value of the silver dollar, and equally absurd to say that you will add value to the gold dollar. And if you do not add to the value of the gold dollar, what is going to make it bring a premium?

Demand and supply are the regulators of value. As matters stand now, only so many gold and so many silver dollars meet the demand for coined money. Add to the number of silver dollars, and the supply of coined dollars will be increased, while the demand will not be increased. As the demand for coined dollars will not be as great in proportion to the supply, it is fallacious to suppose that the value of any dollar will be increased by the free coinage of silver.

HOW THE LAW INSURES GOLD VALUE AND REPUDIATES SILVER VALUE.

Now, Mr. President, let me put a supposititious story. Two gentlemen, we will say, the other day started from the city of Washington to Baltimore. The one of them carried in a bag a thousand gold dollars of the United States, and the other one carried in a bag a thousand silver dollars of the United States. They were equally rich, for the silver dollars, whether in Baltimore or in Washington, or anywhere in the United States, would

answer every efficient purpose of commerce and business as the corresponding number of dollars in the other bag. Midway between here and the city of Baltimore the train ran off the track. The wheels of a car passed over the silver bag and mutilated and crushed into a shapeless lump the silver dollars; and the wheels of another car went over the other bag and mutilated and crushed into a shapeless mass the gold dollars. Then the train took fire, and the fire swept over the bullion as it lay in the wreck.

The men picked themselves up, and they were unhurt. The one went to his lump of gold and the other picked up his lump of silver. What had happened to them? Why, that lump of gold was just as valuable to the man who owned it as it was before, because at the expense of the whole people of the United States who pay the premium of insurance he had bullion there which was guaranteed to him to be turned into dollars at their cost. He picked up the pile of shapeless metal and he went to the Treasury, which is the insurance office, and he got back his gold dollars and went on his way rejoicing. Nothing more had happened to the gold man than had happened to the silver man, but when the silver man who had suffered this accident went to the same insurance office to have his silver dollars restored to him by the Mint, what did this great Government say to him? It said to him, if it spoke the truth, "I am a cheat and a fraud; I have swindled you out of \$300, because I refuse as to you to turn that bullion which you had to take under my stamp back into silver money; while at the same time I have guaranteed the gold and turned it back into dollars for another."

So, Mr. President, when we hear so much about good faith from the hands of our lawmakers here, let them pause and reflect that they stand before the country as repudiators of their own silver circulation and refuse to make it good against the accidents of chance or against the act of God which no man can control.

Sir, if the lightning were to shoot forth from the heavens and strike the pile of silver dollars without any man's default, and strike the pile of gold dollars without any man's default, the Government of the United States guarantees to the gold man that it will remedy the act of God, and restore to him his property in money shape, while it repudiates the holder of the silver dollar, and says "I will not turn your silver back into dollars, you may go and roam about the markets to find a purchaser for it if you will; we have all we want, and will not take it at any price."

NOMINAL PREMIUM ON GOLD DOES NOT MEAN COSTLIER GOLD TO PRODUCER OR LABORER.

Now, Mr. President, to go along a little further with an analysis of this proposition, if a gold dollar were to cost for a time more than 100 cents in silver it would not mean that it would be costlier to get the gold dollar to the wheat, corn, cattle, or other commodity owner, or to the laborer in the workshop or the field. The prices of the commodities being enhanced by an increased volume of money, the silver dollars gotten for them would answer all the ordinary uses of the commodity seller, and the laborer would pay his debts and taxes, would settle his store accounts, would clothe and school his children, would carry himself upon a railroad train, and subservise all his general purposes. And if for some extraordinary use he needed a gold dollar it would be easier for him to pay for it over a dollar in silver with the enhanced price for his products and labor than it is now in the depressed condition of prices to get the silver dollar.

DISTURBANCE WOULD BE TRANSIENT, IF AT ALL OCCURRING.

If the gold dollar were transiently put to a premium over the silver dollar it would be only the spasmodic change of the market due to the transient uneasiness produced by the prophets of evil. All changes, all reforms, all movements of progress are attended with some inconveniences. If a man moves his household goods out of a cabin into a palace, some of his Chinaware will be broken in the wagon that moves it, and some of his chairs and bedsteads may lose a leg here and there, or get the varnish rubbed off. If a railroad takes a short cut through the country side the wayside inn loses its custom.

But men will not hesitate to move into better houses when they can get them, nor to construct railroads when they can build them, because furniture is damaged in the one case or wayside inns are injured in the other. And if temporary ills shall attend the reform and restoration of our currency to its constitutional bimetallic basis, this is no reason why we should not go on with the good work until it is accomplished.

OUR CURRENCY SYSTEM CONFUSED AND DISTRACTED.

One thing is sure, and that is, that our currency is in a distracted and confused condition, and some reform must come. In what way can it come? If it is proposed to increase the greenback currency, which to-day fills every function of a circulating medium, a shudder runs through Wall street, and a wild cry against fiat paper money goes up to the sky.

If it is suggested that the national banks should meet national wants, the answer is that the national banks are discontinuing their circulation, and the continued reduction of our national bonded debt, on which they rest, is rendering their expansion and increased utility impossible. We must therefore refuse to increase our currency at all or the increase must come in gold or in silver. There is not gold enough in the world to meet the demands of commerce and the debts of nations.

GOLD GOING TO EUROPE TO PAY AMERICAN DEBTS IN EUROPE.

It is contended that our gold would be driven from this country by the free coinage of silver, and that the consequent lack of it here will put it to a premium.

Much of our gold goes annually to Europe to meet interest on Government bonds and on other American securities owned by foreign holders. We are a debtor nation. Germany, France, and England are creditor nations, and gold must go from the debtor to pay the creditor to whom it is due whether we have free coinage of silver or not.

In the report of last year of the Treasury you will find that in the year 1891 more of our currency went to Europe to meet dividends and demands there than all of our increased circulation produced at the Mint and by the Treasury Department. You will find there that in 1891 the net loss in our stock of gold and silver coins by exports and sums used in the arts up to July, 1891, was \$70,000,000. This was a greater sum by \$7,000,000 than the entire silver coinage of the United States Mint for the same year.

Then, Mr. President, contemplate how our national-bank circulation is going out of existence. In the year 1884 it decreased \$16,000,000; in 1885, \$20,000,000; in 1886, \$6,000,000; in 1887, \$37,000,000; in 1888, \$40,000,000; in 1890, \$25,000,000, and in 1891, \$18,000,000. In 1880 our national-bank circulation was \$356,000,000; in July, 1891, it was only \$167,000,000, showing a net reduction of national-bank circulation of \$189,000,000 in eight years.

WHAT IS TO TAKE THE PLACE OF GOLD AND FILL THE GAP MADE BY RETIRING NATIONAL-BANK NOTES?

Now, Mr. President, seeing that gold must go abroad; seeing also that our national-bank circulation is going out of existence; seeing also that there is a firm resistance to any increase of our greenback circulation, what is going to take the place of this vanishing circulation to supply the wants of this ever-increasing nation, if we do not coin the metal which nature has stored in our mines for that purpose?

1. Will we permit ourselves to be bereft of all the moneys we now have and provide no substitute? We produce and coin annually some \$30,000,000 in gold—about half a dollar per capita of our population. This is totally inadequate to our monetary needs. What shall we have if not silver?

2. If gold goes abroad and to a premium, the fact that it is at a premium here will bring it back to us. It always rushes toward profit. Its coming back here to get the premium would restore equilibrium to the troubled waters of finance and help to rectify the very evil created.

GOLD WILL GO WHERE BEST INVESTMENTS ARE.

3. Independent of the flow of gold to Europe to pay debt there, which will happen whether we have free coinage of silver or not—why should it go there? Gold is not an idle roamer around the world. It will not go to Europe or anywhere else unless it has something to go for. It will not go there except to invest there, and it will not invest there as long as there is better and enhancing investment here. With our lands increasing in value, with our population increasing in numbers, with our prosperity reassured by financial ease, with our cotton and wheat fields yielding profit to the laborers therein, who is there who believes that gold will run away from this fresh, bountiful, teeming, go-ahead republic to hide itself in the glutted vaults of European banks, or to play for small accretions in sleepy markets.

GRESHAM'S LAW AND SPECIFIC GRAVITY.

Gresham's law will take it there, some say—the law that good currency is driven out by bad. Good currency is hoarded in preference to bad, but good currency does not run away before bad. And what if gold is hoarded? It is already hoarded; it has always been hoarded. But it is not destroyed. When prices are on a rising scale it comes out from its hiding place. When they are falling, as they are now, it rushes into the vaults of banks.

The law of Gresham respecting the currency is nothing but the law of specific gravity as applied to it. If you will take a basin and put into it mercury and oil and water, the mercury having the heaviest specific gravity will sink to the bottom, the oil having the lightest, will rise to the top, but whatever may be the specific gravity of the one fluid or the other, neither one of all their diversities of specific gravity will flow out of the basin until it is filled to the top.

It is the same way, Mr. President, respecting our currency. Whether it be national-bank notes or Treasury notes, whether it consists of gold or of silver, none of our currency is going abroad

out of this country until the basin of our wants has been filled to the brim and there is greater necessity for it somewhere else in the world than here.

GOLD HAS LONG BEEN OUT OF CIRCULATION.

So, Mr. President, I dismiss from the calculation of ills which are possible in case silver is freely coined, the declaration that it will drive gold out of circulation and to a premium. We have only to consider the financial history of this country to observe that gold has long since gone out of circulation amongst the people, and it would be a good sight indeed for sore eyes for one of the commoners to see the face of a gold dollar. Travel on the railroad, go to the theater, move about in the marts of exchange anywhere, and you never anywhere see a gold dollar. I have had the honor to be in the service of this Government for some six years, and I have performed the duty of drawing my salary with all the punctuality of an attentive statesman, but never in all that time has the Government tendered to me even so much as one gold dollar. If I were to seek to get one to-morrow as a curiosity, I know not where I should go to find it.

The disadvantages of the free coinage of silver have already been discounted by the course of events and the tenor of facts, and it remains for us to offset against them the advantages of free coinage, which all realize to be great.

EUROPEAN WAR ON AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. President, this is a silver-producing nation, producing 40 per cent, two-fifths of all the silver of the world. Great Britain and the other nations of Europe who are combined against the free coinage of silver are only making war against an American product, for they have it not, and they war for what they have and against what America has.

If God had cursed our mines with barrenness of silver product, you would hear nothing against the free coinage of silver metal. It would be proclaimed far and near, in all the highways of exchange and by all the metropolitan journals, just as it was proclaimed in 1847 when gold had become plentiful from its discovery in California, that silver was the best money in the world and that gold was only the cheap money of other nations.

Mr. President, I ask leave of the Senate to append to my remarks a letter addressed to me, and which I received this morning, from Mr. William P. St. John, a distinguished financier of New York, which is *appropos* of the discussion which I have just made. He is one of the few bankers who has taken the country's side, the people's side—the side of intellectual reach and broad patriotism. Would that there were more like him!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

THE MERCANTILE NATIONAL BANK OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, April 25, 1892.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 20th instant, which came to the bank on Saturday, with a promise on my behalf that I would reply to-day.

In answering your first inquiry I beg to say that the trade returns between the United States and Great Britain during the period of five years ending 1890 show a balance of trade against Great Britain in favor of the United States of \$1,045,179,923, or an average annual balance in favor of the United States of \$209,000,000. The movement during the year ending June 30, 1891, shows a trade balance against Great Britain and in favor of the United States of \$250,090,764.

Taking the trade between the United States and the entire commercial world at present, and we may assume prospectively the difference is only in degree, which means that we are generally creditor in trade. Therefore, except for foreign investments in our securities and capricious balances either way, occasioned thereby, also except for the foreign expenditures by our traveling public, the United States is now and will likely continue to be, as David Barbour, the British finance secretary to India, asserts, "The most independent of the foreigner among the nations."

It is thus the actual fact that there is nothing upon which to base a prediction of a continuing premium upon gold when our mints are equally open to the coinage of gold and silver. Any temporary premium on gold in our money centers would attract gold to those centers, as against gold remaining in centers where it was not at a premium. A premium abroad in more than one instance in the last two years has attracted gold abroad. A premium on it here would return it here with a like attraction. Laveleye, sharing the opinion of Barbour, has declared as late as March, 1891, that the opening of our mints to silver, if it proved a failure, would be more expensive to Europe than to the United States as the consequence.

The sole degree in which we could possibly suffer by a premium on gold in New York would be limited by the brief period of time in which that excessive demand served to induce the gold in our direction as the best employment offered for it, ceasing with its arrival here or earlier. The Bank of England has established a premium on her only money, gold, thirteen times during a single twelve months by the alteration of her bank rate for discounts. The Bank of France held her bank rate without change at 3 per cent during the entire same period.

An inexcusable misconception exists in the association of our greenback issue, and its relation to both gold and silver, with our silver coinage in relation to our gold coinage under equally free coinage for both metals at a fixed ratio. The latter relation is that of two equally unlimited legal-tender primary moneys. The former, the greenback, was not unlimited legal tender, but was a promise of money, either gold or silver. The greenback was not accepted at the custom-house, and is not legally so accepted to-day.

If there were any possibility of a fulfillment of the prediction of an avalanche of Europe's silver at our reopened mints the predicted premium on gold would be short-lived, for the reason that the tendency of that premium

to retain gold here would soon occasion the overabundant money volume that would deny to gold and silver both a profitable employment as money. There would be nothing more surprising to the popular banking thought than the actual effect on gold of any such result of the reopening of our mints.

With the United States on a silver basis, as in the far East, the trade conditions which I have reported would be the more confirmed, for a time at least, and always to some extent. To every such degree Laveleye's prediction would be fulfilled, that Europe would be the only sufferer. Please note, too, that except for the British taxation in gold imposed on India, India would really be careless of the gold and silver question. You must have observed recent newspaper intimations that India, like Austria and Italy and the Argentine Republic, is soon to adopt a single gold basis. It may have escaped attention that British India is the one invariable creditor among the nations annually and every year.

Were India to adopt the gold standard, therefore, she would denude the commercial world of gold before some of our ablest financiers could account for it or would make that discovery.

Yours, very truly,

WM. P. ST. JOHN.

Hon. JOHN W. DANIEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6923.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does the Senator propose to take up the army appropriation bill?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; the army appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I asked the Senate yesterday afternoon to proceed to the consideration of a resolution, which was taken up and is the unfinished business at 2 o'clock, when it will be laid before the Senate. My intention was to lay it aside informally for the purpose of taking up the army appropriation bill, but I do not want the appropriation bill taken up by a vote, for that would displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it would not, if taken up before 2 o'clock.

Mr. STEWART. It is now so near 2 o'clock that I ask that the resolution which the Senator from Arkansas has in charge be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the army appropriation bill. That will answer the purpose.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no objection to proceeding with the army appropriation bill until 2 o'clock, and then allowing the unfinished business to be laid aside informally to continue its consideration.

Mr. STEWART. It is now within a minute of 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada, before the hour of 2 o'clock, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the army appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6923) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the formal reading of the bill will be dispensed with and the bill will be read for amendment.

Mr. STEWART. And the committee amendments will be considered first, and acted on as reached in the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be considered as they are reached in the reading, in the absence of objection.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations "for pay of officers of the line," on page 1, line 12, after the word "pay," to insert "and allowances of a mounted officer;" and, in line 13, after the word "rank," to strike out "without any additions thereto;" so as to make the clause read:

FOR PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE LINE.

For pay of officers of the line, \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That hereafter any officer performing the duty of adjutant, regimental quartermaster, aid to major or brigadier-general, or acting commissary of subsistence, shall receive the pay and allowances of a mounted officer of his rank.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays the unfinished business before the Senate, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution by Mr. JONES of Arkansas, relative to the President's message of February 18, 1892.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside in order to proceed with the Army appropriation bill. If there be no objection, that course will be taken. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations "for pay of enlisted men," on page 2, line 13, after the word "messengers," to insert "to the number and;" and in line 14, after the words "one hundred and," to strike out "sixty thousand" and

insert "sixty-one thousand nine hundred"; so as to make the clause read:

For general-service clerks and messengers, to the number and at the rate now fixed by law, \$161,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations "for pay of the general staff," on page 5, line 7, after the word "Provided," to strike out:

That the Secretary of War is authorized to assign to duty as acting paymasters the officers acting as quartermasters or commissaries of posts or camps or of troops in the field; and officers so assigned shall, under proper regulations to be established by the President, making the regular payment to the troops with which they are serving, and shall be authorized and required to perform the same duties as are now performed by the officers of the Pay Department of the Army: *Provided further.*

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided. That no appointments shall be made to the grade of major in the Pay Department of the Army until the number of majors in that Department is reduced below twenty, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 5, line 18, after the word "below," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five;" and after the words "fixed at," at the end of line 19, to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to read:

That no appointments shall be made to the grade of major in the Pay Department of the Army until the number of majors in that Department is reduced below twenty-five, and thereafter the number of officers of that grade in the Pay Department shall be fixed at twenty-five.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same clause, on page 5, after the word "paymaster," at the end of line 22, to strike out "or acting assistant paymaster;" so as to read:

And provided further. That the Secretary of War is also authorized to arrange for the payment of the enlisted men serving at posts or places where no paymaster is on duty, by check or by currency, to be sent to them by mail or express, at the expense and risk of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "miscellaneous," on page 7, line 14, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "thirty-five paymasters" and insert "thirty-eight paymasters;" and in line 18, after the word "Department," to strike out "eighty thousand" and insert "eighty-four thousand two hundred;" so as to read:

For pay of not exceeding thirty-eight paymasters' clerks, at \$1,400 each; not exceeding thirty paymasters' messengers, and travelling expenses of paymasters' clerks and expert accountant of the Inspector-General's Department, \$84,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, after the word "buildings," to strike out "and so forth" and insert "and grounds;" so as to make the clause read:

For additional pay to officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in Washington, D. C., \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 7, after the words "for the," to strike out "Inspector-General" and insert "Inspector-General's Department, to be appointed hereafter, in case of vacancy, by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the clause read:

For one expert accountant for the Inspector-General's Department, to be appointed hereafter, in case of vacancy, by the Secretary of War, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 15, after the word "information," to insert "from abroad;" and in line 16, after the words "dollars," to insert "and the officers detailed to obtain the same shall be entitled to mileage and transportation and also commutation of quarters while on this duty, as provided when on other duty;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of a clerk attendant on the collection and classification of military information abroad, \$1,500; and the officers detailed to obtain the same shall be entitled to mileage and transportation and also commutation of quarters while on this duty, as provided when on other duty.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill what is the object in inserting that clause? Of course all officers traveling under orders from the Secretary of War, whether at home or abroad, are entitled to mileage or transportation. There seems to be no reason for inserting this clause, unless it may be to lay the foundation for extended trips abroad by officers. In other words, I can not conceive that there is any need of this clause. I do not understand that there is any limit whatever to the authority of the President, or of the Secretary of War, to order officers to travel and to pay them therefor.

Mr. STEWART. The object was to make their compensation definite so that there should be no additional allowance. It was thought necessary to define it so that they would have the same allowance while on that duty as on any other.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is not this very provision the law now?

Mr. STEWART. There was some doubt expressed about that,

and the committee thought it best to make it definite. It does not enlarge the power so far as that is concerned, but makes it definite.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to offer an amendment, which I believe will be acceptable to the committee.

Mr. STEWART. We are going through with the committee amendments now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it an amendment to the amendment of the committee?

Mr. QUAY. It is an amendment to the part of the bill now reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. QUAY. Not to the amendment; it is an amendment to the original bill.

Mr. STEWART. Where does it come in?

Mr. QUAY. It comes in between lines 13 and 14, on page 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for information. The order of the Senate is that the bill is now being read for action upon the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. QUAY. Then my amendment, unless received by unanimous consent, will not be in order at this time.

Mr. STEWART. I believe I know what the amendment is. Although I would not like to have action upon the committee amendments broken in upon again, I think the amendment may be read for information, and if it is what I think it is perhaps it is well enough to adopt it.

Mr. QUAY. I think the amendment will be acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, after line 13, insert the following proviso:

Provided. That officers temporarily absent on duty in the field, with troops or otherwise, shall not lose their right to quarters or commutation thereof at their permanent station while so temporarily absent: *And provided further.* That the accounting officers of the Treasury are hereby authorized to credit disbursing officers of the Army with the amount of any such sums as may have been charged against them on account of payment of commutation of quarters to officers temporarily absent from their permanent station.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reception of the amendment?

Mr. STEWART. I do not object to it.

Mr. QUAY. Then I ask unanimous consent that it may be agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. I have no objection to it. I believe that is the law now if it is properly construed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 9, line 21, to increase the total amount of the appropriations "for pay and general expenses of the Army" from "\$13,293,049.82" to "\$13,299,149.82."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Quartermaster's Department," on page 13, line 6, after the words "gardens or," to strike out "canteens" and insert "exchanges, but this proviso shall not be construed to prohibit the use by post exchanges of public buildings or public transportation when not required for other purposes, or the purchase of subsistence or quartermaster's supplies at the same rates as officers are now allowed to purchase such supplies;" so as to make the proviso read:

And provided further. That hereafter no money appropriated for the support of the Army shall be expended for post gardens or exchanges, but this proviso shall not be construed to prohibit the use by post exchanges of public buildings or public transportation when not required for other purposes, or the purchase of subsistence or quartermaster's supplies at the same rates as officers are now allowed to purchase such supplies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 21, to increase the total amount of the appropriations for "incidental expenses" from "\$2,660,000" to "\$2,850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 22, after the word "service," to strike out:

Provided further. That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army over any of the nonbonded lines owned, controlled, or operated by the Union Pacific Railway Company, including the lines of the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railway Company or by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

Mr. COCKRELL. I disagreed with the full Committee on Appropriations in striking that provision out, and think it ought to be retained in the bill. I will not take any action upon the

amendment now, but will reserve it until the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. CALL. I desire to say that I agree with the House provision, and I think it should be retained in the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the Senator from Missouri desires to reserve the amendment for a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will reserve it for action in the Senate. I will not contest it here now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 18, line 16, after the word "as," to insert "far as;" so as to read:

And the erection, construction, and repair of all buildings and other public structures in the Quartermaster's Department shall, as far as may be practicable, be made by contract, after due legal advertisement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "barracks and quarters," on page 18, line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three hundred" and insert "one hundred and fifty;" so as to read:

And provided further, That no more than \$1,150,000 of the sums appropriated by this act shall be paid out for the services of civilian employes in the Quartermaster's Department, including those heretofore paid out of the funds appropriated for regular supplies, incidental expenses, barracks and quarters, army transportation, clothing and camp and garrison equipage, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 17, before the word "quarters," to insert the word "such;" so as to make the clause read:

For construction of quarters for hospital stewards at military posts already established and occupied, including the extra-duty pay of enlisted men employed on the same, \$7,000: Provided, That the posts at which such quarters shall be constructed shall be designated by the Secretary of War, and such quarters shall be built by contract, after legal advertisement, whenever the same is practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Medical Department," in line 23, after the word "over," to strike out "forty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to read:

Medical and Hospital Department: For the purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for general post sanitation, expenses of medical purveying depots, and pay of employes, medical care and treatment of officers and enlisted men of the Army and Signal Corps on duty at posts and stations for which no other provision is made, for the proper care and treatment of cases in the Army suffering from contagious and epidemic diseases, and the supply of the Army and Navy general hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., advertising, and other miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, \$170,000; and not over \$45,000 of the money appropriated by this paragraph shall be applied to the payment of civilian employes of the Medical Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seven" and insert "ten;" and in line 8, after the word "all," to strike out "twelve" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Medical Museum and Library: For Army Medical Museum, preservation of specimens, and the preparation or purchase of new specimens, \$5,000; for the library of the Surgeon-General's Office, \$10,000; in all, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Ordnance Department," on page 23, line 5, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" so as to read:

For repairing and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops and for issue at the arsenals and depots, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 7, after the words "one hundred," to insert "and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops, \$120,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For infantry, cavalry, and artillery equipments, including horse equipments for cavalry and artillery, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty," and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For firing the morning and evening gun at military posts, prescribed by General Orders, numbered 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 20, to insert: For purchase of machine guns, musket caliber, of American manufacture, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of the clause making appropriations "for manufacture of arms at the national armories," on page 24, line 7, after the word "dollars," to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That not more than \$60,000 of the money appropriated for the Ordnance Department in all its branches shall be applied to the payment of civilian clerks in said Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "contingent expenses," on page 25, line 8, after the word "general," to insert "in his discretion;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the office of the Commanding General, in his discretion, \$1,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, in line 11, after the word "military," to insert "divisions and;" in the same line, after the word "departments," to insert "including the staff corps serving thereat;" in line 14, after the word "reference," to insert "and;" in the same line, after the word "utensils," to strike out "and so forth, too," and insert "three;" and in line 15, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be allotted by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses at the headquarters of the several military divisions and departments, including the staff corps working thereat, being for the purchase of the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, binding, maps, books of reference, and police utensils, \$3,000, to be allotted by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, to strike out the last clause in the bill, beginning in line 16, in the following words:

Contingencies, Inspector-General's Department: For contingent expenses of the Inspector-General's Department at the headquarters, being for the necessary articles of office, toilet, and desk furniture, stationery, binding, maps, books of reference, professional literature, and police utensils, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole will be taken in gross with the exception of the amendment reserved by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], if there be no objection.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment reserved by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 22, after the word "service," the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out the proviso, the words stricken out being as follows:

Provided further, That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army over any of the nonbonded lines owned, controlled, or operated by the Union Pacific Railway Company, including the lines of the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railway Company, or by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, striking out the proviso which has been read.

Mr. STEWART. I hope that the Senator from Missouri will not insist upon an objection to this amendment. If the provision were ever so just we are in no position to act upon it. We do not know what roads are under the control of the Union Pacific Railroad and the Central Pacific Railroad or the parties who are interested in the branch roads. There is no report to show what roads this would require payment from or how sweeping it would be, and how the parties stand with regard to the Union and Central Pacific Railroads and all the roads that are under the control of those two systems. They have branches extending all over the country. Other parties are interested in them. Before we can undertake this new legislation we ought to have some information upon that subject.

The question of settling the indebtedness of the Pacific Railroads has been intrusted to a select commission, which has taken testimony, and when that is settled, the whole matter ought to be settled together. Besides, this question has been before the Supreme Court. In the first place, the Supreme Court has decided that the interest is not due from these railroads until the maturity of the principal debt other than as provided for by the statutes; that there is no money due from them that can be offset. If it had been ascertained whether the parties that you propose to charge here have anything to do with this obligation, the provision could be understood.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator permit a suggestion right in that connection?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. The whole question as to the interest on

these bonds being payable at any time before the maturity of the bonds, as a matter of course, has been settled by a decision of the Supreme Court, but that decision of the Supreme Court does not prohibit Congress, or interfere with the right or power or duty of Congress to compel those roads to make provision for the payment of this great accumulation of sixty odd million dollars of interest, which will become payable in fact by the course of law when the \$64,000,000 of bonds become due. We have a perfect right to control the companies so as to make them provide a sinking fund, or a fund for the payment of the debt. There are \$64,000,000 of Government bonds loaned or advanced to the companies. The interest is running on them at 6 per cent. If we made no provision for it the interest, by the time the bonds mature, will amount to probably \$125,000,000 all together, in addition to the \$64,000,000 of principal. It would amount to something over \$100,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. If the Senator will let me complete my statement he will see what my position is.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted to call the Senator's attention to that point, so that he would cover it.

Mr. STEWART. I understand it, and I agree with the Senator.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is as to providing a sinking fund?

Mr. STEWART. I agree that it is a large indebtedness. We first passed a law providing a sinking fund, and they are operating under that, and now we have appointed a committee, and they are working on a settlement of this whole matter. I concur with the Senator that it ought to be settled, and we ought to have legislation; Congress ought to give its attention to the subject, but what I object to in this legislation—

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that that committee has not met during this Congress. We are not doing anything.

Mr. STEWART. It exists for this purpose. The matter ought to be settled, but it can not be investigated without a report from somebody so as to ascertain the facts. We do not want to collect any of this money from outsiders who have nothing to do with its payment.

I refer to the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *The United States vs. The Union Pacific Railroad Company* in 98 United States Reports, page 614. There the question is discussed and the court decide that the interest is not due until the maturity of the bonds. In that the Senator from Missouri concurs with me. But the identical question which is here presented has been before the Supreme Court, whether outside railroads could be charged, and the court hold that they could not. Now, I will read from the opinion of the court in the *United States vs. The Central Pacific Railroad Company*:

The syllabus of the case states it pretty clearly:

The act of July 1, 1862, "to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean" (12 Stat., 489), and the act of July 2, 1864 (13 Stat., 356), amending the same, and the act of May 7, 1878 (20 Stat., 56), commonly called the Thurman act, are *in pari materia* and to be construed together; and so construed the act of May 7, 1868, restores provisions of the act of 1862 respecting retention of compensation for services performed by the railroads of the United States which had been changed by the amendment of 1864, and requires the Treasury to withhold all payments for services performed on the roads constructed by the aid of Government grants, but not on roads owned or operated by the same companies which were not constructed with such aid.

When a contract is open to two constructions, the one lawful and the other unlawful, the former must be adopted. (*Hobbs vs. McLean*, 117 U. S., 567, affirmed.)

They say it would be unlawful for the Government to withhold compensation from these nonaided roads, and in commenting upon it they use very strong language. On page 240 the court say:

There is another view of this controversy which seems to us conclusive. As the contract between the United States and the railroad company, contained in the acts of July 1, 1862, and of July 2, 1864, has been interpreted by this court to authorize the retention by the Government of compensation for services only on those roads which the United States aided in building, the construction which the appellants seek to put on the second section of the act of May 8, 1878, would not only render that section a breach of faith on the part of the United States, but an invasion of the constitutional rights of the appellee. We are bound, if possible, so to construe the law as to lay it open to neither of these objections. (*Broughton vs. Pensacola*, 93 U. S., 266; *Red Rock vs. Henry*, 106 U. S., 596; *Hobbs vs. McLean*, 117 U. S., 567, decided at the present term, and cases there cited; *United States vs. Coombs*, 12 Pet., 72.) The construction contended for by the appellee preserves the good faith of the Government and frees the act from the imputation of impairing rights secured by the Constitution of the United States.

This was the identical question which the Supreme Court say would be an invasion of constitutional rights, and that comes up here to be acted upon without any report from the committee, without any ascertainment of the fact as to what roads there are that are in this general system operated by them, when the same persons operate a road, no matter who is entitled to the dividends, or who owns the road, or whose money it is, or how it affects bondholders or stockholders anywhere; and we are to compel them to transport for the United States without compensation.

Now, if any person thinks this is justifiable he should produce

a report and show us what is the effect. Certainly we ought to wait for a report of the committee, because the Supreme Court say it is an invasion of constitutional rights to withhold the compensation for carrying freight from these other companies. But Congress might act perhaps if it had ascertained the fact about these other roads. It seems to me, to attempt to settle the Pacific Railroad question on an appropriation bill by this new legislation, would get us into interminable difficulties.

Mr. COCKRELL. The provision of the House bill does not undertake to settle and adjust all the relations existing between these Government-aided roads and the Government. We have a provision in the bill as it came to us, and necessity compelled the Appropriation Committee of the other House to put it in, that these aided railroads should not receive more than 50 per cent of the full amount of service to be paid. This is only another method that Congress is attempting to exercise for the purpose of securing the people against the payment of this enormous sum of money, \$64,000,000 interest, for which they are liable, and the first lien upon these roads to secure the payment of which was voluntarily released by Congress. It is no difficult problem to ascertain the number of these roads, if anything were necessary. If there should any claim that the Union Pacific—

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator contend that the Government has got any lien upon the system of roads under the control of these two companies? I understand that a branch comes here to Newport News, and there are roads all through the country controlled by them.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no pretence that this clause would reach that far.

Mr. STEWART. It says all roads under their control.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. STEWART. It would reach them all. It is broad enough.

Mr. COCKRELL. The language is—

by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

That would not extend to the Atlantic.

Mr. FRYE. Does the Senator think it is fair?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, I do. I think when the United States paid to these corporations in lands and bonds enough to build their roads without another dollar, and when these corporations have refused to reimburse the United States for the interest they have paid upon the bonds, and by influences not to be discussed just now secured from Congress a release of the first lien the United States held upon the roads and their property, and have turned the proceeds of their roads and the speculative profits of what the Government granted them in lands and bonds into the construction of these roads, the United States has a right to follow that property wherever it may go and enforce its lien. I think it is equitable and just. I do not think any Government has ever been treated as the United States Government has been treated by these bonded railroads.

Mr. FRYE. But is there any violation on the part of the railroads of the agreements which Congress made with them?

Mr. COCKRELL. There may be no technical violation in the strict legal sense of the word, and yet, morally and equitably, there has been a total disregard of what the masses of this country believe were the rights granted to those companies and the rights reserved to the United States. I know that the Supreme Court has decided, for example, that the interest on these bonds does not become enforceable at the instance of the United States in a court of justice until the bonds become due, and yet I doubt whether a Senator or Representative, with a few exceptions—precious few indeed—when that law was passed, ever dreamed of such a construction as that.

Mr. FRYE. But it is the law of the land.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is true. That act of Congress, skillfully, artistically drawn for the benefit of the corporate monopolies created and protected by it, has been construed in that way. As a matter of course that ends the legal remedy, but it does not end the right and the duty of the Congress of the United States to protect the taxpayers from the payment of this \$64,000,000 of bonds and the accumulating interest upon those bonds up to the date of their maturity; and we would be recreant to the trust delegated to us by the people if we did not attempt to secure remuneration and repayment of those sums.

Now, these companies may say technically that we can not enforce by law any lien upon these roads built by the aid granted by the United States to these corporate monopolies, that we can not enforce by law a lien upon their income and dividends to reimburse us for what the Union Pacific Company owes; but we may enact laws, and in that way we can protect ourselves against loss and damage.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think it would be just to enact laws to tax companies which received no aid from the Gov-

ernment, whose stockholders are not stockholders in these other companies, and who had no connection with them, but put their money in these roads, because the roads which they own are under the control of the general system made necessary to carry on trade? Would he withhold payment from persons who had nothing to do with the Pacific railroads? I want to know whether he would do that.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes. The persons in these companies—

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know what persons are in these companies?

Mr. COCKRELL. I will explain what I mean. I mean the few persons who have an interest in these companies simply amount to nothing. It is these two great monopolies, created by the United States, which are reaping all the profits and have all the liabilities of these companies. The original stockholders who built these roads have leased them to these two great corporations, and they get whatever these corporations permit them to receive, and they get it independent of this legislation. This legislation does not affect them at all.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know whether or not the stockholders in these nonaided roads are the stockholders who received the bounty of the Government? Does he know that fact?

Mr. COCKRELL. If that fact does not exist the law does not operate, does it?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, the law operates if those roads are branches of this company.

Mr. COCKRELL. It makes no difference who the stockholders are, the persons who manage the roads get the cream.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator take away the property of the bondholders and stockholders who have liens upon these roads, and who have had nothing to do with these matters? Is it not proper, before you take the property of these private parties, before you pass a law to confiscate their property, to at least secure the report of some competent committee or commission and ascertain what the respective rights of the parties may be? It seems to me that if we are to retain this provision in the bill without a report and take money away from people who had nothing to do with these transactions, we should be imposing a wrong upon them.

We ought to know the facts. We have a committee investigating the facts, and we have no right to take A's property to pay B's debts because B is indebted to us. Whether anything is due or not, we have no report upon which to found any such legislation. Because the world is bad, are we to say that we shall kill everybody? That is the nihilist's theory, who would kill everybody because the world is bad, without trying to separate the good from the evil. If these parties are to be charged with this, there should be an investigation to know who owes the amount.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I objected to striking out this provision in the House bill. We might admit all that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] says upon this subject, and yet a reasonable prudence for the protection of the people and their money would require that this payment should not be made before the facts are ascertained. Why shall these companies not wait until the people ascertain whether or not they are the same parties to whom the bounty of the Government was paid? Therefore, it seems to me, as there is a reasonable probability, as the inquiry has been made here, as the fact has been affirmed time and time again in both Houses of Congress that this was the money of the people that had been improperly applied by these same stockholders of the nonbonded lines and for their benefit and that an equity followed that money into these corporations—it seems entirely proper that until that fact is ascertained to be untrue the people's money should not be appropriated for their benefit.

For that reason I thought the provision of the House was a proper one. It settles nothing. It simply withholds the payment of this money until some future time.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who seems to be familiar with this bill, inform me whether it is the intention of the bill to pay a larger compensation to the branch roads of the Pacific system for the transportation of mails than is paid the Pacific roads themselves, the aided roads?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly; there is no question about that; and the Senator will see that we take out of the aided roads 50 per cent and we take nothing out of the others. There is just that difference.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I should like to know upon what principle it is that the Central and the Union Pacific Railroad Companies can invest the money that belongs to the Government in branch lines all over the country, holding in their own treasuries nearly all of the stock—perhaps some of the bonds, but the stock—that has been issued for the construction of these lines of railroad, to-day the property of these two great corporations,

and they themselves compelled to furnish the Government transportation for 50 per cent and then in turn take their own property, their own branch lines, and claim for them full compensation?

The investigation of this subject by the late commission, which was sent out under Mr. Cleveland's Administration, showed the fact that both the Central and the Union Pacific Railroads had disposed of some of the bonds and securities of these branch lines, and wherever the branch lines did not pay scarcely any of the stock has ever been alienated from either the Union or Central Pacific Railroads because there was no market for those securities. Where the securities were worthless, as most of them are, they remained in the treasuries of the Union and the Central Pacific Railroad Companies as so much assets upon which they could float other securities in the market. This accumulation of branch-line securities has been made a potent factor in securing a new subsidy from the Government by way of extension of time and reduced interest.

It was further shown that as to some one of these branch lines there was a contract made between the parent or trunk line, and these different corporations, the branch lines, for constructive mileage. The Government aids the trunk line and it in turn subsidizes its own branches at the Government expense. These properties to-day are owned by the Central and the Union Pacific Railroad Companies mainly. They represent it. The roads were built contrary to law, without warrant of law, and I may further say in direct violation of law.

Now it is proposed, as I understand, in the army bill to take all these branch lines of railroad owned by these corporations and to give them full rates of transportation upon those lines and only withhold the rebate upon the work absolutely done upon the main trunk lines. It seems to me as though that was a most extraordinary performance.

If there is any reason whatever either in law or in justice by which the Government should exact from the Central or the Union Pacific systems a rate of compensation for carrying the mails and for carrying troops less than the usual rates charged upon other lines of railroad that are under no obligations whatever to this Government, then it is equally true and equally just that the same thing should be imposed upon these branch lines. There is no reason or justice in any other view of the question.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the Senator does not reach the difficulty at all; he does not reach the objections. In the first place, this is new legislation on an appropriation bill, which is against the rule. In the next place, I again state that there is no fact before the Senate showing whether or not these branch roads belong to the Union and Central Pacific Companies. My information is that they do not. That question ought to be settled. My information is that there are a great many stockholders and bondholders outside.

The language used here is most sweeping. Let me read it, and see what it is proposed to do:

Provided further, That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army over any of the nonbonded lines owned, controlled, or operated by the Union Pacific Railway Company, including the lines of the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railway Company or by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

We have no information as to the extent of that system or as to how many roads are brought in.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will take the report made by the late commission which investigated the whole railroad system of the aided lines, he will find the number, the character, and the kind of securities held in their treasuries by the Union and Central Pacific Railroad Companies as a part of the assets of those companies.

Mr. STEWART. Of what companies?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Of the Union and Central Pacific Companies, as part of their assets as for money expended or securities held by reason of money expended by them for the construction of these lines.

Mr. STEWART. In what part of report on the Central Pacific system shall we find those facts?

Mr. MCPHERSON. They will be found in the report of the investigation.

Mr. STEWART. What part of the system does it cover?

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Central Pacific system, the Union Pacific system, the Kansas Pacific system.

Mr. STEWART. It is a question whether it is or not. I undertake to say that before we legislate, we ought to have the report of a committee on so important a matter as that.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I understood the Senator to say this was a new law.

Mr. STEWART. I say it is new legislation.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then I think it would have been well for the committee to understand as to the ownership of these branch

lines and how much these companies represented before they undertook to increase the compensation upon the branch lines.

Mr. STEWART. I think we ought to understand it. The other House presents no report and no facts are stated here. We are legislating in the dark with regard to these companies against the decision of the Supreme Court, which says such legislation is in violation of constitutional rights. We have no right to do it. The Supreme Court has decided the very question. Compensation was withheld over these same roads by the Post-Office Department, the case went before the Supreme Court, and the court said to withhold payment was an invasion of constitutional rights.

We have not had any report to show that the Supreme Court were mistaken, to show that there was any predicate for such a demand on the part of the Government. I think this kind of legislation upon an appropriation bill, without the ascertainment of those facts, is unreasonable, and is putting the cart before the horse. The select committee having the subject in charge will bring in a solution at an early day of this whole question, and when we do act we ought to include those companies that are indebted to the Government, and nobody else.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, for information largely, for it is to sufficiently develop the facts that I suppose exist, I will ask the Senator from Nevada what corporation is it that is the debtor of the United States Government?

Mr. STEWART. The Union Pacific and the Central Pacific Companies are debtors.

Mr. PALMER. Presuming that is so, is there anything unjust in withholding payment from any railroad "owned, controlled, or operated" which is a Government debtor? It is not too much, I suppose, to charge any particular line of railway with the cost of transportation of troops, but I suppose its purpose is to reach the debtor of the Government. The provision amounts to this, that the Union Pacific Railroad Company and the Central Pacific Railroad Company shall not be paid for service performed on any of their lines out of this appropriation. I understand it is not to reach a particular company, but it is to reach a particular debtor to the Government; that is, that the Union Pacific Company, which is the debtor of the Government, shall not be paid for any service which it may render the Government from this appropriation.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator will allow me?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. From the Union and the Central Pacific Companies the Government withholds one-half of the transportation under the contract, and that is all it can withhold under the contract. Here, where there is no contract and no fact showing a liability, outside companies, because they are managed or controlled by these companies that are required to pay into the Treasury one-half of the freight (and you can only take one-half from them under the contract), you propose to take it all from the others without investigation whether they owe anything or not, and do it in an appropriation bill. It seems to me that is a kind of legislation that is not wise.

Mr. PALMER. I will say, by way of answer to the Senator from Nevada, that if these roads are owned, controlled, or operated by the Government debtor, if on the principle that the Government debtor is realizing all the profits to result from their operation and it goes into the treasury of this corporation, which is the debtor of the Government, and it is material to inquire from what sources it is derived, it is enough that we seek to withhold from our debtor compensation for this service, proposing to charge that debtor with the value of the service rendered the Government.

Has the Supreme Court of the United States ever held that you may not look to the particular corporation which is your debtor, and that you may withhold from that particular corporation such compensation for services as will be paid from this appropriation?

I have no prejudice against these railroad companies, but it seems to me that this affords an opportunity for retaining in the Treasury money that ought to be paid into the Treasury by these corporations. It seems to me it is but just and fair that that should be done; it is simply keeping the money of your debtor. It seems to me in this case the doctrine of set-off properly applies.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not care to mingle in this discussion. I agreed to the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for reasons which were satisfactory to me at the time, and I have seen nothing in this debate to change my opinions.

Our relations to the Union Pacific and Central Pacific Railway Companies are perhaps not what they ought to be. We have seen, and we do see, a largely and constantly accumulating debt of these two companies upon their lines of railway, secured to us

by a second mortgage. When the statute of 1864 was passed it provided that one-half, as I remember it—perhaps that was the original act of 1862—

Mr. STEWART. By the act of 1862 the Government retained it all, and by the act of 1864 it retained one-half.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. The act of 1864 retained one-half of the compensation due from the Government for transportation, whether of mails, of munitions of war, troops, etc., and 5 per cent of the net earnings. Under that act the Supreme Court decided, as I remember, Associate Justice Davis delivering the opinion, that *pro tanto* these earnings and this 5 per cent should be applied to the interest, but whatever interest was not paid by the application of these earnings would not become due until the principal sum became due. It has been under the operation of those two provisions that the debt is accumulating so far as interest is concerned.

In 1878, it will be remembered, that we had an adjustment with these companies under what is known as the Thurman act, which was an act intended to provide for a sinking fund which would in a sense meet these accumulations of interest. That sinking-fund act provided, as I remember it—I have not examined it recently, and may in some details be mistaken—that the half transportation due from the Government should be applied presently to the interest and that the other half should be paid into the Treasury and constitute a sinking fund to be invested and reinvested by the Government from time to time in securities, and that in addition to that 25 per cent of the net earnings of these companies should be applied to the sinking fund, and that these two funds together should be made a fund applicable to these accumulations of interest and the payment of the principal sum.

The railroad companies, I believe, resisted that legislation as unconstitutional. The Supreme Court decided that it was constitutional because it did not take the money of these corporations and apply that money to any purpose other than the payment of the companies' debts, and that for the purpose of making these arrangements Congress had the power to take from these railroad companies a certain portion of their earnings to be applied to a sinking fund.

I think one case was decided before by the Supreme Court wherein one-half of the earnings of the Kansas Pacific Railroad Company—if that is the name of the corporation that was subsidized for a part of its way and not subsidized for the remainder—could only have taken from it one-half of its earnings on the subsidized portion of the road, for the reason, as the Supreme Court stated, that that was the particular segregation of earnings that was meant in the law. In another case the court decided that the earnings of nonaided roads could not be applied to the uses and purposes of the Government, although, as I have not examined with care, I am not sure that legislation such as is proposed now has ever been put upon the statute book as respects branches and lines controlled by or operated by either one of these great corporations.

It is true that the Union Pacific Railway Company has built numerous branches, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] says, in violation of law. He may be correct in that statement, although my recollection is quite different. My understanding is that the policy of the Government has been, as respects these branches, rather to encourage than not to encourage them. So, I believe as respects the Union Pacific Railway Company, its branches now have a greater number of miles than the principal company, although I am not familiar with these details.

Mr. STEWART. Very many more miles.

Mr. ALLISON. I know that it has been their policy not only to encourage the building of branches, but, to some extent, to lease railroads. I am told—I do not know with what truth—that the Union Pacific Railroad Company has now leased a line from Denver to Galveston, or at least as far as Fort Worth, although they did not construct a mile of it nor invest a dollar in it; but they have leased that line. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PALMER] says that if they operate that road it is his present opinion that we have a right to say that for that operation we shall hold the entire charge, whatever it may be, and apply it to what? Because if we hold this charge we have a right to apply it to something; that we shall hold all these earnings and apply them to the payment *pro tanto* of the second-mortgage bonds which we hold upon the Union Pacific Railway Company, extending westward from Omaha 1,100 miles.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] says that this railroad company—and I have no doubt it is true—has sold the bonds of these branch lines, and these bonds are held by the public hither and thither.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Very few of them or none of them, except the lines that have been paid.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, but there are a good many of

those. It is doubtless true as respects the Fort Worth line, a line of a good many miles—I do not know how many, five or six or seven hundred miles—

Mr. STEWART. The Southern Pacific line is 2,000 miles.

Mr. ALLISON. Two thousand miles of road. So also with the Oregon Short Line. The bonds of these companies have been sold. Now, I should like to ask whether or not it is equitable for the Government of the United States to say that these branch lines, if you call them branch lines, or these leased lines, which have never been constructed by either of these companies, shall apply all these earnings to the payment of the second mortgage of the Government, which is not due for several years, to the exclusion of the people who have purchased these bonds in the open market, and are in the expectation, at least, that interest will be paid to them as the interest matures semiannually?

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to know what the Senator means by the words "all these earnings?" Do they include anything more than the pay which the United States themselves give to these companies for particular services. Does it extend beyond that?

Mr. ALLISON. I am speaking now of those earnings.

Mr. GEORGE. Those are the earnings?

Mr. ALLISON. Those are the earnings. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that this provision in the Army bill is also found in another bill which provides for the transmission of the mails of the United States over these railways.

Mr. MORGAN. What bill is that?

Mr. ALLISON. The Post-Office appropriation bill.

Mr. MORGAN. That has not come in yet.

Mr. ALLISON. That has not come in here yet, but I say it is found in that bill.

Mr. MORGAN. In just the same phrase?

Mr. ALLISON. In substantially the same phrase.

Now, whilst the army transportation is a small transportation, yet when you come to apply the postal expenditures upon four or five thousand miles or two or three thousand miles, if you please—I do not know the extent of these branch or leased lines—most of them running through an unsettled country and most of them probably, as the Senator from New Jersey says, unproductive in respect to having surplus earnings over and above their fixed charges, or probably some of them not having money enough to pay the running expenses of the roads, it seems to me that it is a pretty harsh measure for the Congress of the United States as respects these lines to say by legislation, by the power we have here, that we will withhold all these earnings and put them in our pocket to pay a debt which is not yet due.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am very anxious to get at the merits of this controversy.

Mr. ALLISON. I am myself, and perhaps I am not contributing much to that.

Mr. GEORGE. I think you are, and I want some information. I have been sick and have just come in. I want to know what is right.

Mr. ALLISON. I know the Senator does.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know what the proposition is. What I want to know is this: Is the proposition of this amendment that the Government of the United States shall retain as a set-off that which the Government owes or which might become due by the Government to these railroad companies and apply this set-off to a debt which the railroad companies owe the Government?

Mr. ALLISON. No, that is not the proposition.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not that the proposition?

Mr. ALLISON. It proposes simply this: The ultimate logical result of that further legislation might be what the Senator suggests perhaps if we had that power, but this simply proposes that no payment shall be made to these railway companies owned, controlled, leased, or operated by either one of these two subsidized roads.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not the proposition, I hope, that these railroad companies shall do work for nothing. Is that the proposition?

Mr. MORGAN. That they shall not do it at all is the proposition of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. That they shall not be paid to do it.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course they will not do it if they are not paid for it.

Mr. ALLISON. There is an obligation on the part of the Union and the Central Pacific Railroad Companies to transport troops, munitions of war, and the mails.

Mr. MORGAN. Over the subsidized lines.

Mr. ALLISON. Over the subsidized lines. Now it is proposed to say that the Government will not pay them for transporting over any lines that they influence or control.

Mr. STEWART. But it goes further than that, and it pro-

vides "or by the Southern Pacific Company," not the Central Pacific Company, but another company entirely, an independent company, and any road which it operates.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there a proposition to strike something out of the bill as it came from the House of Representatives?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, this provision came from the House.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator read what is proposed to be stricken out?

Mr. STEWART. I will read it. It is as follows:

Provided further, That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army over any of the nonbonded lines owned, controlled, or operated by the Union Pacific Railway Company, including the lines of the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railway Company or by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

Mr. MORGAN. The sum of money herein appropriated to which that proviso applies, is the sum of \$2,850,000 for the purposes of army transportation, part of which is appropriated for horses, wagons, and what not. Then the Senator from Mississippi will notice that the proviso which the House of Representatives put in and which the Senate committee propose to strike out is—

That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army, etc.

Over these nonsubsidized branch lines of the Union and Central Pacific companies, or any road in the control of the Southern Pacific Company.

Mr. GEORGE. I want to get the facts. As I understand now, the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific companies are debtors of the Government.

Mr. ALLISON. They are.

Mr. GEORGE. To a very considerable amount?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEORGE. About \$60,000,000, as I understand.

Mr. ALLISON. A large amount, whatever it is.

Mr. COCKRELL. Sixty-four million dollars of principal and fifty-odd million dollars of interest.

Mr. GEORGE. They are debtors.

Mr. MORGAN. To the amount of over \$115,000,000 altogether.

Mr. GEORGE. Then, I understand these two corporations are debtors. They are separate debtors and not joint debtors, I believe?

Mr. ALLISON. They are separate debtors.

Mr. GEORGE. Each of these two corporations is a debtor, and I suppose each has leased certain lines of railroad?

Mr. STEWART. No; it is the Southern Pacific Company that has leased some lines, and not the Central Pacific.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator will allow me. The Union Pacific Railroad Company has got independent charters from different States and Territories through which its main lines run. It has various supply branches of the main trunk line and owns the majority of stock in these branch lines, and where they have bonds the Union Pacific Railroad Company owns a majority of the bonds.

Mr. GEORGE. They are substantially the owners of the branch lines.

Mr. MORGAN. Of course they are. The Central Pacific Railroad has also some similar relations or conditions with the roads that connect with it, not so extensive, however; but this bill seems to relate entirely to the Union Pacific Railroad; that is to say, the part proposed to be stricken out by the Senate committee, what the House put in there, seems to relate entirely to the Union Pacific Railroad Company, including the Oregon Short Line, the Utah Northern Railway Company, and the Southern Pacific Company, over lines embraced in the Pacific system, the Southern Pacific and not the Central Pacific.

Mr. STEWART. The Southern Pacific Company leased the Central Pacific and leased a good many other lines.

Mr. MORGAN. I know it has.

Mr. GEORGE. I was trying to get at the substantial facts as they exist, or in substance, and with this view: If these roads really are substantially owned by these various lines which we do not recognize as our debtors—

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I will say that these two companies are so far substantially the owners of these branch lines that they propose to the Government of the United States to transfer their ownership of stock, bonds, and all, as a condition of security to the Government for the payment of the one hundred and thirteen or one hundred and fifteen or one hundred and twenty million dollars that those two main trunk lines owe the Government. They propose to transfer these securities to the Government of the United States, and the Senate select committee report a bill here favoring the acceptance of the transfer and settlement of that indebtedness by giving them one hundred years of extension at 2 per cent interest, I believe it was, per annum.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Iowa recognize that as a correct statement of facts or is there a dispute about them?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not as familiar with the facts as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. I happen to know only some detached facts respecting this subject which I stated before the Senator from Mississippi came in, one of which was that I happen to know that the Union Pacific Railroad Company has leased a line which it did not build.

Mr. GEORGE. The Fort Worth line.

Mr. ALLISON. The Fort Worth line, which company has issued bonds. I do not know but it may be right and it may be lawful for us to segregate earnings that ought to be used and would be used ordinarily to pay interest upon the cost of constructing a railway; I do not know but we ought to divert them and say that we will take whatever earnings we choose to take from this railroad company and put them in our general caldron for the purposes of settlement hereafter between these two great railway companies and the Government. That is the point that influenced me in the decision I came to that it was not wise for us in this way to simply state that no money should be used for this purpose without going farther and regulating, as the Senator by his intimation seems to think we ought, and I think we ought to. If we are going to do this, I think we ought to say that whatever money arises from this transportation shall be put into this pocket of ours and be invested and used for the purpose of ultimately extinguishing, as far as it can extinguish, the debt that these railroad companies owe the United States.

Mr. FRYE. But what right has the United States to take the earnings of all the California roads but one and two-thirds of all the Texas roads and pay the debt of the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific companies to the United States?

Mr. ALLISON. I was trying to argue that there was some doubt about that, but I infer from some observations made on my left that there seems to be no doubt about it. If there is none, then I submit that, at least, when we take this money we ought to provide for its disposition.

Mr. McPHERSON. If the Senator will permit me, I will try to make it plain to him.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. McPHERSON. I wish to make it plain.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator has made plain to me what he said thus far.

Mr. McPHERSON. I will make it plain once more. It is proposed by the Senate committee to strike out of the House bill these words:

Provided further, That no money herein appropriated shall be used in payment of the transportation of troops and supplies of the Army over any of the nonbonded lines owned, controlled, or operated by the Union Pacific Railway Company, including the lines of the Oregon Short Line and Utah Northern Railway Company or by the Southern Pacific Company over lines embraced in its Pacific system.

We all understand what that means. The companies have all been named here to which this provision is intended to apply. Now I will go back to the Thurman law, of which the Senator has spoken. He has stated correctly as to the adjustment of this Government debt in the Thurman law and the amendments that were therein made to the law of 1862 and the law of 1864 as to the amount of money that should be held back by the Government on transportation account, what for the sinking fund, and what on account of net earnings. Then we turn to section 9 of the Thurman act, which reads in this wise:

SEC. 9. That all sums due to the United States from any of said companies respectively, whether payable presently or not, and all sums required to be paid to the United States or into the Treasury, or into said sinking fund under this act, or under the acts hereinbefore referred to, or otherwise, are hereby declared to be a lien upon all the property, estate, rights, and franchises of every description granted or conveyed by the United States to any of said companies, respectively or jointly, and also upon all the estate and property, real, personal, and mixed, assets, and income of the said several railroad companies respectively, from whatever source derived, subject to any lawfully prior and paramount mortgage, lien, or claim thereon.

So it appears from that that the lien of the Government was a lien upon their assets, a lien upon their income, a lien upon their property of every kind and character wherever found or whatever it consisted of.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator read the remainder of it?

Mr. McPHERSON. I will read it.

But this section shall not be construed to prevent said companies respectively from using and disposing of any of their property or assets in the ordinary, proper, and lawful course of their current business, in good faith and for valuable consideration.

I wish to know if it is in the ordinary, lawful, and proper course of business, of managing and running the Union and Central Pacific Railways, that they should take the assets, the income of these companies, the property of the Government, and proceed

to build branch lines all over this country for the purpose of making money for the stockholders of those lines respectively?

It appears in the report made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], I believe—

Mr. ALLISON. Let me answer that question.

Mr. McPHERSON. If the Senator will allow me to just make one further statement, then he will have two things to answer, and perhaps he will better understand exactly what to answer.

It appears, as I think, in the report made by the Senator from Maine that it was proposed to turn in a large amount of assets of these different branch lines as additional assets which it was claimed the Government did not cover by its present lien upon the property of the company as an inducement to have the debt extended for one hundred years at 3 per cent.

It also appears in the statement made by the commission, which was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate to investigate the affairs of the Pacific Railroads, that the property, the assets, the securities, of these different lines of railway were to-day in the treasury of the Union and Central Pacific Railway Companies. If they are in the treasury of the Union and Central Pacific Railroad Companies, how did they get there, unless it was by advances made by these companies or its officers and agents?

Now, then, whatever was done, after these branch roads were constructed they entered into a contract with both the Central and the Union Pacific Railroad Companies so far as the lines were built by each, by which they were to be entitled to a constructive mileage over the particular part of the line embraced in the branch lines. For instance, a road running 50 or 100 miles into the country from the main line and connecting with the main line was entitled to many times the mileage upon freight and passengers that was charged by the main line itself. This was a contract entered into between the two companies, and the owners of the branch lines, it is alleged, were the parties who were directing and controlling the Pacific Railroad systems.

The Senator from Nevada has raised the question here as to the right and justice of applying this to the Southern Pacific Company. If I understand the history of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company at all, it is this: That road was built, and it is owned to-day, by the very men who incorporated and who constructed and still control the Central Pacific Railroad.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Let me state what the facts are.

Mr. McPHERSON. The Senator can state them after I get through.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield a half hour further to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McPHERSON. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I supposed I was entitled to the floor.

Mr. McPHERSON. I supposed the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, no. I yielded temporarily to the Senator.

Mr. McPHERSON. I supposed the Senator vacated the floor, and that I had taken it in my own right.

If there is any one thing better known than another in this country it is that the Southern Pacific Railroad Company and the Central Pacific Railroad Company have always been, since the construction of the Southern Pacific Railway, really under one management and control.

It has been charged upon this floor repeatedly, and not denied I think as yet, that it has been the practice of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company to turn the switches in San Francisco and thus divert the freight from the Central Pacific Railway over on to the Southern Pacific, because if the freight should go over the Central Pacific it would be required to pay a certain revenue to the Government in liquidation of its debts and obligations, and for the further reason that the Southern Pacific would gain in mileage.

Mr. GEORGE. What does the Senator mean by "turning the switches?"

Mr. McPHERSON. They turn the switches at San Francisco in order that freight, which might naturally go over the Central Pacific, shall go over to the Southern Pacific. They are all connected together; they are all one system; and to-day the Southern Pacific Railroad is the lessee of the Central Pacific system. This fact alone is an all-sufficient reason and justification for all I have said.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator will permit me to make a statement. If a passenger residing near Nebraska City should come down into Missouri and take the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Road, and then go down into Texas, and then go to California in

order to get up to the State of Washington, the railroad companies would sell a ticket at the same rate from that country, nearly 1,000 miles north of where they turn west to go to the Pacific, in order to get to the States of Washington and Oregon.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Evidence of what I have said is found in the report made by the Senator from Maine, in which I think he declares that the Central Pacific Railroad Company is worth nothing practically, and can pay nothing to the Government. I will not say that the Senator uses quite such extravagant terms as I have employed, but it amounts to the same thing in the end.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator from New Jersey had read with care the report which I made, I think the statements which he is making would be much more correct than they are now.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think the Senator reported that the income of the company was so small that it was impossible for the Central Pacific Company to pay one and one-half per cent, and it virtually amounts to nothing. Perhaps my expression is a little too extravagant. As I said before, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company is owned by a certain number of wealthy gentlemen who had constructed the Central Pacific system and now lease it, and to-day, the Central Pacific Railroad, we are told, is practically bankrupt, the business over that road comparatively light.

Now, I wish to know in distributing the compensation to be given to these railroad companies for transportation over the lines by authority of the Thurman law, what is the propriety and where is the justice, with such a condition of things existing, to pay these aided lines 50 per cent, and then to give to the nonaided branches of their own lines they themselves own full compensation?

By what right, confronted as you are by the Thurman act, when there is no authority given there to alienate one particle of their assets, not one dollar of their income, except in the ordinary transaction of their business, can you now authorize them, or can they assume that they are authorized and take the responsibility of leasing or buying the Oregon Short Line and the Utah Northern, whatever that may do with respect to the credit or the stability or the standing or the security of the lines themselves, or the security which the Government may hold upon these properties? No, sir; not one single dollar of money should be paid by either of these companies to the Southern Pacific, which is to-day the lessee of the Central Pacific, or to the Union Pacific Railroad Company for any of its purchased or leased or built lines, wherever they may be found, either for the transportation of troops or the carrying of the mails.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Jersey seems not to have read the whole of the Thurman act when he speaks of the diversion of the assets of these companies. The Thurman act provided that there should be paid into the Treasury 25 per cent of their net earnings computed in a certain way, which, as I remember it, although I have not looked at the act for years, provided that the net earnings should be all the earnings after paying interest upon the first-mortgage bonds and after paying the ordinary running expenses, and not to include the subsequent mortgage debt. Therefore, 75 per cent of those earnings could be used as the railroad company saw fit to use them, but they would not pay any dividends until they complied with the Thurman act. That is all there is about that.

For myself, I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion of the relations of these railroads as respects the proposed amendment of the committee having that matter in charge or as to what should be finally done respecting our debt due from these companies. But I wanted to say one other thing before I sat down, and that is that the Supreme Court has decided that it is a violation and impairment of a contract for Congress by legislation to take away earnings from portions of railroads that are not subsidized and apply them to any portion of a road that is subsidized. Although that perhaps has not been decided as respects this particular case by the Supreme Court, it has been decided by the Court of Claims unanimously. The decision is to be found in their reports, and upon it the Government of the United States, having appealed to the Supreme Court, withdrew that appeal. Upon a case precisely on all fours with the case here, the Court of Claims unanimously decided that the Government could not withhold payment such as this.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, how does that affect this question? As I understand it, the latter part of the House provision I disagree to, but the first part of it I do most emphatically agree to, and it simply provides an additional mode of collection of an honest debt by the Government of the United States from companies that owe the Government this money, because it is a condition-precedent here that these auxiliary lines or branches shall be owned or controlled or operated by the companies that are indebted to the United States. So the decision alluded to by the Senator from Iowa does not touch this case.

Mr. ALLISON. It does absolutely.

Mr. VEST. Certainly the Supreme Court of the United States never decided (if so I would be obliged to the Senator to cite the decision) that when one of these corporations is indebted to the Government and the indebtedness acknowledged we did not have the right to coerce additional security for its collection, when they decided that the Thurman act was constitutional.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly they never decided that we did not have that right.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course we could not take the earnings of a road over which the debtor companies had no control and apply that to the payment of our debt.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Thurman act, instead of taking 25 per cent of their net earnings we can take the whole of them.

Mr. VEST. I should say so.

Mr. ALLISON. But that is not the question we are arguing here. We are, or at least I am trying to argue as respects railroads that have received no aid from the Government that have other lines which are fully recognized by the Thurman act, because it expressly reserves prior liens, and I say as respects those the court has decided that we can not take this money.

Mr. VEST. Unquestionably.

Mr. ALLISON. And that is all I desire to say. I have not the decisions before me, but I have read them. We are now paying interest upon judgments of a precisely similar character to that which will be secured, in my opinion, if the provision we are now discussing shall become a part of the law.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator from Iowa mean to assert that instead of paying over the money to these debtor companies, companies that own and control these lines, we can not provide that the amount due for the transportation shall be credited on the final adjustment of the indebtedness between the companies and the Government of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. It is done now. It is in the sinking fund of roads on which the Government has liens.

Mr. VEST. But it is not the question about its going into the sinking fund. Can we not provide now that instead of paying them money out of the Treasury of the United States we shall simply give them a credit on the final adjustment for the amount due them?

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I will ask the Senator—

Mr. VEST. That is the very point of the discussion.

Mr. ALLISON. I know how able a lawyer he is. Suppose there is a line now leased by one of these companies, having been built by another corporation, and a bond of \$20,000 or \$30,000 a mile has been put upon that line, does the Senator think we could equitably or legally by a statute take money that belongs fairly to the people who paid their money in and constructed the road and apply it to one part and not to the other?

Mr. VEST. I will say emphatically that we would have the right, subject, as a matter of course, to all equitable liens which even the Congress of the United States can not destroy, because it is in the nature of a contract, or ought not to destroy if they had the power; but they have not got it. We would have the right to take the proceeds or the amount of the assets of the auxiliary company or line if it belonged to the debtor company and apply it to this indebtedness.

Mr. ALLISON. So I agree, but that is not the case.

Mr. VEST. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that I drew an amendment here which incorporates my idea about how this matter ought to be adjusted. I am unwilling to pay a dollar in money over to these debtor companies until they pay up the amount that ought long since to have been paid to the people of the United States. I shall therefore offer this amendment. After the word "by," in line 25, I move to insert:

Any railway company or corporation which is indebted to the United States by reason of the aid heretofore given by the Government to such company or corporation, but the amount due from the Government for transportation on lines owned, controlled, or operated by said company or corporation shall be credited upon the indebtedness of said company or corporation to the United States.

I give notice of that amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I submit to the Senator, if he wants to make the amendment correspond with the decisions of the courts, the decision on the Thurman act expressly decided that that act was constitutional because it provided for a sinking fund which could be used at maturity for the payment of the debt, and this debt not being due—

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course that is a matter of adjustment. The sinking fund is only one mode of coercing the payment of the debt. It is exactly like levying an execution, only it is indirect.

Mr. FRYE. It carries interest.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, but it is a mere matter of

adjustment. The principle decided by the Thurman act, which the railroads fought from the beginning at the point of the legal bayonet until coerced into it, was that the Congress of the United States had no right to take one dollar of their assets and apply it upon the payment of their debt without their consent. That was the whole of it, that we could not coerce the payment of it by an act of Congress, and the Supreme Court decided that we could do it by creating a sinking fund, forcing the roads to do it, taking a certain proportion of their earnings and applying it to the debt that was due to us. Now, we are simply doing that same thing here.

Mr. STEWART. Do you take any more than is already taken? Is not all that you propose now already taken by the Government under the arrangement which is going on?

Mr. VEST. We are taking so much—

Mr. STEWART. We are taking all the freight money.

Mr. VEST. We are taking so much, but here this state of the case is now presented to us: These companies have been permitted to construct branch lines, whether rightfully or wrongfully does not touch this question. The United States Government is now estopped from saying anything in regard to the legality of the construction of the branch lines, as I happen to know, because I served once upon a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that was instructed to inquire into the legality of the construction of the branch lines and into the whole question of the indebtedness of these companies. That subcommittee and the Committee on the Judiciary came to the conclusion that it increased the security of the people of the United States to allow the roads to construct these lines or to lease them and operate them.

Mr. FRYE. Undoubtedly a correct conclusion.

Mr. VEST. The committee came to the conclusion that instead of diminishing the security for the debt due from these companies it increased it. Therefore I repeat that we are estopped equitably from raising the question as to the legality of the construction of these lines. We have allowed them to go on and be constructed; we never even remonstrated against it; but, having constructed them, now this question arises: With the knowledge that this indebtedness exists from these debtor companies that are operating or controlling or owning, in the language of this provision of the other House, these lines, ought we to pay them money when they owe it? Have we not got just the same right to take the money that comes from these lines and apply it in the nature of a credit upon the indebtedness to us that we had to pass the Thurman law? In my judgment, there is no difference in principle between the two.

Mr. STEWART obtained the floor.

Mr. SAWYER. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me to have an executive communication taken from the table for reference?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

FOX AND WISCONSIN RIVERS IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. SAWYER. There is a letter on the table from the Attorney-General, which came in on the 11th of April, in response to resolution of the Senate, January 25, 1892, relative to certain awards in the matter of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers improvement. I ask that it be taken from the table, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter and document will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. It has been printed.

PORTAGE LAKE AND LAKE SUPERIOR CANAL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of April 23, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of a report of Maj. Charles E. L. B. Davis, Corps of Engineers, relative to the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Canal; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I have received the resolution of the Senate of April 23, requesting that, if not incompatible with the public interest, I inform the Senate what steps have been taken towards the securing of an international conference to consider the question of the free coinage of silver at the mints of the nations participating in such conference, or as to the enlarged use of silver in the currency system of said countries, and that I transmit to the Senate any correspondence between the United States and other governments upon the subject, and in response thereto beg respectfully to inform the Senate that in my opinion it would not be compatible with the public interest to lay be-

fore the Senate at this time the information requested; but that at the earliest moment, after definite information can properly be given, all the facts and any correspondence that may take place will be submitted to Congress.

It may not be inappropriate, however, to say here that, believing that the full use of silver as a coin metal, upon an agreed ratio, by the great commercial nations of the world would very highly promote the prosperity of all their people, I have not and will not let any favorable opportunity pass for the promotion of that most desirable result, or if free international silver coinage is not presently attainable, then to secure the largest practicable use of that metal.

BENJ. HARRISON.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, April 26, 1892.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to debate the message. I simply want to say that the President has said he will let no opportunity pass. What we complain of is that this Government has been sitting and waiting for an opportunity to come. We say it is the duty of the Administration to make the opportunity and not wait until it may come.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I do desire to debate the message from the President before it goes to a committee. I ask that the message be printed and lie on the table for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The message will be printed and lie on the table.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6923) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, striking out the proviso beginning on page 17.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in regard to the situation of the roads that this provision covers, let us take the Southern Pacific system. It is not the Central. It leases the Central and it leases a good many other roads. It is the general name of a company that has leased and brought under its control a very large system. It operates I do not know how many, but a good many thousand miles of road. It is a notorious fact published in the newspapers. Their bonds are on the market. Take the bonds of the Southern Pacific.

The Southern Pacific was not built with the Central Pacific money, but it was built with money raised on bonds. They are paying no dividends. The constitution of that road, practically from San Francisco to New Orleans, was of great benefit to the Government in the transportation of munitions of war and the Army. We have had along the Southern border the Apaches and a great deal of the expense was incurred by such transportation before the construction of that road. It was impossible to even recover possession of that country or protect the inhabitants until this road was constructed. The Apaches practically had control of the entire southern portion of the country along the Mexican border. This road was built there and it has been very useful for that purpose. The road is paying no dividend. The bondholders have an interest that the road shall not be destroyed. If the Government requires this long line of road to carry mails and munitions of war for nothing, it will certainly affect the interest of private parties.

It may be that the stock of this company, which has not become of value at all, is owned by men who are interested in the stock of the Central Pacific Railroad Company. Probably that is the case. They were the promoters of this enterprise.

Now, take the Utah Northern road. The bonds of that company, I think, are on the market also. It is bonded, and so is the Oregon Short Line bonded. These roads run through a very poor country and are not very profitable. They are feeders of the Union and Central Pacific Railroads. As the Senator from Missouri said, they thought it would benefit them to have feeders. The feeders, particularly of the Union Pacific, were beneficial to the trunk line of the Union Pacific, but so far as the Southern Pacific system is concerned it was built with money raised by mortgaging the road.

While we may deal, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court, with a company that we contracted with, and make it provide a sinking fund for the payment of the debt, and have done that, and it has been sustained by the Supreme Court, that is entirely another question. As to whether the Thurman act takes all from these roads that may be taken, and whether anything further to provide for the payment can be done or not, you have a committee investigating what can be done to secure the Government in the ultimate payment of its debt; but that we can go out and destroy these other corporations and make them do something for nothing is entirely out of the question.

The Supreme Court have met that exact question. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] was not here when I read from that portion of the decision which treated upon this subject. I will read it again. It was contended that under the Thurman act and the various acts of Congress, the Central Pacific and Union Pacific being indebted to the Government, it might do just what

is proposed to be done by this provision. That was the exact question. The Government withheld compensation for carrying the mails, and I suppose they have got some two or three million dollars of judgments drawing 10 per cent interest now against the Government for failing to make appropriations to carry the mails on these nonaided roads. The Supreme Court say, with regard to that:

There is another view of this controversy which seems to us conclusive. As the contract between the United States and the railroad company contained in the acts of July 1, 1863, and of July 2, 1864, has been interpreted by this court to authorize the retention by the Government of compensation for services only on those roads which the United States aided in building, the construction which the appellants seek to put on the second section of the act of May 8, 1878, would not only render that section a breach of faith on the part of the United States but an invasion of the constitutional rights of the appellee. We are bound, if possible, so to construe the law as to lay it open to neither of these objections.

Then the court go on, and after citing the various cases where this question has been decided, say:

Broughton vs. Pensacola, 93 U. S., 206 Red Rock vs. Henry, 106 U. S., 596; Hobbs vs. McLean, 117 U. S., 567, decided at the present term, and cases there cited; United vs. Coombs, 12 Pet., 72. The construction contended for by the appellee preserves the good faith of the Government, and frees the act from the imputation of impairing rights secured by the Constitution of the United States.

To take it from these roads, the court say, would be an invasion of their constitutional rights. This very question was before the Supreme Court. It has been before the Court of Claims. It was always decided that you have no power to do it, and if you attempt to do it in this way by legislation on an appropriation bill it seems to be going out of the way.

If further legislation is to be had with regard to the sinking fund it should be done in a separate bill. I hope the select committee will bring in a bill that will provide for security to the Government and will secure the ultimate payment of this indebtedness on reasonable terms, so that the Government shall be secured and the people at large shall be secured and that the railroads and the good faith of the Government shall be preserved. I believe if the committee brought in a bill it would be entirely satisfactory. They reported one in the last Congress, and I presume will report a similar one after further consideration in this Congress. That would be dealing with a subject that they have under their special control, but we should not go outside on this appropriation bill. These roads have been built with bonds that have been floated on the market. It would be a blow at the good faith of the United States and would be regarded by the bond holders as repudiation.

Suppose we should now cripple some of the railroads and they should go into liquidation. The bonds are held all over the world. The roads have been constructed under the laws of the various States. Congress has sanctioned them. The committee reported that their construction was beneficial to the main roads and nobody objected to it. Their bonds, I say, are in the hands of innocent parties, and if we say that they should carry the mails and transport munitions of war and troops of the Government without compensation we do not know to what extent it may cripple them. It may drive some of the weaker roads into bankruptcy. It will very likely do that and do what the Supreme Court of the United States say is an invasion of their constitutional rights. We do not want to be placed in such a position as that on an appropriation bill.

It seems to me this is wild legislation on an appropriation bill and that it has no place here. If we are going to put such measures as this upon our appropriation bills we shall not get them through. If this precedent is set all our appropriation bills will be loaded with legislation, and this session of Congress will not close until next September if we undertake to remedy all the evils in the world and settle everything on appropriation bills, without any report from a committee stating facts upon which to predicate this legislation and with no investigation.

It appears to me that this is going clear outside of any ordinary legislation ever proposed before. If further legislation is necessary our committee will undoubtedly report it and secure the Government payment for the liens it has, and if anybody is bound to contribute, let them contribute. Let that be found out; but to attack all these roads would be unjust. There is one road in Texas that was built and run there for many years. It runs to New Orleans. That road is in this system. It was built before they leased it; somebody bought it or leased it, but not the Central Pacific. If any company bought it, it was the Southern Pacific, and it is operated to the city of New Orleans. I do not know how many stockholders are in it or who are going to be affected by such a provision. What right have you to make that road carry your mails and your munitions of war for nothing?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, in order that I may make my statement exactly correct so far as my controversy with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is concerned, I wish now to say

that I had actually overestimated the Senator's value placed upon the Central Pacific Railroad property to the Government. In a bill which he introduced in the Senate December 14, 1891, which I suppose represents his deliberate and well matured judgment with respect to what the Union or the Central Pacific Railroad should pay to the Government, I find on page 17 that there shall be a computation made of the amount of debt, principal and interest, due from the Central Pacific Railroad to the Government and that bonds should be issued; that said bonds shall bear interest for ten years at the rate of 1 per cent per annum, and after 1902 they shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per cent per annum. I think I stated that the Senator's recommendation in his report was 1½ per cent or 1¼ per cent, I did not remember which, but I find it was only 1 per cent.

Now, Mr. President, that is the value which the Senator from Maine, after a very careful and exhaustive examination into the whole matter, as is evidenced in his report made one year earlier, placed upon the Central Pacific Railroad property. That property is now leased by the Southern Pacific Railroad and pays nothing on net earnings to the Government. Therefore I say that as to that combination it is worse than a combination in which one party leases to itself a property in which the Government upon its earnings is entitled to a lien, and the rental is made so low that by no possibility can the Government receive any part of the net earnings, as provided by the Thurman law, does not seem to honest people quite fair.

Now, for a single moment let us investigate the other subject, with regard to the branch lines of the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

I find in the report made by the Senator from Maine, February 17, 1890, in which he gives a statement of the number and names of the branch lines of railroad that have been constructed by the Union Pacific Railroad Company. He gives also the bonded debt of those roads, the amount of the bonds that are held by the Union Pacific Railroad Company, the amount of stock of said roads, and the amount held by the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

I need not enumerate the roads, but I find here from his statement that out of the entire bonded debt, amounting to something like fifty-two or fifty-three million dollars, the Union Pacific Railroad Company holds a majority of the bonds, and with the exception of the Oregon Short Line, the Utah Northern, the Utah Southern, and Utah and Southern Extension, and the Union Pacific, Lincoln and Colorado Railway, some three or four roads which have been a recent acquisition by the Union Pacific Company, the general public own but a small part of these bonds.

I suppose two or three million would cover all the bonds held outside of these recently acquired roads. There is in the treasury of the Union Pacific Railroad Company \$26,717,000 in bonds of the branch lines. They are some fifteen or twenty in number. In mileage they make something like 3,339 miles.

Now, we turn to the stock debt of these roads. We find that the general public owns no part of its capital stock except upon the lines of recent acquisition, of which I have already spoken, which securities were already in the hands of the public before the Union Pacific Railway Company became the owner or lessee of the property. We find that there are \$37,000,000 of stock debt, most of which is to-day in the treasury of the Union Pacific Railway Company, which it proposes to turn over to the Government as additional security, provided the Government will consent that their bonded debt may be extended for fifty years or one hundred years, whatever the plan of settlement now is; I confess I do not know. There have been so many bills reported here that I can not really tell how the committee now stand, but I know that it is a long extension of time on their bonded debt due the Government.

And what more does it imply? That the rate of interest which is now 6 per cent upon the bonds, shall be reduced in consideration of their agreeing to pay anything at all to a 3 per cent rate. Three per cent is the annual burden of interest which the Union Pacific Railway Company is to bear as compared with its rival lines, all of whom have been compelled to pay 5 or 6 per cent interest upon their bonds. They ask the Government to reduce their rate of interest to 3 per cent in consideration that they will consent to pay any part of the debt which they are obligated to pay to the Government. That is exactly the condition of this whole affair.

Mr. STEWART. But the principal rival line has received a larger subsidy in fact than all of them together. The Northern Pacific has received more than all the rest combined.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I know nothing about that. We are not discussing the Northern Pacific at all. So far as the Northern Pacific is concerned I know nothing. I do not think this discussion has much to do with that road. The Northern Pacific is not mentioned here, nor do I suppose it has any controversy

with the Government with regard to the transportation of munitions of war, or soldiers, or the mails, otherwise it would have appeared in the House bill with these other suspects.

Mr. STEWART. It is one of the rival lines.

Mr. MCPHERSON. That may all be, but there are four or five rival lines of railroad running from Chicago towards that western country. They have almost reached the easterly end of the Central Pacific Railroad. Some of these lines would be willing to-day to pay the Government every dollar of the Government mortgage upon that property if they could be possessed of that property and make a through line to the Pacific Ocean. It was the original intention of the legislation when it was made by Congress that the Union and Central Pacific Railroads should act as one line and should form a continuous line of communication between the Missouri River and the Pacific Ocean, but ever since those two lines were built there has been a rivalry. There has been no unity of feeling and no unity of action between them, and to-day the Central Pacific property has been alienated away from Government control to such an extent that the Government can not hope to receive the full revenue the Thurman law required and reasonably expected.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, yes; all that is required under the lease.

Mr. MCPHERSON. All that it is entitled to under the lease, and what was the lease? The compensation paid for the use of that road is but a small part of its earning power if to-day managed by the Rock Island or Northwestern or any of these great lines of railroad which have reached almost its easterly end from this side of the Mississippi River.

Mr. FRYE. Is the Senator stating from knowledge or guess?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I state it upon the authority of officers and men who were the owners and the managers of those properties.

Mr. FRYE. What does the Senator mean? That there are people ready to purchase the branch of the Central Pacific over which the Government has a lien?

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Government has now no lien upon the branches. But as to the main line, I do state precisely that fact.

Mr. FRYE. And pay the first mortgage and the Government's lien, too?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Yes, I have stated that fact. I did not say that they will be willing to pay the back interest, but I mean to say they will be willing to pay all the bonds, the prior mortgage, and the Government mortgage, which would be infinitely better for the Government than the plan proposed as a settlement.

Mr. FRYE. But, if the Senator will allow me, the settlement which the Committee on Pacific Railroads proposed that the Central Pacific should make insured to the Government of the United States its entire debt, and protected it by all the property that the Central Pacific had, not only the line over which the United States has a lien but all other lines which it owns, all of its terminals in San Francisco and everywhere else; and in addition to that an assignment of the Southern Pacific lease, with a guaranty for the payment of the entire income of the lease to the United States Government.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator from Maine knows perfectly well that the Central Pacific does not reach San Francisco. There is another line of railroad. The terminal is not one that belongs to the Central Pacific system proper.

Mr. FRYE. The Central Pacific Railroad, over which the Government has a lien, does not commence anywhere or end anywhere, but with the connections over which it has control and which it could give to the Government it does have terminals.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Very well. Now, I say that the Central Pacific Railroad to-day can be sold to other railroad corporations for the entire bonded debt of the Government, less the interest, and also securing the payment of the original twenty-five million of first-mortgage bonds.

Mr. FRYE. Less the interest?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not know. As the Senator says, the road begins nowhere and ends nowhere. It certainly begins at Ogden and connects with the Union Pacific Railroad at this end.

Mr. FRYE. Less the interest, the Senator says. The interest is as much as the debt. Why should we lose the interest?

Mr. MCPHERSON. You propose to compute debt and interest and exact only 1 per cent. You had better lose the interest now rather than grant this new subsidy and lose all in the end.

Mr. FRYE. No, sir; there is 1 per cent for ten years and that is all. The balance of the time it is 2 per cent. And the committee has not reported a bill at this session of Congress. The Central Pacific was in a condition where, in the judgment of the committee unless there was a settlement made before the debt became due, the United States never would receive one single

dollar of debt or interest, and that is my judgment now, unless there is a settlement.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I suppose the Government's only method of relief will be that when the time comes and the bonds fall due, to liquidate the whole concern. The road must necessarily be sold or the Government must undertake either to lease it or to run it. I do not know what decision the Government will reach in respect to that matter. If offered for sale in the market, in my judgment it will bring a great deal higher price than the value at present placed upon it by the committee.

Mr. FRYE. It will bring nothing offered for sale if at either end of the road there is no possibility of the purchasing road making her connection, and there is none now, unless it can buy all these other roads.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It will be very easy for those four lines of railroad of which I have spoken to reach Ogden. Some of them have already reached it. One of them in particular has already reached Ogden, and the others may be able to do it. When that is done I see no reason whatever why they can not run their cars off on the Central Pacific track. As to the Pacific end of the line, I assume the new purchasers would find themselves blocked out as the Government now is.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, in reference to the question whether the people of the United States shall pay to these unbonded and unaided corporations connected with this system a higher rate than they pay the roads which have been subsidized and aided, I still adhere to the opinion that the House provision is the proper one. I see nothing in neither decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which in any way contravenes the reasoning upon which that conclusion rests. The proposition is that certain persons who are intrusted with official position in the management of a great public interest and which was subjected to certain equities and payable to the people of the United States for the repayment of money, have appropriated to their own use through the medium of corporations the funds which should have been properly reserved and invested and applied for the payment of this obligation to the United States. They have taken the public money in the guise of a corporation and have applied it to their own personal use and benefit.

It is contended that there is no power anywhere in this Government to seek redress. The Supreme Court has decided upon the technical question of a separate corporation and in reference to the specific force and effect of the statutes that have been passed, that under the provisions of the statutes and in the manner in which the suit was brought no relief could be had, but in the first case in which this question came up, which was cited by the Senator from Nevada, the court said:

In short, it may be taken for granted that if these allegations are true, as they must be held to be on demurrer, frauds more unmitigated than those set forth in this bill were never perpetrated on a helpless corporation by its managing directors.

That is in the case of the United States vs. The Union Pacific Railroad Company decided in 1878, and in that case the Supreme Court further say in giving their opinion:

We are not prepared to say that there are no trusts which the United States may not enforce in a court of equity against this company. When such a trust is shown it will be time enough to recognize it. But we are of opinion that there is none set forth in this bill which, under the statute authorizing the present suit, can be enforced in the circuit court.

So the ground upon which the court rendered its opinion in that case was certainly the specific terms of the statute, and it did not agree that there was no equity and no trust which could be enforced against the property in which this money of the corporation was invested for the benefit of these parties.

So in a case which was brought up in the Supreme Court in reference to the appropriation for the payment for transportation of the mails the opinion of the court in that case rests entirely upon the force and effect of the terms of the statute which was passed, but if the court had affirmed that the money of the United States could by a conspiracy be fraudulently taken and appropriated for the benefit of these individuals it certainly would be improper for a new case to be made and presented to that court for a new consideration of the subject.

This provision of the other House simply provides that this money shall not be now appropriated and paid, leaving these questions for future action and future consideration. So there is nothing in the decision of the court in the case of the Post-Office Department nor in this previous decision of the United States vs. the Union Pacific Railroad Company and others, which deprives the Government or the people of the United States of the opportunity of bringing this question before the court in the shape of some other bill, and in some statute make a different provision for the suit.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] cited me to the decision of the Court of Claims in the

case of *The Central Pacific Railroad vs. The United States*. After examining it I have not the slightest doubt that the Senator from Florida has correctly stated this legal proposition. I will simply read from the syllabus of that case:

Where a road was not aided by the Government, the Government is not authorized by the Thurman act (20 Stat. L., 53) to withhold compensation. The rule for the construction of the act stated and the decisions relating to the Pacific railroad system reviewed.

That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision of the Court of Claims was affirmed; in other words, the Supreme Court simply said that the Court of Claims was correct in its opinion that the contract upon which the Thurman act was based did not include the nonsubsidized roads.

Mr. STEWART. It ought to be stated further that in the opinion the court said to give it that construction would be bad faith and infringing their constitutional rights.

Mr. VEST. Unquestionably, because they were confining their opinion to the contract on which the Thurman act was based. I agree with the Supreme Court most emphatically. The Supreme Court was certainly right in delivering that opinion, and it would have been bad faith under the Thurman act; but, as I said to the Senator from Iowa, I should like to find any decision of the Supreme Court which says that we as creditors have not the right to take the assets or to put our lien, if you may so express it, upon the assets of a debtor corporation outside of the Thurman act.

Mr. STEWART. Did not the Supreme Court in that very case say that the language of the Thurman act, that construction, if it meant what it was claimed it did; in other words, if it meant that the Government could withhold the compensation for mail service from these roads, it would be in bad faith and would be in violation of the constitutional rights of the roads, and that was one of the reasons why they gave it the other construction, that it would be unconstitutional to construe it that way; that it would be taking property without due process of law?

Mr. VEST. Of course the Supreme Court of the United States very properly said that, while there was no inhibition on the Congress of the United States as to impairing the obligation of a contract still that Congress did not have a right to take the property of any person or corporation for any purpose without due process of law or in violation of a contract. The Senator overlooks the fact that both those decisions were based upon a construction of the Thurman act. Now it is proposed here to make a new law. It is true it is in an appropriation bill, but it is germane to the appropriation bill because it is in regard to an appropriation which is proposed now to pay to these debtor companies certain amounts of money in cash payments.

The other House very properly said, in my judgment, "no, we will not pay these corporations this money because they are indebted to the people of the United States, and that amount of indebtedness shall be credited upon them." While the other House does not say that, as a matter of course I assume that they so meant it, and in the amendment which I have drawn I have put that in express terms. Instead of paying them the money let us give them a credit for the amount which is due them for carrying munitions of war or mails upon the sum found to be due upon a final adjustment to the Government of the United States, and that is all. If the Supreme Court ever made the decision that we did not have a right to pass such a bill, I should like to see it.

Mr. STEWART. I will show it to the Senator right here.

Mr. CALL. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that in the case I quoted the court in express terms say that they will not decide that.

Mr. STEWART. I will show this—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. CALL. I simply—

Mr. STEWART. Allow me one moment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. VEST. In a moment. I do not deny what the Senator from Nevada has said as to the construction of the Thurman act. I admit that that contract or that act did not cover these cases of nonsubsidized branches, but the point between us now is whether Congress has a right to pass this original act.

Mr. STEWART. That is exactly the point, and I want to call the Senator's attention to what the Supreme Court have decided. They have decided that if the Thurman act was such an act as you now propose to pass it would be in bad faith, in contravention of constitutional rights. That is what they decided. They first argued the Thurman act on its language and contended that it did not fairly cover this on its language, but they said if its language did cover it, if it took away the compensation due the nonaided roads, then it would be in contravention of constitutional rights. That is one of the reasons they assign for not

giving it that construction. They say there is another view independent of the language of the law that is persuasive.

There is another view of this controversy which seems to us conclusive.

What is that other view that is conclusive?

As the contract between the United States and the railroad company contained in the acts of July 1, 1862, and of July 2, 1864, has been interpreted by this court to authorize the retention by the Government of compensation for services only on those roads which the United States aided in building, the construction which the appellants—

The United States—

seek to put on the second section of the act of May 8, 1878, would not only render that section a breach of faith on the part of the United States, but an invasion of the constitutional rights of the appellee.

Then the court say if the language of the act did include these non-aided roads and withhold from them compensation, and it could be so construed, it would not only be a breach of faith, but it would be an invasion of their constitutional rights. Now, the Senator says we will pass an act that does include that, and the Supreme Court say such an act would be in bad faith and an invasion of their constitutional rights.

Mr. VEST. Under that contract.

Mr. STEWART. Under any contract.

Mr. VEST. Oh, no.

Mr. STEWART. There is no other contract but that contract. The only claim that we have upon the Union or Central Pacific Railroad grows out of those two contracts. It is by contract, the contract by which the Government aided them in the construction of the roads. The complaint is that they have made a great deal of money, and it has been suggested that they have not complied with the contracts, but it was in reference to these contracts. We have no other contract or no other claim. Our claim rests upon the contract made with them in aid of the construction. That contract does not include these other roads built with bonds that were distributed and sold all over the country, and if we have any respect for public faith we will not interfere with those bonds.

I say that the Supreme Court have decided the exact question. First, they say the Thurman act does not provide for retaining the compensation from these nonaided roads, but if it did it would be unconstitutional; and that is an additional reason for not giving it that construction. Now, it is proposed to pass such a law as the court denounce as unconstitutional. That is the proposition here. It is nothing short of that.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I simply wish to give for the information of the Senate the language of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States *vs.* The Union Pacific Railroad Company. The court say:

We are not prepared to say that there are no trusts which the United States may not enforce in a court of equity against this company. When such a trust is shown, it will be time enough to recognize it.

That clearly answers the proposition of the Senator from Nevada. A contract is one thing; the right of a creditor to pursue a fund misappropriated is another; and the Supreme Court in doing this doubtless had no intention to say, as the Senator from Missouri construes it, that this fund is properly subject to the lien of the people of the United States, that it could not be followed when it was invested contrary to the provisions of law for the benefit of these individual creditors.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, I shall occupy the attention of the Senate but a very short time. It occurs to me, after listening to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], that the relations between these roads and the branches, as the other roads are termed, are not understood by the Senate or by the country. It seems to me very clear, however, that those who have invested their money in the branch roads have entrusted the management of the branch roads to the principal corporations upon terms that are altogether private. It seems to me no occasion can be better than this for saying to all the parties in interest that no money shall be paid for army transportation under this bill to any of them or to the principal corporations, so that if it is unjust to any particular road they can easily furnish to the country or to the Senate such explanation as will show that it is unjust.

The relations are now secret. No Senator will venture to state to the Senate what are the exact arrangements under which these roads are controlled by the Union Pacific or the Southern Pacific. It is perfectly certain that they will never disclose the particulars of these arrangements until they are compelled to do so. The United States is interested in all that concerns these railroads and their manner of operation.

The Senator from New Jersey says that there is a combination existing between the managers of these various roads by which the United States is to be plundered, by which its interests are to be sacrificed, and that all these arrangements are made by persons interested in these properties. If this were a transaction in which we were sitting as judges we would say, "Inasmuch

as you have so made these rights as that parties in interest can not understand it and have furnished no explanation to the parties in interest, something must be done to compel it." The most simple method would be to say to them, "This money is due the United States, and, more than that, good faith is due the United States in the management of these roads."

The Senator's suggestion is, according to the facts of the case, that arrangements are made by which one of these roads is not to be allowed to earn anything, but that all the earnings are to seem to belong to another corporation. Are we to continue to pay them for their services? The money goes out of the Treasury; no explanation is demanded, or if an explanation is demanded, they say, "We will furnish no explanation." Is it not wise policy to say, "These services shall be performed, and they will be paid for properly when you furnish some clear explanation of your expenditure?"

If we were acting for ourselves, with the power which I conceive we possess, we would say, "Here you complain that your rights are likely to be invaded or disregarded; furnish such a clear explanation of your rights as will enable us to do justice to you. You have consented that your property shall be thus confused." It is, perhaps, a part of the policy of the companies to confuse these various interests so as to prevent detection or prevent an ascertainment of the actual state of affairs. The Senator from Nevada tells us it is so exactly, that we must wait until we get more facts. I say keep the money, and let these men furnish the facts to show how the Government can do justice. At present justice is not done to the people of the United States. That seems to be admitted on all hands, and that is a clear proposition.

It is said, however, we may possibly do wrong to somebody else. Let that somebody else who is likely to be wronged furnish the facts, so they can be protected. At present, I repeat what I said before, they have allowed their property to be mixed and confused among various corporations, taking charge of them and running them. That modern system of fraudulent conveyance by means of corporations seems to have applied here with wonderful success. So we are confused now.

The Senator from Nevada speaks of it as being a condition that compels the United States to submit to this injustice on the part of the Government lest we do injustice to somebody else; that somebody else being a party to this scheme by which their rights are confounded with the rights of other people, I would retain the money and await explanation. If there is any innocent person likely so suffer, it is easy for that innocent person to furnish such explanation of his rights as will enable us to see where the right is and do that which is just.

We can not do it now; we are certain to do an injustice to the interests of the public, and we can only be saved from injustice to individuals by those individuals taking the pains to show what their rights are, to separate themselves from these fraudulent parties, present their interests distinctly so we can comprehend them, and when these interests are so stated, so separated that we can comprehend them, the Congress of the United States will have the means of being just. We can not now on account of the conditions of the parties whose rights are supposed to be involved. Let the innocent separate their interests and rights from those who are not innocent, and then we can protect them.

Mr. MORGAN. If the time should ever arrive when we are compelled—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was about making a motion to adjourn if it is agreeable to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection. I wish merely to say one thing, however, before adjournment, and that is if the time shall ever arrive when the Congress of the United States finds itself compelled to legislate upon suspicion in raising revenue or in disbursing revenue either, I am congratulating myself, and I think I can the Senate, that that time is not here now. We have facts ascertained by a committee of this body which are unquestionable, I think, which do disclose the exact relation between all these branch roads and the main trunk lines of the Central Pacific and the Union Pacific railroads.

If the Senator from Arkansas desires to make a motion to adjourn I will now yield to it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1892, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1892.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Hiram P. Mackintosh, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Newburyport, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Thomas C. Simpson, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Quartermaster's Department.

Capt. John Simpson, assistant quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major, April 20, 1892, vice Belcher, retired from active service.

Infantry arm.

Lieut. Col. Edward G. Bush, Eleventh Infantry, to be colonel, April 22, 1892, vice Andrews, Twenty-fifth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. Edward C. Woodruff, Fifth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, April 22, 1892, vice Bush, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. George B. Russell, Ninth Infantry, to be major, April 22, 1892, vice Woodruff, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Thomas S. McCaleb, regimental adjutant, Ninth Infantry, to be captain, April 22, 1892, vice Russell, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 26, 1892.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Speaker, I find I am recorded on the first call of the House yesterday as being absent. I was present and answered to my name.

The SPEAKER. The change will be made.

The Journal was then approved.

A. R. ENGLISH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General, submitting for an appropriation the papers in the claim of A. R. English for services rendered in defending certain Indians charged with crime in the Territory of Arizona; ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. FORMAN, for six days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BRETZ, for two weeks after April 26, on account of important business.

To Mr. BROSIUS, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOHNSTONE of South Carolina, on account of important business.

To Mr. DANIELL, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. ENOCHS, to and including May 4, 1892, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCKEIGHAN, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. CABLE, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE, for Wednesday and Thursday, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILSON of Missouri, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. HARRIES, indefinitely, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. ABBOTT, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of William S. McKnight and James W. Richardson, there being no adverse reports thereon.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission heretofore given, I wish to file the views of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs upon the resolution relative to the persecution of Russian Hebrews in Russia, which report I ask to have printed. I also ask unanimous consent that the majority and minority reports upon this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] submits the views of the minority on the resolution relative to the persecution of Russian Hebrews, and also asks unanimous

consent that the views of the majority and minority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on that subject be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.
The majority report is as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 8) expressing sympathy with the Russian Hebrews in their distress, have carefully considered the same, and report the said joint resolution and recommend that it do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out the word "lately," in line 9, and insert in said line, before the word "decrees," "laws and," and add to the joint resolution the following words: "And the President is requested to use his good offices to induce the Government of Russia to mitigate the said laws and decrees."

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

The undersigned, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submit the following minority views upon the resolutions of sympathy for the Russian Hebrews reported by the majority of the committee:

They are opposed to the adoption of these resolutions, and they believe that the passage of the same by Congress, in view of the condition of affairs that now exists in Russia in reference to these persecutions, would be a reflection upon the good sense and feelings of the American people, instead of an expression of their views upon this subject, and they assign the following reasons in support of their objections.

First. The Russian Hebrews, constituting 5,000,000 of people, the selected victims of religious intolerance, do not require any further expression of sympathy from the civilized world. They have had sympathy from every quarter of the globe, and it is impractical and utterly useless to announce that we simply send them our condolence in their affliction when we have the means of affording them practical relief. It means that we will do nothing else, and we believe that public opinion is opposed to trifling with this question in this manner. No one supposes for a moment that we are not in sympathy with them, and it is wasting our time upon a sentiment that is so strong among the people that it requires no confirmation and needs no encouragement at the hands of Congress.

Second. We have it within our power without in the slightest manner offending the Government of Russia, by the intervention of the good offices of this Government, to be of great practical service to this afflicted race who are looking to us for some friendly intercession in their behalf. The resolutions offered by Mr. RAYNER in the early part of the session, and which with some slight amendments are herewith incorporated and made part of this report, and which, when the matter comes up in the House, will be offered as a substitute for the resolutions of the committee, seem to strike at the root of this subject. They are in strict accordance with the precedents of international usage and they are sustained by numerous authorities in the Department of State. They call in a most respectful manner for an inquiry as to whether the Russian Government intends to repeal the obnoxious laws that sanction these persecutions and which were held out to the world as temporary when they were passed.

It is the opinion of the minority of this committee, in view of the friendly intercourse between the two governments, that the Russian authorities will answer this communication in the same respectful manner that it is conveyed to them, and we will then discover whether this code of religious tyranny will be continued or modified. We believe that upon the demand that is made by this Government, in which it is confidently expected that other Governments will unite, that the Russian Government will change the severity of this system. If it does not however do so then we will at least know it and realize that the thousands of immigrants who are coming to our shores are driven here under an edict that has no counterpart now among any civilized people.

We can then find out whether this is not a violation of the Russian treaty, as the President thinks it is, and we can then call the attention of the Russian Government to this fact and of the obligation that devolves upon it not to flood this country with the victims of its oppression, but to permit them to live in the dominion in which they were born according to that natural code of justice and freedom that prevails now in every other country with which we are upon terms of amity and friendship.

In conclusion, the undersigned desire to state that if the majority of the committee will only see fit, when their resolutions come before the House, to accompany them with some resolutions of inquiry substantially similar to those offered by Mr. RAYNER, then the minority of the committee will be only too glad to unite with them in the expressions of sympathy that they propose.

ISIDOR RAYNER,
THOMAS J. GEARY,
A. C. HARMER,
JAMES O'DONNELL.

Amended resolutions protesting against the treatment of the Russian Hebrews by the Government of Russia, and inquiring into the causes of their continued persecution.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the time has arrived when the Government of the United States is entitled to take an interest in regard to the continued persecution of the Hebrews in the Empire of Russia; that this duty devolves upon it because vast numbers of this afflicted people, driven from their homes in Russia by the policy that has there been pursued against them, are continually seeking refuge upon our shores, and claiming from us upon broad grounds of humanity and public comity, that protection which has been denied them at the threshold of almost every other port which they have reached in their wanderings from place to place in search of shelter and of freedom.

Resolved. That while we appreciate the fact that we have no right to interfere in the treatment of its own subjects by a foreign government, we also know that the laws and ordinances in question are not directed against the citizens of Russia, but that they have been specifically enacted to operate against the Hebrew population of the Empire, and that in a case of this sort modern precedents and customs sanction the right of the citizens of other governments through the intervention of their good offices to concern themselves about the welfare of their fellow-man whenever, without any fault upon his part, he has been made the victim of oppression.

Resolved. That in view of this condition of affairs, and with a full regard for the kind feeling and the friendly intercourse that exist between this Government and the Government of Russia, that the American minister at the Court of St. Petersburg be instructed to respectfully communicate with the proper authorities and representatives of the Government of Russia and obtain whatever information it is possible for him to procure upon the following points:

First. Whether there is a prospect, in accordance with the repeated assurances and promises that have been given to this effect, of repealing the tem-

porary laws, known as May laws, passed by the committee of ministers, and to which imperial assent was given on the 3d day of May, 1882.

Second. Whether there is a prospect of replacing the laws which prohibit Jews (subject to certain exceptions) from residing or settling anywhere in Russia, except within the provinces known as the pale of permanent Jewish settlement.

Third. Whether it is proposed to repeal the restrictions that prohibit them from following the vocations and engaging in the same pursuits as all other citizens of Russia have the privilege of doing, and whether the penalty of banishment and expulsion to which they are now subjected is to be withdrawn or modified.

Fourth. Whether the law of Russian passports that prohibits foreign Jews from transacting business in Russia except by permission of the ministers of finance of the interior is to be continued to be enforced.

And be it further resolved. That all information upon these subjects be returned by the American minister to the Secretary of State, who shall remit the same to Congress for such action as it may deem proper to take in the premises, and that when said return is made that the Secretary of State procure and accompany therewith from the Attorney-General of the United States an opinion as to whether the Russian statutes and ordinances, relating to banishment or expulsion for the offenses herein referred to, and to the rights of foreigners traveling in the dominion of Russia, are not a violation of the treaties existing between Russia and the United States.

And be it further resolved. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Secretary of State with the request that he send the same to the American minister at St. Petersburg, and that said minister present the same to his Imperial Majesty the Czar of Russia.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6185) to absolutely prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States, asked a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. DOLPH, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. BUTLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SAYERS. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back the bill (H. R. 7718) to provide for certain of the most urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes. In this connection I ask unanimous consent that the House consider these amendments as in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that it nonconcur in the Senate amendments in gross. Also, that a conference be asked of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. There are eighteen amendments to the bill, not increasing the bill as it passed the House more than seventy-five or eighty thousand dollars; but the committee think the amendments ought to be nonconcurrent in for the purpose of throwing the bill into conference.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.
The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7818) to provide for certain of the most urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] asks unanimous consent to nonconcur in the Senate amendments in this bill, and to ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. REED. I think the gentleman from Texas should explain the differences between the Senate and the House.

Mr. DINGLEY. They are minor matters, of no consequence.

Mr. REED. I will withdraw the request.

There being no objection, it was so ordered; and the Speaker announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. SAYERS, Mr. HOLMAN, and Mr. DINGLEY.

LYDIA A. MAGILL.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Lydia A. Magill, administratrix.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to Lydia A. Magill, administratrix of the estate of John C. Magill, deceased, late of Cass County, Mo., the sum of \$3,706.22, in full settlement of balance due said Magill for beef furnished under a contract dated May 3, 1863, by said Magill with Capt. W. C. Talkington, commissary of subsistence for Gen. James Shields's division of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BAILEY. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 102, noes 3.

Mr. BAILEY. No quorum.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will with-

draw this bill if there is any objection, because I would like to go on with the diplomatic appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] will please take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 169.

Mr. BAILEY. A quorum having voted, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. On this question the ayes are 169, noes none. So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. TARSNEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

JOSEPH WACKERLY.

Mr. WEADOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4833) to correct the military record of Joseph Wackerly.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct and amend the record of Joseph Wackerly, late a private in Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Infantry, by causing the charge of desertion to be removed therefrom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to hear the report read.

Mr. BLOUNT. If this bill is likely to cause debate, I must call for the regular order. Appeals are coming from every direction. If the gentleman can insure the House that it will take only a moment, I do not desire to stand in the way of the passage of the bill; but the bill just passed consumed considerable time.

Mr. WEADOCK. If it will lead to any discussion I will withdraw the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia demand the regular order?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will not object just now, Mr. Speaker.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4833) to correct the record of Joseph Wackerly, report:

The military record furnished the committee shows that the said Joseph Wackerly was enrolled as a private in Company K, Twenty-fourth Ohio Volunteers, June 13, 1861, that the muster roll for March and April, 1862, reporting him "missing in battle, April 7, 1862, Pittsburg Landing, has not been heard of since; supposed to be dead." Later rolls have the following remarks opposite his name: "Ordered to be reported deserted, by General Orders, No. 77, August 18, 1862."

The prisoners of war records report him captured at Shiloh, Tenn., April 6, 1862; paroled at Montgomery, May 22, 1862, and deserted from Camp Wallace September 10, 1862. Other records show him received at Columbus, August 7, 1862, and sent to Camp Chase, date not stated. The records further show that he was enrolled as a private in Company H, Twelfth Ohio Volunteers, October 16, 1863, and served faithfully with his company until November 14, 1865, at Nashville, Tenn., when he was mustered out with his company, receiving an honorable discharge seven months after the war closed.

The facts appear to be that, after having been taken prisoner, he was paroled, furloughed, and went to Nashville, Tenn.; then to Walhonding, Ohio, 35 miles from the railroad station; that he could not report as soon as ordered, but went at once and reported to provost-marshal at Columbus, Ohio, where he was marked as a deserter and sent to a military prison; that he used every means in his power to get back to his regiment; that he escaped from the bull pen and enlisted as recited above, and served faithfully until the close of the war.

The committee believe this is a meritorious case; that the soldier ought not to have been marked as a deserter; that this bill ought to pass, and recommend that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. WEADOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

JULIUS C. ZANONE.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2100) for the relief of Julius C. Zanone, only heir of John B. Zanone, late of Mound City, in Pulaski County, Ill., deceased.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Julius C. Zanone, only heir of John B. Zanone, deceased, late of Mound City, in the county of Pulaski, and State of Illinois, the sum of \$4,525, as and for the rental value of certain buildings in said Mound City, Ill., from April 20, A. D. 1864, to April 30, A. D. 1869, said buildings having been used and occupied by the United States Government as a marine barracks, etc., for and during said period, and which buildings were, during the time the same were so held, used, and occupied by said Government, the property of the said John B. Zanone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to hear the report read or an explanation.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. The report is very short, and explains the bill.

The report was read, as follows:

Your committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2100) for the relief

of Julius C. Zanone, only heir of John B. Zanone, late of Mound City, in Pulaski County, Ill., having given the same careful consideration, report as follows, viz:

That from the evidence presented to your committee and on file in this case it is shown and proven that John B. Zanone, deceased, was before, during, and for years after the war of the rebellion a resident of Mound City, in Pulaski County, Ill.; that he was loyal to the Government of the United States during all of said war; that he owned at one time a large two-story frame house, situate in said Mound City, Ill., which said house was taken possession of by the forces of the United States Government and by said Government held, used, and occupied for a marine barracks from April 20, 1864, to April 30, 1869; that during said time said house and premises were reasonably worth the sum of \$75 per month for the rental thereof; that said John B. Zanone was not during his life, nor has his legal heir since his death, been paid any sum or amount whatever for the use of such property; that the records of the Navy Department show that the Government, after using said building as aforesaid, did offer to said John B. Zanone the sum of \$75 per month as rental for said building during the time it was so held, used, and occupied by the Government authorities.

"NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 23, 1890.

"SIR: I have the honor to return herewith the letter of Mr. Peter Saup, and its inclosure, referred to this Department by you for information as to the status of the claim therein mentioned.

"The letter of Mr. Saup relates to a claim of the estate of John B. Zanone, deceased, for rent of certain buildings at Mound City, Ill., which were occupied as a marine barracks from the 20th of April, 1864, to the 30th of April, 1869.

"It appears from the records of the Department that the sum of \$75 per month as rent for said buildings was tendered to Mr. Zanone and was refused by him, but the records do not show what sum or sums of money were paid to him on account of the occupation of the buildings.

"There being no appropriation available from which the amount, if any, to which the claimant may be entitled could be paid, the claim is one requiring consideration and action by Congress.

"Very respectfully,

"F. M. RAMSAY,

"Acting Secretary of the Navy.

"HON. GEORGE W. SMITH,
"House of Representatives."

That said Zanone would not accept same, claiming that he was entitled to more, but did not relinquish his claim; that said John B. Zanone had a wife, from whom he was divorced on the 14th day of October, A. D. 1864; that said John B. Zanone died in said Pulaski County, Ill., on or about October 27, A. D. 1887, leaving as his only legal heir Julius C. Zanone, who is still living and has attained his majority.

Your committee, being fully satisfied from the evidence that the property aforesaid was the property of said John B. Zanone during the time it was so occupied by the United States Government, as stated in said bill, and that the reasonable rental value thereof was the sum of \$75 per month, and that no part thereof has been paid, and that in justice and equity same ought now to be paid to the said legal heir of said John B. Zanone, respectfully recommend that said bill as presented do pass.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Government offered a certain sum for the use of these premises; the reason for the rejection of that offer I do not understand.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. I can explain that in one word. Mr. Zanone insisted, and at that time probably correctly, that his property was worth \$150 a month. The Government offered him \$75, but he declined to accept the \$75 a month, and was still insisting on the Government paying him \$150 a month, and he died while that was in process. I introduced a bill for his heir, asking only \$75, being the amount which the Government recognized the property was worth. We ask that that amount be allowed, and that is the only reason why the original claim and this claim are different.

Mr. McMILLIN. How did the Government get possession of this property and hold it all these years without any payment.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois. The Government took possession of it. It was during the war when possession was taken of the property, and it was occupied for four years, or something over, as a marine barracks, but they never paid after getting possession. They entered into and used the property for this length of time and never paid a single cent for it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the consideration of the resolution which was before the House at the hour adjournment on yesterday.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; and also that members having reports from committees may be allowed to file them with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; and also, that members having reports from committees may be allowed to file them with the Clerk. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to object, but I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to make the an-

nouncement that, on behalf of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, we expect to call up the rivers and harbors bill on next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

So the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OATES in the chair.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7624) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, in reporting this bill I deem it proper at the outset to call the attention of this committee to the changes which have been made in both the diplomatic and the consular service. The missions have been reduced by placing Denmark, Sweden, and Norway under one mission, Colombia and Ecuador under one mission, Peru and Bolivia under one mission. The missions of Venezuela and Guatemala are salaried at \$5,000 a year each.

The saving effected by the reduction of salaries and by the remission of some of the salaried officials to the fees of the several offices, amounts to \$62,000. An examination of the report accompanying this bill will show the consulates where the reductions have taken place, the former salaries and the amounts proposed by the committee. The report shows also the compensation at every American consulate and the amount of business done, as indicated by the fees of different kinds.

The reduction made on missions by this bill amounts to \$25,000; the reductions on the consulates to \$37,000, and the reduction in the Bureau of American Republics is \$10,000. The estimates made by the State Department for the fiscal year 1893 amount to \$2,138,466.14. The amount reported in the bill is \$1,584,925. The difference between the amount asked by the State Department and the amount reported in the bill is \$553,541.14.

The act providing for the current fiscal year appropriates \$1,656,925. The bill reported recommends, as I have stated, \$1,584,925; a reduction of \$72,000. While the bill is under consideration, some additional amendments will be offered still further reducing the amount appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I need not invite the attention of the committee to the spirit which at the outset of this session, and along the line of the consideration of the various objects of appropriation, has indicated a desire on the part of this House for a reduction in the expenditures of the Government, and a belief that extravagance obtains in the administration of public affairs.

Responding to that spirit, the Committee on Foreign Affairs have seen fit to make investigation and inquiry as to whether or not some economy might not be effected in the matter of our foreign relations and the compensation of our consulates. In the early history of the Republic various important and difficult questions arose between it and foreign governments; at one time a paper blockade, at another the seizure of our ships by decrees and orders in council in France and England, at another time questions of citizenship, at another, questions of boundary, and, at another, a manifested purpose on the part of this Republic to withstand any movement proposed by the Holy Alliance, or by any of the European powers, looking to the establishment of their own peculiar political institutions in this western hemisphere.

These questions were all met as they arose, and they have been finally and satisfactorily settled. They came upon us when the Republic was weak, but fortunately, sir, we have now passed beyond them. At that time we utilized the best talent that the country could command. At that time the difficulties of international communication were great, and so were the difficulties of transportation, so, likewise, were the difficulties of intimate knowledge of the relations of other nations with our Republic. Enlarged powers were necessarily granted to our ministers by reason of the then existing situation. The highest order of talent was required to deal with these difficult questions, and the difficulties of which I have spoken rendered such enlarged powers necessary.

How is it to-day? No nation would now attempt to treat this Republic with a paper blockade, no nation will attempt interference with the rights of American citizens, or the seizure of our seamen on the high seas. No territorial questions are now irritating us. No Government conceives for a moment the thought of imposing on Central and South American States political institutions which we have announced we will not tolerate.

The immense area of our territory has been productive of a surplus greater than that of any other nation. Our manufacturing industries have multiplied in variety and extent, providing for human wants in a thousand forms, even before they have been anticipated by our people.

The appreciation and diffusion of popular education obtains throughout the land. A fervor for written constitutions, examined and discussed and interpreted by the various courts, communicated to the people in the courts, on the hustings, and through the press, has silently formed the masses of the American people into one homogeneous whole. The popular character of our institutions, our equal laws, have awakened in our people a consciousness of manhood that has promoted patriotism and national courage.

We are isolated by our position between two oceans. We have no entangling alliances with European politics. The "balance of power," which is so vital a question with European nations, involving in some cases even their political existence, does not disturb us. The action of this or that court, which may portend harm to other nations, excites no interest on our soil. We are not concerned with those questions which in other nations give rise to standing armies and to a condition of constant uneasiness. Our concern is not with those questions, but with finance, with taxation, with commerce, with whatever promotes the general happiness of the people.

European countries may require able diplomats. Not so with us. We have no occasion for the toys of courts. The best talent of the land is found devoted to internal prosperity.

Sir, we see in the press occasionally such items as that our minister to Berlin, Mr. Phelps, after long and laborious efforts, has negotiated an extradition treaty; that our minister to France, with wonderful skill, has negotiated another treaty, and that by reason of his influence at that court he has brought to this country the immense boon of admission of American pork into France at a rate not exceeding 200 per cent. The papers tell us that our minister to Russia is about to return home, and is going to bring with him the delightful intelligence that the Emperor of Russia is very much gratified at the sending of supplies from America to his starving subjects.

The Bering Sea controversy, so far as the public here has had occasion to know, is something of which our minister to the Court of St. James has no knowledge. In South America, during the recent controversy with Chile, the state papers sent in by the President indicate that not until one day before the battle of Concon, and within one week of the fall of Valparaiso and the Chilean Government, our minister to Chile communicated to the State Department the intelligence that there was a movement on the part of the Congressional party along the Huascar Valley which seemed to be of formidable proportions.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. The gentleman will allow me to ask in what connection he mentions these circumstances. Certainly he can not but feel most happy that the Emperor of Russia has thanked this country through the American minister, Hon. Charles Emory Smith, that Philadelphia and other American cities have sent food to the starving Russians. I would like to know how he intends to follow up these illustrations. Certainly he proposes to intimate nothing against the manner in which our present minister plenipotentiary to Russia has done his duty.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am undertaking nothing in the world except to show the magnificent ability required of an American minister to-day.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. Speaker, the incident of sending this food to the starving Russians is well worthy to be placed in history, even in the State Department, by an American minister to that country. I do not see how any such references as the gentleman has indulged in can apply in any way to his argument, for I take it for granted that any other business of importance which it might have been necessary for our minister in that country to transact would have been transacted well.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor. I have a great regard for my friend from Philadelphia—for his splendid temper and general worth; but I think that he ought to allow me to go on with my remarks.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I will, of course. I simply wanted to know in what connection the remarks of the gentleman applied to our American minister to Russia.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, this is not a serious conflict between the nations of the earth—

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. But it is a very gratifying thing to all Americans to know that the humanity and heart of this country have prompted this relief of the starving people of another land.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I received from the Secretary of State a communication forwarded by the minister to Denmark containing the very important information (I suppose he had seen this bill or learned of its contents) that in the event we should cut off the mission to Denmark it was not improbable that Denmark would refuse to be represented by exhibits at Chicago. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman seems to have distinguished himself in Denmark by being able to get that Government to make an exhibit at Chicago on grounds personal to himself. At last he seems to have been awakened to his own consequence, and is now trying to rouse the rest of us to realize it.

I think, sir, that he is mistaken: that he overestimates the value of his services, and that Denmark does not value his presence there so highly or regard it of so much importance as he seems to think. I know, sir, that much time is given at these European courts to receptions, to dinners, to entertainments, to balls, operas, and general idleness. Perhaps he is a contribution from this country to scenes like these. But for anything more valuable we are left simply to the exhibit at Chicago. I do not think Denmark will be so silly as to withhold her exhibit here on account of the withdrawal of this minister. If she should, for one I would want the vacant place to be pointed out to our own people as well as to foreigners who visited the Exposition as an indication of what snobbery could do.

I would remind this distinguished minister that if his occupation in Denmark should be lost by the unwise conduct of his countrymen at home, that he will find, doubtless, in his own country, some occupation to relieve him not only from idleness, but possibly from want.

Mr. Chairman, what need have we for a minister at Greece? We are told that Greece is classic ground. But, sir, the muses have long since deserted her mountains. Her beautiful marble no longer awakes the genius of her once gifted sculptors. Her legends are fast passing away from the earth, because the intellectual and moral progress of the age does not stop long or spend much time over the strength of Hercules or the beauty of Apollo, the heroism of Achilles, the wanderings and genius of Ulysses, the beauties of Helen, or the wantonness of Paris. Her halls of philosophy are closed forever. Her seacoast, once the center of an immense commerce, is almost as silent as at the dawn of creation itself. In that land is an ignorant, thriftless, idle population, standing beside the ruined tombs and monuments of a decayed and forever departed greatness. What need have we for a minister at that court, I repeat?

Again, Mr. Chairman, a minister to Switzerland. Providence has taken mountain and water and created there the most bewitching scenery that is exhibited in any portion of the world, and yet, sir, where is there to be found her consideration in the political or commercial relations of the world? She has no standing whatever. Why may we not unite France, Belgium, and the Netherlands in one mission, with the present facilities of intercommunication between these nations? Why not unite Spain and Portugal in the same way? I am inclined to think, sir, that it would not be amiss, nor would it be a radical step in the direction of popular reform, if we would leave at England, France, Germany, Italy, and Turkey our ministers, and whenever there was occasion for intercourse of a delicate character, either to send special agents abroad for that purpose or that these ministers might be a means of communication.

Mr. Chairman, it is useless to talk about maintaining missions in all foreign countries based on any exigencies of the Republic. No such exigencies exist as to warrant the continuation of that system. It is a thing of the past largely. It is a matter of memory solely, and I trust, sir, that it will not be long or that the time will be far distant when these radical corrections will be made all along the line.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, have seen fit to make slight reductions here, thinking that perhaps anything that indicated severe or rigid action on their part would be resisted by the magic of that secrecy which hovers about the State Department and the mysticism that lingers there and makes men afraid to think when they are touching that Department.

But, Mr. Chairman, I care to add nothing more to what I have said in relation to these missions abroad. Our consular service is of all others the most valuable and necessary to us. The total of foreign imports of this country for 1890 were \$789,310,409. The total imports subject to duty received during the same year were \$523,641,780. The total amount of duty collected the same year on these imports was \$220,576,989. The correct ascertainment of the valuation of the goods imported into the United States is a matter of vital importance to our revenues. The importer himself is not likely to protect the Government from fraud or undervaluation. It must therefore resort to various instrumentalities to protect itself. Amongst these one of the most potent is our consular system.

Where goods are sent by a purchaser or manufacturer from

abroad, it is necessary, in the case of a purchaser, that he shall file an invoice setting forth the value of the merchandise at the place of purchase, the currency in which it was paid, the cost to the place of shipment, and many other items fixed by law and consular regulations, to disclose the value of the goods, where they are liable to a duty on their value, and where the duty is specific disclosing also the weights, measures, etc. This statement is to be accompanied with a declaration as to its truthfulness on the part of the shipper. These invoices have to be certified by the consul from the port where the goods are shipped. Where he differs with the importer as to the value, it must be made to appear, samples of the merchandise sometimes accompanying the statements. This is designed for the purpose of aiding the collector of the port in ascertaining the proper value of the shipment.

I will not take up the time of the committee by reciting the various regulations for the purpose of assuring us in regard to invoices. The great work of the consul is to be found in this matter of certifying invoices. He has sometimes questions in relation to the discharge of seamen, in relation to the support of indigent seamen at the port where he happens to be, sometimes it may be the taking charge of the effects of deceased seamen, sometimes the taking charge of the effects of deceased American citizens, and the administering of their estates, and so forth. I will not undertake to pass through the various topics of consular duties in this connection, because the matters of detail are insignificant. In a few places these consuls are invested with judicial functions, but they are exceptional.

On page 40 of this report is to be found a recapitulation of the fees of consuls, mostly for certifying invoices. Sometimes for certifying invoices, sometimes for landing certificates, etc. I will read from the recapitulation made by the First Auditor, as follows:

RECAPITULATION.	
Invoice certificates.....	\$896,655.25
Landing certificates.....	39,882.00
Bills of health.....	20,992.50
Currency certificates.....	8,681.00
Other fees.....	11,951.83
Total.....	978,142.58

These fees almost pay the expenses and should pay the entire expenses of that service. Generally it has been so, but there has been a tendency to enlarge the expenditures for some time, and I believe unnecessarily, and that we ought to curtail them. I will, as we take up the bill by paragraphs—for then it is more easily and intelligently done—discuss the work performed by the consuls at the several ports, with a view of setting out the fact that there has been nothing hastily done.

Indeed, sir, an examination would disclose the fact that there are other places in which the consuls had scarcely any employment, but were getting compensation. For instance, take Athens. The fees, which indicate the work at Athens, are \$8. This would not cover five invoices in a twelvemonth. Not a sailor relieved; and yet the consul is on salary there. At St. Helena we have a salaried officer, and his fees were \$5.50 per annum; little invoices that he could sign up in a day. There are many places which have been continued because the committee were not inclined to follow out rigidly as they might the principles of economy, apprehending that there might be an exaggerated impression as to the purposes of the committee.

I trust, sir, that when this question shall have been examined, the members of the House and the country will see that this State Department and the foreign service is a secret place. We examine every other. We have detailed information in reference to them; but in this place where the servants are abroad, where our knowledge as to their surroundings is not accurate, and where we are flooded with all sorts of vague suggestions as to their consequence, we should learn to value these as they deserve and make proper deductions.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Before the gentleman leaves that subject I would like to ask a question for information. There are some of these places which the gentleman has referred to where the fees are very small. Now, there has been a very great deal of controversy as to whether certain fees should be turned over to the Government. Is it not probable—or have the committee any information on the subject—as to whether there were other fees collected; and were they of a character which it is claimed should not be turned over to the Government? Now, at Jerusalem, for instance, \$50 is all that is reported.

Mr. BLOUNT. What does the gentleman ask?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The point is this: Here we have reported very small amounts at certain places.

Mr. BLOUNT. Take Jerusalem, which you have mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. The question I want to know about is this: There has been a great controversy and loss to us on the question with regard to whether certain fees should be turned over to the Government. Now, have the committee any

information as to whether there were any fees of that character collected at these places, which was not turned over to the Government?

Mr. BLOUNT. I can not conceive how at Jerusalem there could be any fees. No sailor ever gets there. Service rendered to sailors is one of the items; service to American vessels, and vessels can not get there. I can not see how there is anything in that direction to be done there. But I will say to my friend, if he will allow me, that he and I and the committee will be much more successful in the examination of these various items in detail when we come to take up the bill by paragraphs, and I would prefer that as to any matter of detail my attention should be invited to it later.

Mr. HITT. All these fees reported to the State Department are notarial.

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. These are the fees all paid in.

Mr. HITT. The fees are on commerce.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, there is another matter in this bill in which there is not perfect unanimity on the part of the committee. It relates to what may be termed the intercontinental survey. I desire to call attention, and the special attention of the committee, to this object. It imports very much more than appears on the face of the bill. It commits this Government, in my judgment, to policies which the country has not yet discovered, and which the House, in my opinion, has not yet had occasion to examine. The Pan-American Congress, and its assemblage in this country, is a matter well known to the committee.

Amongst the other subjects taken up and discussed by it is what is called the intercontinental railway system, beginning in Mexico, connecting with our lines north, connecting throughout Central America with South America, along through Peru, Chile, Ecuador, and Bolivia, with the eastern coast of those countries; and I wish to call the attention of the committee especially to some suggestions in connection with that subject. On page 43 of this report we are informed:

The International American Conference is of the opinion:

First. That a railroad connecting all or a majority of the nations represented in this conference will contribute greatly to the development of cordial relations between said nations and the growth of their material interests.

I will not read the several sections because it simply occupies time, and is not needful for the purpose I have in view.

Sixth. That if the general direction of the line can not be altered without great inconvenience, for the purpose mentioned in the preceding article, branch lines should be surveyed to connect those cities with the main line.

Seventh. That for the purpose of reducing the cost of the enterprise the existing railways should be utilized as far as is practicable and compatible with the route and conditions of the continental railroad.

Eighth. That in case the results of the survey demonstrate the practicality and advisability of the railroad, proposals for the construction either of the whole line or of sections thereof should be solicited.

Ninth. That the construction, management, and operation of the line should be at the expense of the concessionaires, or of the persons to whom they sublet the work or transfer their rights, with all due formalities, the consent of the respective governments being first obtained.

Tenth. That all materials necessary for the construction and operation of the railroad should be exempt from import duties, subject to such regulations as may be necessary to prevent the abuse of this privilege.

Eleventh. That all personal and real property of the railroad employed in its construction and operation should be exempt from all taxation, either national, provincial (State), or municipal.

Mr. BUSHNELL. Will the gentleman tell us what he is reading from?

Mr. BLOUNT. I am reading from the report of the committee on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, at page 43, "section 12." I beg the careful attention of the committee to these sections:

Twelfth. That the execution of a work of such magnitude deserves to be further encouraged by subsidies, grants of land, or guaranties of a minimum of interest.

Thirteenth. That the salaries of the commission, as well as the expense incident to the preliminary and final surveys, should be assumed by all the nations accepting, in proportion to population according to the latest official census, or, in the absence of a census, by agreement between their several governments.

Fourteenth. That the railroad should be declared forever neutral for the purpose of securing freedom of traffic.

Fifteenth. That the approval of the surveys, the terms of the proposals, the protection of the concessionaires, the inspection of the work, the legislation affecting it, the neutrality of the road, and the free passage of merchandise in transit, should be (in the event contemplated by article eighth) the subject of special agreement between all the nations interested.

I wish to call the attention of the committee briefly to a letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, under date of May 12, 1890:

Under the generous and progressive policy of President Diaz the railways of Mexico have been extended southward as well as northward and toward the two oceans. The development of the Argentine system has been equally rapid. Lines of track now reach from Buenos Ayres to the northern cities of that Republic, and nearly to the Bolivian boundary. Chile has a profitable system of railroads from the mountains to the Pacific Ocean, and the completion of the tunnel that is now being pierced through the Cordilleras will bring Valparaiso within two days' travel of Buenos Ayres. In the other republics similar enterprise has been shown. Each has its local lines of railways, and to connect them all and furnish the people of the southern continent the means of convenient and comfortable intercourse with their neighbors north of the Isthmus is an undertaking worthy the encourage-

ment and cooperation of this Government. In no other way could the Government and the people of the United States contribute so much to the development and prosperity of our sister Republic and at the same time to the expansion of our commerce.

Now, I wish special attention as to the construction of this report, parts of which I have already read, a construction placed by the Secretary of State upon it.

A very important feature of the report, to which I especially direct your attention—

Mr. COMBS. That is, the Secretary says?

Mr. BLOUNT (continuing the reading):

will be found in the international declaration that the line of the proposed railway shall be forever neutral territory; that the material necessary for the construction and operation of the road shall be admitted free of customs dues, and that its property and revenues shall be always exempt from all forms of taxation. This guaranty, having all the force of a treaty, will stimulate private and public confidence, and thus lead to the investment of capital that might otherwise be reluctant and distrustful.

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to ask my colleague a question. Is there anything in the pending bill which seeks to appropriate any aid to the construction of the railroad to connect the United States with the republics of Central and South America? And is there anything else in this bill relative to the continental survey, except an appropriation of \$65,000 to pay our part of the preliminary survey to ascertain whether it is feasible to connect all the republics of the western hemisphere by rail?

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for proposing the question. We propose in this bill an appropriation of \$65,000—I believe that is the amount—for the share of this country towards the survey itself. How came that survey into this bill? The Secretary of State, in the beginning of last Congress, called attention to this report, and the grand purpose in that survey of having a line of railroad to South America, protected by a pledge, in the nature of a treaty, that it should be forever neutral, the concessionaires getting possession of this road with exemption from taxation, with amounts of subsidies, and grants of land, and guaranties of interest; all these things were as much a part of the scheme as the appropriation in the bill itself.

I intend to briefly read from his report all these allegations which are said to be in the nature of a treaty—

Mr. McCREARY. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him again?

Mr. BLOUNT. With pleasure; as often as you like.

Mr. McCREARY. Is it not true that the United States paid thousands of dollars for surveys made in order to ascertain whether it is feasible to have interoceanic canals at Nicaragua and Panama, and if we ever committed ourselves to any subsidy in aid thereof?

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to keep the mind of this House on the proposition made in the report of the International Conference and recommended to Congress, and its purposes stated by the present Secretary of State, to indicate what there is in this measure. What has the survey of Panama to do with this question? Why, I might ask my friend if we did not grant immense domains to the Pacific roads; if we did not indorse bonds and securities for millions of dollars. Yet would the gentleman argue that because we did so that we should cease to have any care for the public Treasury and repeat those extravagances, resulting in crimes against the Government itself?

It is so easy to say, "This is simply a survey." It is not a difficult mental operation to discard a careful consideration of an important question by an innocent suggestion that we have here only a proposition for a survey, but I want to carry this House beyond that. I want to carry it to the point of view of the Secretary of State, with the report of that committee in his hands, indicating the purpose not of a survey alone, but of an obligation on the part of this Government to protect the concessionaires against any violation of any rights which they may obtain in South America.

Suppose, sir, that after this road shall have been constructed, and after there shall have been legislation on the part of Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, or any of those countries exempting from taxation the materials connected with the building of the road and exempting the road itself from taxation for all time to come—suppose that after that one of those countries should change its view of the matter and should insist upon its right to tax that property, and this treaty obligation on the part of the United States should be invoked, would we not be compelled, in good faith, to carry our Navy and our Army there to protect these rights?

Suppose that those countries should grant lands to this road, would not we be bound in good faith, having entered into what the Secretary of State says is equivalent to a treaty intended to protect those rights for all time to come—would not we be bound to go with our forces into those republics in order to enforce these rights? The road is "to be exempt from taxation" in Chile, in Ecuador, in Peru, but suppose a change of mind comes over those states and they insist upon taxing it, or for some pe-

cular reasons of their own they resist the free passage of goods over their territories, will not the American Republic be under pledge to march, if need be, its forces into South America to assert and protect the rights of the concessionaires against that Republic?

Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling that this Government shall occupy such an attitude towards those people. It is her proud distinction that when those provinces had shaken off the authority of Spain, and the Holy Alliance had entered into an agreement to reinstate her authority in those republics, to reinstate monarchical authority and monarchical forms of government there, this country, in connection with England, proclaimed the doctrine that it would resist to the furthest extent any such interference on the part of European powers in the affairs of the western hemisphere, and declared that so far as Europe was concerned we had abstained from interference with its governmental affairs, and that on this western hemisphere no European power should place its foot with any such intent. That proclamation was hailed with delight throughout all the civilized world as one of the grandest events in all the course of time.

As an American, sir, I protest against this great Government lending its power and its flag to a corporation to operate in South America, and obligating itself to protect these concessionaires. I do not want any conflicts of that sort for another reason. If they come they are likely to lead to the use of armies and to a policy of force in that part of the American continent. These countries are revolutionary in character; they are continually being disturbed; they are in conflict amongst themselves, and I do not wish to see any line of policy adopted which can by any possibility extend those controversies to us. Chile has just emerged from civil war. The flames of civil war are seen to-day on the horizon of Venezuela. The timbers in the Republic of Brazil are strained and shattered by popular convulsions of which we have almost weekly reports, and I do not want to see any course taken on our part which will embroil us in a conflict which may result ultimately in a policy of conquest. Those people are incapable of preserving order and stability among themselves; bring them into connection with us, with all these troublesome questions, and the equipoise of our institutions, which we enjoy and preserve to-day by reason of the splendid character of our population, will be endangered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what has been going on in relation to this matter. At the first session of the last Congress we appropriated \$65,000 as our contribution to the survey. At the second session we appropriated \$65,000. We have in this bill a proposition to appropriate \$65,000. Bear in mind that these contributions are to be made by the countries concerned pro rata according to population.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Will the gentleman, while he is upon that point, give the committee some information as to who is to have control of the disbursement of this money?

Mr. BLOUNT. This railway commission.

Mr. MCCREARY. Under the approval of the Secretary of State, my friend will admit.

Mr. BLOUNT. The approval of the Secretary of State is somewhat *pro forma*. I do not see why he should have any trouble with this question, entertaining the views that he does entertain in reference to this South American policy. But, Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes claimed that we are bound in good faith to make this appropriation, that having met these people here and agreed that we would make a survey, and having already made two appropriations, we ought to make the third. Now, while we have been doing that what have they been doing? Brazil has paid her first assessment of \$15,000, I think, since this bill was reported, certainly this year. Chile has paid \$3,000; Colombia has paid \$4,000; Costa Rica has paid \$1,000; Bolivia and Ecuador have promised to pay. The Argentine Republic has declined to contribute, but agrees to build through her own territory; that is to say, she has a number of railroads already built, constructed before she had any connection with this project.

Guatemala paid nothing; Mexico declines to contribute, but will complete a line through her own territory—a line which she would complete, at any rate, without any connection with this scheme.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCCREARY. I ask that the gentleman from Georgia be allowed to proceed until he completes his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOUNT. Nicaragua promises to pay; Paraguay declines; Peru has not paid; Salvador promises to pay; Uruguay declines to contribute, but will complete her own line—a scheme which she carries on without any connection with this.

Mr. KILGORE. What was the proportion of the assessment of these different governments? What proportion was each to pay?

Mr. BLOUNT. They were to pay in proportion to population, measured by millions. For instance, this country, with her

65,000,000 population, was to pay a certain sum, and these various other countries on the same basis.

Mr. KILGORE. This railroad was not to approach the boundaries of the United States at all?

Mr. BLOUNT. It was to be a part of the intercontinental system. My friend from Texas may not be able to see the advantage to us, and I do not myself.

Mr. KILGORE. The plan did not propose to construct any railroad inside of the United States?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, no; we are to go to South America and build this road.

Mr. KILGORE. We are to build the road, and they are to get the benefit; and we are to pay in the same proportion that they do?

Mr. BLOUNT. We are to enter into this work down there under such conditions as I have indicated, and in return it is expected we shall get the trade of those countries.

Uruguay declines to contribute, but will complete her own line. As to Venezuela we have no information. Most of these countries have not contributed a cent. We have gone on making appropriations, and we have paid nearly all the money that has thus far been contributed. We have our army and naval officers down there engaged in the work of the survey. And in the presence of these facts we are told that though these other countries have not made compliance with the conditions except in a few instances, we have entered into an agreement and are bound to go on and make payments and continue the survey.

Mr. KILGORE. Are we to get any of the glory?

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not know about the glory. I do not know who are the parties to this concession; I suppose some day we shall learn who is to get the pay, and perhaps we may not learn of anybody, at least in this country, getting any of the glory. It will, I am afraid, be very much like the glory we gained in our grants to our Pacific railroads. There is a genius in this country for that sort of business, and it is very difficult to contravene it.

Mr. LONG. How much money have we already paid?

Mr. BLOUNT. One hundred and thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. LONG. To what part of the work does this go?

Mr. BLOUNT. The road is in the Central American and South American states.

Mr. LONG. Have we anybody there looking after this enterprise?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, yes; we have detailed army officers.

Mr. LONG. Enough to take care of it?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. MCCREARY. Will the gentleman allow me one more question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. MCCREARY. Was there any minority report put in by any member of the committee opposing this measure?

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Kentucky asks whether there was any minority report on this subject. I take pleasure in stating that there was none. I did give notice, however, that there were differences of opinion in the committee in relation to this measure. I did give notice that I considered it of such serious consequence that I proposed to call the attention of the House to this survey. If I have failed to state any of the facts in this connection I trust my friend will bring to the attention of the House whatever I may have left unsaid.

I have come into this House with these views, intending that if the question hereafter should assume the serious aspect which it now presents to my mind, I would, humble as I am, guard myself against any responsibility for this enterprise, and that on this occasion, the first time since these surveys have been started that the Democratic party has been in possession of this House, there should be an opportunity for the House to make its declaration as to whether it would or would not sanction this undertaking. Hitherto the matter has been in the hands of the President, the Secretary of State, a Republican Senate, and a Republican House. There has never been presented to either House of Congress, so far as I know, the information which I have submitted to-day with this correspondence and these various documents.

The question is now here; and whatever the House may do I shall have no complaint to make. But I wish members to bear in mind that if there is any obligation on our part to make any survey, there is, according to Secretary Blaine, an obligation also in the nature of a treaty that this Government shall protect the railroads which may be built in Central and South America under this scheme in all their rights as corporations—exemption from taxation of real and personal property, the right to have brought in free for the building of these roads the material necessary, the guaranty of the neutrality of the roads, the freedom of merchandise over them. All these things, and all necessary legislation for their enjoyment for all time to come, go along with this pledge, according to the Secretary of State.

Away, then, with the idea that it is \$65,000. It is far beyond

that. Well, sir, we shall be regaled perhaps with the suggestion that the building of this road brings into this land the commerce of South America, that now passes, or the bulk of it, to England and other European countries; that according to Mr. Carnegie railroad transportation is about as cheap as water transportation, and that when we get our railroads we will have freight so cheap that we will get that commerce, notwithstanding the English and other vessels on the ocean. I do not believe, sir, any such doctrine as that. You find in that report where Chile has built her railroads from her mountains to the sea. You will see where the Argentine Republic has built all over its surface, wherever commerce required, her lines of railway; and the tendency of commerce toward Europe has not been by reason of the lack of a railroad system connecting South American countries with this.

It seems to stand on entirely different grounds. Take Argentina, for instance, with her immense wool product. All of this, or the bulk of it, goes to European countries. It finds no customs duties when it enters their ports. The ship goes with a full cargo, and returns with the goods of that country. If the wool seeks this direction it is barred at our ports, and so the ship must come practically empty, and if it goes back at all it goes back with products not as desirable, by reason of cheapness and adaptability to their wants, as those of European countries. In the discussion of the tariff this subject has been so much ventilated that it seems impossible not to feel and understand why that commerce takes the direction it does, instead of a nearer outlet to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have said enough in relation to this scheme. At the proper time I shall move to strike this item out of the bill. But in connection with this we have at the State Department what is known as the International Bureau of American Republics, and provision is made in the bill as follows:

Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, for the prompt collection and distribution of commercial information, as recommended by the International American Conference, \$25,000, to be available when the other nations mentioned by the International American Conference pay all their respective assessments.

It has been heretofore \$35,000. Now, we have got the bureau in splendid working order. Under the suggestions of the International American Conference we have made a \$35,000 appropriation at one session of Congress and \$35,000 at another.

I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State in the month of February last, in relation to the contributions from the other republics of South America, which were to contribute according to their population, so much per million, towards the expense of this union. He says in response to that letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, February 23, 1892.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 18th instant, I have the honor to inform you that, on the several dates hereafter named, this Department received contributions from certain foreign governments towards the maintenance of the Intercontinental Railway Commission and also the Bureau of American Republics.

The amount received for account of the Intercontinental Railway Commission is as follows:

Chile, April 28, 1891	\$3,028.12
Colombia, August 20, 1891	4,000.00
Costa Rica, November 3, 1891	1,000.00
Brazil, November 13, 1891 (in process of collection)	15,000.00

The amount received for account of the Bureau of American Republics is as follows:

Venezuela, October 2, 1891	\$812.50
Guatemala, December 2, 1891	525.00
Costa Rica, January 13, 1892	75.00
Salvador, January 23, 1892	243.75
Mexico, February 5, 1892	3,500.00

Phave the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

HON. JAMES H. BLOUNT,
Chairman of Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

These were all the contributions made outside of the Treasury here at Washington by all of these countries, as appears by this communication from Mr. Blaine. When the committee saw fit to criticize this matter and put in this provision "to be available when the other nations mentioned by the International American Conference pay all of their respective assessments," there began to come in some contributions from some of these other countries—not all; and we have gone on in this most refined recognition of our solemn obligation to these South American countries, surveying the railroad almost entirely at our own expense; and, out of appropriations from the public Treasury, keeping up this bureau of information in South America for the benefit of these countries. For one, I want to arrest this whole matter here.

I want to stop this hidden, mysterious thing at the outset. I want to abolish this bureau. The information circulated can be gathered from encyclopedias and from other cheap sources. It is a place for somebody to occupy. It is one of the numerous bureau "sores" to be found in every Department of the Government. It is active; it appeals to the House by having communications sent to members of Congress of its consequence. It struggles

for its life. So with this survey. I would strike it out from the bill. I would have this Democratic House say once and for all, "we will not provide a dollar on the ground that hereafter there is carried along with it, as with this other appropriation, obligation to do other things set out in the report, to protect concessionaires, perhaps Jay Gould, Huntington, or Carnegie, or some other of the moneyed kings who may be the concessionaires of this railroad scheme."

I know, Mr. Chairman, that I do not stand in accord with all the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in reference to this question. I know that they believe it is nothing but this survey, that they would not go beyond a survey, that they see immense commerce coming to their country by its operations. My vision is too dim to apprehend these things. I have not separated in all my thoughts every section of this report, the building of the railroad and all of the other following sections, interpreted by the Secretary of State to be a pledge upon my country, as of a treaty itself.

If this is it, as the Secretary of State interprets it, and you wish to pursue his policy, go forward in it. If not, if you decline to follow him in this policy, then let us at once unite together and strike the first blow at this appropriation. Take this money away and this scheme withers. Mr. Carnegie is the soul of this report in every one of its sections. I have read the extract from it, and you will find at some hour that there is something besides what is on the face.

Mr. Chairman, I have thought of presenting some other questions to the committee, but I have occupied much of its time, and I shall forego until some other occasion the indulgence of observations which I think are important in relation to our foreign missions and especially our recent diplomatic efforts in Chilean affairs.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. What is the object of the Bureau that the gentleman speaks of? What does it do?

Mr. BLOUNT. It purports to distribute information.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Is it an educational institution?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, yes.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. To educate?

Mr. BLOUNT. To educate and give merchants information so that they can trade—very valuable information!

Mr. COX of Tennessee. Yes!

Mr. BLOUNT. A "Commercial Bureau of American Republics for the prompt collection and distribution of information, as recommended by the International American Conference." It is an educational institution.

Mr. BURROWS. A very important one.

Mr. BLOUNT. Not a very important one. My friend from Michigan thinks it is important. I have some of the documents it issued, and I will contribute them to him if he will take them.

Mr. BURROWS. If you do not appreciate them, I will take them.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not. I do not appreciate any of this business. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel inclined to occupy the attention of the committee any longer. I have gone far beyond anything I expected when I took the floor; but I wish on some future occasion to invite the attention of the House to the unhappy diplomatic attempts that have characterized us in our relations with Chile during all the trouble that the Congressional party had with the Balmaceda government.

Mr. MCCREARY and Mr. HITT rose.

Mr. HITT. If the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] I will ask to be recognized subsequently.

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Chairman, the diplomatic and consular service of the United States should be maintained in a manner suitable and appropriate to the wealth and population of our great country. Mr. Jefferson announced at the beginning of the present century the true policy of the United States when he said we should have "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." I believe that was good doctrine at that time, and I believe that every administration should adhere to the grand words spoken by Mr. Jefferson.

There should neither be parsimony nor extravagance in the management of our foreign service, but there should be justice, fairness, and conservatism. I have had the honor to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for seven years, and I state here now, with deliberation, whatever may be said about our diplomatic and consular service, we are compelled to admit that it has been maintained economically. The diplomatic and consular service of the great countries of Europe cost annually to each of those countries millions of dollars. How much do we pay in this great country, with 65,000,000 of people and with \$65,000,000,000 of property? Our consular service, excepting two years, has for many years been self-sustaining; and the whole amount that we have to pay out of our Treasury, when we in-

clude the amount that we receive from our consular system, is less than one-half million of dollars.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], who has just taken his seat; but the gentleman from Georgia can see a Trojan horse in this bill when there is no just cause for fright. He sounds an alarm when there is no necessity for sounding an alarm. I will go as far as any man to oppose all unnecessary appropriations. I have always, in this House of Representatives, fought subsidies, and I will always be found fighting subsidies, but I do not believe that the record bears my friend out in the statement he has made here to-day with regard to some parts of this diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

There is no necessity to sound the alarm and raise the question of economy on this bill. We are not here to "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." This House has already appropriated in round numbers \$24,000,000 in the army appropriation bill. It has appropriated \$7,000,000 in the Indian appropriation bill, and \$4,000,000 in the District of Columbia appropriation bill; and but a few days ago \$23,000,000 in the naval appropriation bill; and you will be called upon to appropriate \$25,000,000 in the sundry civil appropriation bill, which my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is ready to call up when we get through with the bill now being considered.

This House has appropriated \$134,000,000 for pensions. Now, when we are asking for less than one-half of a million of dollars to pay the expense of our diplomatic service we are told we must pause. We are told that a resolution was adopted at the beginning of this session that called upon us to establish a policy of economy. I voted for that resolution, and still stand by it.

When we maintain a great diplomatic and consular system for this, the greatest Republic in the world, at a net annual cost of less than \$500,000, I say we are adhering to the resolution of economy that was offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

Let us see how we compare with other nations in our expenditures. In Great Britain the ambassadors to Austria, France, and Turkey are paid \$40,000 each annually, and each is furnished with a residence. In France the total amount paid the ambassador to Great Britain is \$46,000 annually, and \$27,000 to the ambassador to Germany, and \$17,000 to the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States. Germany pays \$37,500 per annum to the ambassador to Great Britain. She pays the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States \$15,750. Spain pays \$21,000 a year to her ambassadors and \$17,000 per annum to her envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary. Mexico pays \$27,000 per annum to each of her envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to the United States, France, and Spain, and \$20,900 each per annum to the ministers to Germany, Italy, and Belgium. The United States pay annually \$17,500 each to envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and Mexico, and from \$12,000 per annum to \$5,000 per annum to other diplomatic officers.

I will not occupy time by comparing the diplomatic and consular salaries paid in other countries with those paid in our country, but I will insert at the end of my remarks the tables which have been prepared.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will my friend allow me a question?

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I do not make these references because I am in favor of increasing the salaries. I am opposed to increasing the salaries of our diplomatic officers.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will my friend allow me to ask him a question there? Do I understand that it serves his purpose, and if he is in favor of the consequences coming from them, would he not apply them here?

Mr. MCCREARY. The object of my reference to the salaries in the great European countries is to show that the alarm of my friend from Georgia is needless. When you call the attention of this House to the pledge to stand by the resolution of economy offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] you insinuate, perhaps without intending to do so, that all who support the appropriations contained in the bill now being considered are not remembering the resolutions of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. BLOUNT. Now, Mr. Chairman, one word more, if my friend will allow me. I want to know whether he does not regard the foreign relations of European countries among themselves and with the world as of very much more importance to their safety than the foreign relations of the United States with other countries.

Mr. MCCREARY. I regard the foreign relations of the European powers as of great importance to them, and, since my friend has led me into that path, I will say here and now that our foreign relations have been very important to us in the past. There has never been a day since Jefferson was inaugurated President that diplomatic officers were not beneficial to our country.

Go with me back to the beginning of the century. Go to that grand time in the history of the United States, under Jefferson's Administration, when we acquired the Louisiana territory, that grand empire that has been so valuable to the United States, that has brought so much wealth, so much power, so much glory to the United States. Who negotiated the surrender and conveyance of the Louisiana territory to the United States in 1803? That man who was called "the model President," that man who announced the very doctrine that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] referred to in his speech. James Monroe was the minister of the United States to France when we acquired the Louisiana territory.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to one of the most distinguished sons of his State, a man whose name is prominent in the history of Georgia, and of whom the State of Georgia is proud. It was Mr. Forsyth of Georgia, minister of the United States at the court of Spain, who arranged for the acquisition by the United States of Florida. Thus we find that James Monroe negotiated the treaty by which we acquired the great Louisiana territory, and Mr. Forsyth of Georgia, minister to Spain, negotiated the treaty by which we acquired Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I will not dwell upon the early diplomacy of our country, but I will come down to later days. Is there any gentleman here who will deny that valuable services were rendered by Mr. Adams as minister to England during our late unhappy civil war?

Is there any member here who is familiar with Mr. Washburne's great services during the Franco-German war who will deny that the United States were greatly benefited and that the citizens of this country who were in France were greatly benefited by his services? Is there anyone here who doubts that Mr. Motley, Mr. Bancroft Davis, Mr. Everett, Mr. McLane, Mr. Pendleton, and Mr. Lowell rendered valuable service as diplomatic representatives abroad and reflected honor upon themselves and upon their country?

I am ready always to do justice to men who are conspicuous for their ability, for their wisdom, for their patriotism, and I am ready to-day to compliment my former colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, our present minister to Germany, Hon. William Walter Phelps, for his efforts in obtaining a removal of the embargo upon American pork.

I might refer, in this connection, to the valuable services that have been rendered by our foreign ministers in helping to bring about the International American Conference. It was through the aid of our ministers in South America and in Central America and in Mexico that we were enabled to bring together representatives of all the nations of the western hemisphere when the International American Conference was held in the city of Washington. I do not know that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] intended to refer lightly to that conference; I hope he did not; I shall not construe his language that way.

Mr. Chairman, I regard the International American Conference as one of the grandest conferences ever held in the world. I do not believe that a national conference was ever held that will prove more beneficial in its results than that conference.

But, Mr. Chairman, the question asked me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] caused me to leave the main subject. I return now to the subject under consideration, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

This bill comes here from the Committee on Foreign Affairs without any minority report. It comes here without having been objected to by any member of the committee, except the gentleman who has just addressed the committee [Mr. BLOUNT]. I agree with him in the belief that there are certain consuls whose salaries are too high, and I acted with him in reducing the salaries of fifty-nine of those officials representing the United States abroad. I agreed with him in uniting the mission of Columbia and Ecuador, saving thereby \$10,000 annually; and uniting in one mission Peru and Bolivia, thereby saving \$10,000; in uniting Denmark, Sweden, and Norway in one mission, thus also saving \$10,000. In the proposed appropriation of \$65,000 to carry on, and, as I think, to finish the preliminary survey for the continental railroad which will bring us in closer communication, commercially and socially, with all the republics of the western hemisphere. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and I do not agree, and I do not think any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs agrees with him in his opposition to this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, God in his wisdom seems to have decreed years ago that there should be sympathy and friendship, commercial union, and social relations between all the peoples of the western hemisphere. In the year 1823, when President Monroe announced what is called the "Monroe doctrine," those words of wisdom that are dear to every patriotic heart, he immediately established a sympathy between all the peoples of the American continent, and soon afterwards the peoples in various countries of

South America began to overthrow monarchical institutions and to set up republics in their place, taking our Republic for their model.

Now, after the lapse of nearly three-quarters of a century, we have come to a time when the minds of the people of the United States, and the minds of the people of Mexico, and the minds of the people of Central America and South America are turned towards the improvement of social and commercial relations, and the best way to accomplish that great result is by the construction of the intercontinental railway. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that railroad will be built, because within twenty-five years we have constructed longer lines of railroad in the United States than it will be necessary to build in order to furnish railway communication between the city of New York and the metropolis of every Republic of the western hemisphere.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé Railroad is 4,582 miles in length; the Southern Pacific system, including leased lines, 4,702 miles in length; the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad system 4,250 miles in length; the Northern Pacific Railroad system 4,623 miles in length—longer than any line required to be built to bring together all the republics of the western hemisphere.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman will allow me to ask whose language he is now reading.

Mr. MCCREARY. The length of each railroad is taken from the report of the Railroad Commission.

Mr. BLOUNT. Prepared by Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Davis?

Mr. MCCREARY. But not denied by any person. The same statements are made by Lieut. Brown, of the United States Army, the report from which I am reading.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is not the language identical with that which they use in their report?

Mr. MCCREARY. They give the length of these lines by the same figures. When distances between two points are given, the language of different individuals is always the same. These gentlemen, showing that these long lines have been built, argue as I do that it is possible and feasible to build these other lines.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the Federal Government ever undertaken to assist in the building of a railroad without scandalizing the whole enterprise?

Mr. MCCREARY. I think not; and, Mr. Chairman, I have never been, and am not now, and never shall be, willing to vote one dollar out of the Treasury for the construction of a railroad, for the construction of a submarine cable line, or for the construction of an interoceanic canal. I have a record in Congress consistent with that position.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will permit me to ask him this further question: What can be the purpose of appropriating \$65,000 to ascertain the feasibility of this line, unless, when the feasibility is ascertained, the Government is to assist in its construction?

Mr. MCCREARY. I can explain that very readily; and I am very glad my friend from Texas has asked me the question. I was approaching that line of discussion. There are now three railroads passing down through that grand empire State of Texas which is so ably represented on this floor, in part, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. Those three railroads cross the line between Texas and Mexico, one at Eagle Pass, another at El Paso, and another at Laredo, making the distance from New York to the City of Mexico via El Paso 3,680 miles; via Eagle Pass, 3,174 miles, and via Laredo, 3,026 miles.

These lines are already in operation. The Government of the United States is not asked to contribute one dollar to the construction of the railroad. We have already built lines of railroad down to the Mexican border. Mexico has already taken up our lines at the border and extended them to her beautiful capital, and she is now pushing those railroads on down to the Guatemalan lines. The Government of Mexico, responding to the request for aid in money to help make the preliminary survey for the Continental Railroad, has said: "We will build a line of railroad through Mexico;" and the Government of the Argentine Republic says: "We will build a line of railroad from Buenos Ayres, the commercial city and capital of the Argentine Republic, up to the Bolivian line." Nine hundred and eighty-two miles of that road have already been completed; so that to-day, when we take into consideration the miles of railroad already built and the miles of railroad already under construction, only 2,870 miles of railroad have to be constructed to give an all-rail line from the city of New York to Buenos Ayres, in the Argentine Republic.

In Guatemala and in some of the other Central and South American Republics the country is rough and mountainous, and some have doubted whether a railroad could be built on the line desired. But when the Baltimore and Ohio system crossed the Alleghenies, and when a railroad was built across the Rocky Mountains, it was believed feasible to build a railroad that would connect all the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Some of the small republics of Central and South America have not the money with which to build railroads, and therefore donate lands, and this causes the criticism of the gentleman from Georgia, who said that subsidies in the way of land would be called for to build the Continental Railroad. When he read to you the report of the railroad commission he did not read the names of the gentlemen who signed it. I have here that report which he read. He did not give you the names of those gentlemen who signed that report, but he dwelt at some length upon the twelfth paragraph of that report, which states that—

The execution of a work of such magnitude deserves to be further encouraged by subsidies, grants of land, or guarantees of a minimum of interest.

By whom is the report signed? It is signed by sixteen gentlemen; two of them are United States commissioners, while fourteen represent the republics south of us. They do not build railroads in the Argentine Republic, and Peru, and Bolivia, and Colombia, and Guatemala in the same manner we do. In many of those countries the government builds the railroads or donates land to individuals who build them. That is the way they expect to build this Continental Railroad. We are not asked for a dollar, and we will not be asked for a dollar.

But if, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to contribute money to build the road I shall be found always opposing it. There are members here present who remember that I almost alone at the last session of Congress opposed a subsidy of \$3,000,000 asked in a bill which had already passed the Senate to construct a submarine cable line between San Francisco and the Hawaiian Islands; and this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, in sufficient number voted against the bill and defeated it. We have to-day eight submarine cable lines that connect the United States with the great commercial centers of the world, all controlled by syndicates or corporations, each of them authorized by an act of Congress to build these submarine cable lines, and yet, so far as I know, Congress was never asked to contribute a dollar to build them, and they have never received pecuniary aid from the United States Government.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCCREARY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not quite get at a harmonious understanding of the statement that the governments of these South American Republics build the lines of railroads, in connection with the suggestion the gentleman has just quoted that they are expected to have subsidies, grants of land, etc. Where does the subsidy come from?

Mr. MCCREARY. I will state to the gentleman that the governments of many of the Central and South American countries own large tracts of lands and sometimes make land donations to syndicates, companies, or individuals who are willing to take the lands and build the roads.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the syndicate builds the road?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. That is about the way they do here. Who owns it?

Mr. MCCREARY. Well, let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask who owns the road when it is built?

Mr. BLOUNT. If it will not interfere with my friend from Kentucky, I would suggest, by way of addition to his argument, that some of these roads are built by the Government itself, while others are subsidized.

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, there are a few instances where the Government has built railroads in South America, but their plan of constructing railroads is different from ours.

The amount asked for in the bill on the part of the United States to aid in making the preliminary survey is \$65,000. That amount has been appropriated twice in other general appropriation bills, and the survey is more than half completed. Shall we abandon the half-finished work, or appropriate \$65,000 more, with a view to the completion of it? I believe it was right in the beginning that we should appropriate \$65,000 to the preliminary survey. Why do I believe it?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say it with some modesty, but it is known to the older members of this House, that I am the author of the bill which caused the assembling in this city of the International American Conference. That bill provides in its first paragraph for the very railway that to-day is criticised. That bill, which was approved by Mr. Cleveland when President of the United States and under which invitations were sent out to every republic south of us by Mr. Bayard, his Secretary, that bill was a Democratic measure; and that bill provided in its first sentence for the very communication that we are seeking now to establish through the means of this continental railway. Here is what it provides:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested and authorized to invite the several governments

of the Republic of Mexico, Central and South America, Haiti, San Domingo, and the Empire of Brazil, to join the United States in a conference to be held at Washington, in the United States, at such time as he may deem proper in the year 1889, for the purpose of discussing and recommending for adoption to their respective governments some plan of arbitration for the settlement of disagreements and disputes that may hereafter arise between them, and for considering questions relating to the improvement of business intercourse and means of direct communication between said countries and to encourage such reciprocal commercial relations as will be beneficial to all and secure more extensive markets for the products of each of said countries.

Sec 2. That in forwarding the invitation to the said governments the President of the United States shall set forth that the conference is called to consider—

First. Measures that shall tend to preserve the peace and promote the prosperity of the several American states.

Second. Measures toward the formation of an American customs union, under which the trade of the American nations with each other shall, so far as possible and profitable, be promoted.

Third. The establishment of regular and frequent communication between ports of the several American states and the ports of each other.

Fourth. The establishment of a uniform system of customs regulations in each of the independent American states to govern the mode of importation and exportation of merchandise and port duties and charges; a uniform method of determining the classification and valuation of such merchandise in the ports of each country, and a uniform system of invoices and the subject of sanitation of ships and quarantine.

Fifth. The adoption of a uniform system of weights and measures, and laws to protect the patent rights, copyrights, and trade-marks of citizens of either country in the other, and for the extradition of criminals.

Sixth. The adoption of a common silver coin, to be issued by each Government, the same to be legal tender in all commercial transactions between the citizens of all the American states.

Seventh. An agreement upon and recommendation for adoption to their respective governments of a definite plan of arbitration of all questions, disputes, and differences that may now or hereafter exist among them, to the end that all difficulties and disputes between such nations may be peaceably settled and wars prevented.

Eighth. To consider such other subjects relating to the welfare of the several States represented as may be presented by any of said States which are hereby invited to participate in said conference.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same to be disbursed under the direction and in the discretion of the Secretary of State, for expenses incidental to the conference.

SEC. 4. That the President of the United States shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, ten delegates to said conference, who shall serve without compensation other than their actual necessary expenses, and the several other States participating in said conference shall be represented by as many delegates as each may elect: *Provided, however,* That in the disposition of questions to come before said conference, no State shall be entitled to more than one vote.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State shall appoint such clerks and other assistants as shall be necessary, at a compensation to be determined by him, and provide for the daily publication by the Public Printer, in the English, Spanish, and Portuguese languages, of so much of the proceedings of the conference as it may determine, and upon the conclusion of said conference, shall transmit a report of the same to the Congress of the United States, together with a statement of the disbursement of the appropriation herein provided for.

Approved, May 24, 1888.

This bill was passed by a Democratic House of Representatives, and every Democrat voted for it, so far as the record shows, and every Republican voted for it, so far as the record shows. It was approved by President Cleveland. What was the next step? In pursuance of the bill Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State, sent a letter by authority of the President of the United States to the chief officer of every republic and of every country mentioned in the bill, and called attention in his letter to the fact that one of the purposes of the conference was to "consider questions relating to business intercourse and means of direct communication between said countries."

My friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] raises an alarm because he says Mr. Blaine in a letter has intimated that Congress might be bound in some way to contribute money to build the railroad. I deny that that letter of the Secretary of State is susceptible of that construction, and I deny also that Mr. Blaine has the power to commit us or to commit Congress to any agreement to furnish money for any purpose.

The position taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] is untenable. We are not asked here to appropriate money to construct a railroad; we are only asked to carry out our part of an agreement. When the representatives of the United States met the representatives of all the republics south of us it was believed that they should carry out the very first paragraph of the bill which called them together, to do what they could toward encouraging communication between the republics of the American continent. They did that, and they agreed that there should be paid by each of the countries \$1,000 for every million of population. Our amount is \$65,000, and we have paid that already twice. Shall we now abandon this solemn agreement and prove faithless to it? We are only bound so far as a preliminary survey. Shall we abandon the agreement when we are more than half through with the work, or shall we appropriate \$65,000 now and finish that work?

I say now, as I said in the committee, that we ought to appropriate the \$65,000 and finish the survey. If we should now fail to perform our part of the agreement, we might lose the benefit of the work that has been more than half completed. Let us go on with it. And as certainly as I am standing here, in this age of progress, of improvement, of advancement, of steam, in a few

years a man can get on a train in the city of New York and get off at Buenos Ayres, in the Argentine Republic. Such is the progress that now awaits us; and I for one am ready and willing to help with this little pittance. It does not amount to much; and yet there are men who ask, "Why do you want this?" We want it first because it will forever settle the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine.

I hope the members of the House will listen to the words uttered by Mr. Monroe, who declared in his message—

That the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the European powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and our safety.

With existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

We have maintained that doctrine ever since it was uttered by Mr. Monroe, except once for a short time, when Maximilian was put upon the throne in Mexico, but as soon as the United States was able to gather strength and to get ready to enforce the Monroe doctrine the Government of this country did its duty and again maintained that doctrine. The people of the republics south of us are our neighbors. They have modeled their governments after ours. They are bound to us by closer commercial and social ties than to the people of any other country in the world. They are making a plea in favor of commercial union and more intimate friendship, and when they come to us and "ask for bread shall we give them a stone?"

But there is another reason why I am in favor of making the appropriation for the preliminary survey. There are 50,000,000 of people in these republics south of us. Their trade amounts to \$998,000,000 annually. Where does their trade go now? Four-fifths of it goes across the ocean to England, France, and Germany, and only one-fifth of it is with the United States; and we ought to have it all. In the United States to-day we are suffering because of overproduction of nearly everything. We want markets. Markets will improve the business and trade of our country.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman think a railway would bring us commerce from these countries with their present system of building custom-houses on the lines to prevent trade?

Mr. MCCREARY. I hope, with my friend from Kansas, before many moons pass, that the odious tariff law which we now have will be so amended or repealed that we will not have to think that it is an obstacle or lion in our pathway.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman, then, tell me why his party, which is three to one here, does not bring in a bill to repeal this law, if he thinks it is so odious?

Mr. WHEELER of Alabama. Because you would all vote against it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY. I will answer the gentleman. The party to which I belong tried a few years ago to get the Morrison bill considered in this House, and the Republican party refused then to consider it. Then we passed the Mills bill in this House, and sent it to the Senate, and the Republican Senate refused to pass it, and now we present independent measures, such as a free-wool bill, a bill making cotton-ties free, etc. Republican Congressmen oppose these. If we can not get all we want we propose to take what we can get. We fought for a general tariff bill and gained a victory in the House, but you beat us in the Senate. We referred the matter to the people of the United States at the November election and there we were victorious, but you are still joined to your idols and will not be corrected by the people.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows of any other way in the world of getting what he proclaims he wants but voting for it and going to the people on the issue?

Mr. MCCREARY. We expect to go to the people at the November election, and we expect not only to sweep you Republicans out of Congress, but to put a Democratic President in the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALKER. Then, why not pass your bill and go to the country upon the issue?

Mr. MCCREARY. We will give you thunder enough before we get through with you.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. MCCREARY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not your experience show that the freight

rates on railroads are so much higher than the rates by water that we will not get the freight by railroad if we can not get it by water?

Mr. MCCREARY. I am glad the gentleman from Iowa asked the question. There is nothing in the world that is so instructive as an object lesson.

Mr. BUTLER. Am I that object lesson? [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCREARY. No, sir; you are not the object lesson. But I state that I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. We ought never to become alarmed unless there is something to alarm us. I happen to have what I said is an object lesson.

In the last few years, through the wisdom of President Diaz of the Republic of Mexico and the Congress of the Mexican Republic, we have railroad communications between the United States and the City of Mexico. We expect to have more railroad communication before long, and I hope it will be remembered that all the railroads from the City of Mexico to the United States border did not cost the United States a dollar. During the year ending June 30, 1873, the imports into Mexico from the United States were \$5,231,254, and the exports to the United States were \$11,367,859. Now, contrast that with the present time. We have railroad communication now. In 1889 the imports amounted to \$22,669,420, and the exports, \$43,032,440, an increase in the former of over \$17,000,000, and of the latter of nearly \$32,000,000; and perhaps the great secret of it is railroad communication between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Which does the gentleman call the exports?

Mr. MCCREARY. The exports from the United States.

My friend here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COOMBS], says we should add \$20,000,000, because the business which comes by railroad, or a great deal of it, is not taken into account in the estimates.

Mr. COOMBS. Not a dollar.

Mr. MCCREARY. Thus we see that our trade with Mexico has increased fourfold in the last fifteen or sixteen years.

Give us a railroad connecting us with the other countries and the same results will follow. Take Venezuela as another illustration. Eight years ago our trade with Venezuela amounted to only \$8,000,000. The report I have before me shows that our trade with that country now amounts to a little over fifteen millions. We have no railroad there, but we have improved communication by water.

Mr. BUTLER. The increase is at as great a rate, is it not, where there is improved water communication as where there is a railroad?

Mr. MCCREARY. The increase of our trade with Venezuela has not been as great as the increase of our trade with Mexico, but the gentleman should remember also that there are several republics in South America which can not be reached by water. Again, he should remember that we are to get the railroad communication between our own country and these republics without any cost to the United States, whereas if you have to appropriate money out of the Treasury to secure improved water communication it will cost a large amount.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman suppose that I would want to appropriate money out of the Treasury to improve water communication with those countries? Does he not know that I am no friend of subsidies?

Mr. MCCREARY. I did not say that you would vote to appropriate money for that purpose, but I say you would have to do it if you wanted to get improved water communication.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe in subsidies, either to railroad lines or steamship lines, nor do I believe subsidies necessary to a development of improved water or land communication. The only aid needed is a removal of present restrictions.

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Chairman, I have here a statement showing our trade with all the Central and South American countries. I will not weary the committee by reading the various statements, but I will print them with my remarks.

Argentine Republic exported to the United States in 1889 goods amounting to \$5,500,000 gold, and in 1890 \$6,000,000, and imported from us in 1889 articles to the value of \$8,376,077, and in 1890 \$9,307,315.

The principal articles of export being minerals, wool, tallow, hides, skins, bones, cattle, sheep, etc., and of import wearing apparel, tools, agricultural implements, furniture, canned goods and other food substances, liquors, iron railway materials, machinery, crockery, glassware, pottery, chemicals, fancy articles, coin bullion, etc.

Bolivia, having no seacoast, is obliged to send its exports and receive its imports through the ports of Peru, Chile, or Argentine, hence it is impracticable to give its trade with the United States; but its present trade with our country is small, because of no direct transportation facilities. Its yearly foreign commerce is estimated at \$35,000,000.

Brazil imported from the United States goods amounting in 1888 to \$7,063,893, in 1889 \$9,276,511, and in 1890 \$12,000,000, and exported to the United States in 1888 \$54,000,000, in 1889 \$60,000,000, and in 1890 \$61,000,000, our imports being principally coffee, rubber, sugar, and hides, and our exports, breadstuffs, cotton goods, manufactured articles, petroleum, lumber, agricultural implements, etc.

The foreign trade of Brazil amounts to \$240,000,000 annually, about equally divided between imports and exports.

Chile imported from the United States in 1888 \$2,450,000; in 1889 \$2,970,000, and in 1890 \$3,220,000 worth of goods, and exported to the United States in 1888 \$2,900,000, in 1889 \$2,650,000, and in 1890 \$3,183,000. Her principal imports from us were iron and steel manufactures, cotton goods, wood and its manufactures, mineral oils, agricultural implements, meat and dairy products, chemicals, drugs, dyes, etc., and her exports, nitrate of soda, raw wool, hides and skins, fruits, etc. The annual foreign trade of Chile is about \$122,032,560, of which \$55,000,000 are imports and \$67,000,000 exports.

Colombia imported from the United States in 1889 merchandise to the value of \$3,729,000 and exported to the United States \$1,264,000, her principal imports from us being wheat flour, iron and steel manufactures, provisions, meat and dairy products, cotton goods, wood, furniture, refined sugar, chemicals, drugs, etc., and her principal exports coffee, hides and skins, fruits, India rubber and gutta-percha, crude cocoa, chemicals, drugs, etc. The annual foreign commerce of Colombia is about \$22,000,000.

Costa Rica imported from the United States about \$1,500,000 in 1890 and exported to the United States over \$1,600,000 worth of goods. Forty thousand tons of bananas alone were brought to the United States and 45,000 sacks of coffee, the United States having now a larger trade with Costa Rica than any other country. The total commerce of Costa Rica amounted, for the year 1889-'90, to about \$10,220,000 gold, of which \$5,360,000 were exports and \$4,860,000 imports, the principal exports from Costa Rica being coffee, hides, skins, India rubber, etc.; the imports woolen, linen, and cotton goods, machinery, agricultural implements, tools, furniture, hardware, etc.

Ecuador imported from the United States in 1889 \$756,000, and in 1890 \$715,000, and exported to the United States in 1889 \$695,000, and in 1890 \$534,000 worth; these imports being principally provisions, meat and dairy products, iron and steel, cotton goods, wheat flour, chemicals, drugs, etc., and the exports, cocoa, India rubber, crude gutta-percha, coffee, hides and skins, etc. The total foreign commerce of Ecuador amounts to nearly \$16,000,000 annually.

Most of the trade to and from the interior has to be carried on by means of pack animals, a slow, expensive, and difficult method, which impedes the development of commerce and agriculture. Once build a railroad through this country, connecting with Peru on the one hand and with Colombia and Central America on the other, and an impetus would be given to trade that could not be checked.

Guatemala imported from the United States in 1889 \$1,300,000, and in 1890 \$1,350,000 worth, and exported to the United States in 1889 \$2,347,000, and in 1890 \$2,290,000 worth of goods; these imports being cotton and woolen goods, railroad and agricultural materials and implements, hardware, etc.; the exports coffee, hides, rubber, sugar, bananas, etc. Coffee represents in quantity and value nine-tenths of the exports. The total foreign trade of Guatemala amounted in 1889 to \$16,000,000.

Nicaragua imported from the United States goods in 1883 to the value of \$861,156, in 1889 \$900,813, and in 1890 \$1,270,063, and exported to the United States in 1888 \$1,496,171, in 1889 \$1,747,246, and in 1890 \$1,665,690; these imports being principally machinery, iron, steel, wheat, flour, provisions, manufactured goods, etc.; and the exports coffee, crude India rubber, bananas, hides, and skins, etc. The total foreign trade of Nicaragua amounts to \$3,000,000 annually.

Paraguay: As there is no direct commercial intercourse between the United States and Paraguay, it is impracticable to state the amount of trade between the two countries. Paraguay having no seaports, all her foreign trade must go via Buenos Ayres or Montevideo; the absence of complete railroads requires her imports to be carried by inland navigation over her principal rivers, the Paraguay and Parana. However, the total commerce of Paraguay is about \$6,000,000 annually.

Peru: Owing to the absence of American steamship lines and trunk-line railroads, our commerce with Peru is very small; our exports to that country in 1888 amounted to only \$865,160, and in 1889 to \$773,244; and our imports in 1888 to \$309,040, and in 1889 to \$314,032.

The total foreign trade of Peru, however, amounts to over \$14,000,000 annually, controlled principally by England, but also partially by France and Germany.

Peru is an exceedingly rich country in natural resources and only needs the awakening influence of the modern railroad to develop these possibilities and to secure the United States the major part of the trade now monopolized by European countries.

Salvador imported from the United States goods in 1888 amounting to \$656,076, and in 1889, \$538,000; and exported to the United States, in 1888, \$1,913,742, and in 1889, \$1,515,000; these imports being mainly provisions, flour, cotton and woolen goods, manufactured articles, hardware, crockery, etc., and the exports coffee, indigo, sugar, cocoa, etc. The total foreign trade of Salvador amounts to over \$8,000,000 annually.

Uruguay: The commerce of Uruguay is chiefly with Europe, owing to the lack of facilities for transportation and communication between the former country and the United States. Nevertheless during the past few years our country has had a share of this trade, purchasing bones, bone ash, cowhides, dry and salted skins, calfskins, horsehair, etc., and selling lumber, kerosene, cotton goods, machinery, etc. The exports from the United States to Uruguay amounted in 1888 to \$1,337,430, and in 1889 to \$2,027,383, while the imports from Uruguay were, in 1888, \$2,711,521, and in 1889, \$2,986,964. The total foreign commerce of Uruguay amounts to nearly \$58,000,000 annually.

Venezuela: The exports from the United States to Venezuela amounted in 1888 to \$3,008,515; in 1889, to \$3,738,961, and in 1890, to \$4,028,583; while the imports amounted in 1888 to \$10,051,250; in 1889, to \$10,392,596, and in 1890, to \$10,966,765; exports and imports amounting in 1890 to about \$15,000,000. The principal exports from the United States to Venezuela are wheat flour, lard, cotton goods, manufactures of iron and steel, chemicals, oils, provisions, etc., and the imports, coffee, hides and skins, cocoa, drugs, guano, fruits, etc.

The total foreign trade of Venezuela is \$39,000,000 annually, of which the United States now enjoys a larger proportion than any other country, due mainly to the fact that the steamship lines recently established have afforded an easy method of intercommunication between these two republics.

I return now to the paragraph in the bill providing for the appropriation for this continental railroad. It reads as follows:

CONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Payment of the share of the United States of the expense of a preliminary survey for a continental railway as recommended by the International American Conference, to be available when the other nations mentioned by the International American Conference pay all their respective assessments, \$65,000.

I desire now with emphasis to call the attention of the chairman and of the members of this committee to that paragraph in the bill which provides for an appropriation of \$65,000, when these other republics pay their parts according to the agreement. So, then, no money will be paid by the United States until the other countries pay their part.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON. When this preliminary survey is made does the Government propose to build the railroad?

Mr. MCCREARY. The gentleman did not hear me fully, or he would not ask that question. There is nothing in this bill pledging the Government to pay one dollar toward the construction of the railroad. If there was any such thing in the bill, anything that required this Government to build the railroad or to contribute to its construction, I should be opposed to it.

Mr. SIMPSON. Well, after this preliminary survey is made, will they turn it over to a private corporation, and if so, is there any provision in your bill to compel that corporation to reimburse the Government for the money expended for the preliminary survey?

Mr. MCCREARY. The object of the preliminary survey, as I stated in the beginning, is to ascertain and to show that it is feasible to construct this road. The distance between the northern terminus of the Argentine Republic railroad and the southern terminus of the Mexican railroad extending towards Guatemala is now 4,900 miles. Of that distance 230 miles have been built and are in running order, and 1,800 miles are in process of construction; leaving about 2,870 miles of the railroad not yet built. Three corps of engineers are making surveys for the purpose of determining whether it is practicable and feasible to construct the railroad or not.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And, as I understand, those surveys will be public property?

Mr. MCCREARY. Of course they will be public property. The surveys are being made by three corps of engineers, one corp organized in the United States, and the other two organized elsewhere. As I have already stated, they are supported by contributions from the nations concerned, at the rate of \$1,000 per million of inhabitants; the United States agreeing to pay \$65,000 per annum, and the other countries according to their population.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague on the committee be extended so that he may finish his remarks.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MCCREARY. Amounts so far contributed by the Central and South American governments towards the preliminary surveys for the Continental Railway, are as follows:

Countries.	Actually paid.	In course of collection.
Bolivia.....		\$2,000.00
Brazil.....	\$15,000.00	
Chile.....	3,028.12	
Colombia.....	4,000.00	
Costa Rica.....	1,000.00	
Ecuador and Nicaragua.....		2,000.00
Totals.....	23,028.12	4,000.00
Grand total.....		27,028.12

Argentine Republic declines to contribute money, but will build the railway through its own territory.

Ecuador paid the expenses of the transportation of corps 2 and 3 of the Intercontinental Railway engineers from Guayaquil to Quito, estimated at 1,500 sucres, or \$1,020.

Guatemala has furnished four engineers to assist in making the surveys, but has not yet paid in any money.

Mexico declines to contribute money on the ground that she will complete the railway through her own territory.

Nicaragua has given assurances of the payment of her quota. Paraguay not yet paid.

Bill pending before the Peruvian Congress for the payment of its share.

Salvador has promised to pay its quota.

Uruguay declines to contribute money on the ground that it will complete the railway through its own territory.

Venezuela: No definite information so far received.

From the above summary it appears that Mexico, Argentine Republic, Paraguay, and Uruguay have declined to contribute money towards the preliminary surveys, and in that respect may be said not to have accepted the recommendations of the International American Conference.

So that we find only Paraguay and Venezuela have declined to furnish any money or to build a railroad.

Mr. SIMPSON. Here is my point, if the gentleman will allow me. This survey having been made at public expense at a cost of \$60,000, and the fruits of the work belonging to the Government, is there any provision in your bill that when this survey is handed over to any corporation for the purpose of having the road built, this corporation shall pay the Government for this very valuable information? Or is it proposed to give it to the corporation that may build the road?

Mr. MCCREARY. There is no provision in the bill that any company who may build this railroad shall pay back to us the small amount of the cost of the preliminary survey; neither is there in the bill anything requiring those who may build the railroad to pay back to the other republics south of us what they have contributed. For myself I believe that the vast and incalculable benefits that are to be derived by the construction of this railroad are such that we ought not to stop and ask the return of the pittance which we furnish in order to enjoy these great benefits.

Mr. SIMPSON. Why not have the Government, then, build the road at once?

Mr. MCCREARY. I am opposed to the Government building railroads. I want to say to my friend from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], who I suppose is familiar with what the Government has done in this direction in the past—

Mr. SIMPSON. Very well—

Mr. MCCREARY. That Congress spent hundreds and thousands of dollars in order to ascertain the feasibility of building an interoceanic canal at Panama or at Nicaragua. I have here on my desk two reports made by officers who were sent down there by our Government. The object of the United States was simply to determine whether it was feasible to connect the waters of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans in the interest of commerce and trade.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the Government ought to have dug the canal itself.

Mr. MCCREARY. As I have stated, I have always on this floor opposed and spoken against the Government giving any aid to the construction of the Nicaragua or the Panama Canal.

Mr. BUSHNELL. At this time, does anybody doubt the feasibility of building this railroad?

Mr. MCCREARY. I will say to my friend that when this railroad was commenced I had not up to that time met anybody

who knew the project was feasible and practicable. But in modern times our feats of engineering have been so great that men have concluded they could push a railroad almost anywhere; and now, when that work is more than half completed, the belief is growing—it has become almost a certainty—that that road can be built. I am in favor, therefore, of finishing the survey and establishing beyond question the fact that the railroad can be built; that it is feasible.

Mr. BUSHNELL. One object of the survey, as I understand, is that the very best route may be ascertained and selected.

Mr. MCCREARY. I thank my friend for the suggestion. That is one of the great objects. In addition to establishing the practicability of the construction of the road, one important purpose of the survey is to ascertain the best route.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman allow me one question for information?

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Have you any assurance that after the survey is completed, and the practicability of the scheme settled, capital will be forthcoming with which to build this road?

Mr. MCCREARY. None whatever. And when I first came to Congress I had no assurance that capital would be furnished for the completion of a railroad from the Texas border to the City of Mexico. And when I first came here as a boy to visit this House of Representatives, I had no idea that the Baltimore and Ohio system could be pushed through the Allegheny Mountains, or that the Chesapeake and Ohio system could accomplish what has been accomplished.

Mr. BUSHNELL. Or that anybody could cross the Rocky Mountains with a railroad.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is not the question.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. MCCREARY. I yield for one more question; and then I must go on, for I have occupied too much time.

Mr. BUTLER. I know that the character of the gentleman from Kentucky is such that no one will make any misinterpretation of my question; hence I take the liberty of asking whether it is not the fact that such remarks as the gentleman is now making have been used on this floor as the basis for every subsidy and every scheme of governmental aid that has been proposed in this country?

Mr. MCCREARY. No, sir; and if the gentleman had been in Congress at least one term he would not ask the question.

I stood on this floor and advocated the incorporation of the Nicaraguan Canal Company, but is there any member present who will contend that when the bill was passed by Congress that there was any intention of aiding the enterprise with a subsidy? Our country is not illiberal, and while I favor economy in public expenditures, and have always advocated it, and expect always to do so as long as I am in public life, yet I believe there is a time in the affairs of government as well as in the affairs of men, when a dollar properly spent, like bread cast upon the waters, will repay after many days a hundredfold.

It is only a question of fair play, a question of simple justice. Our weaker brethren in the republics south of us should not furnish all of the money for the preliminary survey of this railroad, pour all their wealth into the lap of the United States, and we be unwilling to pay our part of the small amount that will be needed to make this preliminary survey. Putting it on the higher plane of business intelligence, having twice appropriated the sum of \$65,000, thus making \$130,000, and believing, as I do, that one more appropriation of \$65,000 will complete the preliminary survey, I say it is good business now to make this additional appropriation and allow the survey to be finished.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to the paragraph in reference to the Bureau of American Republics. My friend from Georgia spoke of his intention to make a motion to strike out the appropriation for that Bureau. The Bureau of American Republics was authorized by the International American Conference. It was believed with truth that the people of the United States did not know as much about the people of the republics south of us, either as to their customs and manners or their products and industries, as we ought to know; and it was also believed that the people of these kindred republics did not know as much about this great Republic, its industries, products, commerce, and advantages, as they ought to know; and therefore, after careful consideration, the International American Conference recommended that a Bureau of American Republics be established and that an amount of \$36,000 be furnished annually to pay the expenses of the Bureau.

The appropriation was fixed at \$325 to each million of inhabitants, and was so apportioned amongst these republics that each one of the countries was required to pay a certain sum. These countries have seemingly appreciated their opportunities to ascertain important matters with regard to their sister republics and have come forward with great promptness and paid the

amount they were required to pay. I hold in my hand a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Wharton, addressed to me, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, D. C., April 13, 1892.

SIR: In reply to your inquiry, I beg leave to state that Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Haiti, and the Argentine Republic have paid their assessments for the maintenance of the Bureau of American Republics. Haiti has also paid for one year in advance. The Department is advised that the assessments of Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Brazil have been forwarded, but the drafts have not yet been received. It is also advised that provision has been made for the payment of the assessments of Colombia and Paraguay. The President of Santo Domingo, in his message submitted to the Congress of that Republic on the 5th of March last, recommends an appropriation to pay its share in the support of the Bureau, leaving Chile as the only one of the American republics to be heard from.

I have the honor to be, your obedient servant.

WILLIAM F. WHARTON,

Assistant Secretary.

Hon. JAMES B. MCCREARY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask, what is the date of that letter?

Mr. MCCREARY. April 13, 1892.

Mr. HOLMAN. In this report I find a communication from the State Department dated February 23, 1892—

Mr. MCCREARY. Yes, sir; I remembered that statement, and I sent to the Department and got the latest available information.

Mr. HOLMAN. This statement in the report shows that the total amount paid by these different countries for both purposes, for the railway and the Bureau of American Republics, was only \$13,583.

Mr. MCCREARY. Does the gentleman dispute the letter from Assistant Secretary Wharton, written on the 13th of April, 1892?

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; but it is remarkable there should be such a difference between two statements—

Mr. MCCREARY. It is not remarkable when you remember that this Bureau has been lately established, only about a year ago.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, we have already made two different appropriations for it.

Mr. MCCREARY. Two months have elapsed since that first communication was received, and as this Bureau has only been recently organized, the gentleman will see that there is reason for what he calls a discrepancy.

Mr. HOLMAN. We have made appropriations in the past and have paid on this account about \$202,000.

Mr. MCCREARY. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is mistaken. The whole amount provided for is \$36,000 per annum, and after deducting what the other republics have paid the part of the United States, I think, is less than forty thousand dollars.

We have poor mail facilities with the countries south of us, and if the gentleman should write a letter to the Argentine Republic or Colombia or Peru, it would first go to Europe and then go back across the ocean, taking between two and three months to get to its destination. Mail communication is very slow and I am anxious to improve it. But we find that so far as the Bureau of American Republics is concerned all of those countries have contributed the amount required of them except Chile.

Mr. HOLMAN. Just another fact. Chile is reported here as having paid \$3,038.12, and that letter is from the Secretary of State.

Mr. MCCREARY. This is from the Assistant Secretary of State.

I hold in my hand a statement showing the bulletins of the Bureau of American Republics, amounting to 142,500 copies. Some of them you will all recognize. Handbook No. 1 is one of the best books on Central and South America ever published. Handbook No. 2 is a most excellent book. But I will not enumerate them. There have been 142,500 copies of these handbooks and pamphlets which have been issued by that Bureau.

Now, the object of this Bureau, as I said in the beginning, is to educate. It is to inform the people of the western hemisphere of the industries and products and resources and the commercial advantages of all the countries of the western hemisphere.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. As the gentleman has referred to that, let me ask this question: It is admitted that it is for the purpose of educating all these countries, ours included, in all probability. Now, will the gentleman be kind enough to tell me where he gets the authority to appropriate the public money for the purposes of education?

Mr. CULBERSON. To educate Congressmen?

Mr. COX of Tennessee. To educate Congress or to educate anybody else.

Mr. MCCREARY. This Government has repeatedly—

Mr. COX of Tennessee (interrupting). I am not talking about that; I want your views as to our authority.

Mr. MCCREARY. This Government has repeatedly appro-

appropriated money to issue books. My friend [Mr. Cox of Tennessee] voted but a few days ago for a resolution carrying thousands of dollars to issue a book on the diseases of the horse. Congress has also made an appropriation to pay for a book on dairy farming, and many others that I could name. Surely it is not inappropriate for us to make a small appropriation in order that our business people, our progressive people, our merchants, our farmers, our laboring men shall know where the market is.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman—
Mr. McCREARY. I can not yield any more. I must get through. In that connection I desire to say that the amount for the Bureau of American Republics has been reduced in the bill to \$25,000. It was done because a large number of reports, books, etc., have been sent out and it was thought we should prepare for the time when we will stop making appropriations for this Bureau.

I will add at the end of my remarks a list of the books and reports that have been printed and issued by this Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I have already occupied the time of the committee longer than I intended. These are interesting questions; they are questions that are important to us as representatives of the people of the United States. While the appropriation is small there are vast benefits to be derived from it. I hope the members of this House will give careful consideration to appropriations, indorsed by all the members of the committee but one.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, before my friend takes his seat, do I understand him to say that all the members of the committee except myself favor these appropriations?

Mr. McCREARY. I said there was but one who voted against these appropriations in the committee. If there is any record showing that any other member of the committee was opposed to these appropriations the gentleman can refer to it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I simply announced that I would reserve the right to strike them out of the bill.

Mr. McCREARY. I know you did, and I excepted the gentleman from Georgia purposely from my statement.

Mr. BLOUNT. But what I mean is, that I do not like my friend to put the inference before the House that I am the only one of the committee who is not in favor of this appropriation.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know of any other. I never heard of any other.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think you will hear.

Mr. McCREARY. I will say this much, that during the meetings of the committee, during the discussions, and up to this time, I have never met a member of the committee who was opposed to the two provisions of the bill of which I have spoken. Mr. Speaker, I want to do justice to my friend from Georgia. I believe he is perfectly sincere in the position he takes. I think he is in error. I think he is making a mistake. The Committee on Foreign Affairs did not agree with him; and I hope and believe the members of the House of Representatives will not agree with him as regards the two items of the appropriation bill which have been discussed.

APPENDIX.
GREAT BRITAIN.

Salaries and allowances to some of the more important missions and to consulates in the United States.

[From foreign office list, 1892.]

Country or post.	Rank.	Salary.	Rent.	Office allowance.	Total.
Austria	Ambassador	\$40,000	(*)		
France	do	45,000	(*)		
Turkey	do	40,000	(*)		
United States	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	30,000	(*)		
Do	Secretary of legation	3,500			
Do	Two second secretaries, each	2,000			
Do	Two third secretaries, each	1,500			
Mexico	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	15,000	3,000	\$750	\$18,750
Do	Secretary of legation	2,500			
Argentina	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	15,000	2,000		17,000
Brazil	do	20,000	2,500		22,500
Do	Secretary of legation	3,500			
Egypt	Agents and consul-general	25,000	(*)	5,000	30,000
New York	Consul-general	10,000		8,300	18,300
Baltimore	Consul	4,500		2,500	7,000
Boston	do	6,000		1,125	7,125
Charleston	do	4,500		1,500	6,000
Chicago	do	4,500		1,500	6,000
Galveston	do	3,500		1,075	4,575
New Orleans	do	5,500		1,875	7,375
Philadelphia	do	4,500		2,250	6,750
San Francisco	do	6,000		1,200	7,200

*Government property.

FRANCE, 1888.

In the diplomatic service, when on active duty, the salary is invariable, for

each grade, without regard to the post of duty. Expenses of representation, rent, housekeeping, entertainment, carriages, etc., are fixed for each post, and constitute a maximum allowance to be accounted for, and if there be any unexpended surplus, to be refunded. The following shows the allowance to the more important posts:

Country.	Rank.	Salary.	Representation.	Total.
Germany	Ambassador	\$8,000	\$19,800	\$27,800
Do	Secretary*	2,400		
Great Britain	Ambassador†	8,000	31,600	39,600
Russia	do	8,000	41,600	49,600
Argentina	Minister, second class‡	4,800	9,000	13,800
China	Minister, first class§	6,000	12,000	18,000
Mexico	do	6,000	11,000	17,000
Japan	do	6,000	9,800	15,800
United States	do	6,000	9,800	15,800

*With half a dozen lesser secretaries and attachés. A mission is also maintained in Bavaria.

†With two secretaries of embassy and eight secretaries and attachés of lesser grade.

‡Two secretaries of legation.

§Besides a large staff of secretaries, interpreters, etc.

¶An allowance for outfit (installation) is made, amounting to one-third of the envoy's salary.

Allowances to consular officers at principal consulates in the United States of America, 1883.

State.	Place.	Rank.	Allowance.
New York	New York City	Consul-general	\$12,000
South Carolina	Charleston	Consul	4,000
Illinois	Chicago	do	4,000
Louisiana	New Orleans	do	6,000
California	San Francisco	do	8,000
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Vice-consul	2,400
Massachusetts	Boston	Vice-consul	2,400

GERMANY.

Salaries and allowances to several of the more important diplomatic posts and to the German consulates in the United States.

[Taken from the imperial budget, 1884-'85.]

Country or post.	Rank.	Salary.	Rent.	Allowances.	Total.
Belgium	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	\$12,000		\$1,350	
Do	Secretary of legation	2,250			\$15,600
Great Britain	Ambassador	37,500	(*)		
Do	First secretary of embassy	4,350			
Do	Second secretary	1,875			
Do	Chancellor, clerks, etc			5,362	49,087
St. Petersburg	Ambassador	37,500	(*)		
Do	Secretaries and clerks	20,975			58,475
Mexico	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	9,000		1,500	10,500
Colombia	do	9,000		1,500	10,500
United States	do	15,750	(*)	4,200	
Do	Secretary of legation	4,125			
Do	Second secretary	1,875			25,940
New York	Consul-general	12,000		4,000	
Do	Consul	4,500			
Do	Vice-consul	2,700			
Do	Cashier, clerks, etc	5,850			29,050
Chicago	Consul	6,000		1,750	
Do	Vice-consul	2,250			
Do	First secretary	1,250			
Do	Second secretary	1,000			12,250
Cincinnati	Consul	6,000		1,000	
Do	Secretary	1,250			8,250
San Francisco	Consul	7,500		1,837	
Do	Vice-consul	2,250			
Do	Secretary	1,200			12,737
St. Louis	Consul	6,000		1,000	
Do	Secretary	1,250			8,250

*Government property.

SPAIN, 1883.

Allowance to each legation, made up of salary, expenses of representation (entertainment, carriages, service, etc.), official contingencies. The expenses of representation are generally largely in excess of the salaries paid. The following are the allowances to the more important posts:

Country.	Rank.	Salary.	Representation.	Contingencies.	Total.
France	Ambassador	\$4,000	\$16,000	\$1,000	\$21,000
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,300		2,800
Do	Second secretary	1,000	800		1,800
Do	Second secretary, third class.	1,200	1,600		2,800
Do	Attaché	600			600
Russia	Minister plenipotentiary	3,000	13,000	1,000	17,000
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,500		3,000
Do	Second secretary	1,000	1,200		2,200
Great Britain*	Minister plenipotentiary	3,000	12,400	1,000	16,400
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,400		2,900
Do	Second secretary	1,000	1,100		2,100
Do	Third secretary	600	900		1,500

SPAIN, 1888—Continued.

Country.	Rank.	Salary.	Representation.	Contingencies.	Total.
United States	Minister plenipotentiary	\$3,000	\$10,000	\$2,000	\$15,000
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,500		3,000
Do	Second secretary	1,000	1,400		2,400
Do	Third secretary	600	1,400		2,000
Mexico	Minister plenipotentiary	3,000	9,000	2,000	14,000
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,000		2,500
Do	Second secretary, third class.	1,200	1,800		3,000
China	Minister plenipotentiary, second class.	2,500	6,000	1,500	10,000
Do	First secretary	1,500	1,500		3,000
Do	Second secretary, third class.	1,200	2,000		3,200
Do	Interpreter	1,800			1,800
Argentina†	Minister resident	2,000	4,000	1,000	7,000
Do	Second secretary	1,000	1,200		2,200

*Great Britain has since been raised to an embassy, with considerable increase.
 †The allowance to the other South American states is about the same.

MEXICO.

The salaries of ministers vary according to the importance of the mission and the cost of living. No extra allowance is made for the minister's personal expenses of representation (rent, housekeeping, etc.). An allowance for "voyage" (outfit) is made at the beginning of each envoy's service. It is repeated every four years that he remains at the same post. Half this sum is allowed for the home "voyage" on quitting a mission. Contingencies are allowed. A secretary is attached to each legation; in Washington there are six secretaries. The legation building in Washington is owned by the Mexican Government.

Country.	Rank.	Salary.	Voyage.	Contingencies.	Total.
United States	Minister plenipotentiary	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$2,200	\$27,200
Do	First secretary*	4,000	2,000		6,000
Central America	Minister plenipotentiary	10,000	8,000	1,100	19,100
Do	Secretary	3,500	1,750		5,250
Spain	Minister plenipotentiary	15,000	10,000	1,600	26,600
Do	Secretary	3,000	1,500		4,500
Germany	Minister resident	10,000	10,000	900	20,900
Do	Secretary	3,000	1,500		4,500
Italy	Minister resident	10,000	10,000	900	20,900
Do	Secretary	3,000	1,500		4,500
Belgium	Minister resident	10,000	10,000	900	20,900
Do	Secretary	1,500	750		2,250
France	Minister plenipotentiary	15,000	10,000	2,200	27,200
Do	Secretary	4,000	2,000		6,000
Great Britain†	Minister plenipotentiary	15,000	10,000	(?)	25,000
Do	Secretary	4,000	2,000		6,000

*There are also two second secretaries and three third secretaries.
 †Clerks, from one to four in number, are allowed at each legation, with salaries from \$2,500 to \$1,500, a total of about \$9,600.

UNITED STATES.

Some of the highest annual salaries paid to the diplomatic and consular officers.

Countries.	Rank.	Salaries.
Great Britain	Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.	\$17,500
France	do	17,500
Germany	do	17,500
Russia	do	17,500
Mexico	do	17,500
China	do	12,000
Japan	do	12,000
Spain	do	12,000
Austria	do	12,000
Italy	do	12,000
Brazil	do	12,000
Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Salvador, Honduras, one mission.	do	10,000
Colombia and Ecuador, one mission	do	10,000
Belgium	do	7,500

Consul-general at—	Salaries.
London	\$5,000
Paris	5,000
Havana	5,000
Rio de Janeiro	5,000
Liverpool	5,000
Kanagawa	4,000
Panama	4,000

UNITED STATES.

[Furnished by State Department.]

Consular service, 1887:	
Receipts	\$950,690.64
Expenditures	918,973.26
Surplus of receipts	\$31,717.38

Foreign missions, 1887:	
Expenditures	\$405,385.01
Consular service, 1888:	
Receipts	999,172.31
Expenditures	934,983.93
Surplus of receipts	\$64,188.38
Foreign missions, 1888:	
Expenditures	410,104.82
Consular service, 1889:	
Receipts	979,191.60
Expenditures	953,580.37
Surplus of receipts	15,611.23
Foreign missions, 1889:	
Expenditures	454,449.61
Consular service, 1890:	
Receipts	1,039,653.26
Expenditures	1,032,048.08
Surplus of receipts	7,605.18
Foreign missions, 1890:	
Expenditures	453,005.00
Consular service, 1891:	
Expenditures	1,095,160.93
Receipts	978,142.58
Deficit of receipts	117,018.35
Foreign missions, 1891:	
Expenditures	473,330.60

The surplus of receipts for the years 1887, 1888, 1889, and 1890 amounts to \$119,122.17
 The deficit for 1891 amounts to \$117,018.35

Bulletins of the Bureau of the American Republics.

Edi- tion.	No.	Title.	Cost.
10,000	1	Handbook, No. 1	\$3,430.10
10,000	2	Handbook, No. 2	5,389.43
5,000	3	Patent and Trade-Mark Laws of America	177.83
5,000	4	Money, Weights, and Measures	120.38
5,000	5	Import Duties of Mexico	353.56
5,000	6	Foreign Commerce of the American Republics	1,104.16
5,000	7	Handbook to Brazil	2,550.93
5,000	8	Import Duties of Brazil	586.29
5,000	9	Handbook to Mexico	2,651.33
5,000	10	Import Duties of Cuba and Puerto Rico	770.22
2,000	11	Import Duties of Costa Rica	216.40
2,000	12	Import Duties of Santo Domingo	417.66
1,500	13	Commercial Directory of Brazil	84.49
1,500	14	Commercial Directory of Venezuela	67.95
1,500	15	Commercial Directory of Colombia	58.03
1,500	16	Commercial Directory of Peru	50.85
1,500	17	Commercial Directory of Chile	44.01
1,000	18	Commercial Directory of Mexico	140.50
1,000	19	Commercial Directory of Bolivia, Ecuador, etc.	53.57
2,000	20	Import Duties of Nicaragua	196.93
5,000	21	Import Duties of Mexico	605.97
2,000	22	Import Duties of Bolivia (not delivered)	
2,000	23	Import Duties of Salvador	58.14
2,000	24	Import Duties of Honduras	211.23
2,000	25	Import Duties of Ecuador	74.37
2,000	26	Commercial Directory of Argentine Republic	129.40
2,000	27	Import Duties of Colombia	103.92
2,500	28	Commercial Directory of Central America	188.71
2,000	29	Commercial Directory of Haiti and Santo Domingo	47.17
2,500	30	First Annual Report	152.43
5,000	31	Handbook to Costa Rica	1,416.55
2,500	32	Spanish Handbook	2,526.67
5,000	33	Handbook to Guatemala (not delivered)	
5,000	34	Handbook to Colombia (not delivered)	
5,000	35	Handbook to Venezuela (not delivered)	
2,500	36	Breadstuffs in Latin America (not delivered)	
2,000	37	Import Duties of Venezuela (not delivered)	
2,000	38	Import Duties of British Colonies (not delivered)	
1,000	39	Commercial Directory of Cuba and Puerto Rico (not delivered)	
2,000	40	Commercial Directory of British, Danish, Dutch, and French Colonies (not delivered)	
3,000	41	Mines and Mining Laws of America (not delivered)	
2,000	42	Commercial Information (not delivered)	
2,000	43	Directory of Newspapers in Latin America (not delivered)	
2,000	44	Import Duties of Guatemala (not delivered)	
2,000	45	Import Duties of the United States, English and Spanish (not delivered)	
142,500			

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, before this general debate closes I will make a few practical observations upon the bill, strictly upon the bill itself, and chiefly in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], chairman of the committee, and as to the special provisions in which this appropriation bill depart from the existing law providing for the consular and diplomatic service. He stated that these changes were made in obedience to the sentiment—to the "mandate," I think was his word—which controls the majority in the House. Retrenchment, reduction of expenditures, or of appropriations, is required. That gentleman is an experienced member of the House, a man of personal ability, and in these changes he undoubtedly did the best that an able man could do in discharging a new task.

If on examination these changes plainly appear to be injurious to the public interest, it will strikingly prove how moderate in extent and modest in payment our foreign service is to-day. To arbitrarily change a branch of the public service, to reduce it 25 per cent, 20, or even 10 per cent, without doing harm, is a hard task. It has been attempted before. This annual bill was prepared and reported by my honorable friend from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] when he was chairman in a former Congress, and he examined the service with great strictness and scrutinized it with a severe eye in all its parts. He found, after very intelligent study, that he could not reduce the service and the compensation without detriment to trade, to revenue, and to our interests everywhere. The bill then passed is substantially the present law. It is difficult to make retrenchment in a service which is already inadequate. It is very difficult to reduce the cost of a service which is already too meagerly paid. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has here tried it.

The gentleman spoke of the large reduction, amounting in all to \$25,000, made in the diplomatic service. It is done in a very simple way, by cutting down, consolidating, and suppressing missions. Why? On what rule? There is little explanation given in the remarks of the gentleman, and none in the report. He reduces the salaries of the consular service. Why? and how? By what rule? There is little information on this in the report, or in his remarks, except his observation that the consular posts were to be measured by the consular fees in their importance and value, by the amount of fees collected at each. There is a fee of \$2.50 collected by the consul and sent to the Treasury on every invoice of goods sent to the United States from that place. That is his test. I can easily show how deceptive and illusory it is.

Where are his economies? Four or five missions are cut off. The five largest consulates are reduced each \$1,000. Forty-three are cut off \$500 each—all alike. A very simple method of retrenchment. No great knowledge of this complex service is required for such reform—only to know enough arithmetic to do a sum in subtraction. Twelve of them are reduced \$500, from \$1,500 to \$1,000; ten consulates are cut off altogether from salary and left to the fees, in some cases less than a hundred dollars; so that all this part of the service will have to be filled by foreigners, as no American will go out for them. The gentleman regretted that he could not go further, and thought that a more perfect bill would sweep away the larger part of the diplomatic service and consolidate the missions to the great powers, sending one minister who could journey about Europe from capital to capital as questions arose.

I listened to that remark from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with some surprise.

Ministers are the necessary and regular channels of communication between governments. Their powers and duties are fixed by the long-existing general assent forming the law of nations. No better scheme has yet been discovered for the dispatch of international affairs.

There is—

Says Wheaton—

no legal obligation to send or to receive public ministers, but international assent to the system for a long period of time has given to the custom the force of an obligation upon all civilized powers, and it can not be abandoned without the assent of nations.

The abrupt withdrawal of a minister and discontinuance of a mission without cause is an expression of diminished regard that is close upon an affront. The same is true in a less degree of the lowering in grade and pay of a minister accredited to a friendly country. It should be done with care, with regard to the past and the future. How is it done here?

The gentleman who has just spoken cited some of the ancient precedents, awakened the memories of honors achieved in the past, and the principles that had guided our foreign policy which were the special property of the Democratic party. Let me recall one of them. He invoked the great name of Monroe and the Monroe doctrine. How is it applied here? The first step in this bill is to cut down the mission at Venezuela at this momentous hour for that unhappy republic, when a great European power, England, taking advantage of her weakness and dissensions, has seized upon a portion of Venezuela larger than the State of Pennsylvania. Yes, at this very time, in defiance of the Monroe doctrine, a European monarchy is colonizing a wide, rich, valuable region on the American continent, wresting it from our sister republic and converting it from republican to monarchical government. Instead of sympathy or even respect for the despoiled republic, we show our cold contempt for her falling power by lowering the mission, but keep on making speeches about the Monroe doctrine and retrenchment!

The reduction of a diplomatic post, I repeat, is invariably regarded by the Government to whom the minister is accredited as an expression of want of esteem. The discontinuance of a minister is very nearly a mark of open unfriendliness. Gentle-

men have noticed in the newspapers within a few days a proposition made in the Chilean Congress to discontinue their minister here; and it was instantly answered that this would be an insult to the United States, and that whatever might be the feeling prevailing among the Chilean people, it ought not to be done by the Government. The members of that Congress know full as well as the learned chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the meaning of every act of international intercourse, as long since established by the usages fixing the relations of nations. The Venezuelans in their great trouble know it too and will judge us by it.

The gentleman made some criticisms touching the uselessness of ministers abroad, of whom we hear so little in achievements, such as he would deem great or useful. Let me suggest to the honorable gentlemen around me, who are public men, familiar with public business, that it is not in sensational paragraphs, not in the clamor of the newspapers, not the public anxiety that comes with the disturbance of the relations between peoples that you find most frequent or convincing evidence of the ability of a diplomatic officer. It is his task to prudently secure the peaceful flow of their relations, to watch, and promptly, quietly adjust each rising cause of trouble. There is the test of vigilance and skill. The continued peace and repose of nations is the daily triumph of wise, watchful ministers and statesmen. That story of most useful and honorable effort is often a story of each difficulty met as it rises, met in advance, and closed.

The gentleman thought it a subject of amusement to speak of the minister at Berlin as having done nothing better than negotiate an extradition treaty and remove the pork prohibition. That minister was long a distinguished member of this House. It is possible that some local influence—

Mr. STORER. I hope we shall have order. It is almost impossible on this side to hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. It is complained that the gentleman can not be heard.

Mr. HITT. It is possible, Mr. Chairman, that we are all of us affected in our opinions of the importance of events and measures by their importance to our own localities. There are many gentlemen here who would think it a matter of great importance to remove an absolute prohibition of the introduction of cotton into England. It has been for years a question of importance to several great States in this country to remove the absolute barrier that has long existed in some great European countries to the introduction of American pork; a commerce that sent from this country over \$100,000,000 worth of pork in a single year before the prohibition.

That question may be trivial and mirthful to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT], but it concerns the comfort, welfare, and prosperity of many thousands of our farmers, of many millions of our people; and a minister who has succeeded, like Mr. Phelps in Germany and Mr. Reid in France, in removing that costly obstacle has performed for his country a valuable and, I think, a most honorable service.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unaware of the fact that I am speaking of a body of public servants who are not popular. They are believed to wear good clothes and often meet people with titles. They have been the favorite subjects of a certain cheap form of wit in the debate upon this bill in times past. I have not heard as much of it as usual to-day.

The State Department is usually included in this pleasantry. The gentleman [Mr. BLOUNT] referred to the "mystery" that hangs around that Department. My impression is that the chief part of the mystery that hangs about information on subjects connected with that Department comes from the fact that we are ignorant of, because of our want of interest in it and distaste for it, and so we do not take the trouble to read the voluminous reports that are accessible to all. They are not interesting because the subjects and the men do not concern our districts. A postmaster is a great deal more important in certain contingencies than a far away consul or minister. [Laughter.] It is easy to attack or ridicule him, or be economical at his expense, and it is safe for election purposes.

The consolidation of missions was thought to be a good method of economy by the gentleman who framed this bill. I have little to say on that subject except this—there must be somewhere a seat for each mission, even an itinerant peregrinating minister, a place for the archives and a residence for the minister and his family. They can not be always on the road. The gentleman has united in this bill missions to countries that in some places lie contiguous, but not conveniently so. For example, he has united Ecuador and Colombia. The minister must of course reside at one place or the other, and if he has a residence in one place he must visit the other; and he certainly ought to go at least once a year. Now, as a bird flies the distance from the capital of Colombia, Bogota to Quito, the capital of Ecuador, is perhaps not more than 500 miles. But no human being ever

made the journey by that route. No bird can traverse it. It would be through and over a tumbling mass of the loftiest and most impassable mountains upon the American continent. In making his journey the minister must start from Bogota upon a mule, and, after descending the mountains to the headwaters of the Magdalena, he must descend it for many hundred miles by boat until he reaches Sabanilla. There he must take an ocean steamer to Colon. Then he must take a railway to the Pacific coast.

From there he must take another steamer until he reaches Guayaquil. Then he must equip himself again for a mountain ride into the interior of many days in length. This series of journeys ordinarily requires about eighty days. I know of no instance in the reports where anyone has made that route in less than sixty days, and it is highly probable that it would take the minister ninety days, and he could not take his family with him without great difficulty and exorbitant outlay. Then to return would take as long. Why, Mr. Chairman, you could leave the chair where you now sit, go clear around the world and come back here before that minister could leave one of the capitals to which he is accredited and reach the other. [Laughter.] That illustrates the convenient manner in which these missions have been consolidated.

When that minister turned back and reached his regular post where he had left his family, at the place of his residence, half the year would have gone by—certainly that much time would have elapsed if he had made any stay at his other post. We would, therefore, be really accrediting him to be upon the road the larger part of the year, but not a dollar is provided in the bill for such long and expensive journeys. His dispatches would be for the most part souvenirs of travel. [Laughter.]

There are in the bill other cases of consolidation made with a singular disregard of the actual condition of affairs. What is a minister sent abroad for? He is sent to watch and to wait. In an hour his best and highest services may be required and may be of transcendent importance on a question that might involve to us an expenditure of trouble, of blood, or of money in international conflict, far surpassing all the little cost that is provided for in this whole bill. Every one can recall such crises suddenly arising.

Take the Central American missions. Those five little Central American states have been divided in their ambitions and struggles for the last twenty-five years. The two on the north, Guatemala and Honduras, have always been together in their aims and purposes, and the other three, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Salvador, have likewise been associated together against them.

In the last Congress our committee very wisely provided that we should send a minister to the two states on the north and another to the three on the south, thus, for economy, consolidating three friendly states in the one case and two in the other. But this bill, by an ingenuity that is difficult to explain, takes Honduras from beside its old friend, Guatemala, and unites it with states which it most cordially dislikes, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Salvador. Again I ask, what is a minister sent for? His duty is to make himself acceptable, to become acquainted with public men, to do and to say nothing to make himself disagreeable to the powers where he is, for he is there to secure every possible advantage for us. Now, any expression or action on the part of our minister showing cordiality towards Honduras will tend to destroy his influence and usefulness in the other states. Any evidence that he has shown a warm interest in public men when he was at one capital will make him unwelcome in the other when he returns.

Again, across the water there is a case of economy by consolidation provided in this bill. Denmark is united to Sweden and Norway; in other words, the mission to Denmark is abolished, for that will be the result of it. In this country are many Danes who have come here as immigrants, and many of them after becoming American citizens return to visit their old homes and relatives. Questions of their personal rights are constantly arising among those, and we should have a minister there. The other day there occurred an event to which the honorable chairman of the committee referred, the passage of a bill through the Danish Parliament appropriating 250,000 crowns for an exhibit and representation at our great international fair at Chicago. After it had passed both Houses the telegraphic news to the London papers and to the press of Europe gave them word that this bill had been reported abolishing the mission to Denmark.

Now, that is not a mere incident concerning us only; it is an act so far from friendly, an expression of want of esteem so marked, that no monarchical government will pass it by. The Executive took notice of it. The honorable gentleman from Georgia spoke of some communication to him about this from the American minister. I know nothing of that. But another minister called

attention to it. The minister I refer to is the Danish minister to Washington, Count de Sponneck. He stated, not in the least tone or spirit of threat, but simply as the communication of a fact, that this expressive action from a government that heretofore has been friendly, coming at this moment, would probably cause his Government to pause long before any further action was taken upon the project of sending the large and costly Danish exhibit to the United States. It is but natural. We would resent such a thing most promptly. Were the English Government to reduce its envoy here in grade to a mere minister resident, every newspaper in the United States would promptly utter the public resentment at an insulting implication that the United States was not a great power and of little consequence among nations. Denmark is a country of diminished territory—with an ancient and glorious history of which she is justly proud; and to select her as a mark of diminished regard on our part is not wise. Denmark was the second country in Europe to rescind the prohibition on American pork and her action had a wide influence. But that is the line taken here for retrenchment. I think it most unfortunate and inopportune.

Without going over further details of this part of the bill, I pass now to the consular system. My friend from Georgia said something of its history, its extent, and its utility. Let me recall another thing to your attention; it is like the postal service; it does not cost the people anything from the Treasury or in taxes, for, by the fees collected through the consuls, it puts back into the Treasury all that Congress votes out for the support of the service and a great deal more. Until the passage of the Dingley bill a few years ago, affecting the fees which had been received in the matter of shipping seamen, there was a large surplus, to diminish which that bill was very properly enacted.

This service is the one selected as the special mark for this ill-advised retrenchment. The gentleman said in his report, and the substance of it was in his speech—I noted his remark, for I am careful not to do him injustice—

As the offices increase in importance they become of greater value, requiring men of more ability, to obtain whom we must offer higher compensation.

Carrying out that idea, he selected the five largest offices in the whole service and reduced the compensation of each \$1,000! These are London, Liverpool, Paris, Havana, and Rio Janeiro.

The honorable chairman said in various forms of expression, put with more force than I can repeat, that the importance of the office was indicated by the fees registered. He has been much engrossed with other and great duties in this House, else it would not have escaped his attention (for there is nothing else that would have kept him from informing himself of it) that the collection of fees is the last duty of the consul, not the first.

A consular system was organized all over the world five hundred years before there was any such duty assigned to consuls as the collection of fees for invoices—centuries before invoices were ever heard of. Their primary duty is to protect their countrymen. Men are more important than dollars. Our consuls are the shield of the American citizen wherever he goes all round the world. We have a revenue system peculiar to ourselves by which the great part of the Government income is from import duties, and under it the consular officers in verifying the invoices of goods sent to this country become the sentinels of the Treasury. It is a very important function, and the amount of the fees returned does in many cases indicate to a certain extent the volume of business passing through the office, as each invoice pays a fee of \$2.50.

But I know from my own experience in the Department of State and from observation at the posts I have seen, that this is one of the most imperfect indices of the importance of a post. The gentleman selected the whole body of the consuls in China for reduction—every one of them. For what reason? Manifestly because the fees opposite the names of the consulates were not great in amount. My attention was drawn to this matter a long time ago when I was an officer of the State Department; and with the view of cutting down some of the salaries, I had an inquiry made as to the cost of living, the difficulty of transit, and the amount of business, etc., and I was satisfied that they were not too high.

Look at these fees. They are very trivial in amount—why? An invoice in the China trade which yields a fee of \$2.50 may cover \$120,000 worth of goods—a whole cargo. Amoy makes a very small figure in the list of fees—only \$1,028. The imports from Amoy amounted, however, during the last year to the vast sum of \$5,103,817. An invoice in a German or French port may represent \$25 or \$50 worth of goods.

Consulates in Cuba are also selected for this retrenchment. For example, a reduction is proposed at Cardenas. The fees at Cardenas during the last year were \$447.50. But do those figures inform you of the business of that consulate—the volume and importance of its work?

I will not weary the House with details on this matter, but let

me give this illustration: The consul at Cardenas last year had to look after 139 American vessels arriving, with 2,234 seamen, and 124 vessels departing, with 2,213 seamen. This implies an immense labor, custody, and certification of the ships' papers, shipment and discharge of seamen, hunting up deserters, disposition of effects of seamen deceased, settling disputes among crews, etc. in value to \$332,000—nearly all dutiable goods. The officer who The invoices, though there were only about 180 of them, amounted does all this is to live with his family in that pestilential Cuban coast on \$1,000 a year.

When there pass through a consul's hands goods subject to a very high duty, such as those leaving the port of Havre or Lyons, France, the consul must be most vigilant, because the merchant has every interest in giving a low value in order to escape the high duty here. The duty on those French goods averages 60 per cent or more, they being nearly all luxuries, upon which even our Democratic friends have always joined in levying a high tariff.

Now, a consul at such a port should be a man above any improper influence. He is obliged to employ experts; the State Department is obliged sometimes to make him allowances of money in order that he may employ a man who will disclose the true value of the goods. Do not be surprised when I say that he can not find the value of the goods by simply looking over the price lists. They often have no relation to current prices at all. Why, there are towns in Germany and in France where there are large manufacturing establishments which make their goods for the United States market alone. They have no quoted price lists whatever, and you can not discover their value except by having an expert to examine them upon the ground, who knows the cost of the material, the value of the labor, and the value of the capital invested; and that is one of the duties of the consuls all the time, to watch just such establishments.

The duties of consuls are very complex and depend upon location largely, so that you can tell nothing whatever of them by reading the provision of the law in reference to them, or the list of officers and the fees returned by each. Now, here is Gaspé Basin, where we have a consul, far on the northeast, and one at Port Stanley, Falkland Islands, a place which it would cost a year's salary to reach, in a dreary, inhospitable place, almost a prison. The consul there gets \$1,000. Here are a dozen places in this list, remote and scarcely known, ports frequented by our ships, where seamen are relieved, where great multitudes of our poor sailors go. Gaspé Basin is a dreary place, far away up to the north, the farthest point towards Labrador. We have our consul there, and he is always complaining and trying to get transferred to some place where a human being can find some share in the joys of living.

In this reform of the service, which is a curious reform, are ten of these officers, who receive now only \$1,000, and who are cut off from all salary and reduced to the fees they may collect. Will you bethink yourselves one moment, gentlemen, of the consequences? What will be the result of this action? There is not an American citizen who will hold one of these consular offices after this bill goes into effect. All of your consular appointments of that class will go to foreigners, and under such circumstances they generally go to a merchant; some intelligent merchant, if he can be found, who is interested, however, against us, whose allegiance is to another government, and he interested perhaps in a Manchester house.

Here is a long list of consuls that are reduced from fifteen hundred to twelve hundred dollars, which I will not take up the time of the committee to read. Shall I suggest to you one of the consequences of that change? When a consul is paid but \$1,000 (and it is known that he cannot live on that meager salary) he is allowed by our law to trade. Any officer receiving that salary can trade. In what? Why, he will trade in the things that are wanted.

Suppose he is at some port where our poor sailors go for relief; then he will trade in sailors' supplies, and the more he is tempted to plunder these poor creatures the more it will add to his compensation. Every dollar he makes beyond his salary is of course clear gain to him. Worse than that, if there could be anything worse than the wrong done to the seamen, who are our fellow citizens, he is, we will suppose, in a particular line of trade. This is the man also who inspects the invoices and verifies them, and with others inspects his own. He is a foreigner and a merchant, for you can not get an American to take the appointment. He inspects his own invoices; he is the policeman of the Government appointed to watch himself. He is our sentinel put there to protect the Treasury from fraud, and he is himself the man to be watched.

Added to this is the fact that every other merchant in the place is forced to bring his invoices to him and submit them and all the secrets of his business to a rival. We put an official spy there, and compel every other merchant to put his business

under his rival's eye. And remember, he is a man not subject to our laws; he has no affection nor respect for this Government; he owes his allegiance elsewhere, and is possibly interested with some other establishment engaged in business in England, France, or Germany. In some of these places the amount of the importations is large, and the loss to the Treasury in some cases will certainly be high. I could give you many facts, but I will not weary the House by going into these matters in detail. The loss to the Treasury from such unfortunate changes has in all cases heretofore been great, and the economy proposed in this case is \$500.

I am reluctant, Mr. Chairman, to hold the House longer upon these particulars, which I know have such limited interest to gentlemen; the subject is so far away, so remote from our lives here. But let me speak for a moment of the classes that seem to be in the eye of the honorable gentleman who drew the bill. He spoke of useless consulates and he made a reference during his remarks, which I thought a most unfortunate one, to Athens as an example of a useless consulate, where the fees, he said, were only \$5.40, and which had been properly reduced because of its want of importance. Incidentally I may remark that there was a slight error in his statement of the fees, for there is a town—Piræus—which is really a suburb of Athens, in sight of it, and is the port of the town, quite easy of access—I have walked there myself for a morning walk—and at this town over \$200 were collected from fees. But it is but a small part of the duty to collect fees at that point.

Athens has another sort of value as a consulate; it is the convergent point of travel in the East, and Americans land there, sometimes 80 or 100 in a day. They are an estimable class of people. They are not nonresident Americans, but they are serious people, upon the most enlightened purpose that a man can pursue. That country is one of primitive civilization largely, and there is more often occasion for inquiry, for advice, for protection, than in a country like France or England—twenty times oftener. The gentleman now consul there is, I understand, an able man, an accomplished scholar. I have seen repeated commendation of him. He is, I believe, a distinguished gentleman from Iowa who was induced to take that place because of reasons that are known to himself—probably because his thoughtful mind clothed it in the light of great historic events and associations.

I have heard members of the House who have been there speak of his ability and efficiency in cases where he had well performed that duty to his countrymen which is the primary purpose in the appointment of consuls. Now, his pay is not very great. It is so meager that he has not been able to leave his post during the long burning heats of the summer. He is marked in this bill for a reduction of \$500. Reference has been made here to the need of a minister to Greece. The mission to Roumania, Servia, and Greece is one of the peregrinating missions, and the minister only goes there for a few weeks or months when the weather makes it permissible; but this consul is the one who does continuous work; he stays there through the whole year.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does not the minister now make his residence at Athens?

Mr. HITT. I am not able to state whether he does or not.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is my information.

Mr. HITT. I know from a letter which was handed to me to-day, from a resident, that he is not there the greater part of the year.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think the gentleman will find that he resides there now. Excuse the interruption.

Mr. HITT. Certainly. I am glad to be corrected in any particular. The minister has three capitals or courts which he is required to attend, and he is on the march a good deal of the time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I think his residence is at Athens.

Mr. HITT. You mean he has a house there?

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HITT. Reference has been made here to St. Helena. St. Helena is not a place of large manufactures, and there is no great return of fees, but it is a place where many a poor sailor comes, where many a ship stops. The disputes of these sailors, their discharge, their protection, the settling of their affairs and the remitting of their effects when they are dead, the custody and certification of ships' papers, all these things fall upon this meagerly paid consul on this lonely, dreary island. If you wanted to find the most important of all the consulates, and followed the chairman's rule of judging by fees, you would go to the large European cities, to these German manufacturing towns where invoices cover small amounts and the fees are so great. But the Department knows better, and they are given very moderate salaries, and very properly so.

What is the moral of all this? It is that not even as skillful a

gentleman as the honorable gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] can sit down without preparation, and touch this service, which is so many sided, which involves so many duties, which has been built up so slowly, can not touch it with a knife to cut away without bringing blood. He must be familiar with the service or he will mar all he touches. The recommendations of a Democratic Secretary of State are the same as the recommendations of a Republican, when he is in that Department. Mr. Bayard's estimates are substantially the same as those that were cited by the gentleman from Georgia as a matter of reproach.

When you are familiar with each post, when you have studied their interests, when you have seen their duties, when you have watched the services of the man, you can learn where there should be diminution and where there should be increase, but you can not tell it from a list. I think that this cutting down, especially these poor, humble officers, is inadvisable. I care not so much for their personal welfare. We are all too patriotic to care anything about the personal welfare of officeholders. That does not concern us. We will be patriotic whatever it costs them [laughter]. But the service is of great public importance. We are making it inefficient for its true purpose. This will put a long list of foreigners in office in place of Americans. It will place foreigners in every one of these posts where they are to be paid the small amount of fees. In all the consular offices in Greece there is to-day but one American, the man marked by this bill for diminution of pay. The rest of them are Greeks and Britons. You can not get anybody else to take the smaller offices.

I fear the House is weary with the discussion of particulars. I have only desired to indicate as briefly as I can practically the objections which arise in my mind, and which I think each of you gentlemen of the House will at once see and appreciate. No matter what our party, we are all Americans. This service is our service. It does not concern one part of our country, and we would alike agree, I am sure, if we were executive officers, in preserving the efficiency of the service, in keeping it up at least to its present status. Every Secretary has recommended its enlargement as the country and its commerce, and the movements of our countrymen have enlarged. In the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] reference was made, both by him and his questioners, to the rapid enlargement of commerce of the South and elsewhere.

Right there is the function of the consul, though it is often ignorantly exaggerated. A consul can not make people trade. A consul does not lead people to embark in any particular enterprises; but if he is a practical, active, vigilant man, and intelligently attends to his duty, he will send valuable practical information home to be given to our people who may desire to be put in communication with those with whom they can profitably trade. I think that any one who will read the consular reports will be readily convinced of the intelligence and ability of these officers: there you will see the value of intelligence in such an office. When you lower the pay of the office you cheapen the man. You can not get as able, intelligent, and vigilant a man for \$1,000 or \$1,500 as you can for \$2,000 or \$3,000.

Mr. LYNCH. Are there any fees connected with these offices, the salaries of which are reduced by this bill?

Mr. HITT. You mean fees that go to them personally? Of the fees received by the consuls in these salaried offices that are reduced, not a dollar is received by them. I will state for the information of the gentleman who honors me with his attention, that fees and feed offices are frequently referred to in the newspapers as a kind of a gold mine.

There are, in fact, four or five great offices in the consular service, where, owing to the number of American citizens traveling and sojourning there, who have occasion for personal service, the consul is employed for their private business, especially drawing papers; and when he performs that duty, which is wholly voluntary and not official, they pay him for it. And if a lawyer were next door to the consul he might get that business. Nearly every American who is long in a foreign country may need some legal services, and preferring some one on whom he can rely, he goes generally to our consul, as a reasonable and respectable man of intelligence. If the gentleman who asks the question were abroad and were extremely ill he would probably ask the consul to draw his will, not a French nor Spanish lawyer.

Then if the consul gave you his time and trouble he will be paid for it. In the great consulates of London and Paris, and in some degree at two or three other posts, there is much of this business, wills, deeds, power of attorney, etc. In most consulates there are none to speak of. The notarial fees are not large in amount, except in two. They are all reported to the State Department. Besides these, official fees are collected in all consulates and sent to the Treasury.

Mr. LYNCH. Is there any official fee?

Mr. HITT. For the consul? When the consul has no salary

at all he keeps all the official fees. They are at posts where the fees are small in amount.

Mr. LYNCH. Are there not fees in connection with the salary?

Mr. HITT. When a consul is not salaried he is allowed the fees, retaining them up to a certain point; but he can not keep them beyond \$2,500.

Mr. LYNCH. Is he not allowed fees outside of his salary?

Mr. HITT. Nothing whatever if he is salaried. He must get on with the salary. A man who is appointed consul at Ceylon under this bill would receive \$1,000; but see what it would cost him to take his family and himself, perhaps from Kansas to Ceylon; and if he were to be removed soon you can estimate what this man, who would only receive a thousand dollars a year, would make after paying the cost of going and returning were he to escape death from pestilence or accident in going to the Antipodes and returning.

Some of these officers selected for reduction are at places where the pay is apparently large. There is Colon, for instance: It is a detestable town on the Isthmus of Darien. Eight consuls have perished there of yellow fever within the past twenty-five years. One just died and his successor was appointed to-day. The consul at Colon gets \$3,000 a year; but it is a very costly place to live, and a post of actual personal danger. Now, that man has to keep a kind of post-office. He has to get up at midnight so as to be able to meet the steamer. He has to distribute the mails for the Pacific coast. It is also a naval station, and he is in some degree a dispatch agency. He is placed where there are multitudes of sailors coming and going, and if a sailor is in trouble the consul is the man who has to look after him. You can not tell what the duties of a consulate are unless you inquire specially as to the facts of the post, its situation, its cost of living, etc.

The mission to Venezuela has been selected for reduction. Now, the place where the minister has to live is Caracas. That is said to be the most expensive place of residence on the American continent. Everything has to be carried by animals up a long ascent. It is a place where everything almost that is necessary to civilized man, and to Americans, has to be bought at large cost. The capital is at Caracas. The minister has to appear decently dressed, not necessarily in finery for balls and court ceremonies and in all the splendor that the gentleman from Georgia described, but he has to dress and bear himself just as the gentleman from Georgia does as we see him in his daily walk, and he could not do that with a family on \$5,000 a year in Caracas.

I do not know that my remarks can convince anyone present of the propriety of changing the bill back to the terms of the present statute, which received the approval of the committee last year; that statute which, in nearly all its parts, came from the skillful hand or received the imprimatur of the veteran from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY], who sits behind me. If you gentlemen are constrained, by some "mandate" given out and enacted I know not where, to cut down the service—to make an economy of 20 or 25 per cent—I do not suppose that anything I can say will change the result.

But, knowing the character of the gentlemen in this House, that their titles are not given to them in satire, but that they are "honorable" men, I have made this short appeal to them on behalf of a body of men scattered around the world, with whom I was at one time in some degree associated, as I was the executive officer of the Department of State, and was thus led to know of their wants, their business, their sorrows resulting from residence abroad, amid trying duties, with meager pay, far from friends or support.

Take China, with the apparently good salaries. I have known cases where men have gone there with families, induced, probably, by the apparently large salaries, to meet nothing but a life of continuous struggle, effort, and final failure. Perhaps this reduction of the pay of the service in China may be followed by a still greater reduction, for we passed through this House the other day a bill which, if it should become a law, would save the whole cost of all the consuls in China as well as the mission, as they would all have to be immediately abandoned.

But we are practical men—all of us—Democrats and Republicans. We want to have an efficient service. There is something else to do beside making a political record of economy, hoping that our action will be changed in the Senate and that the service will be saved unimpaired. There is not one of the gentlemen whom I look upon who does not want to see our commerce promoted, our revenues protected, and, more than that, far more, that the American citizens everywhere shall be protected and cared for by officers of this Government, who are upright, who are intelligent, who are fit representatives of the United States. They are to care for our greatest and most precious treasure, the rights of the American citizen.

Why, sir, Mr. Pendleton, who has been mentioned to-day, as an American minister worthy of all credit, tried hard to have a bill passed through the Senate that would stop the practice of appointing foreigners as American consuls, but have salaried Americans everywhere, as no American should be compelled to seek protection from a foreigner clothed by our Government with authority as its representative, yet himself owing allegiance to some King. Mr. Frelinghuysen, as fair a gentleman as ever presided over the State Department, sent a document to Congress recommending a still broader measure, upon the ground that the highest interest of this Government was to protect its citizens. Believe me, it pays, gentlemen. It is not mere sentiment. The British do it, and they are a wise people.

A British consul and eleven men were insulted, maltreated, and imprisoned by a barbarous king, who defied Great Britain. Swiftly her armed men from the four corners of the earth penetrated to his capital fastness far in the interior of Africa, burned his city, stormed the fortress, slew him in his palace—all to rescue that little handful of Englishmen. The prestige of that honorable action by a proud and powerful people gave to all the hundreds of millions throughout the vast Orient the memorable, terrible lesson that no spot was so remote where Englishmen were insulted and stricken down but unrelenting vengeance would come, cost what it might, though it be armies and fleets and hundreds of millions of treasure.

I believe in a service that will, as far as possible, within the bounds of that economy ever characteristic of this House, maintain everywhere fit representatives for the protection of Americans who journey in other lands, the men who press aggressively the outward boundaries of our commerce, extending everywhere our trade. We want a consular service which they can rely upon and find ever ready to protect them promptly and efficiently, a service that will practically guard the interests of the Treasury, a service that will care for our shipping interests and protect our seamen, a service that will be to us in the future, as in the past, efficient, but I hope a great deal more extended, as every Secretary has recommended for thirty years; and I would be glad if this House, instead of cutting down and mutilating that service, would provide for it more liberally, with that care and diligence due to economy, but at the same time worthy of the spirit of Congress legislating for this great nation. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Chairman, during his very able and very happy speech the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] alluded to the appropriation for China, and as to what our probable relations with that empire will be. Unquestionably that is a matter of importance. We are making appropriations in this bill to defray the expenses of our legations; and it is a proper time to consider of what use our legation will be in that country. I do not propose in what I say to-day to indulge in any cheap abuse of the Chinese people. I shall admit the ingenuity, the learning, and the ability of great masses of them. I shall admit, too, their right to be treated in international law with fairness and with entire justice. And yet, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter which concerns us very much to know whether we are standing upon safe ground with that empire.

When gentlemen invoke the faith of treaties here my heart and my understanding alike respond promptly and fully to the appeal. The faith, however, which belongs to treaties is not a mere sentimental one. There is very little which concerns the government of men, or at least the relations of one nation to another, which is, or safely can be, of a sentimental character. To observe a treaty simply because it is a treaty, to do certain things under it simply because it is provided that certain things may be done or shall be done, is not in the broad light of modern civilization sufficient to satisfy the understanding of intelligent men. We may at least ask by what authority was the treaty made? Was it *ultra vires* as to the officers making it?

In our position as a constitutional government questions of a most delicate and serious nature arise in regard to the treaty-making power. Questions, too, which are common to us with all civilized men, force themselves upon us for consideration. The treaty-making power in this country is subject to the Constitution exactly as any other power known to the Government. This is no new doctrine upon my part. It has been affirmed by the most distinguished of our Secretaries of State, by others of our renowned statesmen, and by the Supreme Court of the United States itself. And the idea that, because the Constitution prescribes that a treaty is the supreme law of the land, it therefore overrides institutions and statutes is not well-founded.

The slightest investigation of the subject must at once lead anyone to say that like all other powers under our Government, the treaty-making power is restricted by its collocation with other powers. Does anybody dream that the Senate and the President in making a treaty could give a monopoly of any branch of trade

to the subjects of any nation within this country, or that by a treaty a direct appropriation could be made out of the Treasury? Would it be for an instant contended that under the guise of the treaty-making power taxes might be imposed upon the country and tariffs laid?

Will anybody contend that under the guise of the treaty-making power a uniform system of naturalization might be established through the length and breadth of the land? Why, Mr. Chairman, this power, like all other powers of the Government, is limited and restricted, subservient to the general scope of the Constitution and to the division of powers between the coordinate branches of the Government. Congress alone may regulate commerce; Congress alone has the power to tax; Congress alone may prescribe a uniform rule of naturalization. In these matters the Congress—not the President and the Senate, but the Congress—is the constitutional power; and the President and the Senate can not be permitted, and are not permitted under the Constitution, to do that which might virtually change the form of your Government and ignore the power of the lawmaking body of this country.

Need I dwell upon this? Does it require amplification? Does it need citations of precedents? Have we learned the lesson of constitutional liberty to so little purpose that elaborate argument is necessary to establish that proposition? So, then, Mr. Chairman, treaties must be within the Constitution. If they go beyond that, they are not binding upon the honor, upon the consciences, or upon the action of this people.

Take the treaty with China. We are told that we have certain obligations toward that empire. I admit it. We are told, however, in effect that those obligations are perpetual, because by the terms of the treaty and of all the treaties (three or four in number) which we have with that power, no limit is fixed to their duration.

In many of our treaties it is provided that they shall cease within ten or twelve years, or some other defined period, after notice is given by one of the powers of its abrogation. In a case of that kind there is strength—not conclusive force but strength—in an argument that you must abide by the treaty at least until it expires by its own terms. But here is a treaty specifying no limitation as to time. Is this binding for this generation, and for all generations, upon the American people? Is this treaty a mortgage and a burden upon our industry and our prosperity forever?

Will any one say that such a treaty can not be abrogated? Is that good sense, or is it not the patent, the logical, the proper construction of an instrument of this character that it is practically and entirely an agreement at the will of the parties to it, and that either or both, in this instance as in other instances of contracts at will familiar to the law, may abrogate it. Why shall they not? Why shall not a treaty of that kind be always considered as made with that understanding? Circumstances alter; the conditions of peoples alter; the progress of civilization compels great changes. That which is good to-day may be evil a year from now. That which is a blessing and a benefit to-day may be a hundred years hence a curse, an unbearable burden upon our children.

It is in vain, it is worse than a sentimentality, to say that any nation can put such a yoke upon itself and that all the children of men born in this country for centuries to come (for that is the logic of the argument) are bound by the terms and conditions of the treaty with China.

That treaty was founded on a barren ideality in the very beginning. It was a burst of that sentiment which leads us to believe that all the world are anxious to come here and to live among us as one common people—that sentiment and a more selfish sentiment which desired cheap labor. That treaty talks of the "inalienable rights of men to change their residence and their allegiance," when no Chinaman desires, or ever desired, to change either the one or the other, and when, in the sense of what experience has taught us we have no desire that they shall change either the one or the other.

The treaty, then, with China, Mr. Chairman, being a perpetual one, making provision for something which the Chinese people as a people do not wish or desire, and having for its keynote an idea which can never be accomplished, owing to the peculiarities of that people, can not in the very nature of things be forever binding upon us. It is utterly impossible. It is a dream which fades in the light of sense.

Why, sir, think of it for a moment. Can the treaty-making power bind this nation perpetually, or can it be so bound except by conquest? And conquest always means the right of reclamation with returning strength. It can not by treaty take away from you your homes or your liberty or any of your sacred rights; but under the guise of a Chinese treaty it essays to give up the industries of the country, or, at least, to share them, and to open

to an alien race all the pursuits by which the people seek to live and which they are entitled to enjoy to the exclusion of all others. I affirm there is no power to do this.

Is this the assertion of a fallacy or is it a reasonable doctrine?

Is it an uncharitable doctrine, or is it the doctrine that charity begins at home? Why, Mr. Chairman, I have in my pocket an address from the Federation of Labor of America to the Fifty-second Congress, in which they complain in that address that at least a million of people in this country to-day can not find employment, and that many others can only find partial employment. Is that true? Who gainsays it? Does anyone know more about it than these people, these laborers who framed this address, and who seek relief at our hands? Is not their testimony conclusive on the subject?

But, even if it is not conclusive, I appeal to gentlemen, whether, when such a cry as that comes up to us here, it is not time to ascertain where, if the evil really exists, where the remedy is to be found, and whether after all a treaty is a more sacred thing than the flesh and blood of your own people? Treaties are made for the benefit of nations; they are meant to help, not to burden, not to be fetters, but facilities for national progress. We have come to a stage in our affairs when this treaty with China is found to be a burden and a snare, a fetter to our people. What is the complaint? Is it the cheap complaint of demagogues? Is it a mere outcry of prejudice, of passion, or is it a noble aspiration for such social conditions and advancement as will maintain the decency, the comfort, and civic independence of the American people?

The complaint is against cheap labor; not the cheap labor of the Chinaman alone, but the cheap labor of the assisted emigrant; the cheap labor of the emigrant who comes here under a contract for his services; the cheap labor of the man who is a convict, who competes with honest people. It is not then as to the Chinese alone, but as to all and every form of cheap labor, against everything that tends to demoralize the social standing by reducing the wages of our people, that the protest is made. Is that right or is it wrong? If it is right then the circumstances have arisen; a condition of affairs has been reached when the rule I have laid down may be invoked, and when we may say to China without offense to her, without violating the treaty, and in consonance with the rule which should always apply to perpetual treaties, that a time has come for a change; that we must enter into other arrangements with her. It may be that there are other methods of reaching this result than the one we contemplate.

It may be that there is something valuable in this connection by treaty between this country and China, and that we must not jeopardize it by hasty action. The trade of that great country may be now, as the trade of the Orient has been in all ages, a prize worth contending for and worth keeping when it is won.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is entirely aside from this question of labor. What treaty commercial rights in all the world would be a compensation for the degradation of the labor of this country? There is no objection—there can be none—to a treaty of commerce between us and China, and I have no doubt that that is as far as the treaty-making power in time of peace can go—an arrangement by which commerce may be carried on, by which an exchange of China's products for American products may be made, but never an arrangement by which grown men may come here and compete with the women over the washtub, with the miners in the mines, with the cigar-makers in the factories, and with all our people who are laboring and struggling to make a living in the ordinary and daily occupations of life.

There is no power in any branch of this Government to mortgage the labor of the American people in perpetuity even to secure the advantages of a lucrative commerce. The workingmen desire the benefits of commerce; but deny the power to give their opportunities and their vocations as the price of it.

It does not follow, Mr. Chairman, that because we propose to withdraw the privilege—for it is not a right—to Chinese laborers to enter this country, it does not follow that we are violating a treaty with China, or that our intercourse with her must end. There is no abuse of our relations with that country when we do this. We are standing upon our reserved rights. We are standing upon the agreement, upon the fair understanding which attaches to every treaty, which purports to make perpetual terms between nations.

I know, sir, that the great part of the American people will agree with me in this. There has been criticism, unthinking and unwise, in different quarters, upon the action of this House. Our action went forth undefended, undebated. No reason was given for it here, and portions of the country have the idea that we were simply running amuck in a chase for votes and for popularity, when in fact we were endeavoring conscientiously to protect the dignity of American labor and to prevent its being overwhelmed by further additions of cheap laborers. Now, it

has occurred to me that this much should be said in behalf of the action of this House. I care not what form that action takes, so long as it protects the laboring men of this country.

Continue your treaty of commerce; the only treaty, in my judgment, that the treaty-making power has capacity to enter into. Continue that, if you please. Extend the time under the Angell treaty, during which Chinese labor shall not come into the country in any form or in any shape; but do it thoroughly. Protect the laboring men of this country against the influx of cheap labor. I know that that influx is not so great as many people think, but it is great enough to be an evil; it is great enough to add 110,000 men to the ranks of breadwinners. It is great enough to suggest the possibility, to certain classes of capitalists, of cheaper labor in the future, and it is great enough, if it is not checked, to arouse the fears of every laboring man who respects himself and who loves his family. It swells the hordes of assisted immigrants, of contract immigrants, and of convict competitors to a mighty host.

I know that men who talk as I am talking now are accused of demagoguery. Let it be. I am willing to be assailed with all these high terms of diplomatic faith and of the sanctity of treaties. I am willing to endure these without retorting that the very men who talk in that way are apt to be the demagogues of capital, and are apt to be as swift in the service of capital as I am of labor. I would wish to see capital prosperous; but a capital which is prosperous and does not shed prosperity in its path, which does not make the laborer comfortable, which does not keep up his self-respect, which does not pay him wages enough to enable him to be a decent, intelligent, and useful citizen, that capital deserves no respect, and is an enemy of the people, and as such ought to be opposed.

No war between classes in this country. It is simply a question of the general decency of our people, of their general prosperity, and I think that full consideration will show every gentleman who will take the trouble to give it, that in this combat, whatever strong measures we might be tempted to take, whatever irregular steps we might be tempted to take, that the abrogation or rescission of a perpetual treaty is not a strong measure, is not an irregular measure, but is a measure of plain duty and of undoubted legal right. [Applause.]

Mr. POST. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in opening this debate, said European countries may require able diplomats, but not so with us. He proceeded to ridicule, in a pleasant sort of way, the successes of our representatives abroad, and said the ridicule was for the purpose of showing up the magnificent ability required of our diplomats. He then proceeded to make the minister to Denmark the subject of special comment, and by no means complimentary to his service, and all because he said he had written a letter to him. It seems to me that that letter conveyed a valuable piece of information when he was providing for the union of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway in one mission. I have had no letter and no information from the minister to Denmark or any other minister, but I know something of the history of this country, and I do not agree with all the conclusions of the majority of the committee or with the report of the committee.

When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] entered upon the eloquent defense of our diplomatic agents, I thought I need having nothing to say, but he too, it seems, had agreed to the union of several missions. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reviewed this whole question so completely that I might perhaps forego any remarks on this occasion, but I wish to enforce on one single point, the question of the union of missions, certain of his observations.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. BLOUNT] suggested that we might retain, in his general abolition, the ministers to England, France, Germany, and Turkey—that they might be allowed to remain. Why? The argument which he made on this floor and the reasons assigned in the report would abolish these missions as well. He said in effect that we have no special interest in foreign countries; that our interest is centered in our internal affairs and questions of taxation. On the floor and in his report he referred to quick communication as doing away with the necessity for skilled diplomats abroad. Is not our communication with England and France as quick as it is with Russia?

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to reduce the number of diplomatic offices by placing "Denmark, Sweden, and Norway under one mission, Colombia and Ecuador under one mission, and Peru and Bolivia under one mission. The committee suggests that—

the facilities for the transmission and interchange of thought in every matter connected with foreign countries dispense with much of the need of foreign representation. It enables the home government to communicate rapidly and freely with foreign governments and to give directions in the most minute details.

To give directions to whom? Certainly not to foreign governments. So far as the statement is used to support the idea that it dispenses "with the need of foreign representation," it is misleading.

If it were the custom, if it were practicable for governments to communicate by mail or telegraph directly with each other, then foreign representation might be dispensed with. But such is not the custom, and it is probable that the world will long continue to enjoy the benefit of the services of intelligent and observing diplomatic agents who receive from their own governments confidential and detailed instructions in national affairs and controversies. If international negotiations were conducted directly between the governments by mail or telegraph every difference between nations would develop an ultimatum leading to war or at least to breaking off of intercourse.

The rapid communication to which the report refers is with our own agents who reside near the courts to which they are accredited, and instead of lessening the need of such agents it makes them all the more necessary. The convenience of rapid communication, which furnishes full information, requires prompt decision of every international dispute.

The proposition to send one minister to reside near the government at Copenhagen and at the same time to reside near the government at Stockholm is as unreasonable as it is impossible. It can not be assumed that this Government would willfully insult either of the proud nations to which it is proposed to accredit the moiety of a minister. They are independent powers accustomed to have the accredited agents of other governments residing at their capitals and to be treated with the consideration of sovereign nations. It does not appear that the President or Secretary of State, who are charged with the responsibility of our foreign relations, have suggested this measure. On the contrary, the report alleges that—

Very much might be safely done in reducing the number of our ministers by abolition of the union of several countries under one mission. Not encouraged to hope for an acceptance of their views by the Senate or the President, it has been deemed best, except in a few instances, to postpone needed reforms at this point.

It appears, therefore, that the committee propose to curtail the number of diplomatic agents which has heretofore been authorized and which the President now deems necessary to a successful conduct of our foreign affairs. The committee will find not alone the Senate and the President, but the people of the United States unwilling to accept their views. The people will hardly be willing to transfer the control of the foreign relations of our country from the executive officers who have conducted them with honor and success to those who would sacrifice to a spurious economy even the dignity of the nation.

The abolition of missions or union of several countries under one mission is spoken of as a "needed reform." During the incumbency of the Democratic Administration these missions existed, but no such reform was proposed either by the President or this House. Are these missions less important now than they were then? What reason shall we assign for an act which no foreign nation could consider friendly? How shall we explain the adoption of a policy of breaking off diplomatic intercourse by the abolition or union of missions? What is the excuse for such a course? To say that the United States could not afford to send diplomatic agents abroad according to usage would be ridiculed by everyone, even by gentlemen who suggest that idea. If it be undesirable to carry on our international intercourse in the customary manner, all that this House can do is to refuse to provide for the expenses of that branch of the public service or for any particular part of it.

Under the Constitution the President has power to appoint diplomatic agents. His authority is not derived from any act of Congress, and is not limited or changed by any conditions in an appropriation bill. This bill provides for a union of missions. By what authority does it prescribe to what countries diplomatic agents shall be sent, and that the minister accredited to Sweden and Norway shall be accredited also to Denmark? Suppose the President decides to send a minister to Sweden and Norway and not to Denmark, or to Denmark and not to Sweden and Norway, how is this bill to be construed? You may undoubtedly limit by law the amount to be paid as salary to such diplomatic agents or refuse to make any appropriation at all for such salaries, but Congress can not require the President to maintain ministers of a certain rank at particular courts or remove those who are there and reappoint in a different manner. This House should not fail to observe that the Constitution recognizes the Executive as the source of diplomatic authority.

Before this House commits itself to the innovation of uniting or abolishing missions I beg it to consider whether this is the time and these the missions which need that kind of reform.

The United States has swung into the current of submitting international troubles to arbitration. So far as the amount to be

paid by one nation to another, whether for damages or on any other account, arbitration can not be too highly commended. At the same time the practice of presenting to an international court exaggerated and absurd claims which no nation would make if such claims had to be contended for in the final court of arbitration, can not be too severely condemned. A great nation should make no claim which it is not willing to maintain. We have heard on this floor eulogies of the arbitration of the Alabama claims under the treaty of Washington. Men worship the halo of glory which conceals hideous facts.

Arbitration is one form of negotiation; if the decision is acceptable to both parties it is adopted; if it is not acceptable it is repudiated. More than an attempt at negotiation by disinterested parties it ought not and can not be. The frequent instances in which the decisions of arbitrators have been promptly repudiated by the nations which have attempted that form of negotiation demonstrates that independent nations must always be the final judges of their own rights.

So far as arbitration encourages nations to violate international law and invade the rights of others by securing the aggressor against any greater harm than to be a party to a peaceful compromise, it is totally vicious in principle.

I shall enter upon no eulogy of the modern principle of surrendering national sovereignty and national rights in order to secure a peaceful settlement after such rights are invaded, but the adoption of that policy makes it absolutely essential that we should cultivate friendly relations and secure diplomatic influence at the European capitals where the judges are selected by whom our international rights are decided.

Our jurisdictional rights in the waters of the Bering Sea acquired from Russia and the right to protect the fur seals in that sea have, in accordance with the popular wish, been submitted to arbitration. The powers charged with the duty of preserving the seal fisheries from destruction are the United States and Russia. The whole world is interested in preserving the species.

The Canadians, tempted by the small profit to be derived from exterminating the only fur seals remaining on earth, in defiance of long-established precedent and of the United States, have fitted out fleets for that purpose. Every Canadian and every Englishman knew that the fleets fitted out in a Canadian port to destroy the fur seals were intended to injure and humiliate the United States. Had they also known that when the fleets returned, the ports from which they had sailed would be occupied by the troops of the United States, they would have delayed their departure until after the decision as to the lawful character of such an enterprise. No such question would have arisen but for the encouragement and protection afforded to enterprises of doubtful legality by modern international arbitration holding out the hope of benefits by compromise, and in any event shielding the trespassers from severe consequences.

This American question might have been settled by American methods on American soil. The popular wish is otherwise, and therefore this American question is transported to Paris and is to be decided by arbitrators, two to be named by the President of the United States, two by Her Britannic Majesty, one by the President of the French Republic, one by the King of Italy, and one by the King of Sweden and Norway. The arbitrators are to be jurists of distinguished reputation in their respective countries, and will doubtless be honorable and impartial, as far as human nature permits; but can there be any reason why the United States should seize upon this particular time for disturbing its diplomatic relations with the King of Sweden and Norway, who is to name one of the arbitrators? By this ungracious act, the union of Denmark with Sweden and Norway in one mission, it is assumed that a saving of a salary of one minister will be effected.

It is likely to prove a costly economy, which this Government can ill afford. We may be certain that the British Government will not imitate our example and, pending this arbitration, secure a small economy by means of a discourtesy to a foreign power.

If the edict has gone forth that every appropriation bill must be cut down in order to make a contrast between the wise expenditures of the last House and the wasteful parsimony of this one, let us at least discriminate in our retrenchments and make them where they will do the least harm. No petty and false economy should be allowed to endanger the rights of our country and humiliate the nation before the world. Our diplomatic service should contribute not merely to the wealth but to the honor, power, and glory of this Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] will give me his attention, I desire to ask unanimous consent that general debate shall close to-morrow after the expiration of two hours.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. The gentleman means two hours after the beginning of the debate. I hope the Chair will recog-

nize me as taking the floor, and I will yield to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that on to-morrow, after two hours, all general debate on this bill shall close.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how the time will be divided.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am very careless of the time. I am willing to do anything my friend wants done. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] desires to speak.

Mr. HITT. Let it be divided in the usual way.

Mr. McCREARY. I suggest that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and the other half by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

Mr. HITT. That will be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH], a member of the committee, desires some time.

Mr. FITCH. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] desires an hour, and that would take the entire hour on this side.

Mr. HITT. I will yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. FITCH. I would like to have half an hour.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I hope the Chair will repeat the request, as we seem to have agreed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after two hours, all general debate on this bill shall be closed.

Mr. McCREARY. One hour of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia, and the other hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection to that. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] desires to be heard.

Mr. HITT. I have no objection to the modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. OATES, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7624) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey, for Wednesday, April 27. To Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania, for ten days, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

Mr. GEARY. I ask the gentleman to withdraw that for a moment.

Mr. McMILLIN. I withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. GEARY. Mr. Speaker, the bill restricting the immigration of Chinese has come back from the Senate with some amendments, and as it is a matter which I desire to have disposed of, I ask unanimous consent to nonconcur in the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6185) to absolutely prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY] asks unanimous consent to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BURROWS. I do not think that the bill ought to be disposed of in this way. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT] if that will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. HITT. If it is agreeable to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] it is to me.

Mr. HOOKER of Mississippi. I should be very glad for it to go to a conference, though I do not favor the bill.

There was no objection.

So the Senate amendments were nonconcurrent in, and the conference asked for was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as conferees on this bill the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT].

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

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The following reports of committees were handed in at the Clerk's desk, referred to their appropriate Calendars, and, with their accompanying reports, ordered to be printed, as indicated below:

SOUTHERN UTE INDIANS.

Mr. KEM, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back the bill (H. R. 67) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Southern Ute Indians of Colorado and to make the necessary expenditures for carrying the same into effect; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

LANDS VALUABLE FOR BUILDING STONE.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back the bill (S. 1273) to authorize the entry of lands chiefly valuable for building stone under the placer-mining laws; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. DOLLIVER from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (S. 1287) for the relief of M. B. Ryan, administrator *de bonis non*, son and only heir at law of John S. Ryan, deceased, late of Charleston, S. C. (Report No. 1193.)

By Mr. LOUD from the Committee on Claims: A bill (H. R. 5426) for the relief of James Grace. (Report No. 1194.)

A bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Forman Mathews and David Stout Parker. (Report No. 1195.)

A bill (H. R. 3312) for the relief of W. H. Ward. (Report No. 1193.)

A bill (H. R. 1530) for the relief of J. M. Billings. (Report No. 1197.)

A bill (H. R. 1240) for the relief of William J. Bryan. (Report No. 1198.)

By Mr. DOLLIVER, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution referring the bill (H. R. 7103) to pay Philip Henkel for property unlawfully confiscated and destroyed to the Court of Claims. (Report No. 1199.)

A bill (H. R. 8393) for the relief of William C. Hughes, in lieu of the bill (H. R. 1754) of the same title. (Report No. 1200.)

A bill (H. R. 8229) for the relief of Mathias Pedersen. (Report No. 1201.)

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs: A bill (S. 73) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy of West Point Francisco Alcantara, of Venezuela. (Report No. 1202.)

Also, from the same committee, the bill (H. R. 3369) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Freedley, late major in the United States Army. (Report No. 1203.)

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims: A bill (H. R. 8353) referring the claims known as the Paducah claims of John E. Williamson, administrator of the estate of John B. Thompson, deceased, and other citizens of Paducah, Ky., to the Court of Claims. (Report No. 1206.)

BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 8390) to amend an act to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, approved September 29, 1890—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 8391) for sharing with the several States the expense of State canals, providing free transportation to interstate and foreign commerce—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MEREDITH (by request): A bill (H. R. 8392) to incorporate the Union Passenger Railway Company of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8394) to amend section 3 of the act of March 2, 1889, for the relief of certain volunteer and regular soldiers of the late war and the war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8395) to provide and equip a steam vessel for boarding purposes at Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERBERT: A resolution in relation for leave to print in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 8396) for the relief of Abraham

Buford, administrator of John Buford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASTLE: A bill (H. R. 8397) granting a pension to Mrs. Charlotte O. Van Cleve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8398) for the relief of Susan Lomasney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (by request): A bill (H. R. 8399) to remove the charge of desertion from Edward Quinlan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODNIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8400) increasing the pension of J. G. Dawkins, of South Union, Ky., a soldier in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8401) granting a pension to William E. Floyd, of Sand Hill, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORMAN: A bill (H. R. 8402) for the relief of Matthew T. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8403) granting a pension to Roswell Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 8404) for the relief of Emanuel Clouser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 8405) for the benefit of Adam Bryant, administrator of Nancy Bryant, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8406) to grant a pension to Ira Manly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: A bill (H. R. 8407) directing the Secretary of War to amend the record of Horton S. Maxon, late of Company D, First Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8408) for the relief of Randolph Barton, trustee of the Powhatan Steamboat Company and other claimants—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 8409) granting a pension to Mary Danahay, mother of Daniel Danahay, late a private Company H, Eighteenth New York Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEERLEY: A bill (H. R. 8410) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Finch—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: A bill (H. R. 8411) for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Waters, of Horn Island, in Mississippi Sound—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8412) for the relief of J. C. Shelby—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WARWICK: A bill (H. R. 8413) granting an increase of pension to William H. Manson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8414) to pension William Bass—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8415) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. Andrew Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 8416) for the relief of Newell A. Burrows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of 85 citizens of Hill County, Tex., against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, of 19 members of G. H. Thomas Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Texas (Dallas), asking the lines of battle at Gettysburg be more clearly marked and defined—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 27 citizens of the county of Ellis, of Texas, remonstrating against the passage of the Brosius (or Conger) lard bill, H. R. No. 395—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELKNAP: Three petitions of citizens of Michigan, as follows: Of Leander Kellogg and 21 others, of Kent County; of Franklin Howe and 54 others, of Lyons, and B. A. Rogers and 124 others, of Coopersville, protesting against action on the part of Congress in closing the Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of John Short and 37 others of Moline, Mich., protesting against action on the part of Congress as to closing the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. BELTZHOVER: Petition of 122 members of Riverside Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of Pennsylvania, for an amendment of immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERS: Petition of Dixon Grange, Patrons of Husbandry of California, for the passage of pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition by the same grange, for the passage of pure-lard bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of members of Summer Post, Grand Army of the Republic of Los Angeles, Cal., for the passage of a bill making battle lines at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Three petitions of Alliances of Iowa, as follows: Bald Knob, No. 1940, of Harrison County; Liberty, No. 2050, of Mills County, and Pilot Grove, No. 1918, all for the passage of the option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRÉCKINRIDGE of Arkansas: Four petitions of citizens of Woodruff County, Ark., and three petitions of citizens of Monroe County, Ark., against the passage of the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUNTING: Petition of Mrs. Perry Sherman, against holding the World's Fair open on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of the Fleet Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Brooklyn, against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday, or the sale of liquor on the Fair grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CUTTING: Memorial of citizens of California, praying for favorable consideration of House bill 7689, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make special experiments in raising ramie, flax, hemp, and jute—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Eleven protests of Farmers and Laborers' Unions of Missouri, as follows: Of Bates County, of Vernon County, of Barton County, of Cedar County, of Cass County, of Bates County, of Ore, Cass County; of Dade County, of Barton County, and of Barton County, all against the passage of the Brosius lard bill (H. R. 395), and praying for the passage of a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. C. Pierce and other citizens of Vernon County, against legislation closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. DE FOREST: Three petitions of Hollenbeck Grange, No. 125, of Connecticut, one for laws prohibiting the adulteration of food, the second for laws preventing gambling in farm products, and the third for laws encouraging silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of same grange, for laws prohibiting contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition by the same grange, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the same grange, for laws defining pure lard—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of citizens of Maine, protesting against the provisions of the bill now before Congress entitled "A bill (H. R. 7023) to encourage American shipping"—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petition of H. N. Palin and others, of the Seventh-Day Adventists of Winnebago County, Iowa, against bill or resolution to close the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Mrs. Melcinia E. Arnold, of Los Angeles, Cal., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of citizens of Sumter County, S. C., in favor of the passage of the antioption bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLISH: Petition of J. H. Egbert and others, of New Jersey, against the passage of any law respecting an establishment of religion—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, evidence in the matter of Thomas P. Meehan, for an honorable discharge, to accompany House bill 7733—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENLEAF: Petition of citizens of Rochester, N. Y., in favor of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that no State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Linn County, Iowa, asking that no further appropriations be made for the Columbian Exposition unless the Exposition be closed on Sunday and the sale of liquors be prohibited in the Exposition grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HARTER: Affidavit of William Metzga, for removal of charge of desertion, to accompany House bill 4702—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYNES of Ohio: Petition of Lodge No. 9, Excelsior Marine Benevolent Association, of Toledo, against exempting Chicago River from the provisions of the river and harbor law of 1890—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of C. P. Kline and 126 others, of Sandusky County, Ohio, in regard to the suppression of speculation in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEARD: Three protests of Farmers and Laborers' Unions of Missouri, as follows: Two of Howard County and one of Morgan County, against the passage of the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395, and praying for the passage of a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union, of Boone County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395, and praying for the passage of a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Three resolutions of Alliances of Iowa, as follows: one of Monroe Township, No. 1976, the second of Emeline Alliance, of Parkersburg, No. 2052, and the third of White Water Farmers, No. 1776, of Dubuque, favoring the passage of the antiopium bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Protest against Senate bill 429, with an amendment—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAYTON: Three petitions of Shady Vale Grange, No. 348, of Ohio, one urging the prompt passage of a law to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, the second asking for legislation for the encouragement of silk culture, and the third urging prompt action to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition by the same grange, praying for the extension of the mails to the rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, protest of Denison B. Smith, secretary of the Toledo (Ohio) Produce Exchange, against the Hatch bill to suppress trading in futures in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCKEIGHAN: Fourteen petitions of citizens of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the antiopium bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Remonstrance from Bloomer, Wis., against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of members of S. H. Siger Post, No. 207, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wisconsin, for marking battle lines at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of James A. Garfield Post, Grand Army of the Republic, for properly marking the battle lines of Gettysburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of E. B. Kellogg Post, No. 55, Grand Army of the Republic, of New York, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of 120 citizens of South Dakota, asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two petitions, one of 27 persons of Mechlin, S. Dak., for the closing of the World's Fair on the Sabbath, and the other of 133 persons for the same purpose—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolutions of Industrial Council No. 437, of Owensburg, Pa., in favor of a law restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Eight petitions of Ashford Grange, No. 90, and Border Grange, No. 93, of Connecticut, as follows: A petition of each grange for the immediate passage of House bill 395, defining pure lard; a petition of each for legislation to prevent adulteration of food and drugs; a petition of each for legislation to prevent gambling in food products, and a petition from Ashford Grange to encourage silk culture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, two petitions of the same granges, for legislation to prohibit contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, two petitions of the same granges, of Willimantic, for free delivery of mails in rural districts—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 97 citizens of Colchester, for the amendment of naturalization laws as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD: Two petitions of ex-soldiers and sailors of New York; one of H. H. Whitman Post, No. 486, Grand Army of the Republic; the other of the A. H. Terry Post, No. 300, Grand Army of the Republic, of Amsterdam, N. Y., for legislation providing for the preserving and properly marking the battle lines of Gettysburg, Pa., and urging the passage of the bill introduced by Representative WHEELER for that purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, two petitions of citizens of New York; one of Johnstown Grange, No. 662, to prevent gambling in farm products, and the other of 19 citizens of Fulton County, for the same purpose—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition by the same grange, for the enactment of legis-

lation to prohibit contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition by the same grange, for the immediate passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Park Association, No. 2712, Patrons of Industry, of New York, in opposition to H. R. 6790, for the reclamation of the arid lands of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Select Committee on Arid Lands in the United States.

Also, petition of citizens and church members of West Galway, N. Y., in the interest of Sunday observance, temperance, and purity in art at the World's Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Two petitions of citizens of Glenfield, Allegheny County, Pa., for the passage of House bill 401, restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the faculty and students of the Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny City, Pa., to close the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two petitions of citizens of Allegheny County, Pa., for the passage of House bill 401 restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of S. W. Cows and others, of Connecticut, relating to amendment of the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of citizens of the county of Edgefield, S. C., remonstrating against the passage of the Brosius (or Conger) lard bill, H. R. 395—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WARWICK: Papers and photographs to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Manson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, two petitions of Methodist churches of Ohio, as follows: One of Minerva and the other of Goshen and Damascus, against opening the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of Martha A. Hughes, widow of William T. Hughes, a Mexican veteran, asking a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: Seven petitions of citizens of Georgia, as follows: of McDuffy, of Columbia, of Warren, of Burke, of Glascock, and of Columbia, remonstrating against the passage of the Brosius (or Conger) lard bill, H. R. 395—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Missouri: Protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union No. 3330, of Platte County, Mo., against the passage of the Brosius lard bill, H. R. 395, and praying for the passage of a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Kersville Grange, No. 508, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennsylvania, against contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Sylvester H. Craig and 26 members of the Seventh-Day Adventists of Michigan, against the passage of any bill or resolution to close the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 27, 1892.

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

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. COCKRELL. I notice in the RECORD of yesterday that the bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of D. P. Abbott, A. S. Keaves, and T. E. Smith, which came over from the House of Representatives, and which was in the other House reported from the Committee on Claims, was in the Senate referred to the Committee on Finance. I think that the bill properly belongs to the Committee on Claims, and I ask that the Committee on Finance be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill indicated by him, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7818) to provide for certain of the most urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the