

for cheap telegraphy, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH, of Georgia: Two petitions for post-routes, one from citizens of Calhoun County, Georgia, for a route from Arlington, Calhoun County, to Keyton; the other from citizens of Miller County, Georgia, for a route from Colquitt to Horns Cross Roads, to the same committee.

By Mr. VANCE, of North Carolina: Papers relating to the petition of Elizabeth Sherrill for a pension, to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

By Mr. WALDRON: The petition of Margaret Colburn and others of Ypsilanti, Michigan, that pensioners be paid from the date of their discharge and that the limitation of the statute as to applications, for pensions be removed, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. S. WILLIAMS: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Detroit, Michigan, favoring the erection of a light-house and fog-signal upon Stannard Rock, Lake Superior, to the Committee on Commerce.

IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 21, 1877—10 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The recess having expired, the Senate resumes its session.

Mr. SARGENT, (at eleven o'clock and thirty-five minutes a. m.) Mr. SARGENT, would it be in order to report from the Committee on Appropriations the deficiency bill, that it may be printed?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It would not.

At eleven o'clock and thirty-eight minutes a. m. Mr. G. M. ADAMS, Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared below the bar, and said:

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the vote of R. M. Daggett, one of the electors of the State of Nevada, be counted, the objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am also directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives are now ready to receive the Senate in joint meeting to proceed with the count of the electoral votes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate will now repair to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate accordingly proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at twelve o'clock and fifty minutes, and the President *pro tempore* resumed the chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate having returned from the joint meeting upon objections submitted to the double certificates from the State of Oregon, which were, with the papers, submitted to the commission, the Senate resumes its legislative business.

ELECTORAL VOTE OF OREGON—ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I beg to make a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections in reference to the inquiry into the Oregon electoral vote. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would state that he has been informed the printing can now proceed in the usual manner.

Mr. KERNAN. I do not think it ought to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS. Did I understand the Senator to say in the RECORD?

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. Is not that very unusual? Of course there is no objection to printing the report in the usual way, but to have it printed in the RECORD is another question.

Mr. KERNAN. It is very long and would take a great deal of space, from what I know of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think there should be no objection to the report being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SARGENT. Reports of committees in both Houses have been printed in the RECORD this session on account of the necessity of their being printed there to be of any use. I remember the report from the House side on Louisiana which covered about one hundred pages was printed in the RECORD. There are special reasons this year why the reports on both sides should be printed in the RECORD in order that they may get the ear of the tribunal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon desires the report to be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WITHERS. I object.

Mr. DAVIS. O, yes; there are three or four objections.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the question to the Senate. Shall the report made by the Senator from Oregon be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. KERNAN. I desire to be heard a moment on the question of printing the report in the RECORD. Such reports have not been printed in the RECORD heretofore as I understand.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the Senator from New York yield to me to allow me to present a memorial?

Mr. KERNAN. I too have morning business to present. I suggest that we be allowed to submit petitions and memorials first, and then I may resume the floor upon this question, as I desire to be heard upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the introduction of morning business at this time?

Mr. MITCHELL. I will state that I am compelled to go before the electoral commission immediately and I should like to have this matter disposed of.

Mr. KERNAN. Then I have a word to say upon the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I rise to a question of order. Is not morning business in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Three or four minutes remains of the morning hour as the Chair observes by looking at the clock; and morning business is in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I supposed I had the floor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Morning business is in order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mine is morning business, the report of a committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. So the Chair understands.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the morning hour should be extended a half hour, because there is a great deal of morning business that we ought to get rid of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Petitions and memorials are first in the order of morning business. Is there objection to extending the morning hour to receive morning business?

Mr. WINDOM. Subject to a call for the regular order or for appropriation bills, of course. I am not willing to consent to extend the morning hour unless we can have some understanding that we shall have a night session in case the morning business is extended.

Mr. SHERMAN. The morning hour need not be extended beyond half an hour, and there is morning business which should be presented.

Mr. WINDOM. I will not object to that provided we can have a night session if we do not pass the post-office and legislative appropriation bills this afternoon. If we can get them through to-day we need not have a night session. Can we have an understanding of that kind?

Mr. MORRILL. There is no objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the understanding that the legislative and post-office appropriation bills shall be proceeded with to-day until completed?

Mr. DAVIS. I hardly think the chairman proposes to make that rule now. Let us wait and see what we can do in the progress of the bills.

Mr. WINDOM. I propose that there be a night session unless those two bills can be disposed of before the evening adjournment. If that can be agreed to I have no objection to the extension of the morning hour for half an hour.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we move on and see what progress we may make. It may be that it will not be necessary to go into a night session.

Mr. WINDOM. The point is I am unwilling to agree to an extension of the morning hour unless we can have an understanding that we shall have a night session if it is necessary, and if it is not necessary it will not be done.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest to the Senator that probably we can pass the appropriation bills in to-day's session, without a night session, by remaining here until five or six o'clock.

Mr. WINDOM. If we can do that, then there will be no necessity for a night session. The Senate certainly understands that we should have a night session unless those bills can be passed to-day; and I only ask for an agreement to hold a night session on that condition.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to extending the morning hour half an hour?

Mr. WEST. The proposition was put a little differently a moment ago.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota desires it to be understood that, in case the bills named by him are not concluded, namely, the legislative and post-office appropriation bills, there shall be an evening session.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest to my friend, the chairman of the committee, that later in the day we can see whether that be necessary. Only an extension of half an hour is asked.

Mr. WINDOM. Then I must object to the extension of the morning hour for half an hour.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota objects to the extension of the morning hour, and the morning hour has expired.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have an important report which I desire to make; and if necessary I will move to postpone the present and all prior orders for the purpose of presenting it. It would take but a moment to make the report, and it must be made to-day in order to have it printed.

Mr. WEST. If we extend the morning hour that it should be for a definite period, because discussion on the Oregon question might run us into a discussion of three or four hours. Let the Senator from Ohio make a definite proposition to extend the morning hour.

Mr. SHERMAN. We should have a specified time, say not exceeding fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would remind the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] has the floor also on the question of a report from a committee.

Mr. WINDOM. I will not object to an extension of the morning hour for fifteen minutes; but I desire to express the hope that if we do not finish the appropriation bills we may have consent for an evening session.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will vote with the Senator for that with great pleasure if it is necessary. I desire to make a report now while I am on the floor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator from Oregon insists upon the floor the Chair must recognize him, as he has presented a report from a committee which is under consideration.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot yield, because I must go before the commission in a moment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The understanding is that the morning hour has been extended for fifteen minutes, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. MITCHELL. I now ask consent that the report on the Oregon electoral votes which I presented be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let that order be made.

Mr. KERNAN. I object.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. I want to add five minutes more to the time allowed for morning business. There is an important bill, which concerns the State Department, that it is important to pass today. I ask that the extension be for twenty minutes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania desires five minutes additional, fifteen minutes having been agreed upon. Is there objection to the extension? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Oregon asks the printing of his report in the RECORD.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say just one word in reference to this matter. I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 10, in the House proceedings, the whole of the report made by the House Committee on Louisiana Affairs, and a much longer report I think than the one presented by myself from the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. I certainly hope that the objection to the printing of this report in the RECORD will be withdrawn by the Senator from New York.

Mr. KERNAN. Mr. President, I feel bound to object to this report being printed in the RECORD on behalf of the minority. I dissent from the report, the conclusions of fact, and the conclusions of law. It is very long. I do not know how many pages it would take of print; but it would take some hours to read if I am satisfied. The decision of the commission, made since this investigation was commenced by the committee, excludes the consideration of evidence taken before the committee, and no part of it can be necessary in their deliberations. The evidence is really not yet closed, unless it is being closed now. There is a little evidence that I desire to produce whenever the investigation is closed by the majority. I understand that the chairman of the committee says that now I can produce it. The report of the majority is not a document that ought to be printed in the RECORD. The reason, as I understand, why those other reports were printed in the RECORD was that there was no appropriation for printing reports in the ordinary way. There is an appropriation for that purpose now; and this report should be printed in the ordinary way; and it should not encumber the RECORD. It would be very unjust to have a report of that character printed in the RECORD as a part of the proceedings of the Congress of the United States. Therefore I think the precedent should never have been established except from necessity, owing to the want of means, and we should not now print in the RECORD what would make an immense document.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know not what the reason was that led to the printing of the House Louisiana report in the RECORD. I do know as a matter of fact that it is in the RECORD; and if the democratic party had the benefit of having their report printed in the RECORD, no matter what the cause was, the same privilege should be accorded to the other side, it seems to me, and I earnestly hope that the objection will not be insisted upon.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe it is known that the cause of printing different reports in the RECORD, both in the Senate and in the House, was because there was an appropriation for printing the RECORD and the appropriation was exhausted for printing reports or doing other printing for Congress. I believe, and I submit to the Chair, that it is out of order to print anything in the RECORD except by unanimous consent, unless the matter is read at the desk. I make the point of order, among other things, that unless any paper is read at the desk, unless unanimous consent is given, it cannot go into the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Any question made in regard to printing shall be submitted to the Senate. The Senate has a perfect right to dictate in what manner a paper shall be printed. The Chair will therefore submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. I submit to the Chair whether or not it has not been the usage of the Senate that no matter should go into the RECORD unless it was read at the desk, unless unanimous consent was given. I ask whether that has not been the usual course in the Senate? I do not believe there is any positive rule on the subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the new rule, as the Senator will see, when a question is raised as to printing it shall be submitted to the Senate; and in several cases where it has been asked that papers be printed the question has been submitted to the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. I know there is a new rule on the subject, but I have just examined that rule, and, in my judgment, it does not cover the case now before us. My recollection is that the usage previously has been that a paper had to be read at the desk to be printed in the RECORD, unless unanimous consent was given to its publication.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is correct. The Senator from Oregon has asked that the report be printed in the RECORD,

which is not the ordinary mode of printing the reports of committees. The rule requires reports of committees to be printed, and when a question is raised as to the manner in which a report is to be printed, that question is left to the Senate, in case an objection is made. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to Rule 55, referring to the reports of committees; that is, ordinary printing; but the Senator from Oregon has asked that the report be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WALLACE. Is not the request of the Senator from Oregon in fact a motion to print additional numbers of the report, and must not that motion under the rule go to the Committee on Printing? Is not that the effect of it?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would not so rule. It is not the case of the printing of additional numbers.

Mr. WALLACE. Does it not bring the additional expense? Is it not an addition to the number to be printed by law?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon has not asked that the ordinary number be printed under the rule, and the number in the RECORD would be the ordinary number; so that it would not be an extra number. If, in addition, the Senator from Oregon asked that the report should be printed under the rule, the point made by the Senator from Pennsylvania would be well taken.

Mr. WRIGHT. It seems to me the point of order made by the Senator from West Virginia is this: It is asked that this paper be printed in the RECORD without being read; the Senator from Oregon asks that the paper may go into the RECORD by a vote of the Senate, without having unanimous consent, as the paper has not been read. The point is whether that can be done by a vote of the Senate or otherwise than by unanimous consent, unless the paper shall be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will answer the Senator from Iowa that the Senator from West Virginia has not made that point of order. The Senator from West Virginia made the point of order that the paper could not be printed in the RECORD without having been read.

Mr. DAVIS. Without first being read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from West Virginia has not insisted on the reading of the report. If the Senator from West Virginia makes that point, the Chair will of course rule that it must be read.

Mr. DAVIS. I dislike very much to make a suggestion of that kind. Of course the report could be printed in the RECORD in that way, but we know it would take up a great deal of time. I hoped that the Senator from Oregon would have his report printed in the ordinary way, without pressing his request to have it printed in the RECORD; and as that may lead to the necessity of its being read at the desk, I hope, now that he sees there is opposition to printing it in the RECORD, and as it cannot be done, that he will not insist on it further.

Mr. MITCHELL. With all deference to the Senator from West Virginia, I know it can be done. I insist on it because I can have the report read or make it part of my remarks. I know there is objection to printing it in the RECORD, and I know where that objection comes from. There being objection and objection coming from the source it does, I will withdraw my request and let the report be printed in the ordinary way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be printed under the rule.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, in favor of an appropriation for the erection of a light-house and steam fog-signal on Stannard's Rock, Lake Superior; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Legislature of Montana, praying that a portion of the Crow Indian reservation may be restored to the public domain and opened up for settlement; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Importers and Grocers' Board of Trade of New York, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4250, to provide remedies for overcharge of duties on tonnage and imports; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Captain J. N. Stout and 62 others, of Lenawee County, Michigan, praying Congress to pass an act giving to soldiers pensions from the date of their discharge; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Legislature of Dakota Territory, in favor of the passage of a law re-imbursing the settlers upon the lands set apart by executive proclamation of January 11, 1875, and May 20, 1875, for their improvements made thereon; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LOGAN presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, by order and on behalf of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago, and representing in large measure the marine interests of the great lakes, beg leave to respectfully represent unto your honorable bodies that a dangerous reef of rocks, known as Stannard's Rock, exists in Lake Superior directly in the usual course of vessels navigating those waters, above Marquette, and that no appropriate light or other appliance exists to indicate the location of said rock and warn mariners of the danger to which they are exposed. Therefore,

Your memorialists respectfully pray your honorable bodies that you will, at the present session, make the necessary appropriation, as asked by the Light House Board, and authorize the early construction of a suitable light-house at the place

indicated, to the end that the perils of navigation, incident to the exceedingly dangerous character of this obstruction, may be abated.
And your memorialists will ever pray, &c.

Attest:

CHARLES RANDOLPH, *Secretary.*
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, February, 1877.

Mr. KERNAN presented the petition of John Cobb, praying for indemnity out of the Geneva award fund for damages sustained by acts of the cruiser Alabama; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of John Owens, administrator of the goods, chattels, and credits of John H. Verdon, late of the city of New York, praying for indemnity out of the Geneva award fund; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY presented a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, in favor of a light-house and fog-signal on Stannard's Rock, in Lake Superior; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a memorial of the executives of various States and Territories, together with scientific men interested in the subject, assembled to consult upon the practical and concerted means for the arrest of the prevalent locust or grasshopper plague, praying for the appointment of a commission to consist of three entomologists and two practical men of experience with the locusts, to examine into the history, nature, and habits of the insects, &c. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The memorial of the undersigned, executives of various States and Territories, together with scientific men interested in the subject, assembled to consult upon practical and concerted means for the arrest of the prevalent locust or grasshopper plague, respectfully represents that various portions of the country have been devastated by the insects known as locusts or grasshoppers, at divers periods of the past, for one hundred and fifty years; that during the past twenty years the number and ravages of these insects have increased with alarming rapidity; that many of the settlers in the Western States and Territories have suffered a total loss of crops from the ravages of one species (the Rocky Mountain locust) for four years in succession, and are in consequence reduced to great poverty and distress; that these insects, as history shows, confine their devastation to no one State or section of the country, but have overrun no less than sixteen States and Territories during the year 1876; that by their swift migrations from State to State, destroying millions of dollars of the farmers' hard earnings, crippling the progress of the border States, and retarding the settlement of the Territories, these destructive insects have become a national plague; and it is our profound conviction that an evil which, by impairing the prosperity of agriculture threatens the source of productive industry, deserves the prompt and thorough consideration of the National Government.

Your memorialists therefore respectfully ask—

First. That a commission be appointed by your honorable body at the earliest practicable moment, to consist of three entomologists and two practical men of experience with the locusts, to be appointed by the chief of the geological and geographical survey of the Territories, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the duty of which commission it shall be to examine into the history, nature, and habits of the insects, and to suggest such means of destroying them, and such remedies against their ravages, by the offer of bounties for the destruction of their eggs or otherwise, as their investigations shall prove most practicable. And for this purpose that the sum of \$25,000 be added to that part of the sundry civil appropriation bill providing for said survey of the Territories, in order to pay the salaries and expenses of such commission.

Second. That the Signal Service be authorized and required to take regular observations of the movements of the insects, of the time, direction, and extent of their flights, the time of the hatching and departure of the young locusts, and other particulars concerning them; and that the information thus obtained of the appearance and progress of the swarms, and such other observations as may prove of practical service, be published with the daily weather reports; and that General Meyer be provided with such additional means and assistance as shall be adequate to the demands of such enlarged operations.

Your memorialists ask this in view of the ravages of the past, and with grave apprehensions for the future, arising from the increased numbers of the pests and the enlarged area in which they have deposited their eggs. They believe that by reason of the winged and evasive movements of the locusts, the limitless field of their operations, and the predatory and mysterious character of their incursions, as well as their countless numbers, these insects constitute an enemy too formidable to be successfully encountered by any single State or community; and they are fully persuaded that the evil has swollen into a scourge of national dimensions, requiring the interposition of the General Government. Your memorialists moreover believe that if it is within your legitimate province to improve our rivers and interior harbors in order to facilitate the movement of crops, the rescue of those crops from the rapacity of a common enemy cannot be less an object of your rightful care, and that the same public policy which encourages internal commerce equally justifies the preservation of those important agricultural products without which there can be no commerce.

All of which is respectfully submitted, and your favorable action thereon urgently solicited. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

C. H. HARDIN, *Governor of Missouri.*

PROFESSOR C. V. RILEY,

State Entomologist of Missouri.

JOHN L. BEVERIDGE, *Governor of Illinois.*

PROFESSOR CYRUS THOMAS,

State Entomologist of Illinois.

SAMUEL J. KIRKWOOD, *Governor of Iowa.*

THOMAS A. OSBORN, *Governor of Kansas.*

SILAS GARBER, *Governor of Nebraska.*

ROBERT W. FURNAS,

Ex-Governor of Nebraska.

ALVIN SAUNDERS, *Ex-Governor of Nebraska.*

PROFESSOR C. D. WILBER, *Nebraska.*

PROFESSOR A. D. WILLIAMS, *Nebraska.*

JOHN S. PILLSBURY, *Governor of Minnesota.*

PENNOCK PUSEY, *Minnesota.*

PROFESSOR ALLEN WHITMAN, *Minnesota.*

JOHN L. PENNINGTON,

Governor of Dakota Territory.

B. F. POTTS, *Governor of Montana Territory.*

Mr. McMILLAN presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of the city of Minneapolis, Minnesota, praying for the establishment of a post-route and military road from Fort Lincoln to Deadwood City, in the Black Hills; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, in relation to the coinage of the silver dollar; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the senate, (the assembly concurring.) That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin in Congress are requested to use all proper endeavors to secure the repeal of the law known as the act demonetizing silver, and to secure such laws as may be necessary to establish the coinage of the old standard silver dollar, and to make it legal-tender for all debts, public and private.
Approved February 16, 1877.

HARRISON LUDINGTON,
Governor.
C. D. PARKER,
President of the Senate.
J. B. CASSADAY,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, also presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, in favor of an appropriation to aid in the completion of the Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship-Canal and harbor, and to extend the time for the completion thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHYTE presented the petition of John Saunders, of Baltimore, Maryland, praying for the removal of his political disabilities; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAYTON presented a petition of officers and citizens of Garland County, Arkansas, praying for the passage of a bill granting to that county a certain portion of the Hot Springs reservation for the use of a court-house; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of citizens of Plain Township, Wood County, Ohio, praying that there may be a pension granted to Robert Spoons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Ohio, praying the passage of the act allowing pensioners the amount of arrears to which they would be entitled by a removal from the statutes of the unjust limitation which has debarred many from receiving their just dues, and that they shall be entitled to receive in all cases a pension from the date of discharge of the soldier; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition, very numerously signed, of citizens of Warren, Ohio, praying an appropriation for the improvement of the outer harbor at Ashtabula; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (H. R. No. 3370) to amend the statutes in relation to damages for infringement of patents, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Lancaster, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the tax on banks and banking; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Missouri; which was read and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, as follows:

STATE OF MISSOURI, ss:

I, Michael K. McGrath, secretary of state of the State of Missouri, hereby certify that the annexed pages contain a full, true, and complete copy of a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, entitled "Concurrent resolution instructing Senators and Members of Congress to prevent the removal of Sioux Indians to the Indian Territory," approved February 8, 1877, as appears by comparing the same with the original roll of said resolution now on file, as the law directs, in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office. Done at office, in the city of Jefferson, this 13th day of February, A. D. 1877.

[SEAL.]

MICHAEL K. MCGRATH,
Secretary of State.

Concurrent resolution instructing Senators and Members of Congress to prevent the removal of Sioux Indians to the Indian Territory.

Whereas an attempt is being made, by parties acting under some pretended authority from the Government of the United States, to remove the savage tribes of Sioux Indians from their present location and to settle them in the Indian Territory, bordering on the States of Missouri, Kansas, Texas, and Arkansas;

And whereas, by such removal and the location of said savage tribes in the said Indian Territory, great injustice and injury would be done to the cause of civilization and to the trade and business of Saint Louis and Kansas City;

And whereas by locating the said wild tribes of Indians in Indian Territory a large area of the most fertile and productive lands of the Southwest would be permanently withdrawn from settlement or occupation by any useful class of citizens and converted into a haunt of marauders and outlaws, to the serious detriment and peril of the inhabitants upon our western borders;

Resolved by the house of representatives, (the senate concurring therein.) That our Senators be instructed and our Representatives in Congress requested to use all their influence to prevent the removal of said tribes to the Indian Territory.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Approved February 8, 1877.

Mr. DAWES presented the petition of Adelia E. Ball and Edwin P. Ball, administrators for the extension of a patent granted to William Ball, deceased, May 27, 1856, for operating steam-stamps; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WALLACE presented a memorial of citizens of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. No. 1056) concerning commerce and navigation and the regulation of

steam-vessels and sailing-vessels; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented two petitions of citizens of Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania, praying for an appropriation for the erection of a post-office building at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented the petition of Lieutenant George W. Leamy, Ninth Pennsylvania Veteran Cavalry, praying for a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. U. S. GRANT, jr., his Secretary, announced that the President had on yesterday approved and signed the act (S. No. 1141) to encourage and promote telegraphic communication between America and Europe.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SARGENT, from the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 4559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for prior years, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HEREFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 4301) for the relief of A. W. Plymale, of West Virginia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. WITHERS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 2847) granting a pension to Lucinda Starnes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. MERRIMON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3745) to prevent the sale and use of adulterated and explosive illuminating oils and other fluids, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Finance, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. No. 1267) to aid in the resumption of specie payments; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WRIGHT. The Committee on Claims have had under consideration the bill (S. No. 1193) for the relief of John W. Schoenecker, James T. Porter, and Henry Finnegrass, and I call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to the report that I now make. The appropriation asked for the benefit of these persons is recommended by the Treasury Department, and it is recommended by the committee that it be included in the deficiency bill. The Committee on Claims find that the claim ought to be allowed, and they make a favorable report upon the claim and recommend the passage of the bill. I am instructed, however, in reporting the bill with a favorable recommendation to move that the bill with the papers be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Claims will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, if there be no objection.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the petition of T. A. Walker, praying to be re-imbursed for the amount of certain moneys paid by him for clerk-hire while acting as register of the United States land office at Des Moines, Iowa, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. No. 1268) for the relief of Thomas A. Walker.

The bill was read twice by its title, and the report was ordered to be printed.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1909) for the relief of John W. Chickering, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3483) to restore John Pulford, lieutenant-colonel United States Army, (retired,) to his former rank on the retired list, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1231) for the relief of the board of trustees of the Antietam National Cemetery, reported it without amendment.

Mr. OGLESBY. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 1765) respecting the limits of reservations for town sites upon the public domain, to report it without amendment, and to say that the committee recommend the passage of the bill without amendment. It is an important subject and ought to be acted upon at this session.

Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3681) for the relief of B. B. Connor & Brother, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. No. 3566) to authorize the board of trustees of the city of Cheyenne, Wyoming Territory, to enter and purchase for the use of said city certain public lands, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1205) to authorize the board of trustees of the city of Chey-

enne, Wyoming Territory, to enter and purchase for the use of said city certain public lands, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred a resolution of the Legislature of Kansas in favor of payment for losses sustained by citizens of that State through depredations committed by guerrilla bands during the year 1861 and thereafter, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the committee was discharged from its further consideration.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 605) for the relief and re-appointment of Captain Thomas B. Hunt, assistant quartermaster in the United States Army, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon; which was ordered to be printed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. DENNIS asked, and by unanimous consent obtained, leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1269) relating to the Washington City and Point Lookout Railroad Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report an amendment to the bill (H. R. No. 4472) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes. I call the attention of the committee to this amendment. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON and Mr. HOWE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. No. 4559) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for prior years, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. GEORGE M. ADAMS, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. No. 631) providing for the adjudication and issue of patents in mission-land cases in the State of Oregon and the Territories of Washington, Idaho, and Montana; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (H. R. No. 7) to provide for the sale or exchange of a certain piece of land in the Wallabout Bay, in the State of New York, to the city of Brooklyn;

A bill (H. R. No. 429) for the relief of Charles C. Campbell, of Washington County, Virginia;

A bill (H. R. No. 859) for the benefit of Andrew Williams, of Weakley County, Tennessee;

A bill (H. R. No. 4251) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. No. 4576) to provide for changing and fixing the boundaries of certain property ceded to the Government of the United States by the city of Memphis, Tennessee.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CAMERON, of Pennsylvania. I ask the Senate now to take up the bill to carry out the provisions of the treaty with Mexico. The government of Mexico has made a very great effort to pay a large sum of money to the Government of the United States, and it is thought desirable at the State Department that the transaction should be closed before the present Administration goes out. I move that the Senate take up the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DAVIS. Let the bill be read, subject to objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion has been made and a single objection will prevent going to the Calendar.

Mr. WITHERS. Let the bill be read by its title.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (H. R. No. 4629) to provide for the distribution of the awards made under the convention between the United States of America and the republic of Mexico, concluded on the 4th day of July, 1868, by its title.

Mr. WITHERS. There is objection to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Virginia object to the motion?

Mr. WITHERS. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. As the Senator objects to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Chair cannot entertain it.

Mr. McDONALD. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of House bill No. 901.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The twenty minutes allowed for

morning business have expired. Is there objection to the motion of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEST. What is the question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would remind Senators that the rule is that when a motion is made to go to the Calendar within the morning hour a single objection prevents the Chair from entertaining a motion for that purpose, and that is why the Chair puts the question, is there objection to the motion?

Mr. WEST. How much of the morning hour is left?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has stated that the twenty minutes have expired.

Mr. WEST. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Louisiana calls for the regular order.

Mr. McDONALD. I hope the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. WEST. I should like to oblige the Senator, but it is impossible for me to do so.

Mr. McDONALD. It would take but a moment to consider the bill.

Mr. WEST. What is the proposition?

Mr. McDONALD. It is a small bill for the relief of a very honest man, J. E. Robertson, of Indianapolis, Indiana.

Mr. WEST. I am sure that would give rise to debate. I am compelled to call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield, the time having expired granted by the Senate. If there be no objection, the Chair will lay before the Senate the business on his table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, communicating, in answer to a Senate resolution of February 13, 1877, a statement of appropriations and expenditures, civil and miscellaneous, of the Department of State from March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1876; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a letter of the Secretary of War, communicating information upon the expediency and utility of constructing a harbor of refuge from ice floods upon the Ohio River in what is known as Mill Bottom, above the city of Newport, on the Kentucky shore, opposite the city of Cincinnati, and recommending an appropriation for that purpose; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Colonel B. H. Grierson, protesting against the restoration to his former rank and position of Thomas J. Spencer, late lieutenant Tenth United States Cavalry; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in answer to a Senate resolution of December 29, 1876, a statement of Osage ceded lands sold by the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad Company prior to February 25, 1874; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

AGREEMENT WITH SIOUX INDIANS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. No. 1185) to ratify an agreement with certain bands of the Sioux Nation of Indians, and also with the Northern Arapaho and Cheyenne Indians.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was on page 1, line 6, after the word "confirmed," to insert the following:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the removal of the Sioux Indians to the Indian Territory, and the President of the United States is hereby directed to prohibit the removal of any portion of the Sioux Indians to the Indian Territory until the same shall be authorized by an act of Congress hereafter enacted.

The amendment was concurred in.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

The bill (H. R. No. 2695) for the relief of S. T. Marshall, of Lee County, Iowa—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. No. 4418) to pay William L. Scruggs, late minister at Bogota, from October 10 to November 21, 1876—to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The bill (H. R. No. 631) providing for the adjudication and issue of patents in mission-land cases in the State of Oregon, and the Territories of Washington, Idaho, and Montana—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (H. R. No. 776) for the relief of James J. Waring, of Savannah, Georgia; and

A bill (H. R. No. 2830) for the relief of Charles Mason.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (H. R. No. 2697) supplementary to the act entitled "An act to carry into effect the convention between the United States and China, concluded on the 8th day of November, 1858, at Shanghai," approved March 3, 1859, and to give the Court of Claims jurisdiction in certain cases;

A bill (H. R. No. 3654) to relieve William F. Russell, of Florida, of political disabilities;

A bill (H. R. No. 4552) to remove the political disabilities of James Austin McCreight, of Alachua County, Florida;

A bill (H. R. No. 4675) to remove the political disabilities of Henry H. Lewis, of Maryland;

A bill (H. R. No. 4676) to remove the political disabilities of Henry B. Tyler, of Virginia;

A bill (H. R. No. 4677) to remove the political disabilities of William B. Mackall, of Virginia; and

A bill (H. R. No. 4678) to relieve Charles H. Levy, of the State of Louisiana, of his political disabilities.

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

The bill (H. R. No. 2690) to refund to the mayor and city council of Baltimore certain moneys illegally assessed and collected for internal-revenue tax was read twice by its title.

Mr. WHYTE. I ask the Senator of Louisiana to allow me just one moment to ask for the passage of this bill, to which there can possibly be no objection. It is to refund to the city of Baltimore a sum of money which under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States was illegally exacted. The court has said that the money should be refunded and it is simply to refund \$13,000 which was paid in 1862 under the internal-revenue law. It had the unanimous report of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House. It will not take a minute.

Mr. WEST. I am sure the Senator from Maryland will not call upon me to make an invidious distinction in behalf of his constituents that I was not able to accord to other Senators.

Nothing but a sense of duty as a member of the Committee on Appropriations compels me to adhere strictly to the agreement. I propose myself to lay aside a measure in which I am much interested in order that the public business may proceed.

Mr. WHYTE. If the Senator from Louisiana will bear with me one moment I will state that if this bill should go to the committee it would have to be reported back, there would be a delay of perhaps three or four days, and the opportunity may be lost of getting the bill passed, whereas the bills moved by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Indiana are on the Calendar and may be called up at any time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator object?

Mr. WEST. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHYTE. I appeal to the Senator.

Mr. WEST. I am sorry that I cannot oblige the Senator without doing injustice to another Senator. Let the bill lie over and the Senator can call it up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie on the table.

Mr. WHYTE subsequently said: I hope the Senator from Louisiana will give way and allow me to take up the bill from the House which was laid on the table a moment ago.

Mr. WEST. If the Senator will give me the assurance, now that the post-office bill is before the Senate, that the consideration of his bill will require no time, I shall yield.

Mr. WHYTE. It cannot possibly occupy more than three minutes.

Mr. WEST. Very well.

Mr. WHYTE. I move to take up the bill (H. R. No. 2690) to refund to the mayor and city council of Baltimore certain moneys illegally assessed and collected for internal-revenue tax.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the payment of \$13,500 due the mayor and city council of Baltimore as interest from the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company collected from that company illegally as an internal-revenue tax by Joseph J. Lewis, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, on the 9th day of January, 1864.

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

PACIFIC RAILROAD ACTS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will call up the unfinished business, which is Senate bill No. 984.

Mr. WEST. I hope now to obtain the consent of the Senate that that bill, known as the railroad bill, may be laid aside without prejudice to its order of business as the unfinished business of the Senate, until the appropriation bills can be disposed of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to this understanding? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WEST. I move now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the post-office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 4187) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was in line 11, to increase the appropriation "for mail deprecations and special agents" in the office of the Postmaster-General from \$21,500 to \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 18, to increase the appropriation

"for preparation and publication of post-route maps" from \$20,000 to \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 22, to increase the appropriation for advertising general mail-lettings of each State and Territory from \$40,000 to \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 30, to insert the following:

For miscellaneous items in the office of the Postmaster-General, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 34, under the heading of "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General," to increase the appropriation for compensation to postmasters from \$7,000,000 to \$7,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 37, to increase the appropriation "for compensation to clerks in post-offices" from \$3,290,000 to \$3,390,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 45, to increase the appropriation "for payment to letter-carriers" from \$1,750,000 to \$1,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 53, to increase the appropriation for wrapping-paper from \$20,000 to \$22,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 58, to increase the appropriation for rent, light, and fuel from \$390,000 to \$420,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 61, to increase the appropriation for stationery from \$45,000 to \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 62, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous and incidental items in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 69, under the head of "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General," to increase the appropriation "for transportation by railroad" from \$9,000,000 to \$9,600,000.

Mr. HAMLIN. After line 70 I move to add the words:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the same may be used by the Postmaster-General to obtain proper facilities over the great trunk lines of railroads for the railway post-office service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

Mr. BOGY. I must object to that amendment without some explanation of it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I will give the explanation which induced the committee to offer the amendment. I understand the increase recommended by the Appropriation Committee was founded on two reasons, designed to accomplish two purposes, both of which, I think, will meet the approbation of the entire Senate: First, to have a fund with which service can be placed upon newly constructed railroads. Last year when the appropriations were passed the Senator from Texas, [Mr. MAXEY,] who is not now in his seat, in connection with myself, called the attention of the Senate to the reduced appropriations, and stated to the Senate that the appropriations already made would not enable the Postmaster-General to place service upon roads that should be newly constructed, as the amount then embraced in the bill was only designed to cover existing roads. The results prove that we were correct. I regret that the Senator from Texas is now absent. Several hundred miles, I think, of new railroad during the past year were completed in that State, but the service could not be placed upon them for the reason that there was no appropriation with which to pay for the service; and the transportation of the mails side by side with the railroad is being carried on to-day. For such a reason I understand the Appropriation Committee have increased the amount. Secondly, we had inaugurated what was called a fast system of mails, by which, I think, between New York and Saint Louis, all the regions beyond and all the points radiating from the great trunk roads, and there was a saving (of course the longer the distance the more the saving) of from an hour to forty-eight hours in the delivery of the mails. It was said then that the diminution of the appropriation would destroy all the fast-mail service. It did it, and to-day we are transporting our mails upon a system that existed sixteen years ago, without the slightest advance within the last sixteen years; and the reduction last year accomplished that result.

It was believed by many that the amount paid the railroad companies was in excess of the service which they performed, and there was a commission raised for the purpose of investigating the railroad service. That commission was appointed. They are now doing their duty. They are gathering information from foreign governments in relation to the service. They have not completed their work, and I think they will furnish the legislative body with information that will be very useful. I can only speak my own judgment, but I feel a confidence when I say that from the information so obtained we shall be able to make a new system which shall be a saving to the Government in the transportation of our mails. The Senate will also recollect that at a subsequent period in the session, to meet the exigencies of the occasion, we adopted certain amendments upon the post-route bill to correct the evil. Now, that commission being in existence, I will say that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads have come to the unanimous conclusion that it is not wise to-day to enter

into a system of fast mails, because when we shall have obtained that information, the very best information that can be had in this country and in regard to foreign countries, we shall be ready to adopt a system which I think would be a saving. If we undertake to extend the fast-mail system to-day, we may find ourselves embarrassed when we shall have obtained this information. It is, therefore, I believe, the unanimous opinion of the Postal Committee that it is unwise to do that, but it is also, I think, the unanimous opinion of that committee that it is very wise to do precisely what this amendment of the Appropriation Committee have recommended, with the amendment which I, as their organ, have suggested, to wit, to put postal cars on the large trunk roads. That will not have any connection with fast mails. The amendment as it comes from the Appropriation Committee does not cover the ground.

Mr. WEST. Although it gives the money.

Mr. HAMLIN. It gives the money, but it does not give the power to use it, and the amendment which I have offered gives that power. Senators will recollect that the mails are now transported by weight. A forty-five feet car will carry as much weight as a sixty feet car, with a space in the sixty feet car set apart for distribution. Consequently every railroad in the country will run forty-five feet cars, and with forty-five feet cars the mail cannot be distributed along the line of the road. Let me illustrate. Between Baltimore and Saint Louis, between New York, over either the New York Central or Pennsylvania Railroad, and I take those great roads to illustrate the position, they are now running forty-five feet cars, which do not furnish the room by which the mails can be distributed. They will not furnish any other than the forty-five feet cars because they get the same compensation, such a car carrying as much bulk in weight, and they get their pay in that way, as the larger car.

This amendment proposes not to increase the speed of the mails until we have obtained the best information, but to enable the large trunk lines to place distributing postal cars upon the road; in doing which, while you do not increase the speed of the mail a single moment you will increase the delivery of the mail between the points I have named twenty-four hours. You thus add to the speed, because if the mails are distributed as they go along it saves the distributing in the offices at the termini of the road and at the principal points along the road. The very terminal point would not be benefited by this distribution, as they would only have to distribute, but every point beyond and every point radiating from these roads would be benefited. Every inch of your country beyond Saint Louis, north of Baltimore, or north of New York, would receive a benefit of twenty-four hours simply by placing such postal cars upon the road as would enable the distribution of your mail as it goes along the road.

I think, Mr. President, that the good sense of this body will admit and that the good sense of the American people will demand that the business communications of this country shall travel along our railroads as fast as the passengers may travel; but under the present arrangements the mails must go in bulk, lie over at Saint Louis, lie over at Baltimore, lie over at Cincinnati, lie over at Pittsburgh, lie over at your large points, and be distributed in the post-offices, and there they lie by until the next mail shall go.

It is economy to adopt this amendment. I have given this matter I think pretty careful attention. The additional force required in the post-offices to distribute is an equivalent, probably more than an equivalent, in the expense of distributing the mails as they go along.

For these reasons the Appropriation Committee have, in my judgment, wisely recommended an appropriation to meet these two necessities of the American people: first, that there shall be means to put mail service upon newly constructed roads and, secondly, that by distributing the mails upon the roads there will be a saving equivalent to what was one-half of the saving of the fast mails. For these reasons the Committee on Appropriations have seen fit to increase the appropriation from \$9,000,000 to \$9,600,000, and the amendment which I have offered simply gives power to the Postmaster-General, without making any more appropriation, to utilize the appropriation the committee have recommended.

Mr. BOGY. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine, or the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads rather, is not as extensive as the speech of my friend from Maine. It is very possible that I might agree with him so far as his speech goes, but I cannot sustain the amendment. That amendment gives the power to the Postmaster-General to use in a very indefinite way the sum of \$250,000. It does not specify that the money shall be used for the purpose of putting these cars upon the roads upon which this distribution is to take place.

Mr. HAMLIN. The Senator is mistaken; it does specify that.

Mr. BOGY. Let the amendment be read again.

Mr. HAMLIN. It is to be used for postal-car service on "the great trunk lines," in the language of my amendment.

Mr. BOGY. Let the Clerk read the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment proposed is at the end of line 70 to insert:

Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the same may be used by the Postmaster-General to obtain proper facilities from the great trunk lines of railroads for the railway post-office service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

So as to read, if amended:

For inland mail transportation, namely: For transportation on star routes and by

steamboats, and all other than railroad routes, \$6,237,993; for transportation by railroad, \$9,600,000; \$250,000 of the same may be used by the Postmaster-General to obtain proper facilities from the great trunk lines of railroad for the railway-post-office service during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878.

Mr. BOGY. The \$250,000 are to be used by the Postmaster-General to obtain the proper facilities, and what those are we do not know. It is to be a matter of discretion with him; and I am not myself prepared to say whether it would be proper to have the distribution spoken of. It is very possible it would be, but it is a change of the whole system.

Mr. HAMLIN. Not a bit.

Mr. BOGY. I am not disposed to change the postal system in a bill of this kind at this time. This would put in the hands of the Postmaster-General the sum of \$250,000 to obtain postal facilities. What they are we do not know. It does not specify what they are. It may be in the special line of these railroads for the purpose of establishing fast mails, or in any other way that he may decide, which he may believe would facilitate the service. The proper way to make an appropriation is to specify the object of the appropriation, and not to leave it as a matter of discretion to the Postmaster-General.

I remember something about the fast lines, although I am not opposed to fast lines and I favor very much the rapid distribution of mail matter. Notwithstanding, it is a subject that has to be remarkably well guarded or it will lead to very great partiality. It must be guarded with great care. That is the reason why heretofore the fast-mail service has been unpopular. Although I think there are many good things to recommend it, yet it was always for the benefit of one or two places and greatly to the detriment of other places. Therefore the fast-mail service became unpopular, however good it may have been in itself. The same is true in regard to this proposition. It is putting an amount of money in the hands of the Postmaster-General to obtain proper facilities, without saying what they are.

With regard to the first point made by the Senator from Maine in his speech, that it is to enable the Postmaster-General to utilize new railroads that may be built, there cannot be much force in that argument. There are very few railroads being built now, and the sum is so large that it would cover a very large and extended line of railroads. There may be some little extension of railroads in Texas, but perhaps nowhere else. Of course I would be very much in favor of giving to that State all mail facilities possible, but the sum is too large for that purpose.

It seems to me that the whole amendment is very indefinite. It is not as well expressed or as definite as the speech made by my friend from Maine. He speaks a great deal better than he has prepared the amendment, and I would prefer that the amendment should be at least as good as his speech.

Mr. WITHERS. The objection which I have to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maine to the amendment of the committee is that the idea which influenced the committee in adding to the amount appropriated by the sum of \$600,000 was to furnish mail facilities along railroad lines which have now for the first time become open to mail transportation. The extent of that new service we were not of course able definitely to ascertain, but we supposed that this sum (at least that was my idea about it) would suffice to cover it. Now, if from the amount thus increased to furnish that service the sum of \$250,000 shall be deducted for the purpose of increasing the facilities for fast-mail service, we diminish to that extent our ability to furnish mails along new lines. I think the whole amount appropriated would not probably be more than sufficient to furnish increased mail facilities to the people along new line, which to my view is a matter of a great deal more importance than the increased facilities for the fast mails alluded to by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WEST. If the premises of the Senator from Virginia were correct, then the conclusion to which he would ask the Senate would be correct also; but I scarcely think he is in that regard correct.

Mr. WITHERS. I stated that it was not my understanding of it. Of course I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. WEST. As I understand from the Postmaster-General, the increase recommended by the committee would accomplish both objects, with the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WITHERS. If the Senator from Louisiana states that he has reliable information from the Department that the sum of \$600,000 will discharge both services fully, will supply the mail service to all the new lines which demand and require it and leave a surplus sufficient to supply the additional facilities asked by the Senator from Maine, I have no objection to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I can answer that question. I can assure the Senator from Virginia that I have the information that from a computation made by the Department it is believed the gross sum will cover both purposes. I am so told, and I do not doubt it is correct.

If the Senator will pardon me one moment, I want to say a word and only a word, as I am usually pretty brief, in reply to the Senator from Missouri. I want to express my regret at the opposition of the Senator from Missouri to this amendment. I regret that any Senator in this body should not be willing to add a little of the postal facilities of the country to its great business interests, and it is certain that an opposition to this amendment, whether so designed or not, has that precise effect.

One word in relation to the powers of the Postmaster-General, and one word in relation to the phraseology of the amendment; which is not so accurate, clear, and distinct as what I say, says the Senator. Now, I say that that amendment does not give to the Postmaster-General one particle of power in addition to what he now has in relation to the management of the Post-Office Department; by which I mean to be understood that the management of the mails and the regulation of the mail service is a thing within his control. If you make an appropriation, not for fast mails, as my friend from Virginia stated, but for increased railway post-office service—and that is the amendment and it is in better language than I speak—it is not to be used for any other service than postal-railroad service, postal cars, railroad cars with post-offices in them. I know of no language that can define it more clearly. If you make the appropriation in gross, you compel the Postmaster-General to disburse that and designate the lines upon which it shall go, under the existing law that regulates the pay on weight. This simply removes that restriction in the law. It takes the restriction of weight away and allows him to put on a larger car and pay for the additional space we will use and which we must have if we are going to distribute the mail. It gives the Postmaster-General no additional power; it is to remove that restriction, without which your amendment is good for nothing. Is it not a sensible proposition that our mail ought to go along our great trunk roads without asking any greater rate of speed than the cars ordinarily go? That is all that the amendment does.

Mr. MAXEY. Mr. President, both the questions so well presented by the Senator from Maine have been the subject of very serious and laborious consideration by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. A paper which was sent to us, I believe, by the superintendent of the railway mail service threw more light upon this subject than any other that I have seen coming from any source. This is not, as the Senator from Missouri puts it, the fast-mail service at all, but it is simply for the purpose of putting on a car sixty feet in length, so arranged as to enable the mail to be distributed, *en route*, between New York and other great commercial points in the East and Chicago, Saint Louis, &c., in the West; so that when the mail reaches these last-named points it is ready distributed on the cars and is passed from the railway mail car to the trains passing west and south and thus no time is lost, instead of being distributed at Saint Louis, Chicago, and so on, as it would be without these facilities, and thus some twelve hours, according to the testimony which we had before us, was thereby saved each way, going and coming. So much then for that.

Now in regard to the appropriation for the additional mail service on new railroads. The necessity of that, to my mind, is perfectly apparent. In the State of Texas alone, for example, since last year, there have been added between three hundred and five hundred miles of railway, the last calculation that I noticed was three hundred and thirty-eight miles; and work on new roads there is still going on. I will call attention—I see the Postmaster-General present—to a correspondence which took place between that officer and myself last summer. One hundred and ten miles of new railway were completed last fall, running through the town in which I live, and no arrangement had been made whereby the Postmaster-General was authorized to place the mail upon that new road, the effect of which was that a little hack went on a dirt road alongside the railroad, landing the mail at the termination of the eastern point of our road, Texarkana, about two days after the train got there. I called the attention of the Postmaster-General to that fact, and asked him if the service could not be put upon it. The Postmaster-General advised me that no appropriation had been made to secure that; and it was only through the courtesy of the railroad officers that it was done at all. Since then, by some arrangement made between the Postmaster-General and the railway officers, we have had that service. And this, I apprehend, is equally true of other new roads in Texas, made, as I have stated, within a year past; and new roads are being built or old ones extended all the time.

The last papers that I received from Texas state that the route connecting San Antonio with Galveston direct was completed. New railroads have been made and old ones extended in different parts of the State. It is a necessity in the interest of the people to make an increased appropriation for this railway mail service. Recurring to the time saved by distributing postal cars, I have to say that so far as Saint Louis and Chicago and all those large places are concerned, they are not particularly profited or benefited by placing these distributing mail cars on the roads. The Senator from Missouri, as a citizen of Saint Louis, is not interested in having a sixty-foot car put on the track, but, as a Senator from Missouri, he is interested in all that tends to benefit that portion of his State which lies west and south of Saint Louis, because the trains reach there, I think, at eight o'clock and fifty-five minutes in the morning; the mail is then transferred to the west and south-going trains, and goes right straight along, instead of being distributed at Saint Louis, for the reason that the mail is properly distributed on the cars *en route* to its destination, and it is for this reason, because our main mail from the North and East goes by Saint Louis, that the people of Texas are so interested in having these distributing cars, because by this means they get their mail about twelve hours earlier.

These are the reasons, and precisely like ones applying to other sections, which induce the Post-Office Committee to recommend these appropriations, and I am very much gratified indeed that the Com-

mittee on Appropriations saw proper to insert them. I believe them to be just, wise, and in the interest of the people.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I think it clear that the additional \$600,000 should be added for mail service. The question is, how it should be used, I understand, and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to correct me if I am wrong, that the intention of his amendment is not to put on additional trains of fast-mail lines, as they are termed, but to give additional mail facilities with the trains at present running. How? By adding, instead of a forty-five feet car, which is probably the length of the car that is now run, a sixty feet car, which will give an opportunity to distribute the mails to a greater extent than at present, as the trains pass along over the different roads, and thus prevent the delay at the terminal points for distribution.

Now, one question that is not clear in my mind is, what is meant by trunk lines—"the main trunk lines," I think, is the language? There are five or six or seven in the country, leading from the seaboard to the western rivers. I should like to see that made a little more definite. At the same time, I do not well see how this amendment can cover it. To a considerable extent it will be left to the judgment of the Postmaster-General. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads what, in his mind, is included in the main routes to the West, or the trunk lines?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia could not have been in his seat when I first addressed the Senate, because I did illustrate the necessities of this amendment and the propriety of it in relation to the fast-mail service by an illustration of what I thought were the three prominent trunk lines that would receive the attention of the Postmaster-General and everybody else, to wit: Baltimore and Ohio Railroad from New York, by way of Baltimore, to Saint Louis; the Pennsylvania Central and the New York Central Railroads. I regard those as the three prominent trunk lines, and I cannot doubt if we will give the Postmaster-General an appropriation sufficient to enable him to give us postal cars, we will certainly have them on all those lines.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be read.

The next amendment was in line 72, to increase the appropriation for compensation to railway-post-office clerks from \$1,125,000 to \$1,300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 74, to increase the appropriation for route-agents from \$945,000 to \$1,050,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 76, to increase the appropriation for mail-route-messengers from \$147,000 to \$153,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 78, to increase the appropriation for local agents from \$100,000 to \$114,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 80, to increase the appropriation for mail-messengers from \$600,000 to \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 81, to increase the appropriation for mail locks and keys from \$16,000 to \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 82, to increase the appropriation for mail-bags and mail-bag-catchers from \$175,000 to \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 85, under the heading of "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General," after the word "postage-stamps," to insert:

Of official stamps, and of newspaper and periodical stamps.

And in line 87, after the word "and," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For manufacture of adhesive postage-stamps, of official stamps, and of newspaper and periodical stamps, \$150,747.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out lines 90 and 91, in the following words:

For manufacture of official stamps and of newspaper and periodical stamps, \$24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 95, to increase the appropriation for the manufacture of stamped envelopes and newspaper-wrappers from \$535,878 to \$600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 99, to increase the appropriation for pay of agent and assistants to distribute stamped envelopes and newspaper-wrappers and expenses of agency from \$12,000 to \$16,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 100, to increase the appropriation for manufacture of postal cards from \$250,000 to \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 108, to increase the appropriation for office envelopes and for dead-letter envelopes from \$25,000 to \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 109, to increase the appropriation for ship, steamboat, and way letters from \$5,000 to \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out lines 113 and 114, in the following words:

For miscellaneous items in the office of the Postmaster-General, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 177, under the heading of "Office of Superintendent of Foreign Mails," to increase the appropriation for transportation of foreign mails from \$230,000 to \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 124, to insert the following:

For the commission appointed under the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1876, to continue and complete the service required of them by said act, \$10,000.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I want to add a very brief amendment to that section by inserting, after the word "act," in line 131, the following words:

And to include an examination of mail service, other than by railroad.

I offer that amendment because this commission, in making an investigation into the railroad service—I am very well satisfied that they will not do much with anything else—are already in possession of some information valuable to us, in relation to other kinds of service, and they simply want power to report it as they get it. I hope, therefore, that their powers will be enlarged to that extent.

Mr. DAVIS. I see no objection to that, except that it may continue the commission longer than the time named here.

Mr. HAMLIN. No, not an hour; not a minute.

Mr. DAVIS. With the declaration of the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads that it will not continue the existence of the commission, I see no objection to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was in section 2, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for the Post-Office Department from \$2,338,460 to \$4,395,375.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment which has just been read.

Mr. WEST. Before this amendment is disposed of changing the amount of the deficiency, I move to strike out lines 123 and 124 of the bill, and then the amount in section 2 will be changed by a reduction of that sum.

I would state that this method of appropriating money for the official postage-stamps of the Post-Office Department really amounts to nothing. It is of no benefit to them. They get no revenue from it and it only increases the aggregate of the bill without any object whatever. I would say to my colleagues on the committee, and also to one of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who served with me on the subcommittee, that I have ascertained this fact since we made this report, and the Post-Office Department are quite willing to have this matter stricken out, as it is really of no use to them, and we can thereby reduce the appropriation \$750,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Reduce the deficiency, the Senator means to say.

Mr. WEST. Reduce the deficiency, I mean, of course. Therefore I move to strike out lines 123 and 124, in the following words:

For official postage-stamps for the use of the Post-Office Department, \$750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEST. Now, Mr. President, in lieu of the sum of \$4,395,375, in lines 4, 5, and 6, of section 2, I move to insert "\$3,645,375," which is the deficiency with the \$750,000 off. I ask the Clerk to read the amendment as now proposed.

The CHIEF CLERK. The proposed amendment to the amendment is to strike out, in lines 4, 5, and 6, the words "\$4,395,375" and insert "3,645,375;" so that the section will read:

SEC. 2. That if the revenue of the Post-Office Department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, then the sum of \$3,645,375, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in revenue of the Post-Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1878.

Mr. DAVIS. That is, I take it, just the difference in the total amount of the deficiency made by striking out lines 123 and 124. I ask the Senator having charge of the bill if that is so?

Mr. WEST. You strike out of the body of the appropriation \$750,000, and you reduce your deficiency by precisely that amount.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. WEST. Those are all the amendments that the Committee on Appropriations propose to offer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am directed by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to submit the following amendment, to come in as an additional section:

That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to continue the steamship mail service between San Francisco, Japan, and China, for one year with the Pacific Mail Steamship

Company, upon the terms specified under the act of February 17, 1865, and February 18, 1867, "for transporting a monthly mail from San Francisco, Japan, and China," at the same terms and conditions so far as applicable; and the Postmaster-General is directed to continue said service as herein provided.

Mr. DAVIS. That amendment, as the Senator from Maine has stated, comes from the Post-Office Committee. It was considered to some extent in the Committee on Appropriations, and, without saying what was the action there, I may say it was not recommended by that committee.

I believe that probably some encouragement ought to be given to this line; but I submit to the Senator who offers the amendment whether the amount is not too large. It is in effect continuing a former contract that was made when the line was established, to last ten years, I believe. I am disposed to believe that some encouragement ought to be given to this line, but I am not disposed to vote for so large an amount; and for one I shall have to oppose it if the amount remains as reported.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, if I were so disposed, I think I could occupy very considerable time in inviting the attention of the Senate to the consideration of this important question. It stretches away beyond any matter relating to postal affairs; it is connected with the commercial prosperity of the country in a very important manner. We occupy to-day the lamentable position of seeing upon the Atlantic nearly all our commerce carried in foreign bottoms, and this has been brought about through the aid which foreign governments have contributed to their own navigation interests, until they have almost literally driven our steamships from the ocean. I hope to see the time when a more liberal spirit will be manifested on our part so as to meet the action of foreign governments in a manner which the best interests of our commerce demand. There is no time, at this session, to go into a full examination of it; but for wise purposes Congress did enter into a contract with this company and agreed to pay them a certain sum of money for transporting the mails between our country and China and Japan, and that company have afloat to-day the best class of vessels to be found, I think, in any part of the world. They were all constructed for naval purposes; every one of them underwent the inspection of naval officers; and on one or two occasions a requisition has been made, when it was supposed there might be a necessity for their use, to have them in readiness. They have performed that service, and we have now a commerce between us and Asia which ought to increase annually; a commerce that comes nearer to us than to any of the European governments, and a commerce that can be made to subserv the best interests of our industries at home. It does seem to me most unwise to refuse to extend a feeble hand, a hand with a slight appropriation, to keep that commerce in the channel in which it belongs, and not allow it to be taken from us by the subsidized vessels of foreign countries. There being no time at this session in which this as a general subject could be considered, the committee deemed it wise only to recommend that the service be continued for a single year, when this, in connection with other subjects, will come up.

We had one other little line from here to Brazil; that is gone; and how are we situated there? Here are all these South American republics at our door; their commerce ought to be ours; we manufacture everything they want and of a better quality than they can get abroad. We ought to have a little sympathy with them from the very character of our institutions as assimilating to theirs; we ought to have an interest in them from our own selfish interests. We talk about a protective tariff. There is a mighty world that we might open up that would afford absolute protection to all our manufactures. That little line to Brazil I believe is no longer in existence. I am told an amendment will be offered in regard to that, and it will receive my most hearty support upon the same rule that I give to this amendment my support. That amendment was not submitted to the committee. If it had been, it would have received my favorable consideration.

It seems to me that we may now in the eye of economy, of the strictest economy, grant fair compensation for mail service; and I say to the Senator from West Virginia that while this company is running a vast number of lines—and you may divide this among them, though we do not deem it advisable to do so, and make the sum very much less for each—this sum is vastly less than would be a fair compensation for the mail service performed by them. True, you may tell me that that mail service does not replenish your Treasury. In reply I can point you to the hundreds of lines inland over the country supplying a sparse population with mails, under what is called "the star system," that do not yield a tenth part of the expense to the Government; and yet while that system affords mail facilities to a population sparsely situated, it aids in opening up and developing your country.

So in relation to this matter. While you do not receive from letters transported a sum adequate for the purpose, yet I do insist that there are other considerations which should come in, equally obligatory upon us as those which apply to what is called the star service on the non-paying routes. It is a subject prolific with thought. It is a subject in which the best interests of all the country are concerned, in my judgment.

But I have no disposition to consume the time of the Senate. I have stated very briefly the considerations which operated upon myself, and, I suppose, upon the committee which directed me to report the amendment.

Mr. BOGY. Mr. President, it was my intention some time ago to propose an amendment to the bill providing for a mail service from the city of New Orleans via different points in the West Indies, and on the coast of South America, and Rio De Janeiro in Brazil. I intended to propose an amendment providing for mail service from that city of \$500,000. I think a mail service from the city of New Orleans to South America should be established. We have lost the trade of South America entirely. A letter cannot go now from the city of New York to South America without going by the way of England. The letter cannot go from the city of New Orleans to South America or to the West India Islands without going to the city of New York, and in some cases, going to England to come back to some of the West India Islands, and in every case if it is to be sent to some portion of South America; while the fact is that all the exports from this country to South America are from the valley of the Mississippi, and should find their outlet by the way of New Orleans; but, for the want of shipping facilities, those exports now are not exported, and the consequence is that South America is supplied with goods and everything else from Europe. The little republic of Argentine imports from England the amount of \$6,000,000 a year, and from the United States less than \$300,000 a year. I could go on citing one republic after another to which the same statement applies. The time has come when we must build up the trade of this country with that vast country there; but I have not had time to prepare my amendment. I have not had time to get the statistics, nor do I believe the Senate or the House are prepared at this time to favor a *projet* of that kind. It is nevertheless one which in time, I think, will be adopted.

Therefore I shall oppose at this time the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine to pay \$500,000 for mail service from San Francisco to Japan; but if at the proper time during the next session of Congress the two items can be combined, I shall favor the amendment then if the one I have suggested meets with favor, because both are essentially necessary to this country. The trade between the west coast of Africa and China and Japan should be fostered. The trade between the valley of the Mississippi and South America should be fostered; and it cannot be fostered unless you first sustain the great facilities through which you create shipping facilities. Therefore I will object at this time to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine; yet at the proper time I shall favor it. I think both objects are important, and both should, at a proper time, be adopted by Congress; but it requires time to mature an amendment; it requires time to get up the statistics to show the limited trade which now exists between us and that country and the vast trade which could exist under a proper system of legislation. I have no doubt myself that South America in time ought to be to the United States what the East Indies have been to England. It is a country of vast extent, of vast resources, and it will give us all its vast trade if we will take the proper steps to secure that trade. As the Senator has said, our institutions are similar, and I think are growing more similar every day. I think we are fast Mexicanizing and South Americanizing our institutions, and on this account I think there is sympathy between us and them.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine, [Mr. HAMLIN.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* put the question and declared that the ayes appeared to prevail.

Mr. BOGY. I call for a division.

Mr. HAMLIN. Let the question come up in the Senate on the amendment.

Mr. WEST. Reserve it for a special vote in the Senate.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I appeal to the Senator from Missouri to let the amendment pass without further question now.

Mr. HAMLIN. The question will come up in Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. We will reserve it. I cannot consent to its passing finally without having the yeas and nays upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator can have it reserved when the bill is reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Are there any reserved amendments?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes. I wish to have reserved the last amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there are no other reserved amendments, the rest, will be concurred in in gross.

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the reserved amendment, being the amendment offered as in Committee of the Whole by the Senator from Maine, [Mr. HAMLIN.]

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for the yeas and nays upon that amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to continue the steamship mail service between San Francisco, Japan, and China for one year with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company upon the terms specified under the act of February 17, 1865, and February 18, 1867, for transporting a monthly mail from San Francisco, Japan, and China, at the

same terms and conditions, so far as applicable; and the Postmaster-General is directed to continue such service as herein provided.

Mr. INGALLS. I desire to vote understandingly upon this subject, and am not able at present with the information before the Senate to say whether I oppose the amendment or whether I favor it. I should like to have some information either from the chairman of the committee or from the Senator who proposed the amendment as to whether this is a new proposition or whether it is merely to carry out an existing contract?

Mr. BURNSIDE. It is a continuation of the old arrangement.

Mr. WEST. That is all.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I merely rose to say to the Senator from Kansas that this contract is a continuation of the old arrangement and provides for entering into a further and a new arrangement. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Missouri says on this subject, and shall vote for any amendment the Senator from Missouri may offer covering the point he has spoken of. I know of my own knowledge that the English people are driving our ships off the seas as rapidly as possible. They have even subsidized a line around the Cape for the trade of the west coast of South America, with a view of preventing that trade from coming across the Isthmus and attracting the attention of the people of the Mississippi Valley and the manufacturers of our country. They are doing everything under the sun they can to drive our steamship lines from the seas, and I shall vote cheerfully for any fair amendment which the Senator from Missouri may offer with a view to subsidizing lines that will get back to us the trade of South America, which I believe really belongs to us.

I see no reason why this amendment should not pass and why we should not continue this temporary subsidy, if you can call it a subsidy. It is simply a payment for carrying the mails, and, I think, not a large payment. Senators desire to see lines established in which their sections of the country are particularly interested, and I trust that, as this is a matter of interest to the whole country, and not to any one section merely, it will meet with favor on all sides.

Mr. DAWES. I may be mistaken about the matter, but I think we had a contract with the Pacific Mail to carry the mails to Japan and China which extended by its terms for ten years, for which we were to pay \$500,000 a year for the whole service. That expires, I believe, with the expiration of this fiscal year.

Mr. WEST. No, it expired the 1st of January last.

Mr. DAWES. The whole purpose of the amendment, as I understand it, is to extend the contract one year—that is all—so that the whole service may not fall during any subsequent or different arrangement that it would be proper to enter into on the part of the Department and any service that it would be wise to contract for doing. The argument, as presented by the Senator from Maine, in favor of the extension of this contract for one year is that it is a temporary matter, leaving it open for the Department without a pressure of important necessity and without acting upon limited information to make a contract, so that they would not, as otherwise, be driven into making a contract under pressure, but may go on, as in the past, and complete a more permanent arrangement either with this line or some other line. I think that is the object of the amendment.

Mr. INGALLS. I have a very indistinct recollection that on some previous occasion the subject of the Pacific mail subsidy was before the Senate, and if I recollect correctly upon some reason, at that time adjudged to be sufficient, the contract that had been made with that company was abrogated. As this is confessedly a subject of very great importance and has for a long time engaged the attention of the people and Congress, it seems a little remarkable to me that this amendment should be reported by a member of the committee as an amendment to the bill after the main bill had itself been under consideration and reported with sundry other amendments.

Mr. HAMLIN. It came from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. INGALLS. The amendment is merely to carry out an existing contract, it is true, but it is an attempt to re-institute or re-inaugurate a contract that for sufficient reason has hitherto been abrogated. It seems to me that it requires some explanation before the Senate should be called to vote upon it.

Mr. DAWES. I do not pretend to be absolutely accurate in my statement, but I do not understand that the contract has been abrogated for any cause. I understand that it expired under its own limitation and was completed. I think that is the fact.

Mr. INGALLS. Let me ask the Senator if the Senate has not on a previous occasion, then, if those are the facts, declined to recognize the contract anew?

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Louisiana has risen to answer the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WEST. The confusion in the mind of the Senator from Kansas on this subject arises from the fact that there were two contracts, one, the original contract, for a monthly mail, passed in 1865 and completed in 1867, expiring on the 1st day of January, 1877. During the existence of that contract another contract was awarded by an act of Congress providing for a semi-monthly mail. Under circumstances that are well known to the Senate and to the community the semi-monthly contract was abrogated. The original contract of monthly service lapsed and expired on the 1st day of January, 1877, leaving us with no arrangement with any ocean-mail steamship company to carry our mails from San Francisco to China and Japan.

Mr. INGALLS. Does not this bill provide for the expenses of carrying the mails commencing with the fiscal year that begins July 1, 1877?

Mr. WEST. The bill does that, but the specific amendment provides for the continuation of the old monthly contract and paying no consideration of course, as there should not be any consideration paid, to the abrogation of the semi-monthly contract. It extends the monthly contract for the term of one year until, as the Senator from Massachusetts has correctly said, the Department and Congress can have power to make ample and necessary arrangements.

Mr. DAVIS. That is true; but the Senator well knows that the mail would be carried as all other mails are carried upon the ocean without any arrangement in the bill. In other words, if this amendment should fail, it would not necessarily prevent mails from being carried there as they always have been. It is true the compensation of this line is very limited, and probably they ought to have some encouragement from Congress, but at the same time it does not prevent the mails from being carried as usual, and they may have the same compensation that all other vessels obtain in carrying the mail.

Mr. WEST. In reply to what the Senator has stated I will say that as long as an American line of steamers run between San Francisco and Japan they will be compelled under the statutes of the United States to carry the mails for what is called sea passage, because if the Senator will refer to the Revised Statutes, I cannot remember exactly the section, no American vessel can clear unless the captain certifies to the fact under oath that he is carrying with him such United States mails as may have been offered to him. But is it not possible that we may be left in the same predicament that we have been left in by the Brazil line, and should that occur we have no other line and no other method of communicating with that country. There is another line of steamships, but that is a British line, and once you sacrifice your American line the British line can command its own terms and drive you all around the world to communicate with the trade of China.

Mr. COOPER. Is there not another line of American vessels?

Mr. WEST. No, sir; there is a line of British steamships under an American organization, but very adroitly brought into competition with our American line.

Mr. CHRISTIANCY. I wish to make a suggestion, or rather an inquiry. I wish to know why it becomes necessary here to designate any particular ship or line of ships by which the mail is to be transported, and why the appropriation would not be equally effective without that designation, leaving it to the Postmaster-General to avail himself of such lines as he finds the cheapest and best for the public interest.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BOGY. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment, if in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will receive it.

Mr. BOGY. As it was written in a very great hurry I will read it myself. I move to add:

That the sum of \$500,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated for a monthly mail service from New Orleans to Rio Janeiro; and the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter into a contract for this purpose with any party or parties to carry such mails by American built and owned vessels of not less than two thousand tons burden, and of approved construction, and seaworthy.

Mr. WEST. I suggest to the Senator to add after "\$500,000" the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. BOGY. Very well.

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

Mr. SARGENT. My recollection is that when the Brazilian mail service was begun the contract with the Government of the United States was about one-fifth of the amount named in the amendment. I may be in error, however. I should like to say with reference to the Chinese service that some time since I submitted an amendment providing that in this contract not more than one Chinaman to fifteen registered tons should be transported upon these vessels. I was moved thereto because of my firm belief that the evils inflicted upon the Pacific coast arising from the unlimited influx of the Chinese are greater than any benefits which arise to that coast from our commerce with China. I am still of that opinion, but I think the effect of the adoption of my amendment, provided the provision as amended should be retained in the bill, would be to turn over the business of carrying Chinese to the English ships and that the evil would not be remedied at all, and consequently that no real good would be attained. In order to reach the evil which I had in view, it is necessary that there should be a general change of the law applying to all vessels landing that class of passengers, immigrants, coolies, or whatever they may be designated, upon our shores. I think there is no opportunity to procure legislation as extensive as the subject demands at this session, and the amendment which I proposed would not really I think, on reflection, accomplish my object. Therefore I shall not move it in the Senate.

I understand the proposition which comes from the Post-Office Committee is to continue the contract with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company for one year longer, upon the same terms that they have done that service for nine years past. I shall give my vote for

that proposition, although I have some doubts with reference to it. I realize the fact that it is necessary to have strong steamship lines in order to protect our commerce. They are the pioneers of commerce. By means of subsidy of this character England has carried her trade and her flag to all parts of the world. She is far more liberal in this respect than it is proposed by the amendment the United States Government shall be. The beneficial results have been seen in making the little island of England rich beyond computation, far surpassing for its area any other country on earth. I believe one of the great causes contributing to this result is the wide commerce of England, and one of the means by which that commerce has been attained has been by this system of subsidy to steamship lines from which other commerce grows up.

We have now to a very great extent, by means of this policy pursued by the Government, control of the commerce of the Pacific Ocean. The Atlantic is an English or European mill-pond, and nothing more. We scarcely venture out upon it with our own American lines. The case, however, is reversed in regard to the Pacific, and there the enterprise of our people, aided in this manner by our Government, has been able to seize upon the prominent lines of communication, and commerce is extended there on every hand. We have nearly as much control of the Pacific as England or any European power has of the Atlantic. The statistics show that there has been an increase of duties paid into the Treasury of the United States on account of the commerce built up by the Chinese mail line greater by a million and a half of dollars than the amount of subsidy which has been paid out by the Government to aid in maintaining that line. The Government has made money by it. I believe it would be wise policy for the Government to continue to do so, even if it did not make anything out of it, even if it should be out of pocket by the operation. There is a return to the tax-payers of the Government many fold the loss of the Government in this direction.

For these reasons influencing my mind I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall propose any amendment to this proposition, but it seems to me that subsidies are started for the purpose of building up commerce. I know on the face of it the appropriation is for carrying the mails, but the real purpose is the building up commerce. If this mail-route has cost five millions for the past ten years, it appears to me that the line ought to have reached a condition so healthy as to do the work for something less; and yet it is proposed that we shall pay the precise sum now that we paid ten years ago.

The Senator from California admits that the trade has largely increased. He claims that the Treasury of the United States has benefited by this subsidy by receiving a million and a half where we paid out but half a million. I do not quite so understand it. I suppose that that portion of the trade of China and Japan and the Indies has been transferred to the Pacific from the Atlantic and there has been a consequent diminution of the receipts on the Atlantic. To all this I do not object, but I should like to know for a certainty whether this service cannot be as well and faithfully performed for \$300,000 as for \$500,000. I have understood that there are other lines offering to carry the mail for the postage. I hardly think it would be fair for us to abandon a line which has built up large, fine steamships and confine them to nothing but the mere postage, and yet it does appear to me that after we have paid this large bonus as a subsidy for ten years the line ought to be able to get along with something less.

Mr. SARGENT. Unless I am in error, there has been no diminution whatever in the receipts of the custom-house upon the Atlantic side. There has been no apparent diminution of business in that direction, but rather an increase, while the gain at the port of San Francisco alone has been a million and a half of dollars more than the amount paid out to this line under this contract for carrying the mails.

Mr. MORRILL. But the Senator will see at once that the trade which goes overland by railroad is of necessity that trade which would have come the other way if it were not for this line.

Mr. SARGENT. I do not know that I concede that to be the case at all. Under the operation of this subsidy, for instance, teas have been very much cheapened. Every one knows that a cheaper article goes more largely into consumption, and that business grows up on account of the greater demand for articles of consumption. A good article of tea ten years ago was worth a dollar and a half and a dollar and seventy-five cents a pound, whereas now it is worth from eighty cents to a dollar a pound, on account of the facilities for getting it.

Mr. BOGY. Ten years ago we got no tea from Japan.

Mr. SARGENT. Ten years ago we got no Japan tea at all, and now we get it in large quantities. This line has developed business and made the articles of Asiatic production which go into consumption cheaper to the people who consume them; and the articles are necessities of life.

Mr. MORRILL. As the Senator from California expressed some doubt why he proposed to vote for this proposition, I should like to ask him if he does not think that \$300,000 would be ample compensation for the services to be rendered hereafter?

Mr. SARGENT. My doubt did not arise on account of the amount. The amount is about one-fourth that which England appropriated for the same purpose. I think the \$500,000 which we have given all along

is rather a starving amount. My doubt arose from another cause entirely, in which I know the Senator would not sympathize with me at all. I alluded, in speaking of the amendment, to the amendment which I proposed in regard to the conveyance of the Chinese. The Senator is remote from that question at present, at any rate, and I hope that his State always will be remote from it; but it presses upon us of the Pacific with terrible force, for reasons which I have elaborately given heretofore. My doubt sprang from the consideration whether we should not restrict the facilities for landing upon our shores the untold millions of Asia, who do not assimilate with our people, who have no love for our institutions, who do not come here to make a home, who impoverish our working-classes, and bring with them the traditional diseases and vices of paganism. Those are the matters upon which I have doubt, but the application of a restriction upon this line would not prevent these consequences occurring; for if such an amendment were placed upon this bill it would still leave the British ships to bring over Chinese in unlimited quantities and make a profitable trade for them in that direction. I see no object in doing that, although I did at the time I proposed the amendment and had it printed. I see no object in it now, because if they are to come they might as well come by means of one conveyance as another.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that this same company is now running a line from San Francisco to the Isthmus and another line from San Francisco I think up to the British possessions. The proposition as first presented to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads was to apply this sum for all foreign service, but there were no lines competing with them. There was no time for a general consideration of the subject, and the committee deemed it advisable simply to continue this contract for one year. Now, if you were to divide it among the three routes it would be a mere pittance indeed; but as there was no time to make any equitable adjustment, and for the fear that we would lose the service entirely and in the end our commerce upon the Pacific would be in that deplorable condition which we witness upon the Atlantic, where nine-tenths of it is done in foreign bottoms, we thought it wise to extend this contract for one year, and in the mean time to make such arrangements as should be wise and proper.

In relation to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri to my amendment I want to say that I am for it, but it ought to have been a little more carefully prepared. I have had no time to look into the statutes; but when the contract with the Pacific Mail was entered into we had stipulations in the contract as to what the company should do. I have hastily drawn an addition to the Senator's amendment which will cover it, though probably not in as good terms as are employed in the statute. I will send it to the Chair, that the Senator may hear it read, and, if it meets his approval, that he may adopt it as part of his amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be reported. The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed by Mr. BOGY to insert at the end of the pending amendment the following:

And that the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated for a monthly mail service from New Orleans to Rio Janeiro; and the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter into a contract for this purpose with any party or parties to carry said mails in American built and owned vessels and of not less than two thousand tons burden, and of approved construction and seaworthy.

The amendment suggested by Mr. HAMLIN is to add to the amendment to the amendment the following:

Said steamships shall be built under the direction and inspection of some naval officer to be designated by the Secretary of the Navy; and the said steamships shall at all times be subject to the use of the Government when demanded at reasonable rates of charter-party therefor.

Mr. BOGY. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment is accepted, and the question is on the amendment to the amendment as modified.

Mr. WEST. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that he extend the qualification of the ships so that ships already constructed may be used. The words are "shall be built."

Mr. HAMLIN. I will say "built or accepted." If they have got them already built it is just as well.

Mr. BOGY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That modification will be made.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, there ought not to be fish made of one and flesh of another. Either the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary" ought to be stricken out of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOGY] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HAMLIN] or the same words should be inserted in the amendment proposed by the Post-Office Committee with regard to the service between San Francisco and Japan. As that amendment now reads there is an absolute appropriation of \$500,000 for that specific service to a particular line of steamships. The amendment proposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine provides "that \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be appropriated for the steamship service between New Orleans and Rio Janeiro. Therefore I suggest that what is sauce for one should be sauce for the other, and if we are to have a specific appropriation of \$500,000 for the Pacific mail service there should be \$500,000 specifically appropriated for that service from the mouth of the Mississippi River to Brazil.

Mr. HAMLIN. The Senator will see the difference. In the one case it is to extend an existing service that had its existence upon

the terms and conditions stipulated in the contract, and it is proposed to inaugurate another service upon the same terms and conditions; while in the other case it is a new service, a new contract.

Mr. INGALLS. But if the Senator from Maine will permit me, the contract under which the Pacific mail steamship service has heretofore been performed has expired.

Mr. HAMLIN. Precisely.

Mr. INGALLS. That is not, then, a continuation of an old contract, but it is the institution of a new contract. Now it appears to me that if we are to make subsidies or to appropriate moneys for the transportation of the mails, it ought to be done at the least possible expense. If we are to appropriate a specific sum irrespective of the value of the service to be performed for the transportation of the mails from San Francisco to Japan, it is just as proper that we should appropriate the same sum for similar service from New Orleans to Brazil.

Mr. HAMLIN. I understand the Senator to wish to strike out the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary" in the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. INGALLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPENCER. I should like to inquire if an amendment is now in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the amendment made in Committee of the Whole, to which an amendment has been offered by the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. BOGY.] That being in the second degree, another amendment is not in order until the amendment to the amendment is disposed of.

Mr. INGALLS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri. He having accepted the modification made by the Senator from Maine, it becomes his amendment. It will be reported as modified.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment to the amendment as modified.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. SPENCER. I move to strike out the words "Pacific Mail Steamship Company" wherever they occur in the amendment, and also in regard to the line between New Orleans and Brazil, if that is named, wherever it occurs, and insert "the Postmaster-General shall let to the lowest bidder."

Mr. INGALLS. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, I will state to him that I have prepared an amendment in the way of a substitute to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine, which, I believe, will meet his views; it certainly expresses my own. I propose to amend so that it shall read:

That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to carry the mails between the United States and China and Japan upon the best attainable terms for monthly service, the same to be let as provided by law, to be carried in American built and owned vessels of not less than two thousand tons burden.

Mr. SPENCER. I withdraw my amendment in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WEST. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator from Kansas will allow me to suggest that he had better fix some limit and say that the appropriation shall not exceed a certain amount.

Mr. INGALLS. I say "\$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. DAVIS. For the two lines or for each case?

Mr. INGALLS. For the transportation of the mails between San Francisco, China, and Japan.

Mr. PADDOCK. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that I understand this line carries the mail to the ports of other countries than those named in his amendment; for instance, to Australia.

Mr. DAVIS. The same line takes the mail also to Oregon, up the Columbia River, I believe, and to other places. The amendment ought to include all, if any.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas, [Mr. INGALLS.]

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out that portion of the amendment relating to the Pacific mail between China and Japan and San Francisco and insert:

That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to carry the mails between the United States and China and Japan upon the best attainable terms for monthly service, the same to be let as provided by law, to be carried in American built and owned vessels of not less than two thousand tons burden.

Mr. DAWES. I do not desire to oppose the substitute just offered, but I desire to inquire of the Senator from Kansas if there is an existing law to authorize the letting?

Mr. INGALLS. I think there is.

Mr. SARGENT. I think the Senator is in error in that. The only existing law I know of is the one authorizing the contract to be made with the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

Mr. DAWES. That contract has expired, and that led me to make the inquiry.

Mr. SARGENT. That is the only existing law. There is no general law to which this amendment could attach, in my judgment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as amended.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think the amendment of the Senator from Kansas needs a little amendment, and then I shall not be opposed to it. I think the law is defective, or in other words, I think there is no existing statute under which the Postmaster-General could make such a contract. If the Senator will add the words "and that the Postmaster-General be authorized to make said contract," so that the amendment shall contain the power to do that, I will not object to it.

Mr. INGALLS. The object desired by the Senator from Maine can very readily be obtained by striking out the words "the same to be let as may be provided by law;" so as to read:

That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to carry the mails between the United States and China and Japan, upon the best attainable terms for monthly service, to be carried in American built and owned vessels of not less than two thousand tons burden.

However, if the Senator from Maine desires to incorporate his suggestion in additional language, I certainly shall have no objection.

Mr. HAMLIN. I suggest to strike out the words "the same to be let as provided by law," and insert the words:

And the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to contract for such service.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Kansas accept the amendment?

Mr. INGALLS. Yes, sir. I do not know what it is, but I accept it.

Mr. HAMLIN. It is to authorize in terms the Postmaster-General to make the contract provided for.

Mr. MERRIMON. That is legislation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the amendment as modified.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to carry the mail between the United States and China and Japan, upon the best attainable terms for monthly service; and the Postmaster-General is hereby authorized to contract for such service, to be carried in American built and owned vessels of not less than two thousand tons burden.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment as modified to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as amended.

Mr. DAVIS. If the amendment to the amendment should be adopted, would it still be in order to amend the amendment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It would be in order to strike out and add. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as modified.

Mr. MERRIMON. I submit whether the proposed amendment is not in fact a violation of the rule which provides that no general legislation shall be incorporated into an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It does not change the amount agreed to in committee.

Mr. MERRIMON. It provides, however, in fact that there shall be a mail carried between San Francisco and China and Japan. There is no existing law which provides for it, and without this provision the mail could not be carried under specific contract.

Mr. HAMLIN. I suggest that the amendment has been offered and acted upon in the Senate and the time has passed when the question could be raised, if it were a question to be raised.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair was about to state that in Committee of the Whole the Senate agreed to a certain amount and like service embraced in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas. Therefore, it is not a new proposition. The amount is not increased, nor is the nature of the service changed. The point of order was not made in Committee of the Whole, and it is too late to make it now.

Mr. MERRIMON. I submit whether the point of order cannot be raised at any time whenever the Senate wishes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the new rule as to the question of relevancy the Chair will submit to the Senate whether the amendment to the amendment is relevant under the rule. [Putting the question.] The yeas have it, and the Senate decides that the amendment to the amendment is relevant. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] to the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as modified.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to strike out \$500,000 and insert \$300,000.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment to the amendment is in the second degree. The Chair cannot entertain the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HAMLIN. Let me suggest to my friend from West Virginia that such an amendment is unnecessary, it seems to me, because the amendment only calls for so much of the sum as shall be found to be necessary.

Mr. DAVIS. Still it is the difference of limit between \$300,000 and \$500,000, and I want to fix the limit definitely. If the amendment is not in order now, I ask if it would be in order if the pending amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HAMLIN. No.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It would not unless the Senator should move to strike out and insert. If the Senate adopts the amendment it will remain as it is.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to strike out \$500,000 and insert \$300,000.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair cannot now entertain another amendment, because the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] is now in the second degree.

Mr. DAVIS. Do I understand that there is no way of reaching the object I desire?

Mr. CLAYTON. Vote down the amendment proposing \$500,000.

Mr. DAVIS. With great deference to the Chair I think probably on reflection he will see that to strike out and insert would be in order either now or if the amendment should be adopted or rejected.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. What point of order does the Senator make?

Mr. DAVIS. I raise the point for the Chair to rule upon whether my motion to reduce the maximum amount from \$500,000 to \$300,000 would not be in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair cannot entertain the amendment. If the Senator should move to strike out the whole paragraph, it would then stand as a simple proposition; under what is known as the Carpenter rule it would be a proposition by itself, but to simply move to strike out \$500,000 and insert \$300,000 would be an amendment in the third degree, and could not be entertained.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I ask the Chair, if the amendment should be adopted, whether an amendment would be in order to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$300,000."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator should move to strike out a portion of what has been adopted and insert a little different language which would be different from what had been adopted, the Chair could entertain it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I beg the Chair to pause a moment. When the Senate have adopted an amendment in certain words and it becomes the judgment of the Senate, they cannot change it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair states that after the Senate have adopted it, if the Senator should move to strike out and insert other words, the Chair must entertain it. The rule says that when a motion is rejected to strike out and insert, a motion to strike out and insert other words can be entertained.

Mr. HAMLIN. Precisely; but when the Senate have agreed to an amendment inserting words, it stands in the judgment of the Senate and you must reconsider the vote to change it, and that is a rule as old as parliamentary law itself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. So it does. The Chair and the Senator from Maine do not disagree. The ruling of the Chair is that after this amendment has been adopted, if the Senator from West Virginia should move to strike out a portion of these words and insert other words, the Chair must entertain the motion.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then the Chair and the Senator from Maine do disagree most thoroughly.

Mr. INGALLS. Is it the understanding of the Chair that after this amendment shall be agreed to it is then beyond the power of the Senate to modify it?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is not. The Chair has not so ruled.

Mr. INGALLS. I misunderstood the Chair.

Mr. McDONALD. If the motion to strike out and insert is divisible I ask that the question be first taken on the motion to strike out.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. On the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to strike out the amendment of the Senator from Maine and insert what he has proposed?

Mr. McDONALD. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair cannot divide that question. If that is the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana the Chair cannot entertain it. A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the amendment to strike out and insert what has been read.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DAVIS. Now I move to strike out \$500,000 and insert \$300,000 in the amendment that has just been voted upon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair cannot entertain that. If the Senator moves to strike out "five" and insert eight, it is an increase of the amount and may be entertained. The greater includes the less.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. President, I am going to raise no question of order here, but ask the Senate to vote down the motion. The amendment now stands at "\$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary." If there can be a contract made with the American line for any sum less, it can be done under this provision. It may be that it can be done for \$400,000 and cannot for \$300,000. I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not insist on his amendment, though it is one out of order from beginning to end.

Mr. DAVIS. My object, of course, can be reached by voting against the amendment, which is now to be voted on as a whole, as I understand it. I understood the Chair, when I made the inquiry of him whether or not the amendment could be amended after having been adopted by the Senate, to answer in the affirmative. Now I understand the Chair to say that if it is moved to increase the amount it can be done, but not if it is to diminish it. Am I correct in that?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has before stated pre-

cisely that if the Senator moved to strike out and insert other words in the amendment besides those already agreed to, the Chair could entertain it; but the Senator must understand that the agreement of \$500,000 would include \$300,000, as the greater includes the less. That is the parliamentary usage. If the Senator had moved to strike out and insert different language the Chair would have entertained the motion.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no wish except as to the amount. As to the ruling of the Chair, I believe it is correct in this instance. But, Mr. President, there are now two subjects presented here, one relating to the mail service from New Orleans and the other to the mail service from the Pacific coast. There are perhaps Senators who desire to vote for the one and against the other. Now can that be done or not under the ruling of the Chair? In other words, can a Senator move to have the vote taken on the two propositions separately, or can an amendment be offered to strike out the proposition relating to the Pacific mail?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator asks for a division of the two propositions, the Chair will entertain that.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes sir; I do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment contains two ideas. The Senator did not before ask for a division of the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I asked the Chair if it be in order. I do ask for a division of the question. I do not wish to consume the time of the Senate; I only ask that the Senate divide the propositions.

Mr. BOGY. I hope there will be no division of this question. If it be necessary to establish a line from San Francisco to Japan, it is surely as necessary to have a line from New Orleans to South America.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from West Virginia insist on a division?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question then is on concurring in the amendment as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think that the yeas and nays were ordered upon that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They were ordered some time ago. Mr. WEST. But the call was withdrawn, I think.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the call insisted upon?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, sir; I insist upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee insists on the yeas and nays being taken. The Secretary will call the roll.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 27, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Barnum, Bogy, Booth, Burnside, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chaffee, Christianity, Conover, Cragin, Dawes, Dennis, Ferry, Goldthwaite, Hamlin, Ingalls, Johnston, Kernan, McMillan, Morrill, Paddock, Patterson, Sargent, West, Windom, and Withers—27.

NAYS—Messrs. Alcorn, Bailey, Clayton, Cooper, Davis, Hereford, Hitchcock, McCreery, McDonald, Maxey, Merrimon, Randolph, Ransom, Robertson, Sherman, Spencer, Teller, and Wright—18.

ABSENT—Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Blaine, Boutwell, Bruce, Cockrell, Conkling, Dorsey, Eaton, Edmunds, Frelinghuysen, Gordon, Hamilton, Harvey, Howe, Jones of Florida, Jones of Nevada, Kelly, Logan, Mitchell, Morton, Norwood, Oglesby, Saulsbury, Sharon, Stevenson, Thurman, Wadleigh, Wallace, and Whyte—30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. WEST. I know of no further amendments to be offered.

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

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WINDOM. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 4472) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WINDOM. Mr. President, I am extremely anxious to yield to my good-natured friend from Indiana, but I dare not do it.

Mr. McDONALD. It will take but a minute.

Mr. WINDOM. The Senator says that the bill which he proposes to take up will occupy only a minute. If there is no objection from anybody else, I am willing to yield to him for a minute.

I give notice that I cannot yield any further.

J. E. ROBERTSON & CO.

Mr. McDONALD. I ask consent of the Senate now to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 901) for the relief of J. E. Robertson & Co., of Indianapolis, Indiana.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to proceeding to the consideration of the bill named by the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read. It directs the payment to J. E. Robertson & Co., of Indianapolis, Indiana, of \$432.96, or so much thereof as they shall prove to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that they have expended in the purchase of revenue-stamps used by them to stamp manufactured tobacco, upon which a tax had been previously paid under the revenue in force at the time of its manu-

facture and sale, but which was made liable to be stamped under the act of July 20, 1868, thus requiring a double tax on the same tobacco.

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

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 4472) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

Mr. WINDOM. I give notice that I cannot yield any further until this bill is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read and the amendments will be considered as they are reached in the reading.

Mr. WINDOM. Mr. President, I think I may facilitate the passage of this bill by explaining, in about three minutes, its general provisions. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was \$14,979,345.50. The amount as reported by the Senate committee is \$16,737,895.89. The increase as made by the Senate committee is \$1,758,550.39. The amount of the bill for 1876-77, the current year, is \$15,717,933.30. So that the aggregate of this bill is greater than the appropriations for the current year by \$1,019,962.59, and I will very briefly explain wherein this increase consists. Before doing so, however, let me state that the Committee on Appropriations, finding several hundred amendments, adopted a general principle which governs throughout the bill.

There are a great many changes of salaries, the old question which was fought over for two months during the last session of Congress. The Committee on Appropriations have simply reinstated the salaries in every case at what they are the current year; that is, they have taken the compromise measures, so to speak, of last summer as their guide. We have not in a single instance increased a salary over the amount which was fixed by the conferences of last summer. That general principle covers a very large number of the amendments in the bill. As a general rule, the committee have not increased the number of employes; but there are a few exceptions to that rule, to which I will call attention very briefly.

In the Senate, there is an increase of three laborers in the Engineers' Department, there being none during last summer to carry on the work of repairing the heating, ventilating apparatus, &c. In the State Department there has been no increase, but a slight change. There is an increase of two firemen and a reduction of ten charwomen, making a slight saving to the Government. In the Treasury Department, Secretary's Office, there is an increase of eight laborers, for which we have the recommendations of the Department showing that it is absolutely necessary. I will explain them more fully when we reach that point, if it is desired. In the Third Auditor's Office, there is an increase of three laborers. In the Sixth Auditor's Office, there is a considerable increase of the clerical force. Senators will remember that the Sixth Auditor settles all the accounts of the Post-Office Department. We are informed by the Postmaster-General and by the Sixth Auditor that there are some four hundred applications for money-order offices which are refused because there is not sufficient clerical force in the Sixth Auditor's office to settle their accounts; that there will be from one hundred to two hundred more applications during the next year for money-order offices that must be denied unless this increase be given. The money-order offices pay their own way and a small profit to the Government, so that this increase in the Sixth Auditor's Office for that and other purposes connected with the office is not really a charge upon the Government. The increase there is of three clerks of class four, four clerks of class three, nine clerks of class two, and two at \$1,000. There is a reduction of three clerks of class one.

In the Treasurer's Office we have made some changes; that is, we have reduced eighteen counters and added some clerks over last year. The reduction in the cost to the Government by these changes is about \$3,000. So that I presume that will not be challenged. In the Treasurer's Office, Bureau for the Redemption of National Currency, we have increased the force by two clerks of class four, two clerks of class three, and five clerks of class one. The expense of the Redemption Bureau is paid for by the banks of the country, who send their money there under the law for redemption. It was conclusively shown to the Committee on Appropriations that there is not enough clerical force to do the business, that the banks complain, and as they pay the expense, and not the Government, it is but fair that they have force enough to do the work promptly.

For the Register of the Treasury there is a slight increase of one clerk and one charwoman and a reduction of nine copyists, so that there is an absolute saving of money there.

In the Patent Office there is no change that adds any considerable sum. The reduction there is greater than the increase. In the Post-Office Department there is an increase of seven clerks of class three, five clerks of class two, ten clerks of class one, and ten copyists. When that part of the bill is reached, we have letters from the Department to present, which I think will prove most conclusively to the Senate that the committee has acted wisely in making the increase.

In the Attorney-General's Office one clerk had been omitted and he has been added. For the Solicitor of the Treasury one clerk who was omitted last year, we think by mistake, has been restored.

That is the whole of the increase of the clerical force in the bill over the force of the present year.

I have a statement which I hardly feel like taking the time of the Senate to read, explaining each and every item which goes to make up the increase over the bill of last year. The total increase over the bill of last year is \$1,019,962.59; and the explanation of that increase and of several items that I have upon this paper before me, I will not take the time of the Senate to read, but will ask permission to print in the RECORD. I think it will be entirely satisfactory to the Senate.

Items of interest in bill as reported over appropriations for current fiscal year.

Compensation of Senators, \$10,000. Increase rendered necessary by admission of Colorado.

Mileage of Senators, \$6,000. Partly due to admission of Colorado Senators. Officers, clerks, and employes of the Senate, \$8,564. Due to addition of one clerk to Committee on Privileges and Elections, at \$2,250, and to length of session.

Contingent, including clerks to committees during session, \$15,821. Mainly due to long session; seven months estimated for next year and four months for this year. Officers, clerks, and employes of the House, \$3,570. Increase made by House of Representatives.

Contingent expenses of House of Representatives, \$44,072. Increase made by House of Representatives.

Public buildings and grounds, \$700. There is a deficiency this year. State Department, \$9,115. The whole of this increase is for printing and distributing Statutes at Large.

Treasury Department, including miscellaneous and contingent, \$52,080. This increase is for eight laborers in Secretary's Office, three laborers in the Third Auditor's Office, fifteen clerks in Sixth Auditor's Office, and for clerical force in Treasurer's and Register's Offices.

Internal revenue, \$15,000. Salaries and expenses of collection. This bill is \$25,000 less than last year's appropriation for same purpose, including the deficiency appropriated at this session.

Mints and assay offices, \$131,350. This increase is made up as follows: Fifty-five thousand dollars for repairs of machinery and apparatus of the mint and assay office at New York, and wages of workmen, &c., at mints and assay offices at other places.

District of Columbia, \$26,500. This amount is merely a transfer from the sundry civil bill of last year, and is not an increase of appropriation.

War Department, \$13,800. Of this amount \$12,000 is for rent which was provided for in sundry civil bill last year. Balance is for fuel and increase of contingent in office of Secretary.

Post-Office Department, \$87,040. Of this increase \$12,800 is for furnishing and fitting up lower story of Post-Office Department, (new); \$20,000 for Postal Guide, provided for in sundry civil bill list. Miscellaneous, \$3,000; balance increase of clerical force.

Department of Agriculture, \$17,940. This increase is caused by adding \$5,000 to item for collecting statistics, and \$15,000 to item for purchase of seeds, plants, &c. A reduction of \$2,000 in contingent and \$0 for clerical force makes the \$17,940 net increase.

United States courts, &c., \$33,450. Of this amount \$26,000 is for expenses of courts in Utah Territory, a portion of which was appropriated in another bill last year, and balance is for salaries of judges.

Department of Justice, \$8,500. Increase is occasioned by adding Naval Solicitor, (omitted last year, but provided for in deficiency bill for that year,) and by adding one clerk of class four and one clerk of class one, and also \$2,000 to the contingent fund.

Court of Claims, \$500. This is for stationery, fuel, and other miscellanies which were deficient the current year.

To pay judgments of Court of Claims, \$639,410.59. This amount is for judgments of the Courts of Claims which have been confirmed by the Supreme Court or in which the time for appeal has expired.

Total added, \$1,123,472.59. Deduct reductions made in items from appropriations of current year, \$103,510. Net increase, \$1,019,962.59.

I move now that the five-minute rule be applied to this bill, although I suppose it is hardly necessary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the five-minute rule being applied to the bill? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was in line 18, to increase the appropriation for hire of horses and wagons for the Secretary's Office of the Senate from \$600 to \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 19, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chief Clerk of the Senate from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 19, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of the principal clerk, principal executive clerk, minute and journal clerk, and financial clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Senate from \$2,500 each to \$2,592 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 26, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of the librarian and seven clerks in the office of the Secretary of the Senate from \$1,800 each to \$2,220 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 28, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the clerk of printing records from \$2,000 to \$2,220.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 29, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of five clerks in the Secretary's office of the Senate, from \$1,800 each to \$2,100 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 30, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the keeper of the stationery from \$1,600 to \$2,102.40.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 30, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one messenger in the Secretary's office from \$1,200 to \$1,296.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 36, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one special policeman from \$1,200 to \$1,296.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 37, to increase the appropriation

for extra clerk hire and copying in the Department of State from \$1,000 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 439, after the word "thousand" to insert "five hundred;" in line 441, after the word "foregoing" to strike out "one thousand two hundred and fifty" and insert "three thousand;" and in line 442, after the word "all" to strike out "17,250" and insert "10,500;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, namely: For fuel, \$10,000; for lights, \$3,000; for repairs, \$2,000; for care and subsistence of horses and repairs of wagons and harness, \$1,500; and for miscellaneous items, not included in the foregoing, \$3,000; in all, \$19,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 445, to increase the appropriation for rent of stable and wagon-shed for the new State Department building from \$500 to \$600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 453 to insert the following clause:

For official postage-stamps for the State Department, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 459, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of two Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury from "\$4,000 each" to "\$4,500 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 461, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief clerk and *ex officio* superintendent of the Treasury building from \$2,500 to \$2,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 463, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one chief of the division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations from \$2,500 to \$2,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 465, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one assistant chief of division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations from \$2,000 to \$2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 468, to increase the number of clerks of class four in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury from twenty to twenty-three.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 471, to increase the number of clerks of class three from sixteen to nineteen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 471, to increase the number of clerks of class two from fifteen to eighteen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 472, to reduce the number of clerks of class one from twelve to eleven.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 474, to strike out the words:

And five clerks at \$900 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 475, to increase the number of laborers from twenty-eight to thirty-six.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 480, to increase the number of watchmen from fifty to sixty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 484, before the word "firemen" to strike out "six," and in the same line after the word "firemen" to strike out at \$720 each, and insert "\$4,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 487, to increase the total appropriation for the compensation of officers and employes in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury from \$263,560 to \$287,070.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the clause making appropriations for the consolidated division of loans and currency, before the word "clerks" in line 496, to strike out the word "female;" in line 497, before the word "messengers" strike out "assistant;" in line 498, before the word "dollars," strike out the words "seven hundred and twenty" and insert "eight hundred and forty;" and in line 501, after the word "all" strike out "\$87,965.50" and insert "\$88,685.50;" so that the clause will read:

For the consolidated division of loans and currency, namely: One chief of division, at \$2,500; two assistant chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; ten clerks of class four, and additional pay to three fourth-class clerks, namely, receiving clerk of bonds and two book-keepers, \$100 each; six clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; thirty-five clerks, at \$900 each; six messengers, at \$240 each; six laborers, at \$720 each; and six laborers, at \$2.25 per day each; in all, \$88,685.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the clause making appropriations for the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, line 506, after the words "Supervising Architect" strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$4,500;" in line 507, after the word "photographer" strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,250;" in line 508, after the word "dollars" insert "one principal clerk at \$2,000;" in line 509, after the words "class four" strike out "at \$1,800;" and in line 512, after the word

"all" to strike out "\$17,390" and insert "\$20,140;" so that the clause will read:

Supervising Architect:

In the construction branch of the Treasury: For Supervising Architect, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,250; photographer, \$2,250; one principal clerk, at \$2,000; one clerk of class four, two clerks of class three, two clerks of class one; one clerk, at \$900; and one messenger; in all, \$20,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 515, after the words "First Comptroller of the Treasury" to strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$5,000;" in line 517, before the word "hundred" to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" in line 518, after the word "thousand" to insert "one hundred;" and in line 521, after the word "all" to strike out "\$32,600" and insert "\$63,700;" so the clause will read:

For First Comptroller of the Treasury:

For First Comptroller of the Treasury, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,700; four chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; four clerks of class four; ten clerks of class three; eight clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; six clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, \$63,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 524, after the words "Second Comptroller of the Treasury" to strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$5,000;" in line 526, after the word "thousand" strike out "five" and insert "seven;" in line 527, after the word "thousand" insert "one hundred;" in line 529, before the word "clerks" strike out "eight female" and insert "nine;" in line 531, after the word "all" strike out "\$83,200" and insert "\$85,300;" so that the clause will read:

Second Comptroller of the Treasury:

For Second Comptroller of the Treasury, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,700; five chiefs of division, at \$2,100 each; five clerks of class four; twelve clerks of class three; thirteen clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; nine clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, \$85,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 534, after the word "thousand" to strike out "five hundred;" in line 535, after the word "thousand" to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 536, after the word "thousand" insert "one hundred;" and in line 539, after the word "thousand" to strike out "\$48,960" and insert "\$48,410;" so that the clause will read:

Commissioner of Customs:

For Commissioner of Customs, \$4,000; deputy commissioner, \$2,250; two chiefs of division at \$2,100 each; two clerks of class four; five clerks of class three; ten clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$48,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 545, before the word "clerks" to strike out "six" and insert "seven;" in line 546, before the word "clerks" strike out "ten" and insert "eleven;" and in line 547, after the word "all" to strike out "\$49,730" and insert "\$52,330;" so that the clause will read:

First Auditor:

For the First Auditor of the Treasury, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; four chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; seven clerks of class two; eleven clerks of class one; one messenger; and two laborers; in all, \$52,330.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 549, to strike out before the word "clerks" the word "two" and insert "three," and in line 551, after the word "all" to strike out "\$13,600" and insert "\$15,400;" so that the clause will read:

For the division of loans, namely: Three clerks of class four; three clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; and two clerks of class one; in all, \$15,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 556, before the word "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 557, before the word "clerks" to strike out "fifty" and insert "sixty;" in line 558, strike out "ten female clerks, at \$900 each;" and in line 560, after the word "all" to strike out "\$197,250" and insert "\$204,000.50;" so that the clause will read:

Second Auditor:

For Second Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; six clerks of class four; twenty-eight clerks of class three; sixty clerks of class two; thirty-five clerks of class one; one messenger; and eight laborers; in all, \$204,050.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 565, before the words "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 566, before the word "clerks" strike out "fifty" and insert "sixty;" in line 567, before the word "clerks" strike out "ten" and insert "five;" in line 568, before the word "laborers" to strike out "four" and insert "seven," and in line 570, after the words "in all" strike out "\$174,050" and insert "\$187,510;" so that the clause will read:

Third Auditor:

For Third Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; six clerks of class four; fifteen clerks of class three; sixty clerks of class two; thirty-five clerks of class one; five clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; seven laborers; and one charwoman, at \$480; in all, \$187,510.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 574, before the word "chiefs" to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 576, before the word "clerks" to strike out "twelve" and insert "sixteen;" in line 576, before the word "clerks" to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;"

in line 577, before the word "clerks" to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in line 577, before the word "clerks" to strike out "eight" and insert "five;" in line 579, after the words "in all" strike out "\$62,930" and insert "\$71,230;" so that the clause will read:

Fourth Auditor:

For the Fourth Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; three chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; sixteen clerks of class three; nine clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; five clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and two laborers; in all, \$71,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 584, before the word "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 585, before the word "clerks" strike out "four" and insert "five;" in the same line, before the word "clerks" strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 586, before the words "clerks" strike out "five" and insert "three;" and in line 587, after the words "in all" strike out "\$39,110" and insert "\$41,510;" so that the clause will read:

Fifth Auditor:

For the Fifth Auditor, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; two clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; three clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$41,510.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 594, before the word "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "eight;" in line 595, after the word "fifty" insert "four;" in line 596, after the word "sixty" to insert "nine;" in line 597, before the word "clerks" strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-seven;" in line 598, before the word "assorters" strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty;" in line 601, after the words "in all" strike out "\$289,070" and insert "\$311,570;" so that the clause will read:

Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department:

For compensation of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, \$3,600; deputy auditor, \$2,250; eight chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; eight clerks of class four, and additional to one clerk as disbursing-clerk, \$200; fifty-four clerks of class three; sixty-nine clerks of class two; thirty-seven clerks of class one; one messenger; and nineteen laborers; twenty assorters of money-orders, \$18,000; also fifteen female assorters of money-orders, at \$900 each; in all, \$311,570.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 607, before the word "dollars" to insert "two hundred;" in line 609, before the word "dollars" to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" in line 614, after the word "thousand" insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 614, after the word "each" strike out "ten" and insert "thirteen;" in line 615, before the word "clerks" strike out "eleven" and insert "thirteen;" in line 616, before the word "clerks" strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in line 620, after the words "in all" strike out "\$145,730" and insert "\$156,680;" so that the clause will read:

Treasurer:

For compensation of the Treasurer of the United States, \$6,000; Assistant Treasurer, \$3,600; cashier, \$3,600; assistant cashier, \$3,200; chief clerk, \$2,500; five chiefs of division, at \$2,500 each; one principal book-keeper, at \$2,500; one assistant book-keeper, at \$2,400; two tellers, at \$2,500 each; two assistant tellers, at \$2,250 each; thirteen clerks of class four; thirteen clerks of class three; nine clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; forty clerks, at \$900 each; five messengers; five laborers, at \$720 each; and seven laborers, at \$240 each; in all, \$156,680.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 623, after the word "namely" to strike out "thirteen" and insert "seventeen;" in line 624, before the word "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 625, before the word "clerks" strike out "six" and insert "five;" in line 625, before the word "clerks" to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in line 628, after the words "in all" strike out "\$164,000" and insert "\$172,600;" so that the clause will read:

For the division of loans, namely: Seventeen clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; one hundred counters and copyists, at \$900 each; seven messengers; and twenty-six laborers; in all, \$172,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 636, before the word "clerks" to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 637, before the word "clerks" strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 638, before the word "clerks" strike out "thirty-five" and insert "thirty-six;" in line 639, before the word "clerks" strike out "twelve" and insert "fifteen;" in line 647, after the words "in all" strike out "\$112,336" and insert "\$123,336;" so that the clause will read:

For the force employed in redeeming the national currency, namely: For superintendent, \$3,500; two principal tellers and one principal book-keeper, at \$2,500 each; one assistant book-keeper, \$2,400; and two assistant tellers, at \$2,000 each; four clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; four clerks of class two; thirty-six clerks of class one; fifteen clerks, at \$1,000 each; twenty-six clerks, at \$900 each; two messengers; three assistant messengers; three employes, at \$432 each; in all, \$123,336.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 648, after the words "six clerks of class four" to insert "one of whom shall receive \$200 additional for services as disbursing clerk, and shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine;" in line 651, before the word "clerks" to strike out "six" and insert "seven;" in line 652, before the word "clerks" strike out "nine" and insert "ten;" in line 653, before the word "copyist" strike out "eight" and insert

"six;" and in line 654, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$59,050" and insert "\$60,450;" so that the clause will read:

Register of the Treasury:

For compensation of the Register of the Treasury, \$4,000; assistant register, \$2,250; six clerks of class four, one of whom shall receive \$200 additional for services as disbursing clerk, and shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine; seven clerks of class three; ten clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; six copyists, at \$900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, \$60,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 656, before the word "chiefs" to strike out "four" and insert "five;" in line 657, before the word "clerks" to strike out "eight" and insert "nine;" in line 659, before the word "copyist" strike out "sixty" and insert "fifty-eight;" in line 661, after the word "messengers" strike out "and;" in the same line, after the word "laborers" insert "and one charwoman at \$380;" and in line 662, after the words "in all" strike out "\$104,440" and insert "\$106,800;" so that the clause will read:

For the division of loans, namely: Five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; nine clerks of class four; eight clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; fifty-eight copyists and counters, at \$900 each; four messengers; four laborers; and one charwoman, at \$380; in all, \$106,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 666, after the words "Comptroller of the Currency" to strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$5,000;" in line 667, after the word "thousand" strike out "five" and insert "eight;" in line 668, after the word "thousand" to insert "two hundred;" in line 669, after the word "thousand" to strike out "four" and insert "eight;" in line 670, before the word "clerks" to strike out "six" and insert "eight;" in line 671, before the word "clerks" to strike out "ten" and insert "twelve;" and in line 675, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$94,020" and insert "\$102,820;" so that the clause will read:

Comptroller of the Currency:

For Comptroller of the Currency, \$5,000; deputy comptroller, \$2,800; four chiefs of division, at \$2,200 each; one stenographer, at \$1,800; eight clerks of class four; twelve clerks of class three; nine clerks of class two; eight clerks of class one; twenty-five clerks, at \$900 each; three messengers; three laborers; and two night-watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$102,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 680, after the word "at" to strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,000;" and in line 682, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$21,140" and insert "\$22,340;" so that the clause will read:

For expenses of the national currency, namely: One superintendent, at \$2,000; one teller and one book-keeper, at \$2,000 each; and one assistant book-keeper, \$2,000; fifteen clerks, at \$900 each; and one messenger; in all, \$22,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 694, before the word "clerks" to strike out "four" and insert "five;" in line 695, before the word "clerks" where it first occurs to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in the same line, before the word "clerks" where it occurs the second time strike out "five" and insert "six;" and in line 699, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$37,940" and insert "\$42,740;" so that the clause will read:

Bureau of Statistics:

For the officer in charge of the Bureau of Statistics, \$2,400; chief clerk, \$2,000; five clerks of class four; six clerks of class three; six clerks of class two; four clerks of class one; five copyists, at \$900 each; one messenger; one laborer; and one charwoman, at \$480; in all, \$42,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after the word "dollars," in line 700, to insert the following:

And for the additional duties imposed upon the Bureau of Statistics by the legislation of the second session of the Forty-third Congress, the sum of \$12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, in payment of the services of experts, and for other necessary expenditures connected with the collection of facts relative to the internal and foreign commerce of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 710, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the Chief of Bureau of Engraving and Printing from \$4,000 to \$4,500, and to increase the total appropriations for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing from \$19,830 to \$20,330.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 717, after the words "Commissioner of Internal Revenue" to strike out "\$5,500" and insert "\$6,000;" in line 719, after the word "dollars" to insert "two heads of division, at \$2,500 each;" in line 720, before the word "heads" to strike out "seven" and insert "five;" in line 723, after the word "thousand" to strike out "four" and insert "eight;" in the same line, after the word "twenty" insert "five;" in line 724, before the word "clerks" strike out "thirty-five" and insert "forty;" in line 725, before the word "clerks" strike out "twenty-five" and insert "eighteen;" and in line 727, after the words "in all" to strike out "\$244,410" and insert "\$253,410;" so that the clause will read:

Commissioner of Internal Revenue:

For Commissioner of Internal Revenue, \$6,000; one deputy commissioner, \$3,200; two heads of division, at \$2,500 each; five heads of division, at \$2,250 each; one stenographer, \$1,800; twenty-five clerks of class four; thirty clerks of class three; forty clerks of class two; eighteen clerks of class one; fifty clerks, at \$900 each; four messengers; and ten laborers; in all, \$253,410.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 736, before the word "thousand"

to strike out "six hundred and seventy-five" and insert "eight hundred and forty," and in line 737, after the word "dollars" to strike out the following:

And from and after the 30th day of June next there shall be no more than one hundred and twenty collection districts; and it shall be the duty of the President, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to reduce the internal-revenue districts to not exceeding the number aforesaid, in the manner heretofore provided by law. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause a careful examination to be made of allowances to collectors of internal revenue under the provisions of section 3145 of the Revised Statutes, for collection of revenue in the several districts, and to equalize the same, and reduce the aggregate of such allowances not less than 5 per cent. on the amount of the same;

So that the clause will read:

For salaries and expenses of collectors, \$1,540,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 758, to increase the appropriation for detecting and bringing to trial and punishment persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws, or conniving in such crime, including payments for information and detection, from \$50,000 to \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 763, to strike out the words "and the several Executive Departments, according to the exigencies of the public service, to be apportioned by the Secretary of the Treasury;" so that the clause will read:

For temporary clerks for the Treasury Department, \$60,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be paid to any officer or employé of the Government as additional compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 775, to increase the appropriation for arranging and binding canceled marine papers, requisitions, and other important records; sealing ship registers; for foreign postage, newspapers, books, hand-stamps, and repairs of the same, from \$10,000 to \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 783, to increase the appropriation for care and subsistence of horses for office and mail wagons, including feeding and shoeing, and for wagons, harness and repairs of same, from \$3,000 to \$3,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 786, to increase the appropriation for ice, buckets, file-holders, book-rests, labor, clocks, and repairs of the same, from \$4,000 to \$9,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 789, to increase the appropriation for coal, wood, grates, grate-baskets and fixtures, stoves and fixtures, blowers, coal-hods, hearths, shovels, tongs, poker, matches, and match-safes, from \$8,000 to \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 791, to increase the appropriation for gas, drop-lights and tubing, gas-burners, brackets and globes, candles, lanterns, and wicks, from \$12,000 to \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 794, to increase the appropriation for carpets, oil-cloth, and matting, and repairs, cleaning, and laying of the same, from \$5,000 to \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 799, to increase the appropriation for desks, tables, and chairs, and shelving for file-rooms, and cases, repairs of furniture, boxes, rugs, chair-covers and caning, cushions, cloth for covering desks, locks, screws, hand-saws, turpentine, and varnish, from \$12,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 817, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant treasurer at New York from \$7,200 to \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 819, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the deputy assistant treasurer at New York from \$3,240 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 820, to increase the appropriation for the salary of cashier and chief clerk from \$3,780 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 821, to reduce the appropriation for the salary of the chief of the coin division from \$4,000 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 823, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of note-payment division from \$2,700 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 824, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief of the note-receiving division from \$2,700 to \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 826, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of check division from \$2,700 to \$2,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 827, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of registered-interest division from \$2,520 to \$2,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 829, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of coupon-interest division from \$2,250 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 830, to increase the appropriation for chief of fractional-currency division from \$2,250 to \$2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 832, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of bond division from \$2,160 to \$2,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 834, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief of canceled-check and record division from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 835, to increase the appropriation for the salary of two clerks from \$2,160 each to \$2,250 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 836, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of six clerks from \$1,980 each to \$2,100 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 838, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of ten clerks from \$1,800 each to \$2,000 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 839, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of nine clerks from \$1,620 each to \$1,800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 840, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of four clerks at \$1,530 each to \$1,700 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 842, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of four clerks from \$1,440 each to \$1,600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 843, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of two clerks from \$1,350 each to \$1,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 845, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of ten clerks from \$1,260 each to \$1,400 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 847, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of five messengers from \$1,200 each to \$1,300 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 849, to increase the appropriation for the salary of keeper of building from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 850, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief detective from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 852, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant detective from \$1,260 to \$1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 856, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the assistant treasurer at New York from \$137,840 to \$148,530.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 860, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant treasurer at Boston from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 861, to increase the appropriation for the chief clerk in the office of the assistant treasurer at Boston from \$2,430 to \$2,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 863, to increase the appropriation for the salary of paying teller from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 864, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief interest clerk from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 865, to increase the appropriation for the salary of receiving teller from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 867, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the first book-keeper from \$1,530 to \$1,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 869, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the second book-keeper, depositor's accounts, from \$1,350 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 870, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the currency clerk from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 872, to increase the appropriation for the salary of specie clerk from \$1,350 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 873, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant specie clerk from \$1,260 to \$1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 875, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of two coupon clerks from \$1,260 each to \$1,400 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 882, to increase the appropriation

for the salary of messenger and chief watchman, from \$1,000 to \$1,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 884, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the assistant treasurer at Boston from \$31,680 to \$34,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 887, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant treasurer at San Francisco from \$5,000 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 888, to increase the appropriation for the salary of cashier from \$2,700 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 889, to increase the appropriation for the salary of bookkeeper from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 890, to increase the appropriation for assistant cashier from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 892 to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant bookkeeper from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 893, to increase the appropriation for the salary of stamp-clerk from \$2,160 to \$2,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 895, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one clerk from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 896, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of three night-watchmen from \$1,000 to \$1,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 897, to increase the appropriation for the salary of one day-watchman from \$900 to \$960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 898, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the assistant treasurer at San Francisco from \$21,230 to \$24,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 901, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant treasurer at Philadelphia from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 903, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the cashier and chief clerk in the office of the assistant treasurer, Philadelphia, from \$2,430 to \$2,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 904, to increase the appropriation for the book-keeper from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 905, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief interest-clerk from \$1,710 to \$1,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 907, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant book-keeper from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 908, to increase the appropriation for the salary of coin-teller from \$1,530 to \$1,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 909, to increase the appropriation for the salary of chief registered-interest clerk from \$1,710 to \$1,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 911, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant coupon-clerk from \$1,440 to \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 912, to increase the appropriation for the salary of fractional-currency clerk from \$1,440 to \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 914, after the word "thousand," to strike out "three hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" and in line 916, after the word "thousand," to strike out "two hundred and sixty" and insert "four hundred;" so that the clause will read: "Two assistant registered-interest clerks, one at \$1,500 and one at \$1,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 917, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant coin-tellers from \$1,260 to \$1,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 918, to increase the appropriation for the salary of receiving teller from \$1,170 to \$1,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 924, to increase the total appropriation for the office of assistant treasurer at Philadelphia from \$37,120 to \$39,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 927, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant treasurer at Baltimore from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 928, to increase the appropriation

for the salary of the cashier in the office of the assistant treasurer at Baltimore from \$2,150 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 930, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of three clerks from \$1,620 each to \$1,800 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 931, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of three clerks from \$1,260 each to \$1,400 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 935, to increase the total appropriation for the office of assistant treasurer at Baltimore from \$22,240 to \$23,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 939, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant treasurer at Saint Louis from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 940, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief clerk and teller from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 942, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant teller from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 943, to increase the appropriation for the salary of book-keeper from \$1,350 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 946, to increase the total appropriation for the office of assistant treasurer at Saint Louis from \$14,720 to \$15,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 950, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant treasurer at Chicago from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 951, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the cashier from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 953, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the paying teller from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 954, to increase the appropriation for the salary of book-keeper and receiving teller from \$1,350 each to \$1,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 958, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the assistant treasurer at Chicago from \$12,480 to \$15,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 961, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant treasurer at Cincinnati from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 962, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the cashier from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 963, to increase the appropriation for the salary of book-keeper from \$1,620 to \$1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 965, to increase the appropriation for the salary of assistant cashier from \$1,350 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 971, to increase the total appropriation for the office of assistant treasurer at Cincinnati from \$14,230 to \$15,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 974, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant treasurer at New Orleans from \$4,050 to \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 975, to increase the appropriation for the salary of cashier from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 976, to increase the appropriation for the salary of receiving teller from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 978, to increase the appropriation for the salary of book-keeper from \$1,350 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 981, to increase the total appropriation for the office of assistant treasurer at New Orleans from \$13,230 to \$14,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1012, after the words "class three," to insert "one clerk of class two," and in line 1015, after the word "of," to strike out "fifteen thousand five" and insert "sixteen thousand nine;" so that the clause will read:

Office of the Director of the Mint:
For Director, \$4,500; examiner, \$3,000; one computer of bullion, \$2,000; one assay clerk, \$1,800; one clerk of class three; one clerk of class two; one translator, \$1,200; one copyist, \$900; one messenger; one laborer; making, in all, the sum of \$16,960.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after line 1031 the following additional clause:

For fitting up an assay laboratory in the office of the Director of the Mint, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after line 1032 the following additional clause:

To repair the machinery and apparatus of the coining mints and of the assay-office at New York, and to add some additional machinery, \$55,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available immediately.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1044, after the word "thousand" to strike out "four" and insert "five;" in line 1045, after the word "thousand" to insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 1046, after the word "at" to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 1048, after the word "and" to strike out "two clerks" and insert "one clerk;" in line 1049, after the word "dollars" to strike out "each;" and in the same line, after the word "all" to strike out "thirty-five thousand seven hundred" and insert "thirty-four thousand eight hundred and fifty;" so that the clause will read:

Mint at Philadelphia:

For salaries of the superintendent, \$4,500; for the assayer, melter and refiner, coin-er, and engraver, four in all, at \$3,000 each; the assistant assayer, assistant coin-er, and assistant melter and refiner, at \$2,000 each; cashier, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,250; book-keeper and deposit clerk, at \$2,000 each; weigh-clerk, \$2,000; and one clerk, at \$1,600; in all, \$34,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1052, to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen and adjusters in the office of the Mint at Philadelphia from \$250,000 to \$320,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1054, to increase the appropriation for incidental and contingent expenses in the office of the Mint from \$60,000 to \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1060, to increase the appropriation for the chief clerk of the mint at San Francisco, California, from \$2,250 to \$2,500; and in line 1063 to increase the total appropriation for assayer, melter, refiner, &c., in the mint at San Francisco, California, from \$24,650 to \$24,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1065, to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen and adjusters from \$250,000 to \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1068, to increase the appropriation for material and repairs, fuel, lights, chemicals, and other necessaries from \$75,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1075, under the head of "Mint at Carson, Nevada," after the word "weigh-clerk" to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in line 1077, after the word "thousand" to strike out "six" and insert "eight;" and in line 1078, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "twenty-two thousand nine" and insert "twenty-three thousand five;" so as to read:

For salary of superintendent, \$3,000; for assayer, melter and refiner, and coin-er, at \$2,500 each; chief clerk, at \$2,250; cashier and book-keeper, at \$2,000 each; weigh clerk, \$2,000; voucher clerk and computing clerk, at \$1,800 each; assayer's clerk, at \$1,200; in all, \$23,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1081, to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen and adjusters from \$60,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1084, to increase the appropriation for materials and repairs, fuel, light, charcoal, chemicals, and other necessaries from \$35,000 to \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Assay office at New York," in line 1098, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" in line 1101, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "two hundred and fifty;" and in line 1107, after the word "thousand" to strike out the words "one hundred and fifty" and insert "nine hundred;" so as to read:

For salary of superintendent, \$4,250; for assayer, \$3,000; for melter and refiner, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; weighing clerk, \$2,500; paying clerk, \$2,000; bar clerk, \$1,800; warrant clerk, \$2,250; two calculating clerks, at \$1,800 each; assistant weigh clerk, \$1,600; for assayer's first assistant, \$2,250; for assayer's second assistant, \$2,150; for assayer's third assistant, \$2,000; in all, \$32,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1109, to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1111, to increase the appropriation for acids, copper, coal, lead, &c., from \$8,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1122, under the head of "Assay office at Helena, Montana," after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" and in line 1123, after the word "each" to strike out "four" and insert "five;" so as to read:

For salaries of assayer in charge, and of melter, at \$2,500 each, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1129, under the head of "Assay

office at Boise City, Idaho Territory," to increase the appropriation for salary of assayer, who shall perform the duties of melter, from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1131, to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen, fuel, crucibles, chemicals, &c., from \$1,300 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "District of Columbia," in line 1159, after the word "thousand," to strike out the words "seven hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred;" and in line 1160, after the word "health-officer," to strike out the words "one thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert "two thousand;" so as to read:

Provided, That any two of the above-named offices may be filled by the same person at the discretion of the board; medical sanitary inspector, \$1,500; health-officer, \$2,000; four clerks, \$4,800; five sanitary inspectors, \$6,000, &c.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Government in the Territories," in line 1181, after the word "judges," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1182, after the word "secretary," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in line 1184, after the words "in all," to strike out the words "twelve thousand three" and insert "fourteen thousand five;" so as to read:

Territory of Arizona:

For salary of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, \$3,000 each; secretary, \$2,000; interpreter and translator in the executive office, \$500; in all, \$14,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1191, after the word "at," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1192, after the word "secretary," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in line 1193, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" so as to read:

Territory of Dakota:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1201, after the word "at," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1203, after the word "at," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" and in line 1204, after the word "dollars," insert the following:

And the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department are hereby authorized to audit and settle the accounts of Mason Brayman for salary as governor of Idaho Territory from September 18, 1876, the date of his assuming the duties of said office, to November 13, 1876, the same as if he had taken the oath of office in said Territory instead of the District of Columbia.

So as to read:

Territory of Idaho:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000. And the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department are hereby authorized to audit and settle the accounts of Mason Brayman for salary as governor of Idaho Territory from September 18, 1876, the date of his assuming the duties of said office, to November 13, 1876, the same as if he had taken the oath of office in said Territory instead of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1219, after the word "at," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1221, after the word "at," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" so as to read:

Territory of Montana:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1228, after the word "at," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1230, after the word "at," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in line 1232, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words "twelve thousand three" and insert "fourteen thousand five;" so as to read:

Territory of New Mexico:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, at \$2,000; and interpreter and translator in the executive office, at \$500, \$14,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1241, after the word "at," to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1243, after the word "at," to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" so as to read:

Territory of Utah:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1252, after the word "at" to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1254, after the word "at" to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in line 1255, after the word "dollars" to strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" so as to read:

Territory of Washington:

For the salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1263, after the word "at" to strike out the words "two thousand five hundred" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1265, after the word "at" to strike out the words "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" and in the same line to strike out the words "eleven thousand eight hundred" and insert "fourteen thousand;" so as to read:

Territory of Wyoming:

For salaries of governor, chief-justice, and two associate judges, at \$3,000 each; and secretary, at \$2,000, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "War Department," in line 1275, after the word "thousand" to strike out the words "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred," and in line 1282, after the word "thousand" to strike out the words "one hundred and thirty" and insert "three hundred and eighty;" so as to read:

For compensation of the Secretary of War, \$8,000; one chief clerk, at \$2,500; one disbursing clerk, at \$2,000; two chief clerks of division, at \$1,800 each; six clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; four clerks of class two; twelve clerks of class one; eight messengers; seven laborers; and six watchmen for the Northwest Executive Building; in all \$69,380.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1289, to increase the appropriation for the purpose of examining the rebel archives, and having copies furnished for the Government, from \$5,000 to \$6,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1297, after the word "one" to strike out "six" and insert "eight," and in line 1298, after the word "and" to strike out the words "ninety-two thousand six hundred and forty" and insert "ninety-four thousand three hundred and twenty;" so as to read:

In the office of the Adjutant-General:

One chief clerk, at \$1,000; eleven clerks of class four; seventeen clerks of class three; forty-one clerks of class two; one hundred and fifty-one clerks of class one; eight messengers, at \$840 each; in all, \$294,320.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1301, to increase the appropriation for the contingent expenses of the office of the Adjutant-General from \$8,000 to \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1308, after the word "three" to strike out the words "one thousand six hundred dollars;" in the same line, after the word "two" strike out the words "female copyists, at \$900 each" and insert "clerks of class one; one messenger;" and in line 1310, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "five thousand two hundred" and insert "six thousand six hundred and forty;" so as to read:

In the Bureau of Military Justice:

One chief clerk, \$1,800; one clerk of class three; two clerks of class one; one messenger; in all \$6,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1316, after the word "dollars" to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" in line 1317, after the word "four" to strike out the word "ten" and insert "nine;" in line 1318, after the word "twenty" insert "four;" in line 1319, after the word "one" strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty;" and in line 1326, after the word "and" to strike out the words "forty-six thousand one" and insert "fifty-two thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

One chief clerk, at \$2,000; seven clerks of class four; nine clerks of class three; twenty-four clerks of class two; forty-eight clerks of class one; twenty copyists, at \$900 each; one female messenger, at \$30 per month; one messenger, at \$840; two assistant messengers; six laborers; one engineer, at \$1,200; one fireman; five watchmen; and one draughtsman, at \$1,800; in all, \$152,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1352, after the word "dollars" to strike out the words "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" in line 1354, after the word "two" to strike out "four" and insert "six;" and in line 1355, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "sixteen thousand one" and insert "twenty thousand three;" so as to read:

One chief clerk, at \$2,000; two clerks of class four; two clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; one messenger; one laborer; in all, \$20,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1367, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "four" and insert "six;" in line 1368, after the word "three" to strike out the word "ten" and insert "fourteen;" in line 1369, after the word "two" to strike out the word "twelve" and insert "nine;" and in line 1370, after the words "in all" to strike out

the words "fifty-three thousand two" and insert "fifty-eight thousand eight;" so as to read:

Chief clerk, at \$2,000; six clerks of class four; seven clerks of class three; fourteen clerks of class two; nine clerks of class one; one messenger; two watchmen; three laborers; in all \$38,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1372, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses in the office of the Paymaster-General from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the clause making appropriations for the office of the Chief of Engineers, line 1374, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "three" and insert "four;" in line 1376, after the word "two" to strike out the word "four" and insert "three;" and in line 1377, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "twenty-three thousand four hundred" and insert "twenty-four thousand;" so that the clause will read:

One chief clerk, at \$2,000; four clerks of class four; three clerks of class three; three clerks of class two; three clerks of class one; one messenger; two laborers; in all, \$24,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1384, to increase the appropriation for contingent expenses of the office of the Chief of Engineers from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1388, in the appropriations for the War Department buildings to increase the compensation of one engineer in the War Department building from \$1,000 to \$1,200; and in line 1389, to increase the total appropriation, one engineer, four watchmen, and two laborers in the War Department buildings, from \$5,320 to \$5,520.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1392, to increase the appropriation for labor, fuel, light, and miscellaneous items for the War Department buildings from \$6,000 to \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Navy Department," in line 1414, to increase the compensation of the chief clerk of the Navy Department from \$2,250 to \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1418, to increase the total appropriation for compensation of the Secretary of the Navy, chief clerk, one disbursing clerk, &c., from \$31,170 to \$31,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1449, after the word "three," to strike out the words "one clerk" and insert "two clerks;" and in line 1451, after the words "in all," to strike out the words "eight thousand one" and insert "nine thousand five;" so as to read:

Bureau of Ordnance:

For chief clerk, \$1,800; draughtsman, \$1,800; one clerk of class three; two clerks of class two; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$9,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1474, after the word "two," to strike out the word "two" and insert "three;" and in line 1475, after the words "in all," to strike out the words "thirteen thousand five" and insert "fourteen thousand seven;" so as to read:

Bureau of Provisions and Clothing:

For chief clerk, \$1,800; one clerk of class four; two clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; three clerks of class one; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$14,760.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1486, after the word "for," to strike out the word "four" and insert "five;" and in line 1487, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "four thousand five hundred and seventy" and insert "five thousand two hundred and ninety;" so as to read:

For one superintendent of the building occupied by the Navy Department, and for five watchmen and two laborers; in all, \$5,290.

For incidental labor, fuel, lights, and miscellaneous items for said building, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1489, after the word "for," to insert the words "incidental labor;" and in line 1490, after the word "building," to strike out the word "three" and insert "five;" so as to make the clause read:

For incidental labor, fuel, lights, and miscellaneous items for said building, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Department of the Interior" in line 1494, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the chief clerk of the Department from \$2,250 to \$2,500; and in line 1502, to increase the total appropriation for compensation of employés in the office of the Secretary of the Interior from \$62,650 to \$62,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1510, after the word "and," to strike out the word "twenty-four" and insert "twenty-eight;" and in line 1512, after the word "direct," to strike out the words "seventeen thousand two hundred and eighty" and insert "twenty thousand one hundred and sixty;" so as to read:

For one captain of the watch, \$1,000; and twenty-eight watchmen, to be allotted to day or night service, as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, \$20,160.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1514, after the word "for" to strike out the word "stationery," and in line 1517, after the word "library" to strike out the word "eight" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

For furniture, advertising, telegraphing, ice, and miscellaneous items, including new books and books to complete broken sets, and cases and maps for library, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1519, after the word "superintendent" to strike out the words "at \$1,600, five thousand," and insert "six thousand two hundred and fifty;" so as to read:

For expenses of packing and distributing official documents, (including salary of superintendent,) \$6,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 1526, to insert the following:

For stationery for the Department of the Interior and its several bureaus and offices, \$29,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 1529, to insert the following:

For temporary clerks for the Department of the Interior, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1535, in the clause making appropriations for the General Land Office, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the recorder from \$1,800 to \$2,000, and in line 1543, to increase the total appropriation for compensation to employes in the General Land Office from \$213,440 to \$213,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1551, to increase the appropriation for maps of the United States (including paper) from \$3,000 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1552, after the word "diagrams," to strike out the words "stationery, parchment paper for land-patents;" and in line 1559, after the word "telegraphing" to strike out the words "twenty-five thousand" and insert "twenty-one thousand five hundred;" so as to read:

For diagrams, furniture, and repairs of the same, miscellaneous items, including two of the city newspapers, to be filed, bound, and preserved for the use of the office, for the actual expenses of clerks detailed to investigate fraudulent land-entries, trespasses on the public lands, and cases of official misconduct, and for advertising and telegraphing, \$24,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the appropriations for the Indian Office, in line 1563, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "four" and insert "five;" in line 1564, after the word "four" to strike out the word "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 1565, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "nine" and insert "thirteen;" in line 1566, after the word "two" to strike out the word "twelve" and insert "thirteen;" in the same line, after the word "one" to strike out the word "eight" and insert "six;" and in line 1568, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "sixty-one thousand four" and insert "sixty-nine thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Indian Office:

For compensation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; five clerks of class four; eight clerks of class three; one stenographer, at \$1,600; thirteen clerks of class two; thirteen clerks of class one; six copyists, at 900 each; one messenger; one assistant messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$369,880.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1571, after the word "binding" to strike out the word "stationery;" in line 1572, after the word "including" insert the words "price-lists and;" in line 1573, after the word "two" strike out the word "city;" and in line 1574, after the word "office" to strike out the words "five thousand" and insert "three thousand five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For blank books, binding, fuel, lights, telegraphing, and miscellaneous items, including price-lists and two newspapers, to be filed and bound and preserved for the use of the office, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. In line 1590 I move to insert after the word "actual" the words "and necessary;" so as to read:

For actual and necessary expenses of clerks detailed to investigate suspected frauds and attempts at fraud, as provided by law, \$40,000.

Mr. WINDOM. The Senator is a little out of order; but there is no objection to it. The amendments of the committee are usually acted upon first. I have no objection to it, however, and it may as well be acted on now.

Mr. DAVIS. I knew I was out of order, but it would save time. There is no objection to the amendment, I understand.

Mr. SARGENT. It is all right.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator will be considered in order. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in the appropriations for the Pension Office, in line 1593, after the word "for" to strike out the words "stationery, \$6,000 for;" so as to read:

For carpets, mats, furniture, awnings, and repairs of the same, \$2,000; for fuel, gas, engraving and retouching plates; for bounty-land warrants, printing and binding the same, engraving and printing pension certificates; for repairs of building; and for other necessary expenses of the office, including two daily newspapers, \$4,500; in all, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1603, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" in the same line, after the word "commissioner" to strike out the words "two thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1606, after the word "at" to strike out the words "two thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert "three thousand;" in line 1617, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "four" and insert "five;" in line 1622, after the word "languages," to strike out the word "fifteen" and insert "twenty-one;" in the same line, after the word "and" strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert "thirty-five;" in line 1624, after the word "twenty" insert "five;" in line 1629, after the word "for" to strike out the word "four" and insert "six;" in line 1630, after the word "for," to strike out the word "three" and insert "four;" in line 1632, after the word "for," to strike out the word "forty-five" and insert "forty;" in line 1634, after the word "each" to insert "three folders and pasters, at \$480 each;" and in line 1635, after the word "and" to strike out the words "forty-seven thousand nine hundred" and insert "eighty-four thousand five hundred and forty;" so as to read:

United States Patent Office:

For compensation of the Commissioner of the Patent Office, \$4,500; for assistant commissioner, \$3,000; for chief clerk, \$2,250; three examiners-in-chief, at \$3,000 each; examiner in charge of interferences, \$2,500; trade-mark examiner, \$2,250; twenty-two principal examiners, at \$2,500 each; twenty-two first assistant examiners, at \$1,800 each; twenty-two second assistant examiners, at \$1,600 each; twenty-two third assistant examiners, at \$1,400 each; one machinist, \$1,600; five clerks of class four, (one of whom shall receive \$200 additional for services as financial clerk, and shall give bond in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine); five clerks of class three, one of whom shall be translator of languages; twenty-one clerks of class two; and thirty-five clerks of class one; also for twenty-five permanent clerks, at \$1,000 each; for forty copyist clerks, at \$900 each; for three skilled draughtsmen, at \$1,250 each; for one messenger and purchasing clerk, \$1,000; for one skilled laborer, \$1,200; for six attendants in model-room, at \$1,000 each; for four attendants in model-room, at \$900 each; for forty laborers, at \$750 each; for six laborers, at \$600 each; three folders and pasters, at \$480 each; in all, \$44,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1639, after the word "for" to strike out the words "stationery for use of office;" as to read:

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Patent Office, namely: For repair of model-cases, stationary portfolios for drawings, furniture and labor connected therewith, repairing, papering, painting, carpets, ice, advertising, books for library, moneys refunded, printing engraved patent-heads, international exchanges, plumbing, gas-fitting, extra labor on indexes and abstracts for annual reports, fitting rooms, and other contingencies, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1653, after the word "draughtsmen" to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "forty;" and at the end of the clause to strike out "the work to be done under the supervision of the Commissioner of Patents, who shall receive competitive bids therefor;" so as to make the clause read:

For photolithographing, or otherwise producing copies of drawings of current and back issues of the office and for sale, including pay of temporary draughtsmen, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1660, to increase the appropriation for "photolithographing, or otherwise producing plates for the Official Gazette, including pay of employes engaged on the Gazette, and for making similar plates," from \$20,000 to \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1666, after the word "done" to strike out the following words:

In the city of Washington, if as cheaply as elsewhere, under competitive bids, under the supervision of the Commissioner of Patents, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Under the supervision of the Commissioner of Patents in the city of Washington, if it can be there done at reasonable rates; and the Commissioner of Patents, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to make contracts therefor.

So as to make the clause read:

For photolithographing, or otherwise producing copies of the weekly issues of drawings, to be attached to patents and copies, \$25,000; the work of the said photolithographing, or otherwise producing plates and copies, referred to in this and the two preceding paragraphs, to be done under the supervision of the Commissioner of Patents and in the city of Washington, if it can be there done at reasonable rates; and the Commissioner of Patents, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to make contracts therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1676, to increase the appropriation for tracings of drawings preparatory to photolithographing back issues from \$10,000 to \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1686, after the word "namely" to strike out the words "stationery, \$1,500;" and in line 1693, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "twelve thousand nine" and insert "eleven thousand four;" so as to read:

For contingent expenses, namely: cases for library, \$500; library, \$1,000; current educational periodicals, \$250; other current publications, \$225; completing valuable sets of periodicals and publications in the library, \$200; telegraphing and expressage, \$200; collecting statistics, and writing and compiling matter for annual and special reports, and editing and publishing circulars of information \$8,000; fuel and lights, \$275; office furniture, \$.50; contingencies, \$500; in all, \$11,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1701, to increase the appropriation for compensation of surveyor-general of Louisiana from \$1,800 to

\$2,000; and in line 1703, to increase the compensation for clerks in his office from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1704, to increase the compensation of surveyor-general of Florida from \$1,800 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1707, to increase the appropriation for compensation of surveyor-general of Minnesota from \$1,800 to \$2,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1711, to increase the appropriation for compensation of surveyor-general of the Territory of Dakota from \$1,800 to \$2,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$2,500 to \$4,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1716, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of Colorado from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1719, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of the Territory of New Mexico from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1721, to increase the appropriation of the surveyor-general of California from \$2,750 to \$3,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$8,000 to \$12,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1724, to increase the appropriation for the surveyor-general of the Territory of Idaho from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1728, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of Nevada from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and for the clerks in his office from \$2,500 to \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1731, to increase the appropriation for the surveyor-general of Oregon from \$2,250 to \$2,500 and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1736, to increase the appropriation of the surveyor-general of the Territory of Washington from \$2,250 to \$2,500 and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1741, to increase the appropriation for the clerks in the office of the surveyor-general of Nebraska and Iowa from \$3,000 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1743, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of the Territory of Montana from \$2,750 to \$3,000, and in line 1744 to reduce the appropriation for the clerks in his office from \$4,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1746, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of the Territory of Utah from \$2,750 to \$3,000 and for the clerks in his office from \$2,500 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1751, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of the Territory of Wyoming from \$2,750 to \$3,000 and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1755, to increase the appropriation for surveyor-general of the Territory of Arizona from \$2,750 to \$3,000 and for the clerks in his office from \$3,000 to \$3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out from line 1758 to line 1767, inclusive, in the following words:

That public lands situated in States in which there are no land offices may be entered at the General Land Office, subject to the provisions of law touching the entry of public lands; and that the necessary proofs and affidavits required in such cases may be made before some officer competent to administer oaths, whose official character shall be duly certified to by the clerk of a court of record; and moneys received by the Commissioner of the General Land Office for lands entered by cash entry shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1787, under the head of "Post-Office Department," after the word "thousand" insert the words "one hundred;" in line 1794, after the word "four" strike out the word "sixty-three" and insert "seventy;" in the same line, after the word "three" to strike out the word "forty-eight" and insert "fifty-three;" in line 1795, after the word "two" to strike out the word "sixty-five" and insert "seventy-five;" in line 1796, after the word "fifty" insert "seven;" in line 1800, after the word "each" to strike out the word "seven" and insert "eleven;" in line 1802, after the word "dollars" to strike out "nine" and insert "fourteen;" in line 1803, after the word "each" to strike out the word "twenty-seven" and insert "thirty-seven;" and in line 1813, after the word "and" to strike out the words "43,240" and insert "85,780;" so as to read:

Chief of division of free delivery, \$2,100; superintendent of blank agency, \$1,800; assistant superintendent of blank agency, \$1,600; four assistants of blank agency, \$1,200 each; two assistants of blank agency, \$900 each; stenographer, \$1,800; seven clerks of class four; seventy clerks of class three; fifty-three clerks of class two; seventy-five clerks of class one; fifty-seven female clerks, at \$900 each; one messenger to Postmaster-General, \$900; three messengers to Assistant Postmasters-

General \$840 each; eleven assistant messengers, \$720 each; captain of the watch, \$1,000; fourteen watchmen, at \$720 each; thirty-seven laborers, \$720 each; one engineer, \$1,400; one assistant engineer, \$1,000; one carpenter, \$1,200; one assistant carpenter, \$1,000; one fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, \$900; one fireman, who shall be a steam-fitter, \$900; one fireman, \$720; three female laborers, \$480 each; and for temporary clerks, \$10,000; making, in all, \$485,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1817, after the word "stationery" to strike out the word "nine" and insert "ten;" in line 1821, after the word "painting" to strike out the word "two" and insert "five;" in line 1828, after the words "miscellaneous items" insert "\$8,000;" and in the same line, immediately following, to strike out the word "including" and insert "for;" in line 1829, after the words "Official Postal Guide" to strike out "18,400" and insert "20,000;" and in line 1831, after the words "in all" to strike out the word "60,000" and insert "72,400;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses of the Post-Office Department: For stationery, \$10,000; fuel for the General Post-Office building, including the Auditor's Office, \$7,400; for gas, \$5,000; plumbing and gas-fixtures, \$3,000; telegraphing, \$3,000; painting, \$5,000; carpets, \$3,000; furniture, \$5,000; keeping of horses and repair of wagons and harness, \$1,200; hardware, \$1,200; and for rent of house numbered 915 E street, northwest, \$1,800; and for miscellaneous items, \$8,000; for publication of copies of the Official Postal Guide, \$20,000; in all, \$72,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 1831 to insert the following:

For furnishing and fitting up and for plumbing and gas-fixtures for the new basement story of the Post-Office Department building, \$12,800, to be available immediately.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1833, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," after the word "clerk" to strike out the words "two thousand" and insert "one thousand eight hundred;" in line 1843, after the word "statistician" to strike out the words "two thousand" and insert "one thousand eight hundred;" and in line 1846, after the word "dollars" to strike out the words "lady superintendent of flower-seed room, \$900;" in line 1850, after the word "four" to strike out the word "three" and insert "four;" in line 1851, after the word "three" to strike out the word "four" and insert "five;" in line 1859, after the word "and" to strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" and in line 1860, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "sixty-two thousand and twenty" and insert "sixty-four thousand six hundred and forty;" so as to read:

For compensation of the Commissioner of Agriculture, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$1,800; entomologist, \$2,000; chemist, \$2,000; assistant chemist, \$1,400; superintendent of experimental gardens and grounds, \$1,800; statistician, \$1,800; disbursing clerk, \$1,600; superintendent of seed-room, \$1,600; librarian, \$1,400; botanist, \$1,800; microscopist, \$1,800; three clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; five clerks of class two; six clerks of class one; engineer, \$1,200; superintendent of folding-room, \$1,200; two copyists, at \$900 each; two attendants in the museum, \$1,000 each; one messenger, at \$840; two assistant messengers, at \$720 each; one carpenter, at \$960; two watchmen; and eight laborers; making, in all, \$64,640.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1869, after the word "seventy" to insert the word "five;" and in line 1873, to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

For purchase and distribution of new and valuable seeds and plants, \$75,000; for expense of putting up the same, including purchase of one paper-box machine, for labor, bagging-paper, twine, gum, and other necessary materials, \$5,000; in all, \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1876, to increase from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the appropriation "for the purchase of garden and field seeds for distribution in those States which in 1876 were ravaged by grasshoppers or locusts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1881, to increase from \$3,000 to \$5,000 the appropriation "for labor on experimental garden, and for flower-pots, repairs to greenhouse, and purchase of new plants and seeds for the same."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1884, to increase from \$1,000 to \$2,000 the appropriation for collecting and modeling specimens of fruits and vegetables, and collecting and preparing specimens for the museum and herbarium.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1894, to increase from \$1,000 to \$1,300 the appropriation for chemicals and apparatus for the use of the microscopist.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1911, to increase the appropriation for marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States from \$2,500 to \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1935, after the word "courts" to insert "including compensation of the United States district attorney;" so as to read:

For defraying the contingent expenses of the courts, including compensation of the United States district attorney, and the fees, per diem, and traveling expenses of the United States marshal in the Territory of Utah, with the expenses of summoning jurors, subpoenaing witnesses, of arresting, guarding, &c.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1947, to increase the appropriation

for the expenses of the courts, &c., of the Territory of Utah from \$20,000 to \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1955, after the word "dollars" to insert the words "naval solicitor, \$3,500;" in line 1957, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" in line 1958, after the word "thousand" to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" in line 1959, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "two hundred;" in line 1960, after the word "thousand" to strike out the word "six" and insert "eight;" in the same line, after the word "hundred" insert the word "dollars;" in line 1961, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "three" and insert "five;" in line 1962, after the word "dollars" to strike out the words "two clerks" and insert "one clerk;" and in line 1966, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "seventy thousand three" and insert "seventy-seven thousand one;" so as to read:

Office of the Attorney-General:

For compensation of the Attorney-General, \$8,000; solicitor-general, \$7,000; three assistant attorneys-general, at \$5,000 each; one assistant attorney-general of the Post-Office Department, \$1,000; solicitor of internal revenue, \$4,500; naval solicitor, \$3,500; examiner of claims, \$3,500; law-clerk and examiner of titles, \$2,700; chief clerk, \$2,200; stenographic clerk, \$1,800; one law clerk, \$2,000; five clerks of class four; additional for disbursing clerk, \$200; one clerk of class two; two clerks of class one; five copyists; one telegraph-operator, at \$1,000; one messenger; one assistant messenger; two laborers; and two watchmen; in all, \$77,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1971, after the word "Department," to strike out "one" and insert "three;" in line 1972, after the word "thousand," to insert "five hundred;" in line 1974, after the word "necessaries," to strike out the words "six thousand;" and in line 1975, after the words "in all," to strike out the word "ten" and insert "fourteen;" so as to read:

For contingent expenses of the Department, namely: For furniture and repairs, \$1,000; for law and miscellaneous books for the library of the Department, \$3,000; for stationery, \$2,500; for miscellaneous expenditures, such as telegraphing, fuel, lights, labor, and other necessities, \$7,500; in all, \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1977, to increase from \$500 to \$1,000 the appropriation for care and subsistence of horses and repairs of wagons and harness.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1979, to increase from \$10,000 to \$14,000 the appropriation for the rent of the four floors of the building occupied by the Department of Justice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 1984, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" in line 1986, after the word "dollars" to strike out the word "two" and insert "four;" in line 1988, after the word "two" to strike out the word "three" and insert "two;" and in line 1989, after the words "in all" to strike out the words "twenty-three thousand seven" and insert "twenty-six thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Solicitor of the Treasury:

For compensation of the Solicitor of the Treasury, \$4,500; assistant solicitor, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; four clerks of class four; two clerks of class three; two clerks of class two; two clerks of class one; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, \$23,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the head of "Court of Claims," in line 1999, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred," and in line 2003, after the word "thousand" to insert the words "five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For stationery, books, fuel, labor, postage, and other contingent and miscellaneous expenses, \$2,500; for reporting the decisions of the court, clerical hire, labor in preparing and superintending the printing of the twelfth volume of the Reports of the Court of Claims, to be paid on the order of the court, \$1,000; in all, \$3,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was after line 2004, to insert the following:
To pay judgments of the Court of Claims, \$639,410.59.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the sums respectively appropriated by this act for the salary or compensation of officers and employes therein named shall be the salary and compensation of such officers or employes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This concludes the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WINDOM. On page 13, lines 290 and 291, under the head of "Public Printer," I move to strike out "twelve thousand nine hundred" and insert "thirteen thousand four hundred;" so as to read:

For compensation of the Public Printer at the rate of \$3,600 per annum, and of the clerks and employes in his office, \$13,400.

I have only two or three little amendments that I wish to offer.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINDOM. On page 14, line 322, under the head of the "Botanic Garden," I move to strike out "three thousand" and insert "four thousand five hundred;" so as to read:

For improving the garden, procuring manure, tools, fuel, and repairs, and purchasing trees and shrubs, under the direction of the Library Committee of Congress, \$4,500.

That is the amount which was appropriated last year.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINDOM. On page 77, in line 1877, after the word "dollars," I move to insert the words "to be available immediately;" so as to read:

For the purchase of garden and field seeds for distribution in those States which in 1876 were ravaged by grasshoppers or locusts, \$10,000, to be available immediately; the same to be deducted from the foregoing appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINDOM. On line 1663, page 68, after the word "copies," I move to strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert "thirty;" so as to read:

For photolithographing, or otherwise producing copies of the weekly issues of drawings, to be attached to patents and copies, \$30,000; the work of the said photolithographer, or otherwise producing plates and copies, referred to in this and the two preceding paragraphs, &c.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WINDOM. On line 1671, in the appropriation for photolithographing drawings attached to patents, &c., I move to strike out the words:

In the city of Washington, if it can be done at reasonable rates.

Mr. SARGENT. I do not think that is a judicious amendment.

Mr. WINDOM. I do not insist upon it. I thought that was unanimously agreed upon in committee.

Mr. SARGENT. I think it would be rather an injudicious amendment.

Mr. WINDOM. I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. DAVIS. Out of order as I was reminded a few moments ago I offered an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator was decided to be in order.

Mr. DAVIS. I would inquire if the amendment which I offered was made at the time?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment was made.

Mr. DAVIS. I intended to say something on that subject, but the lateness of the hour prevents me, and the words "and necessary" being added, which gives an opportunity to the committee of conference to change it if a change is necessary, I refrain from offering myself the amendment which I intended. So much for that. Now, after line 1904, I propose an amendment which I think probably will meet with no objection. I have a letter from the Commissioner of Agriculture, which is very short, to sustain it and which I shall ask the Clerk to read, for it will explain the amendment. The amendment has been considered by the Committee on Agriculture, and also it has been before the Committee on Appropriations. I move to insert after line 1904:

For the erection of a gallery around the museum of the Agricultural Department for the reception of the contributions to it by the representatives of foreign governments at the Centennial, \$2,500.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter referred to by the Senator will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate:

A very extensive contribution has been made to the museum of the Agricultural Department by the representatives of foreign governments and by some of our own States. Their value is not less than \$100,000, if they could be purchased at all. Our present museum, which contains five thousand square feet, as at present occupied will not contain them. I have had an estimate made by Architect Closs, who reports to me that a gallery may be added to the present museum which would add three thousand square feet to our surface room and would be sufficient for the reception of the contributions referred, and that such gallery would cost \$2,500. I have no means of making any other disposition of these contributions; and they will be lost unless they are thus cared for. I therefore ask for the following amendment to the bill making appropriations to this Department.

Respectfully,

FREDK. WATTS,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. SARGENT. There is no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERNAN. I wish to offer an amendment and I will state briefly what I wish to accomplish by it. I move to strike out from line 729 to line 734 inclusive in the following words:

For dies, paper, and stamps, \$466,000; said engraving and printing to be done in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, provided the cost does not exceed the price paid under existing contracts.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For dies, paper, and stamps, \$466,000; said engraving and printing to be done in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department unless it can be done at less cost under private contract, the cost in no case to exceed the price paid under existing contracts, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

My information is that this work has been done since 1874 and is still being done under contract by certain companies, some three or four of them. The bill as it reads proposes that the work shall be done by the Government in its own office. The amendment provides that the work shall be done by the Government, unless it can be done at less cost under private contract, and that in no event shall the cost by contract exceed what the existing contract is now. My information about these contracts is that they were made in 1874, when prices were higher than now, and if this amendment should prevail, these companies which have contracts with the Government and other

companies will compete and the work will be satisfactorily done and at a very much lower figure than it is done now, and perhaps lower than the Government can do the work itself.

My information is not direct, however, that this change is asked for by the head of the Treasury Department. I hope we will leave the law as it is, so that the work shall be done by contract unless it can be done in the Treasury Department cheaper than it is now being done. My information and belief is that if the amendment prevails the work may be done as it is now under contract with the American Bank Note Company, the Continental Bank Note Company, and the Columbia Bank Note Company, which are competent and skillful companies, and have done the work satisfactorily. I think it is wise in every case not to attempt to get up a bureau and to hire men and buy dies and buy what they must necessarily provide themselves with to do this work, and therefore I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. WINDOM. I am very anxious to complete the bill to-night, and think it very important that it should be done. Not being entirely clear as to the merits of the amendment, if it is agreeable to the Senator from New York, I will consent, and ask the Senate to consent, to his amendment, and the matter may be fully investigated in the conference committee.

Mr. STEVENSON. Is this amendment in order? I differ with the Senator from New York so widely in his views about the Government employing outside companies and placing the Government at the mere beck and power of these companies that I shall raise the question of order on the reception of the amendment.

Mr. KERNAN. I believe it is in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment does not increase the appropriation, neither is it a new appropriation, and it is in order.

Mr. WITHERS. I am opposed to the amendment on principle. The Government has provided at great expense a large amount of most costly machinery and is paying the highest salaries for the most skilled workmen and keeping them here at expense for the use of the Government to do this particular kind of work; and I think while that is the case it is wrong policy to let the work be put out under private contract or given to private companies when the Government is itself provided with all the appliances and means, secured at great cost, for doing identically this work.

Mr. KERNAN. My information is different. Of course I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, but my information is that this work has been done since 1874 and is being done now under contract. The amendment which I have proposed provides that it shall be continued with these companies if the cost does not exceed the price paid under existing contracts. But one of the reasons suggested to me (for I am not familiar with the subject myself) by different persons, a member of the other House among others, who is familiar with the subject, is that instead of the Government being provided with costly apparatus, if it undertakes to do this work there will have to be provided a great deal of costly apparatus.

On principle I believe that wherever there are responsible companies or individuals who will do manufacturing work for the Government, as a rule it is better to employ them than to have a bureau where everybody knows that the men in charge are pressed to put in political favorites instead of skilled workmen. Therefore the work must be done at less cost than the Government can do it or else the amendment would not be effective. I think that all these attempts to get men in charge in the Treasury Department to do work which foreign countries employ some of these very companies to do is a mistake in principle as it is extravagant. The amendment is in the interest of what I believe to be real economy, and I trust it will prevail.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have only a word to say to the Senator from New York, and that is that the late Secretary of the Treasury, who ought to have had some experience, opposed such an amendment. I heard him say that it would be a great mistake. I heard him say that whenever the Government puts out such work under contract it is putting the Government at the power of these companies. The gentleman says they have no skilled workmen in the Treasury. I am amazed at such a statement as that. With all the bank-notes that this Government has issued during the war, with all the means and appliances in every department of printing and engraving, I had supposed that we stood in the very front rank, and it is the first time I have ever heard it stated that the printing at the Treasury was not equal to any printing anywhere else. As I have heard, and I know of my own personal knowledge, so far as some artisans engaged in the Treasury Department are concerned, they have not any superior, and I stand by the testimony of more than one Secretary of the Treasury. If the Government has gone to this expense and has the appliances, why not keep up the work at the Department? I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. KERNAN. If the Senator will pardon me, of course on such a question the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury would have great weight, but are we speaking about bank-notes? I would ask the chairman of the committee if this matter does not relate to the work for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue?

Mr. WINDOM. It is for internal revenue stamps.

Mr. INGALLS. It is about the same thing, however.

Mr. KERNAN. Then I should like to know how it is the work is being done under contract. These internal-revenue stamps, as I understand, now are being furnished by contract. My amendment

provides that the work must be done in the bureau unless it can be done at less cost under private contracts. The work is now being done under contract, as I understand. I am not talking about greenbacks. I have heard no complaint that the work was not done well, but on the contrary my information is, though not from the head of the Department, that it is being done cheaper, and if there was an opportunity to make new contracts now and have the companies compete, it would be cheaper still than under the existing contract. The amendment which I propose provides that if they can do it as cheap in the Treasury Department it shall not be given out under contract, and the work would not go to these companies. The amendment provides for doing the work in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department unless it can be done at less cost under private contract. It is an important amendment. I do not say it shall be done cheaper by the Government, but if the Government can do it as cheap the amendment leaves it to them to do it there, unless it can be done cheaper under private contract. I think if the companies are doing the work now satisfactorily we should not put it back into the Treasury unless they can do the work as cheap in the Treasury as these parties will do it. Of course I only state my opinion. I spoke of unskilled men, but I did not say that there were not skilled men in the Treasury. I did say as every Senator knows that in this Bureau of Printing and Engraving in the Treasury there is a great pressure, and people are put there who are more or less incompetent, and they are put in through favoritism, and not on account of their skill. I do not believe that is a good mode of carrying on the Government.

Mr. WITHERS. I will state to the Senator that the class to which he alludes are simply placed in the subordinate positions, but I re-assess that the Government has in its employment the most skilled labor that it is possible to command and secure upon that particular class of work. These revenue-stamps which are now being printed by contract, as the Senator very truly says, require a much less amount of skill in the preparation of them than the greenbacks and bank-notes which are now printed by the Department. That they are now printed under contract is because of the immense influence brought to bear by these wealthy corporations which was sufficient to induce Congress to divide the work and give them a part of it. A year or two ago when the same subject was under consideration the intelligence derived from the Secretary of the Treasury and the chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was that the work would be done much more conveniently and at less expense and just as well or better than if taken by these private contracts, and I think myself while it might be a question as to which were the best course to adopt, the Government having adopted the principle of doing this work itself and under its own supervision and having secured the necessary labor and machinery, they ought to carry it on.

Mr. STEVENSON. I wish to say a single word to my friend from New York. I have had some little experience in this matter. I once looked into it. It may be that these companies underbid the Government now. It is a trick of the trade for them to underbid the Government so that the Government shall give up the work, and when the Government has given up all the materials and all their skilled labor then these companies put up the price three times as high as it was before. We have heard of that sort of thing before. The object of putting down these bids is to take away the work from the Government, to persuade us to take away this printing that they may raise their prices afterward. If the Government has skilled labor enough to print and engrave such bank-notes as we have seen in circulation and in such illimitable amounts in the last ten years, it seems to me almost an absurdity to say that the Government cannot print these internal-revenue stamps. It does not require half the skill to print internal-revenue stamps that it requires to print bank-notes.

But I answer the Senator by telling him that I know the Secretary of the Treasury who preceded the present incumbent attempted to get the entire printing done in the Treasury. He believed it was right; he believed it was economical; he believed that they had the right to do the work; that they had the clerks who could distribute it without any increased force, and you would not have to send off by express work which could be done in the Department. I know that my friend desires economy, but I say to him in all frankness, when we have had the experience and testimony of the Secretary before one of the committees of the other branch of Congress, with his idea of the capacity of the Department to do the work, it seems to me unwise legislation to take away from that Department these skilled workmen and these appliances and to allow private companies to raise their prices on us. What guarantee have we that the companies will not do that? What security have we that that would not be done?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator's five minutes have expired.

Mr. KERNAN. The Government has the same security that a man has—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No further debate is in order by the Senator on this amendment. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York, [Mr. KERNAN.]

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I desire to offer an amendment to which I am sure the honorable chairman of the committee will not object and I am sure no Senator here will object to it. On page 77, line 1876, I move

to strike out the word "ten" and insert "thirty;" so as to increase the appropriation "for the purchase of garden and field seeds for distribution in those States which in 1876 were ravaged by grasshoppers or locusts" from \$10,000 to \$30,000. The amount appropriated in the former bill was \$30,000 and the effect was very good, and it is certainly as small an amount as there is any reason or propriety in giving.

Mr. WINDOM. The Senator from Nebraska knows my weakness in that direction, and I think he ought not to appeal to me. I think, however, we cannot sustain an amendment at \$30,000, deducting it from the appropriation for seeds in the previous paragraph.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that is a proper deduction, and that Congress should make the same appropriation that it made before independently of the other appropriation for the distribution of seeds. They made the appropriation before, and the effect was good.

Mr. WINDOM. I am aware of the necessity of the amendment, and will go with the Senator as far as any other Senator will.

Mr. SARGENT. Would it not be better to strike out the succeeding words, "the same to be deducted from the foregoing appropriation?"

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I would be very glad to make that modification of my amendment, if it is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator certainly does not mean to deprive the whole country of a large proportion of the seeds that have been distributed annually heretofore, and apply it to a particular section of country. The bill already takes from that appropriation \$10,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That has been made already; but my amendment would make it independent of that appropriation as I have accepted the suggestion of the Senator from California.

Mr. INGALLS. I very heartily concur with the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I know as well as he does the wants of the section of the country which during the past two or three years has been ravaged by locusts; and it is the most fertile, the most populous, and one of the most valuable portions of this entire country, comprising a very large proportion of the entire valley of the Mississippi. The agricultural products of that region have been damaged to the extent of not less than forty millions of dollars annually for several years last past; and it is certainly a very small contribution that Congress can make to furnish them with the means of seeding their ground anew. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment. I am sure it is one that will commend itself to the consideration of every Senator.

Mr. WINDOM. I certainly make no objection to it.

Mr. INGALLS. It will commend itself, I am confident, to the approbation and judgment of the entire country.

Mr. DAVIS. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 1876 it is proposed to strike out "ten" and insert "thirty" and to strike out the words "the same to be deducted from the foregoing appropriation;" so as to read:

For the purchase of garden and field seeds for distribution in those States which in 1876 were ravaged by grasshoppers or locusts, \$30,000, to be available immediately.

Mr. DAVIS. That is a very extravagant amount. If the Senator will make it \$20,000 I shall not object to his amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I believe \$30,000 is too small.

Mr. DAVIS. It is an extravagant amount. Other portions of the country have suffered, as well as the West, not from grasshoppers so much but from the army-worm and other things which have destroyed the crops in other sections, and I see no reason why a particular section of the country should be singled out and favored.

Mr. SARGENT. Make it \$25,000.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will agree to make it \$25,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Very well.

Mr. WITHERS. No, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. If it is in order, I will move to strike out \$30,000 and insert \$20,000.

Mr. INGALLS. O, no.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to fix the appropriation at \$20,000.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Several SENATORS. O, no.

Mr. SARGENT. We ought to have about five minutes of executive session. There are matters that ought to be referred to committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not object.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were re-opened, and (at five o'clock and fifty minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, February 22, at ten o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 21, 1877.

The Senate having withdrawn,

The SPEAKER (at twelve o'clock and fifty-one minutes p. m.) again called the House to order, and said: The Chair decides that a new legislative day now commences. The Chaplain will offer prayer.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. No. 4680) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. KASSON. Let all points of order be reserved on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Points of order will be reserved.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is the same bill which is printed in the RECORD this morning. I propose to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering this bill, but there are several gentlemen who wish to submit business to which there will be no objection and which will occupy no time. I am willing to yield for this purpose.

ELECTION IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. SAYLER. The committee appointed to investigate the recent election in South Carolina have directed me to submit a report and to ask that it be printed and recommitted. I am also directed to ask that the report may be printed in the RECORD, so that it may be of use to members at once. In the same connection I ask that the minority, whose views are not quite prepared, may have leave to report hereafter at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. And that the minority report when presented be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SAYLER. There is no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the report just presented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAYLER] will be ordered to be printed and recommitted, and also printed in the RECORD; and leave will be granted to the minority of the committee to report at any time hereafter, and have their views printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The report presented by Mr. SAYLER is as follows:

REPORT OF THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE.

The select committee of the House to investigate the recent election in the State of South Carolina, appointed under a resolution of the House, passed on the 4th day of December, 1876, in the following words, to wit:

"Resolved, That three special committees, one of fifteen members to proceed to Louisiana, one of six members to proceed to Florida, and one of nine members to proceed to South Carolina, shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate recent elections therein and the action of the returning or canvassing boards in the said States in reference thereto, and to report all the facts essential to an honest return of the votes received by the electors of said States for President and Vice-President of the United States, and to a fair understanding thereof by the people; and that for the purpose of speedily executing this resolution the said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to take testimony, and, at their discretion, to detail subcommittees, with like authority to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony; and that the said committees and their subcommittees may employ stenographers, clerks, and messengers, and be attended each by a deputy sergeant-at-arms; and said committees shall have leave to report at any time, by bill or otherwise"—

beg leave to submit the following report:

"Our committee, upon their appointment, proceeded at once to South Carolina, and arrived at Columbia Thursday, December 7. They immediately took means to obtain copies of all the proceedings before the courts of the State and United States, growing out of the recent election and the count of the votes cast thereat, and also copies of all the election laws of the State.

ELECTION LAWS.

By legislative enactment each county is divided into election precincts, there being in all four hundred and ninety-two precincts in the thirty-two counties of the State. The county commissioners of election appoint three managers for each precinct, who preside at the election, receive the votes, and at the close of the polls proceed publicly to count the same and make a return of the vote, before separating to the county commissioners of election, together with the ballots. The three county commissioners of election who constitute a county board of canvassers, are appointed by the governor; all of the returns of the precinct managers are made to them, and they proceed to canvass the votes of the county, by precincts, as they appear by the returns of the managers. Having ascertained the result for the whole county, it is returned, under their hands, with all the papers, to the board of State canvassers. Two of each precinct managers and two of each county commissioners were republicans and one on each board a democrat. Very clearly neither of the three boards had anything but a purely ministerial duty to perform: the managers to count the votes and make due return thereof and the commissioners of election to aggregate the returns of the precinct managers and make a true return of such aggregation to the board of State canvassers.

THE BOARD OF STATE CANVASSERS

was composed of the secretary of state, comptroller-general, attorney-general, State auditor, State treasurer, adjutant-general and inspector, and chairman of the committee on privileges and elections of the house of representatives. Of these the secretary of state, comptroller-general, and State treasurer were candidates for re-election, and as such passed upon all the questions involved in their own election. Their duty was, "upon certified copies of the statements made by the board of county canvassers, to proceed to make a statement of the whole number of votes given at the election for the various officers and for each of them voted for, distinguishing the several counties in which they were given." Upon "such statements, they shall then proceed to determine and declare what persons have been, by the greatest number of votes, duly elected to office." They shall also "have power and it is made their duty to decide all cases under protest or contest that may arise, when the power to do so does not by the constitution reside in some other body." The constitution provides specifically for only two cases for deter-

mining elections. One is that of governor and lieutenant-governor, when the returns are to be sent to the speaker of the house of representatives, who is to open and publish them in the presence of the house and senate, and in case of contest the same is to be decided by the General Assembly. The other is the election of members of the house of representatives and senate, when "each house shall judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own members." It is clear that the best possible way of obtaining the result of the votes cast in South Carolina at the last election was from the returns of the managers of election at the different precincts. Those officers were to count the votes publicly as soon as the polls closed, and make a certificate of such count before separating. Of course these returns would be the best way of ascertaining the votes cast if they were made honestly and with truthfulness. Your committee obtained statements of the result of the vote for presidential electors in each precinct in the State from the secretary of state, where any could be placed on file.

MISSING RETURNS.

At first there was an entire absence of managers' returns from more than thirty precincts. From time to time during the investigation some of the absent returns were found, so that there were but twenty-five precincts for which no returns were produced. The committee also obtained a copy of a statement of the vote of the State, as canvassed by the State board from the returns of the county commissioners, and compared it with those returns from each county, and it was found to be correct. It was proven, indeed admitted, that when the State board commenced their canvass they not only took the result as given by the county canvassers but also the result from the canvass of the managers' returns from the different precincts, and proceeded to canvass by precincts through the first six counties. In these counties the results obtained from the precinct returns were materially different from the results as given by the county commissioners' returns, and were such as to elect one or two electors on the democratic ticket instead of the whole of the republican ticket. At this point the State canvassers decided to abandon the canvass by precinct returns. This was done against the protest of those representing the democratic party. A request in writing was also made in behalf of the democrats for permission to examine the precinct returns and take copies of them, but this was refused.

THE VOTE CAST.

Your committee by testimony supplied the place of all the missing returns, so that they were enabled satisfactorily to show the vote as it was cast and counted in each precinct. Many mistakes and irregularities were found in the different returns. Some of them were signed by one and some by two managers; but if all the returns affected by such irregularities were rejected, it would not change the result. There were several cases where no votes appeared to be cast for some of the candidates and others where the votes were returned as having been cast for Hayes and Wheeler and Tilden and Hendricks instead of for the electors. It was proven in all such cases that the votes were properly cast for the electors. The result by thus ascertaining the votes cast at all the precincts, and correcting the mistakes made by the managers in the returns, is as follows:

REPUBLICAN ELECTORS.	
Bowen	92, 093
Winsmith	92, 123
Johnson	92, 140
Hurley	92, 123
Nash	92, 037
Cook	92, 110
Meyers	92, 124
DEMOCRATIC ELECTORS.	
Baker	91, 240
McGowan	91, 262
Harrington	91, 236
Ingram	91, 246
Wallace	91, 246
Erwin	91, 241
Aldrich	61, 200

This gives Bowen, who received the smallest vote on the republican ticket, 92,093 votes, over McGowan, who received the largest vote on the democratic ticket, 91,262 votes, a majority of 831. Your committee believe that they have obtained with substantial accuracy the number of votes cast, so far as it can be obtained from the present managers' returns, but no opinion is advanced upon the truth and accuracy of these returns.

The law of South Carolina passed in 1875 divided the counties into precincts and provided that all the elections should be held at the voting-precincts so established. It established in the

COUNTY OF ABBEVILLE

seventeen voting-precincts, naming Abbeville Court House and fifteen other places. Thus, although it was enacted that there should be "seventeen voting-precincts as follows," the names of but sixteen were given. The same mistake was made in the several statutes in some of the other counties. In several of the other counties provision was made for two to four voting-places in the county seat, usually called the "court-house," as "Abbeville Court House," in the county of the same name, but in all these instances they were carefully specified as Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. Previous to the election the commissioners of election for this county, having no manner of power by law in the premises, in addition to the voting-precincts provided in the statute at Abbeville Court House, ordered another precinct to be established in the same town called No. 2. This action was protested against by the democratic member of the board of commissioners, who also took the opinion of counsel and presented it to his associates, setting forth such action to be illegal and unauthorized, but the two republican commissioners persisted and the voting-place was established, and 432 votes were there cast for the republican electors and 10 for the democratic electors, giving a majority of 422 to the republicans. Your committee are of the opinion that this voting-place was illegal and unauthorized, and that no votes cast there should be received or counted.

ROBBINS'S PRECINCT.

An attempt was also made by the board of State canvassers to count the vote alleged to have been given at the precinct of Robbins in the county of Barnwell. No returns by any managers of election were claimed to have been made to the county board, and no vote from that precinct was ever counted by the county canvassers. A paper purporting to be a return, signed by only one of the managers, and by another person never appointed as manager, and by a republican supervisor under the law of Congress, was sent to the secretary of state, who, when the State board was canvassing the counties by precincts, produced this paper from the package containing the genuine returns of Barnwell County, as if it had been sent with the others. The attention of the board was called to the fact that this return was irregular and void, and had not been received from the county canvassers, and it was not counted at that time. The facts in reference to the election at this precinct are these: The polls were opened about eight o'clock a. m., and kept open until between twelve and one o'clock, when the polling-place was fired into from the edge of the brush. About fifteen shots were fired. During the forenoon a large portion of the democratic vote had been polled. At the time of the firing there were four whites and three colored persons in the polling-place. The whites were men of standing and property in the neighborhood. The polling-place was abandoned because of the firing, and the voting ceased. One witness, who is not contradicted, testified that a short time before the firing began he saw

five or six negroes, armed with guns, in the edge of brush in the direction from whence the firing came. His attention was attracted by the guns, as all parties had agreed that no guns should be carried on the day of election. Several witnesses testified when the voting was thus abandoned about half the usual votes of the precinct had been cast. All the people and officers of election immediately left, and nothing further was done at the regular voting-place, and no return of the votes cast there was ever made. The return which was sent to the secretary of state, and produced by him among the genuine precinct returns, was signed as above stated. This return gave the republican ticket 1,317 votes, and none for the democratic ticket. The only manager signing it could not be obtained as a witness, although many efforts were made to procure his attendance. One witness testified that he was ill, but the committee are satisfied that this was a pretense and that he was evading the subpoena, not wishing to testify. The republican supervisor, Mott, who signed the returns, testified that Burt and Allen opened the polls about one o'clock p. m. at an abandoned school-house, from a quarter to half a mile removed from the legal polling-place, and closed it from five to six o'clock. That during this time 1,317 voters deposited their ballots, and that each person separately took the oath before voting. No polling-list was produced showing the names of those voting. No person in the neighborhood knew of such poll being opened, or heard of it, until several days afterward, and no person saw or heard anything of this usual assemblage of voters, although respectable witnesses from the neighborhood were called. The vote cast at Robbins in 1874 was 366, and the supervisor at that election testified that this was the full vote of both parties. If the 1,317 votes claimed to have been cast at the Robbins poll are added to the vote of the county, there will be about 800 more votes cast than there were voters in the county in 1875. Not a single person of the thirteen hundred and seventeen, who, it is claimed, cast their votes at the deserted school-house, could be found to testify that he was one of them who voted. The committee are satisfied that no voting took place at the school-house, and the whole matter was purely a fabrication and fraud for the purpose of affecting the election in the county and State. There was no evidence that the democrats had any motive for breaking up the poll, and it is hardly to be supposed that the whites would fire into the polling-places when a majority of those present consisted of their own friends. The testimony that a squad of armed blacks was seen in the brush, from where the firing came, a very short time before it began, was not controverted, and your committee are satisfied it was true, and that the intention was, on the part of persons interested in the county vote, to break up the regular poll, and then substitute fraudulent votes and return, just as the attempt was made. Your committee consider it highly improbable, indeed impossible, that 1,317 voters could have voted in from three to four hours each one taking an oath, and that such an assemblage could have gathered in the neighborhood and not have been known to those residing there. The number of votes cast is also incredibly large. Four times the number cast in 1874, when a full vote was polled, cannot be explained or accounted for. It was proven that another polling-place, Canaan's Fair Church, adjoining Robbins, did not hold an election, and it was claimed that the voters from that place might have voted at Robbins. No attempt, however, was made to substantiate this assertion. There were several other precincts as near Canaan's Fair Church as Robbins, and the usual vote of that precinct is only about two hundred, so that if all had voted at the school-house, together with all the voters of Robbins, one-half the number returned could not be accounted for. But, admitting the facts as claimed, the return is utterly illegal and ought not to be counted. But one out of the three managers was present, and the election was not held at the place prescribed by law. Your committee are satisfied that no votes were ever cast as claimed, and that no second polling-place was ever opened, and that the whole return was a fraud gotten up to insure the election of county and State candidates on the part of the republicans.

REGISTRATION.

The constitution of South Carolina, adopted in 1868, provides in article 8, section 3, "that it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to provide, from time to time, for the registration of all electors." The General Assembly and the entire State government, from the time of the adoption of the constitution down to the present day, has been wholly under the control and in possession of the republican party. Notwithstanding the mandate of the constitution, the General Assembly has persistently refused to "provide for any registration of voters." It has made many laws regulating elections, and the manner of conducting them—indeed, the whole machinery of elections has been carefully provided for, except the single measure most important to protect the purity of the ballot-box, and the only one specifically named in the constitution. Not only has registration been omitted, but other provisions have been made, which, taken in connection with this omission, can only be accounted for upon the supposition that the party in power has designedly refused to perform a constitutional duty, for fraudulent and corrupt purposes—indeed, to enable it to keep possession of the government. The different counties, as has been stated, are divided into precincts, one into as many as fifty or more, many into from fifteen to thirty, and none into less than seven. By the law enacted by the General Assembly, instead of registering, any voter can vote at any precinct in the county of which he is a resident. If any better method could be devised to render easy the perpetration of frauds on the ballot-box by repeating, in fact, to encourage them, your committee has failed to discover it. There is no doubt that where there are large numbers of colored voters there is much repeating, it being almost impossible to identify such voters. Under such circumstances it is worthy of your consideration, whether any officials who are to participate in the election of a chief magistrate, or in making laws for the whole country, should be recognized when they only claim an election when the constitutional mandate to provide for a registration of voters has been utterly disregarded. Take the case of the presidential electors claiming to have been elected in November last. Their vote may decide who shall be Chief Magistrate of five and forty millions of people, most of them not citizens of South Carolina. Before they can exercise such a right ought it not to be determined whether they have been appointed in compliance with or in defiance of law? They are to be appointed by the State, in such manner as the Legislature may direct. No doubt the Legislature may choose them, because the Legislature represents the State—and is the State for such a purpose—but if the Legislature does not appoint them, then the only other manner in which the State can appoint them under a republican form of government is by the votes of the citizens thereof, under the provisions of law. The appointment must be by the State; the Legislature can only direct the manner of appointment, but the appointment must still be by the State. There are but two ways in which the State can appoint; one is by the Legislature, and one by the choice of its citizens entitled to vote under the constitution. In this case the appointment by the State is by the election of the voters. In order that such appointment should be legal, it must be in compliance with the constitution and not in conflict with it.

But in this case the constitution requires that the Legislature shall provide for a registration of voters, to prevent fraud at elections, and the Legislature undertakes to provide for the appointment of electors by vote of the people without registration. It would seem clear that this was not an appointment by the State when it was in conflict with the constitution. It may well be said that so far as the State itself is concerned and its own officers, a failure to establish registration would not vitiate the election. It may well be said that the Legislature represents and in part is the State, and if they refuse to perform their duty it is the refusal of the people, and so the election should not fail. But different considerations apply to members of Congress and presidential electors. Those officers are to take part in making laws for the whole country, or electing its Chief Magistrate. The constitution of the State, the organic law, provides and requires a registration

of voters in order to preserve the purity of elections. Can officers elected without compliance with the requirements of the organic law be permitted to affect the rights of others outside the State? Why not require a compliance with the State's own organic law before permitting them to control in part the rights of the rest of the country by their action? They have been elected in violation of the highest law; can they on such an election claim to exercise the powers of the office? If a statute had provided for a registration, and they had been elected without any, it is clear that such an election would have been invalid. Why is a statute to be held more sacred than the constitution itself under which the statute is made? It has been repeatedly held by this House in cases of contested elections, and the same has been held in almost every State, that if the laws require a registration and none is made in any particular voting-precinct, the votes of such precinct must be thrown out. In one case where the registration was made, though not used at the election, it was declared void; although it was proven that no person voted whose name was not on the registration, strict justice and any rule of fairness, a proper regard for the purity of elections would seem to demand that if a State by its constitution from public policy, and to protect the purity of elections, required a registration of voters, and none was had, that no person elected in violation of such mandate of the constitution to participate in making laws or electing a Chief Magistrate for the whole country should be recognized as legally chosen. Before South Carolina claims, through her Representatives, to help make laws for the people of her sister States, or through her electors to participate in the election of a President of the Republic, she ought in justice to be held to comply with the provisions of her own constitution to secure a just and honest election. Every consideration of public policy, where the very existence of a government like ours must depend on preserving the purity of the ballot, would require that any election held in willful violation of a constitutional provision, made only to secure honest voting, should be treated as void and of no effect. That the recent election in South Carolina was held in violation of the mandate of the constitution is clear. That it was so held that the party in power might better retain its hold on the government your committee have no doubt. That great frauds were committed there by reason of such refusal to set up the great safeguard of registration your committee think is equally clear. Under these circumstances it is for the House of Representatives to consider what effect is to be given to an election so held.

MILITARY INTERFERENCE.

It was proven that a large number of United States soldiers were stationed in many different places in South Carolina for some weeks previous to the election and remained until after it. The pretense of thus stationing troops in the State and keeping them there until after the election was to preserve the peace and prevent violence growing out of the political issues to be passed upon by the people at the election. The fact of troops being sent to the State was used to overawe the colored people and prevent them from voting the democratic ticket. They were told the troops had been sent there to compel the blacks to vote the republican ticket and to shoot all those who voted for the democrats. Their presence undoubtedly had its influence and effect on the election. One of two propositions is true beyond question. Either the troops were sent to South Carolina without any legal and justifiable cause, for political purposes and to overawe a portion of the voters, or there was a state of violence and turbulence amounting to insurrection against the State, and which the State authorities could not deal with and restrain. If either proposition is taken as the true one, no election was held in that State, certainly for members of Congress and presidential electors, who are to participate in making laws for or choosing a Chief Magistrate for the rest of the country should be recognized as valid. If the troops were sent there without legal cause for political purposes, to control the election, to overawe the voters, clearly an election held under such circumstances should not stand for a moment. To uphold it would be at war with all sense of right and would shock every fair mind. An election to be valid must be free. No awe of military power at an election to interfere with or in any way to control or influence it should be tolerated for a moment. On the contrary, if there was such a state of turbulence and violence, amounting to insurrection against the State government, which the authorities could not put down and restrain except by calling in the aid of United States troops, your committee think it clear that an election held under such circumstances cannot be taken to be valid. In no sense is it a free election where an insurrection exists against the State government that can only be kept down by national troops. The people are not in a condition to take part in legislating for the whole country or in electing its Chief Magistrate. An election under such circumstances would be worse than a fraud: it would bring our institutions into disgrace and contempt.

PROCEEDINGS IN THE COURTS.

As has been before stated, the committee obtained copies of all the proceedings in the courts growing out of the election and counting the votes cast thereat. The first was a proceeding in behalf of The State at the relation of Sims and others, claiming to have been duly elected to certain State offices, vs. The Board of State Canvassers, for writs of mandamus and prohibition directing that board to aggregate the county commissioners' returns and give the certificates of election according to such aggregation, and prohibiting them from deciding contests and protests in reference to any office voted for. Such proceedings were had in that case that the court ordered the board to aggregate the county canvassers' returns for all State officers except governor and lieutenant-governor and return a statement of such aggregation into court. This was done. The court then issued a writ of peremptory mandamus to the board, commanding them to declare duly elected to the offices of senators and members of the house of representatives the persons who by the returns of the board to the court had received the greatest number of votes therefor, and to deliver a certified statement thereof to the secretary of state, who was to make a proper record thereof and transmit a copy thereof, under his seal of office, to each person declared thereby to be elected and a like copy to the governor, and to make a like copy to be printed in one or more newspapers. A writ of mandamus was issued and served on the members of the board. Before it was actually served on them, but when they knew the proceedings were still pending before the supreme court and after they had passed a resolution which was filed in the case that "they would not act on any proposition until the question of their powers and duties was decided by the supreme court," the board issued certificates of election to all members of the General Assembly who had the highest number of votes except to those from two counties, to whom they refused to give any certificates; and they then dissolved the board. This refusal was made upon *ex parte* statements only and affidavits, no opportunity being given to the parties interested to be heard, to examine the persons making the affidavits, or to contradict them, indeed no proof being offered of the genuine character of the affidavits acted on. This act gave a majority of both branches of the Legislature to the republicans. Giving the certificates as ordered by the court would have given the house of representatives to the democrats, with a majority in joint convention with the senate. For this act the members of the board were declared to be in contempt and were ordered to pay a fine and be imprisoned. A writ of *habeas corpus* was sued out from the circuit court of the United States, and the members of the board were thus liberated during its pendency. Finally judgment was given on that writ discharging the petitioners from the commitment. The committee have no doubt that the duties of the board of State canvassers, so far as counting the votes for members of the General Assembly was concerned, was purely ministerial, whatever may have been their duty and right as to the other officers. The act, as has been stated, only gave them the right to decide protests and contests "when the power to do so does not by the constitution reside in some other body." The constitution expressly provides that "each house shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own

members." The words, "of the election-returns," are significant not of the election but of the returns of the election, clearly indicating that the election-returns themselves were to be judged of by the house. The statute incidentally intended to exempt the members of the Assembly from the power to decide protests or contests by the State board of canvassers because by the constitution the "power to do so resided in another body." The committee has no doubt that the court had full power and authority to compel the board to perform this purely ministerial duty, and that the interference of the judge of the circuit court was unauthorized by law and his proceedings therein and the opinion by which he attempted to justify his judgment are calculated to throw discredit on the administration of justice and weaken the confidence of the people in the courts.

A proceeding in the nature of a *quo warranto* was also instituted in the supreme court in favor of the democratic electors against the republican electors. This has been recently dismissed. There was also a petition for a mandamus at the relation of William Wallace, the speaker of the democratic house of representatives, against the secretary of state, to order the delivering of the returns of votes for governor and lieutenant-governor to him as provided for by the constitution, he claiming to be the speaker of the only legal house, and that the other house was an illegal body and had no authority as a part of the General Assembly. The court decided that Wallace was the speaker of the only legal house of representatives and that the other body was illegal, with no authority as a part of the General Assembly; in fact, usurpers. Before the service of process, however, the votes had been delivered to the speaker of the illegal body claiming to be the house, that house had counted them, rejecting the votes from two counties entirely on *ex parte* affidavits and declaring Chamberlain elected. And on such a declaration he was inaugurated and kept in office entirely by the authority and power of United States troops. The State-house was also taken possession of with the aid of United States troops by this body (declared to be illegal by the highest court of the State) and was held by them, a body of soldiers being quartered in it night and day until the final adjournment of this body. Thus the military power of the United States was used to uphold the authority of a body declared to be usurpers by the highest court of the State. It would be difficult to imagine a greater crime against liberty and law than thus using the soldiers of the United States to force an usurping governor and Legislature upon the people. The committee think that the employment of the soldiers of the United States in South Carolina for this purpose of sustaining a usurping legislature and executive against the judgment of the highest court of the State, one of the gravest crimes that can be committed under a government like ours, and it cannot be condemned in terms too strong.

CONTEST FOR THE STATE GOVERNMENT.

Another writ of *habeas corpus* was issued from the circuit court in behalf of Peter Smith, a convict, who had been paroled by Governor Chamberlain, and whom the superintendent of the penitentiary refused to discharge on the ground that Chamberlain was not the legal governor. The judge refused the discharge. He found as a fact however, that General Hampton was legally elected; that the house of representatives of which Mackey was speaker was an illegal body, wholly without authority to count the votes and declare Chamberlain to be elected; but that he held over until his successor was legally inaugurated, and that General Hampton, although legally chosen, had not been legally inaugurated. No question has ever been made that General Hampton did not receive from eleven to twelve hundred majority of the votes cast, applying to the counting the same rules adopted by the committee in ascertaining the votes cast for electors. He has substantially been declared legally and constitutionally entitled to the office by the highest court in the State, composed entirely of republicans, and by the decision of the circuit court judge, also a republican. The action of the house of representatives in declaring Governor Chamberlain elected has been decided by the same courts to be illegal, and that the members of that body were usurpers of the rightful authority which belonged to the body of which Wallace is speaker. This usurping legislative body and the governor were put into power and kept there by the military force of the United States. Had that force not been used the decision of the highest court would have been upheld, the rightful Legislature and governor would have been inaugurated in peace, and the present conflict would not have arisen. A great wrong against the whole spirit and policy of our institutions has been committed by thus using the troops of the United States, first, to impose upon one of those States a usurping executive and Legislature never chosen by the people, and then to maintain them in power against right and law. In the judgment of your committee this has been done in South Carolina.

INTIMIDATION AND VIOLENCE.

Much evidence was taken before the three subcommittees upon the subject of intimidation and violence previous to and during the election. Evidence was also introduced to prove that there had been many homicides and other wrongs committed upon colored people by the whites, which had never been punished by process of law. The condition of affairs in the State for the last ten years has been such that much turbulence and disorder would be natural and to be expected. The government has been completely and entirely in the hands of and under the control of the republicans, in every department, executive, legislative, and judicial. It would be difficult to conceive of a worse government than the one that has cursed this State for the last ten years. Its debt has been increased, its treasury has become bankrupt and its credit ruined. An instance of this came to the knowledge of the committee. Copies of papers from the secretary of state's office were requested by the committee as soon as they could be obtained, and the answer was that work on them could not be done at night, as the gas company had cut off the gas, refusing to furnish it on the credit of the State. The superintendent of the lunatic asylum also gave notice while your committee was there that the inmates must be discharged, as the State had neither money nor credit to furnish supplies. It is understood that this want was afterward supplied by the voluntary payment of taxes to Governor Hampton. Of course taxes have been so increased as to become ruinous to property-holders. It is claimed by republicans themselves that no protection for the lives and property of colored people has been afforded by the republican governments. It was to be expected from the condition of affairs at the close of the war, when not only the mass of the people were reduced to comparative poverty, but society itself was disorganized, that there would be much disorder and violence. Under the best possible conditions of government, to suddenly emancipate the slaves, who were in a majority and necessarily from their condition unfitted either by education or habit to exercise the right and franchise of governing themselves or others, would be attended by difficulties great enough if the highest wisdom governed all parties. A few unprincipled men from the Northern States, together with a still smaller number of worse men, natives of the State, taking advantage of the ignorance and prejudice of the negroes, obtained power, which they used, not to give protection to the people, but for their own aggrandizement. Perhaps the best evidence of the utter unfitness of the State government for the last ten years is furnished by this claim of the republicans that it has not protected the blacks, who are in a majority, from great wrongs and violence, which to a certain extent is true. If the government cannot protect the majority of the people, it is a conclusive reason for surrendering up its trust to other hands. This state of things of course created great bitterness of feeling throughout the State, and undoubtedly found expression in some unjustifiable acts. Your committee is satisfied that all the democratic candidates, headed by General Hampton and the State committee, the organ of the party, together with all the influential men, exerted their whole influence in favor of a peaceful canvass and a perfectly free election. This is quite apparent from the testimony and speeches of General Hampton and the testimony of Colonel Haskell, chairman of the democratic State committee, General Connor, General Butler, and others. That there was great intimidation and

violence resorted to by the blacks toward their own people to prevent them from voting the democratic ticket was proven beyond question. Your committee has no doubt, upon the evidence, that a much larger number of blacks were kept from voting the democratic ticket by the threats, violence, and intimidation from people of their own race than were prevented from voting the republican ticket by a resort to like measures on the part of the whites. Many cases of threats and actual violence were proven as coming from colored people to deter men of their own race from voting with the democrats. Women utterly refused to have any intercourse with men of their own race who voted against the republicans. One instance was proven of the actual desertion by a wife with the children of a husband because he made campaign speeches for the democrats. An examination of the vote in detail will show conclusively that no large number of voters were kept from voting in any way. The colored people cast a larger vote for the republicans than ever before, and a larger proportion of the voters actually voted than in any other State. The increase of votes was no more where the democrats controlled than in those places where the republicans were largely in the majority. Both parties cast votes at every voting place, and there was no precinct where there were not some colored republican voters.

The testimony coming from the officers of the Army is very significant and important in this connection. It not only shows that there was no considerable intimidation or violence, either before or at the election, but it is in direct conflict with most of the testimony of the colored people called to testify as to the same places. It is the strongest proof of the utter unreliability of the witnesses called to prove intimidation of the blacks by the whites.

OATH-BOUND SOCIETIES.

To prevent the colored people from voting the democratic ticket they were enrolled in secret societies, called the Laborers' League, formerly the Union League. All the members of these societies are compelled to take an oath to support the republican party and vote the republican ticket. These societies are numerous. It was not ascertained what were the other objects of these organizations, nor what penalties were incurred by a violation of the oath. The State, too, was crowded. In addition to the Army, with United States deputy marshals and supervisors of election. Fully fifteen hundred of these officials were stationed on election day at the various precincts in the State. Many of these men certainly acted as electioneering agents for the party in power. Many, if not most, of them were so ignorant that they could not read their own commissions and the printed instructions issued by the Attorney-General. They were unfitted in every way to be charged with preserving the peace of the community at a time of so much excitement. Indeed the whole influence of the State government and its officials, and of all the United States office-holders, was brought to bear on the people to carry the election for the republican party. In addition a considerable portion of the Army of the United States was freely used for some weeks before the election, together with the cloud of deputy marshals, to accomplish the same purpose. In this connection your committee feel bound to say that the conduct and bearing of the officers and soldiers of the United States was both prudent and wise. Although their presence was made available to overawe the colored voters and prevent them from voting against the republicans, yet as a general thing, so far as your committee could ascertain, neither the officers nor men did anything to give encouragement to such a belief. That a people impoverished by ten years of bad government were enabled to throw a clear majority against their oppressors, in the largest vote ever cast, and under such circumstances, is the best evidence of the absolute necessity felt for a change. Your committee believe that in no other way can peace, prosperity, and protection to all, particularly to the colored race, be so surely restored and securely established in South Carolina as by recognizing the government legally elected by the people, of which General Hampton is the head, as the *de facto* as well as the *de jure* State government. It is pledged before the whole country to mete out exact justice and protection equally to blacks and whites, and it will have the power and strength to do so, while the present government, like its predecessors, has no power to protect the people and is so utterly weak that nothing but the moral power of the support of the General Government keeps it in existence a single day. Take this wrongful support from Chamberlain's unlawful government, and it will quickly vanish, like dew before the sun, and no longer disturb the peace of an oppressed and long-suffering people.

ALLEGED ATTEMPT TO BRIBE AN ELECTOR.

After the return of the committee, at the suggestion of some member thereof, Nash, one of the electors from South Carolina, was summoned as a witness. He testified that Colonel Childs, president of the South Carolina National Bank, sent for him on the day the electoral college organized and offered him a large sum of money to obtain the vote of three State senators to seat certain other members of the senate, and also \$10,000 to promise to vote for Mr. Tilden in the electoral college and \$40,000 more when it was consummated. Nash says that he refused the offers; that he was urged by Childs, and finally agreed to meet him again at another time to discuss the question, but that he failed to do so. He testified that he left Childs on entirely friendly terms, and that his friendly relations and intercourse have never been changed in the slightest degree or interrupted by this gross attempt to buy him like an article of merchandise in the market. This testimony was uncorroborated. Colonel Childs was summoned, but the committee received a certificate from his attending physician that he was unable to attend on account of illness. He has made an affidavit denying the testimony of Nash. Your committee attach no credit or weight to Nash's testimony. A person who could permit such an offer to be made to him without resenting it, on the contrary consenting to meet the proposer a second time to consult about it, and who had kept up his friendly relations with the person who had made so wicked and disgraceful a proposition, would most certainly have taken the \$50,000 if it had been within his power to do it. Besides your committee is satisfied that a person who has so little sense of decency, honesty, and propriety as to openly confess that so disgraceful an offer, the most insulting, decidedly, one could receive, did not alter his friendly feelings toward or relations with the person making it, cannot be trusted or believed with safety. Evidently he is so wanting in self-respect, in a sense of duty, in all idea of what constitutes honesty, right, and even common decency that it would be utterly unsafe to put the slightest reliance on his statements, uncorroborated by other testimony.

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.

Your committee also present the following reports of the majority of each of the two subcommittees that proceeded to Charleston for the purpose of taking testimony. Said reports are fully concurred in and made part of the report of the majority of the committee.

MILTON SAYLER, Ohio.
J. G. ABBOTT, Massachusetts.
ALEX. G. COCHRANE, Pennsylvania.
JOHN R. EDEN, Illinois.
THOS. L. JONES, Kentucky.
JNO. F. PHILIPS, Missouri.

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.

To Hon. MILTON SAYLER, Chairman:

The subcommittee which went to Charleston, and of which Hon. ALEXANDER G. COCHRANE, chairman, and Hon. THOMAS L. JONES constituted a majority, submit the following report:

The subcommittee arrived in Charleston on the 20th of December, and immediately

proceeded with an investigation of the election. Their inquiry embraced three counties, to wit: Charleston, Colleton, and Georgetown, but the great mass of the testimony taken relates to the conduct of the election in the first of these counties. The time was limited in which the committee was required to complete its labors and the means of communication with Georgetown and Colleton Counties very poor. This will account for the comparatively small amount of testimony taken in reference thereto; but sufficient evidence was taken to indicate very clearly that what was true of the election in Charleston County was equally true of the other counties referred to. In all of these counties (situate in what is known as the "low country") the blacks greatly outnumber the whites. It was therefore very evident that that party only could be successful in the political struggle which received the negro vote. The leaders of both the democratic and republican parties fully appreciated this fact. Prior to the last election the negroes as a mass had voted the republican ticket. There was, however, great dissatisfaction among them with the party leaders. The effort of the democrats was to take advantage of this dissatisfaction, while the republicans were determined to hold the vote. In the last canvass the first great effort since the war was made by the democratic party. Theretofore the democrats had joined with the more conservative element of the Republican party in the support of republicans more acceptable than those running upon the regular ticket, and no real struggle had ever been made to influence or secure the vote of the blacks. But in the last canvass each party had placed its nominees in the field, the lines between the parties were drawn, and each put forth its strength. To influence the negroes and secure their votes it became necessary that they should be made acquainted with the claims which each party had upon them for their support and hence arose what were known as

JOINT DISCUSSIONS.

That is to say, meetings would be called, at which democratic and republican speakers would attend. The time would be equally divided and the claims of the various candidates and of the parties would be presented by their respective adherents.

Charles H. Simonton, chairman of the democratic county committee of Charleston, speaks in his evidence of these joint discussions. He says, (see pages 125 and 126:—)

"As soon as I was appointed the chairman of the executive committee, being well aware of the enormous majority in color against us in this county, I saw that the only possible chance for the democratic party was, by a policy of conciliation, to endeavor to win over the men to our side. I was very much encouraged in the conclusion to which I had arrived by the fact that there were already in Charleston a large number of colored people whom we knew as free people, who had always been free, the descendants of free persons, who were strongly in sympathy with the democratic party, and whose aid I certainly could calculate upon in carrying out this purpose which had been devised. I made every effort, therefore, to reach the colored people. * * * I then thought that possibly they might be persuaded by means of argument, listening to the expression of our kind feeling toward them. I desired to satisfy them that the great apprehension which seemed to exist in their minds that the democratic party was determined to deprive them of their privileges, and especially of their freedom, could be answered. In order to carry out that purpose I sought an interview with the chairman of the republican executive committee of this county and proposed to him that in all of the appointments which he had previously made for discussions by one party in this county we should be allowed to join, and that these discussions, instead of being *ex parte*, should be joint discussions. My relations with the chairman of that committee, Mr. Bowen, are of somewhat a pleasant character. He is the sheriff of this county, and I am a practicing lawyer here, and our official relations had always been pleasant. We had a frank, full conversation in regard to this matter, and in it we agreed that the joint discussion should go on; that I should be informed as to every meeting which the republicans were to have, and that at all those meetings I would be allowed to attend with such speakers as I thought proper, and the time should be divided."

Mr. C. C. Bowen, chairman of the republican county committee of Charleston, in his testimony, says, (see page 158:—)

"I went down to Colonel Simonton's office here on Broad street, and had an interview with him. There was no one there but himself and myself, and we talked over the situation generally and agreed that we would have joint discussions at all the places where I had called meetings."

The meetings at which the joint discussions took place were mainly republican meetings, and were attended almost entirely by negroes. The suggestion that the democrats should have an opportunity to be heard came from the democratic leaders. When the joint discussions were agreed upon it was understood that no armed men should attend on either side. Colonel Simonton, in his testimony, (see page 126:—) says:

"Both of us concurred in the propriety of this rule, that those meetings should be attended by none but unarmed men. Owing to the fact that the white population of this county is exceedingly sparse, Mr. Bowen also concurred in the suggestion that I made to him, that I should send up with our speakers several white persons from the city, who should be, as it were, their supporters in the audience, applaud them when the time came, and call attention to the strong points; but both of us concurred in the agreement that neither of these gentlemen that went up should go with any arms at all. Under this agreement these joint discussions were held."

Mr. Bowen also says, (see page 158:—)

"It was also agreed that the men should not go there armed."

This agreement as to joint discussions was entered into early in October—about the 10th. Prior to this time there had been joint discussions at Strawberry Ferry in September, Mount Pleasant on the 6th of October, and again at Strawberry Ferry on the 7th of October; but these discussions were the result, not of any arrangement between the democratic and republican committees, but by the permission of Mr. Bowen and at the solicitation of individual democrats living at the places where the meetings were held. At the first Strawberry Ferry meeting both the whites and blacks were armed with guns. There was some disorder but no violence upon either side. There were about three hundred and fifty or four hundred negroes at this meeting, and about two hundred or two hundred and fifty whites. Theodore G. Barker, in speaking of the armed men at the meeting, (see page 74.) says:

Question. I understood you to say awhile ago that in reference to this Strawberry meeting you went there on a boat; you took some arms, and while you were landing you saw Mr. Bowen, their leader, surrounded by a large number of negroes; he went up to the church, and when he took the stand to address them, he said something about arms when he was speaking, and thereupon you said that you were not the aggressors in that respect; that you took arms there because they had taken arms previously?

Answer. I said that the first arms that have appeared on this hill to-day are in the hands of your followers, and we had notice that all of your followers were summoned to this meeting to come with their arms, and that the threat had been given out throughout the country that the colored democrats would be prevented from attending the meeting. He admitted that the first arms that appeared on that hill that day were in the hands of his own men, and he went on to say that he discouraged it.

At the Mount Pleasant meeting there was no violence either upon the part of the whites or blacks. As to arms, Mr. Bowen (see page 171) says:

Question. Were there any guns at Mount Pleasant in possession of the white men? Answer. No, sir. No guns in the possession of anybody, either white or black.

At the second Strawberry Ferry meeting some of the negroes had guns, as also had some of the white men who had gone down from Charleston upon the boat, but they did not take them ashore or show them at any time during the meeting. It is quite evident from the whole testimony that the only purpose the whites had in taking these arms was to protect themselves if necessity required, and to give encouragement and protection to such democratic negroes as might be at the meeting. After these meetings came the agreement between Colonel Simonton and Mr. Bowen before referred to, and in pursuance of this agreement five meetings for joint discussion were held, namely, Johns Island on October 11, Wadmelay Island on October 12, again at John's Island on October 13, Edisto Island on October 14, and Cainhoj on October 16. It appears from all the evidence that the whites attending all these meetings scrupulously observed the agreement made by Colonel Simonton, that they should not carry arms, while it is equally apparent that the agreement in that regard was violated by the negroes. Joseph Barnwell, a member of the Charleston bar, in his testimony (see page 49) says:

On another occasion I attended a meeting on John's Island. We were to have a joint discussion there, and we took Mr. Bowen and all his speakers up with us. When we got to the meeting, (we marched about four miles to get there,) we found at least three hundred blacks assembled; of that number at least one hundred and twenty-five had arms—muskets. The twenty-five white men who were with me had to go up to the stand through columns on either side.

Q. Through columns of blacks?
A. Yes, sir; columns of blacks, drawn up on either side, some with rifles and some without, and some with sticks. I was the first democratic speaker, and while I was speaking four sentinels were pacing up and down about ten yards right behind me.

Attention is also called to the following admissions of Mr. Bowen. He (see page 171) says:

Question. On the 11th of October a meeting was held on John's Island?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. That was a quiet, orderly meeting?

A. Well, yes, sir.

Q. Had the white men arms?

A. Yes, sir; pistols; nothing but pistols.

Q. Had the negroes their guns?

A. Probably a hundred or more.

Again, on the same page the witness says:

Question. On the 13th of October there was a meeting at John's Island?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the white men have guns?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did the negroes have guns?

A. Yes, sir; twenty or twenty-five guns.

At most of these meetings some of the whites carried their pistols. This, however, they claimed not to be a breach of the agreement, which they asserted applied only to men being armed with guns. It does not appear from the evidence that any protest was made against the carrying of pistols. The design of Colonel Simonton and Mr. Bowen was evidently to prevent a recurrence of an occasion like that of the first Strawberry meeting, where bodies of men on both sides took their loaded guns to the meeting and when under the circumstances a trifling thing might have led to serious difficulty. The pistols were carried only by an individual here and there, doubtless upon both sides, and were not displayed by their owners. Notwithstanding this breach of agreement on the part of the negroes (and other matters which will hereinafter appear) however the joint discussions went on until the 16th of October, when at Cainhoj they were brought to a sudden termination. The tragic events which occurred upon that day will long be remembered with horror by the whites of South Carolina. On Monday morning, October 16th, a boat carrying perhaps a hundred or a hundred and fifty white men and twenty or thirty blacks started for the little town of Cainhoj, beyond which, at the distance of perhaps three miles, a meeting was to be held and a joint discussion to be conducted. Among the passengers upon the boat were Mr. O'Connor, a candidate for Congress, Mr. Jervey, a member of the Charleston bar, and a negro named Delaney; these were to be the democratic speakers. Mr. Bowen, a negro named McKinley, and a negro named Cyrus Guillard, were also aboard. These were to be the republican speakers. Apparently the best of feeling prevailed and there was nothing to create even a suspicion of the dreadful events which were so soon to follow. The boat arrived at its destination about two o'clock p. m. The visitors were welcomed by their friends upon the shore who awaited their coming. All sorts of vehicles were pressed into service, and it was not a great while before the whole party was at the place appointed for the meeting. A long table had been procured for use as a stand for the speakers. Two chairmen were chosen, one to introduce the republican and the other the democratic speakers, and the discussion soon commenced. Mr. Jervey was the first speaker. He occupied about thirty minutes of time, and then McKinley, the colored republican speaker, was introduced. The latter had not spoken more than twenty words when the first step was taken toward the massacre which followed. The committee will not attempt to describe in its own language the terrible events which occurred, but will give them in the language of one of the eye-witnesses, Mr. George Rivers Walker. Mr. Walker's testimony (see pages 214, &c.) is as follows:

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Question. What is your age?

Answer. Twenty-nine.

Q. What is your profession?

A. I am a lawyer.

Q. Do you practice in Charleston?

A. I am senior member of the firm of Walker & Bacot, practicing lawyers in Charleston.

Q. Are you a son of the English consul?

A. I am.

Q. How long have you practiced here?

A. I left Hartford in 1869, and have been practicing here since.

Q. Where were you born?

A. I was born in South Carolina. I was brought up in England and the North.

Q. Will you state, sir, whether you were at the meeting held at Cainhoj?

A. I was.

Q. Did you go up on the boat?

A. I did, sir.

Q. Will you just state what occurred in detail and in its regular order from the time you left the wharf here until after the riot?

A. At the wharf in Charleston I found a steamer engaged, as I understood, by the democratic party. It being a beautiful day, and on account of the freetrip up the river, quite a number of boys (I lay stress on the word "boys," because the number of persons was large but the number of men was comparatively small) and young men were on board. The steamer waited at the wharf, and, in fact, put back, for Mr. Bowen, the leading republican of this county.

Q. How many were on board?

A. By my calculation, there were in all one hundred and fifty went up on that steamer, democrats and republicans.

Q. How many men were on board?

A. Judging from the number of men that staid up there to do picket duty, there could not have been more than sixty men at the most.

Q. And those were not, all told, more than one hundred and fifty?

A. I should think not. I would not like to be positive on this point, because my attention was not called to the matter, but that is my impression; and my impression is derived from the number that came down. Mr. Bowen came aboard and a large number of well-known negro bullies. My attention was called at the time to the bad character of bullies that were getting aboard with him. Everything, however, seemed to be perfectly peaceful. We went up the river, republicans and democrats, chatting together peacefully, without the slightest sign of any ill feeling. We arrived at Cainhoj, and still everything was very peaceable. We got into the ambulance and rode up three miles to the brick church. When we reached the brick church Mr. Bowen and his party had preceded us and were already there. The meeting was called to order and some speaking occurred.

Q. Who spoke?

A. Mr. Jervey, the democratic candidate for solicitor.

Q. Was there a colored man in your party named Delaney?

A. There was; a democratic colored speaker. He had been a major in the United States Army.

Q. What do you know, if anything, about a report that he was to speak there?

A. Major Delaney was to speak at the meeting.

Q. Do you know whether the negroes at that place expected him to speak, from what they said at the time?

A. From what negroes said to me afterward, I know it.

Q. Well, were those negroes who thus spoke to you persons who were upon the ground there?

A. Yes, sir; I heard it constantly spoken of among the negroes not to allow Delaney to speak; and I know, also, as a matter of fact, that the negroes not only at that meeting, but at several other preceding meetings which I had attended, seemed to be very hostile to any negro democrat speaking; the cry was that any white man had a right to be a democrat, "but no damned black man had."

Q. Did Mr. Jervey conclude his speech?

A. Mr. Jervey concluded his speech, and a colored man by the name of McKinley then got up to speak; he was what I would call a conservative-republican; as soon as he began speaking there was a commotion in the crowd. There seemed to be an objection to him; evidently he was taken for a democrat. I heard him say in effect, "if not in actual words, 'Listen to me; I's your friend.'" Before I go any further permit me to show you from a diagram the situation of the crowd. [The witness here drew a diagram of the grounds and indicated the position of the different parties, the buildings on the ground, &c.]

I have just given you a small diagram here of the situation. The horses were hitched on either side of the church and somewhat to the front; the speaker's stand, was almost opposite the church. The old house was to the left of the stand about forty or fifty feet as you faced the church, and the vestry to the right. A road ran by the vestry and in front of the old house. When the speaking began I retired over to the church and was standing directly in front of the church when the attack began which I am about to narrate. The crowd was all around the stand. I was entirely out of the crowd, perhaps two hundred feet away from them. I could just barely hear the speaker, but heard McKinley, over the murmurs of the crowd, cry out, "Listen to me, I's your friend," or words directly to that effect. The commotion continued; in a few moments I heard a shot. This commotion was by the old house chiefly, between the house and the stand. A little of the commotion might have been at the other end of the house, but it seemed to me to be chiefly at the stand. Some one near me called out, "A horse has broken loose;" and I looked over intently to see at what spot it had occurred, when I heard this pistol-shot. I will call your attention to the fact that some distance back of the old house there were some pine trees, and directly behind the house, and more toward the road, there was a pool of water or small swamp. In a moment, in a shorter time than I can describe, standing at the church where I could distinctly see, I saw the whites withdraw toward the vestry in great disorder. The negroes, on the contrary, fell back a few feet and appeared more quickly than I have told it here, in perfect skirmish order, every man with a musket—not an arm appearing the moment before. They evidently had their guns placed in the bushes about four feet apart, and every man seemed to know his position the very moment the signal was given; I allude to the firing of the pistol.

Q. You say they appeared with their muskets. What did they do?

A. They fired volley after volley into the flying white men. I walked from the church to the vestry, calling on the white men to rally; but they being totally unarmed, with the exception of a trifling number of pistols, (there was scarcely a man on the ground with anything but the smallest kind of a pistol, and the most of them being boys were without even that,) which, opposed to muskets in the hands of negroes behind pine trees, were utterly useless. When I reached the vestry I found a small body of men, say fifteen or twenty, rallying behind it, and in some order, but no better armed. Just before reaching the vestry I saw Abram Smith, now a member of the State Legislature of South Carolina, on the stand, firing upon unarmed men who were flying to their horses hitched to the right of the church. As they ran he fired three shots from a revolver. I drew my pistol, aimed it at him, but it would not go off. I was about to fire on him when a democrat at my right knocked my arm down and said, "Nobody is shot; don't kill him." I then called out to Smith, "If you fire again I will shoot you;" and he held up his hands and ran into the swamp. At that time I had seen no one killed. I will here state that, standing at the church door, had the old negro Lachicotte, fallen here I afterward saw his body, to the right of the meeting, it would have been a miracle if I had not seen it.

I will state, before I proceed further in my narrative, that intelligence was brought to me by a party of young men immediately upon my arrival on the ground that there were a number of guns hidden in a chimney in the old house. They came to me, accustomed to take my advice in other matters, for advice as to what they should do with regard to these guns. I instructed them to closely watch the guns, but not to touch them unless there were an attack or direct signs of treachery.

An ex-officer of an organization known as the Butler Guards was present with these young men and evidently had them under his command—when I saw under his command I mean that they obeyed him—and the men on the ground informed me that he followed my advice rigidly and gave no order for the seizure of the guns, nor were they seized until the negroes were advancing upon the squad of white men on a bayonet charge. When I reached the vestry, coming from the church, I found Mr. Bowen among the men at the vestry. He seemed to be eager to go over to the republican negroes, and repeated two or three times, "Will no one go with me and make peace?" After hearing him I at once volunteered. He accepted my offer, saying to me, "Stop the democrats firing." I turned around and called out in a very loud voice, "Gentlemen, cease firing, as Mr. Bowen and myself, are going over to stop this row," or words to that effect. The democrats immediately ceased firing. I took Mr. Bowen's arm and we walked across the ground arm in arm. The negroes seeing us also stopped firing, and there was an absolute cessation of all hostilities.

When we had reached the negroes Mr. Bowen began speaking to them. Apparently he was endeavoring to stop the row. At this time Cyrus Guillard, a negro of a most incendiary character, rushed by, saying, "Mr. Bowen, we can't listen to you now," and urged the negroes to recommence firing on the whites; and I solemnly swear that, without a shot being fired by the whites, without the slightest cause for any hostility whatsoever, the negroes began refraining on these unarmed men volley after volley; and although I had gone among them as a messenger of peace, I heard suddenly behind me, "Shoot the son of a bitch." I jumped behind a pine tree, and three shots were immediately fired. I then, dodging from tree to tree, returned to the vestry, the whole party of negroes firing at me while doing so.

When I reached the vestry I said to the men there present "Men, all we can do now is to defend ourselves." At that moment I saw the present sergeant-at-arms to the other committee shot in the back and three or four others wounded. The negroes fired muskets loaded with buck-shot, duck-shot, nail-heads, and cut-up pieces of lead-pipe, apparently. I was wounded in the leg.

It was impossible, however, we being in the cleared ground in front of the church, and for the most part so utterly unarmed, to resist the hail-storm which was poured into us; and we had to retire and leave our wounded to the mercies of the negroes. We went to Cainho, sent home most of the boys and some of the wounded, who had managed to get off the ground. I do not think there were more than twenty of us, there may have been thirty, who remained that night at Cainho to protect the village. I sent out two faithful colored men to bring in the wounded, providing a buggy for them. I performed both picket and hospital duty that night, and saw the mutilated dead and wounded brought in. Old Mr. Simmonds, a very old man, was lifted out of the buggy dead on one trip. His head was cut open with some instrument, such as an ax or hatchet; he was shot through the body, and every bone in his body apparently broken with the stocks of the muskets, for as they moved him the bones could be heard crushing against each other.

I am not certain about the names of all the others. King, it was, however, who with other fatal wounds and cuts, had one which I distinctly remember. His arm seemed to have been cut into by an ax, one cut down in one slanting direction and another in another direction, taking a slip out of the bone; the balance of the arm seemed to hang by the muscles alone, and this had evidently been twisted around, I suppose, for the purpose of giving pain. He died a few minutes after he was brought in. McNeil, or Daley, I forget which it was, had a number of cuts—five, I think, I didn't count them—but I saw his head all cut open from an ax or hatchet. Daley was also cut up more or less. Both of these died within twenty-four hours. Most of them died that night; in fact, with the exception of Walter Graddock, I know of no wounded man who was left among them who escaped. Walter Graddock was a boy—a mere boy. He was most horribly hacked up, and his eye was protruding most fearfully, as if it had been gouged out, when we saw him next morning. I don't know whether he has lost his eye or not; I have not heard.

There was one other, I remember; his name was Pregel. He was fearfully used, and, I understand, escaped because he was thought to be dead. He is here to-day, though, and can tell his own story. I saw him outside.

The question naturally suggests itself, was the

CAINHO MASSACRE PRECONCERTED?

As bearing upon this question the committee refer to several important matters which appeared in evidence:

First. *There was an absence at the meeting of negro women and children.*

This fact was singular, because all of the meetings which had been held previously were marked by the presence of negro women. Indeed, the whole evidence indicated that the women were more interested in the political canvass than the men. They not only attended the meetings, but on election day were present in large numbers at the polls. Among the blacks gathered around the stand at Cainho no women were to be seen. Mr. Walker, in speaking of the matter, (see page 217,) says:

Question. How many negroes were present?

Answer. Those with me estimated them at about three hundred. I do not think there were a less number than of the whites, but they were all men. At every other meeting I ever attended the negro women were present. The women and children were kept out of the way at this meeting, for some unknown reason.

There was some evidence as to three negro women being in the old building in which the whites discovered the guns. The witness Smith (see page 253) says:

There was three women in an old building to the left that appeared like it was a place some time back to drive carriages in.

Question. Where was the building with reference to the platform?

Answer. To the left. The women ran out and says, "The democrats has those republicans' guns."

These were the only women present.

Second. *From the time of the organization of the meeting until the first shot was fired the negroes preserved an ominous silence.*

At all previous meetings there had been more or less noise and confusion. The negroes had frequently interrupted the speakers by asking questions, &c. The undisputed evidence is that at Cainho scarcely a word was to be heard from one of the assembled blacks. The witness Smith, (called by the minority on the committee,) in his evidence (see pages 254 and 255) says:

Question. During the speaking, up till the time when the cry was heard that you spoke of, you are positive that there was great order observed by the colored people?

Answer. Yes, sir; as I afore said, I never seed a better-behaved meeting than that.

Q. You have had some experience in this campaign?

A. O, yes, I always went around, and spoke some myself.

Q. And you were struck with the singular good order that was preserved?

A. Yes, sir; I was listening to the speaking myself.

Q. You did not hear any singing, or whistling, or hollering?

A. Not even talking among themselves—just listening to the speaker.

Q. There seemed to be a perfect silence?

A. A perfect silence. You could a most hear a pin drop on the floor.

Q. You were struck with that at the time?

A. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bowen (see page 161) says:

"Mr. Jervy was the first democratic speaker. That meeting was unusually quiet up to that time. Mr. Jervy spoke his twenty-five minutes and got down, and the most of the time you could have heard a pin fall. It had been the most quiet meeting I had seen; that is, there was no interruption."

Third. *Just as McKinley commenced speaking one of the negroes near the stand fired a pistol in the air.*

It will be remembered that prior to this and at the time there was perfect silence, nothing had occurred to create ill-will between the whites and blacks. Mr. Jervy's speech had been a mild and conciliatory one, McKinley, who was speaking, was a colored man and a republican, and yet suddenly and without previous warning a negro fires a pistol in the air, with what purpose?

Attention is here called to the testimony of Mr. C. C. White, a white man, who was present at the meeting and who was severely wounded. He says, (see pages 238 and 239.)

Mr. Bowen mounted the stand and addressed the crowd. I think his remarks were addressed more particularly to the colored people that were assembled there, and he pressed upon them, I think fairly and squarely, the necessity of keeping order and quiet, and begged them not to make any noise or disturbance while the speaking was going on, as an agreement had been made between the two parties to have a friendly discussion and that neither party should be interrupted through their speaking. After these few remarks Mr. Jervy took the stand.

Question. Who was he?

Answer. A democratic speaker; a white man. He spoke about thirty minutes. That was the time allotted by agreement. I think he was called to time by the watch. He withdrew, and a colored man by the name of McKinley followed.

Q. Who was he?

A. A colored man that belongs to Charleston. He is in the conveyance office in this city.

Q. He was a republican?

A. Yes, sir; he hardly spoke more than two or three sentences. I was standing with my hand on the table he was speaking from, and in a line beyond him, with the stand to the left. The crowd was divided, the republicans on the left of the stand and the democrats were on the right.

Q. Then the republicans were toward this old building?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The democrats were on the opposite side?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far away was the old building from the stand?

A. Well, I should judge it was about forty feet, perhaps. The rear of the republicans was almost on a line with the building, and they were almost in front of it, so that I could see behind the republicans. I could see through the opening of the building, the space under the roof. After McKinley had spoken a sentence or two, in fact as he began to speak, I saw a decided commotion among the colored people. I went up closely, to pay marked attention to the effect the speaking would have upon the colored people, and as soon as he got on the stand I saw a decided commotion, like a dissatisfaction, among them; and about the time he had made two or three remarks this commotion began. I think his first remark was, "My colored friends, I have arrived to speak in your interest." That was all the further he got. At that time I saw some of the men that went up on the boat with us; and it appears they discovered some rifles, and they picked them up, and as they held them in their hands I saw a colored man discharge a pistol.

Q. Where was he?

A. He was near the corner of the old building. I could not tell you exactly whether he was just beyond it or nearer to me, but I saw him distinctly.

Q. In the air?

A. It was apparently elevated at an angle, say of about thirty-five or forty degrees, and as he fired the pistol he sang out, "Look out, look out!" and in an instant, almost, the rush of the colored people was made to the swamp in the rear, and in a very short time I saw quite a number—I should think forty or fifty people—rushing in that direction, and a great many of them, if not all, armed with guns, which they commenced to fire with. While this rush was being made, these men that had these guns in their hands, as the party attempted to rush to the house, held the position of "ready," and cried, "Stand back, stand back!" almost simultaneously with the firing of the pistol. At the very minute that pistol was fired there was a mutual separation of the political parties, and they separated, as near as I can remember, about a hundred yards or more. I saw at once the disadvantage that we were laboring under, for going up the little boys were firing at chips in the water, and I went around among them requesting them not to do it; and knowing there were no other arms among us except pistols, I thought it was folly to attempt to keep up firing with pop-guns, and I walked between the two parties and held up my arms and pleaded with all the boys for peace and quietness. While in that position, I saw six or eight men rapidly advancing toward me with their guns. In the direction of them, a little to my right, was a cluster of trees. They were in a comparative thicket, and the open ground was behind us. The cluster of trees was a little to the right, between me and them, and I found I would have to retreat, and I made a quick step to these trees, calculating to wheel and run, and as I had about got the trees in line, I wheeled and made a run, and as I did the volley fired, and I was struck by three balls.

Fourth. *The negroes took their loaded guns to the meeting and concealed them.*

As to this fact there is no dispute. The guns concealed in the swamp and thicket, as well as those hidden in the chimney of the "old house," were placed there by the negroes. It is not proven or even alleged that a single gun was taken to Cainho by the whites.

Fifth. *The report of the pistol was followed by the report of a gun from the swamp, and immediately the negroes emerged from the swamp in regular skirmish line, while those around the speakers' stand retreated in a body toward their friends.*

If the negroes had from any cause been seized with a sudden panic would their actions have been marked with such precision and method?

Mr. Bowen, in his testimony, claimed that under the agreement with Colonel Simonton the members of an organization known as the Butler Guards were not to be permitted to attend these joint discussions. He alleged that the members of this organization were men and half-grown boys of very bad character, and their attendance at meetings might result in difficulty. Undoubtedly some of the men who had formerly belonged to that organization did attend the meeting at Cainho, but their attendance was evidently without the knowledge or consent of the democrats. It is not pretended that any of the democratic leaders either invited them or knew of their presence. Mr. Bowen says that he recognized some of these men not long after he had gotten aboard the boat, but he does not allege that he made any protest or called the attention of the democratic leaders to the fact, although these men were present at the meeting. The committee do not believe that their presence had anything to do with the trouble which occurred. Mr. Bowen, it is true, seeks to place all responsibility for the trouble upon the shoulders of these men, but under all the evidence such a conclusion is utterly without warrant.

If Mr. Bowen and the colored man Smith are to be believed, then Mr. Walker, Mr. White, Dr. Grimke and Mr. Magill are to be disbelieved. The last four witnesses are men of high character. Mr. Walker, upon cross-examination, gives the following account of himself:

"I was brought up out of this country; I studied my profession in Massachusetts. There I acquired a profession and a respect for republicans—bona fide republicanism. I have with one exception voted the republican ticket in every campaign, and that exception was in the Seymour and Blair campaign. I voted then for Seymour and Blair, and voted the democratic ticket at this last election. With the exception of those two I have voted the republican ticket at every election. I have always been regarded, I believe, as an exceedingly conservative man until this last election. When Hampton was nominated I was a strong Chamberlain man, and for long after Chamberlain was nominated. When this campaign began I would more readily have voted for Mr. Chamberlain than for Mr. Hampton, and it was only after the treatment that I found the whites were receiving here at the hands of the negroes and the negro leaders that I felt it my duty as an honest man to support Hampton, and that I entered so fervently into this campaign."

Dr. Grimke has been a practicing physician in the city of Charleston for sixteen years. Mr. Magill is a book-keeper, and a very intelligent witness, while Mr. White (who is by occupation a pilot) has been engaged in business for many years, and is fifty-one years of age. No evidence was taken before the committee which tended to cast a cloud upon the evidence of these witnesses. In this respect, however, Mr. Bowen was not so fortunate. On cross-examination he admitted that he had some years ago been charged with "murder." That he was imprisoned upon that charge for about ten months. That he was not tried upon the charge until within the last two years. That he was tried before a judge who was elected by a republican Legislature; by a jury composed entirely of negroes, and the case of the Commonwealth presented by a republican prosecutor. Mr. Bowen tells the story of the trial (and a very remarkable one it was) in the following language, (see pages 177 and 178.)

Question. How long after you were discharged from custody did the trial take place?

Answer. Several years.

Q. How many years?

A. The trial was a year ago last June. Since I have been sheriff. A certain party trumped up the charge with the intention of holding it over me, and when they got that far I forced them to a trial.

Q. You were tried for what?
 A. I was tried for murder, and they undertook to use this man Grimes against me.
 Q. Did he appear as a witness?
 A. O, yes; they brought him here and I insisted on his being kept in jail; they succeeded in getting him away and would not allow him to be tried afterwards.
 Q. Did you appear as a witness?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Did he allege that you had been the instigator of the affair?
 A. Yes, sir; he made four different statements. These parties were my political enemies. They went after Grimes in Georgia, and put him in jail and got an affidavit out of him and let him out of jail when they found they could not do anything with me without getting Grimes's head in also; and he went off with their connivance.
 Q. Did he swear on the trial that you had employed him to do the shooting?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Was the jury white or colored?
 A. It was colored. The verdict was given without their leaving the box. The solicitor himself admitted that he had no cause. The judge was a democrat by the name of Shaw. The trial took place in Georgetown County, and the first proposition made by my enemies was that the court would continue the case until some special term after the next regular term. I saw that they wanted to hold it over me. I employed counsel and insisted on a trial, and I finally got the time fixed for a trial.
 Q. Is the judge who tried the case living yet?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Did he instruct the jury to find a verdict for you?
 A. He did; the solicitor says, "Well, I submit the case without argument;" and my counsel says, "No;" and the solicitor then got up and says, "Your honor, I'll admit that we have no case;" and the judge then instructed the jury to find a verdict of acquittal.
 Q. By whom had the judge been appointed?
 A. He had been elected by the Legislature.
 Q. By a democratic or republican Legislature?
 A. We have not had any democratic Legislature since reconstruction.

Mr. Bowen had for a time during the war been in the confederate army. He was tried by a court-martial for "conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman," and dismissed from the army. In relation to these charges he says, (see page 177):

Question. What were these charges?
 Answer. O, they brought a great many trifling charges against me—some for conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. I had on several occasions asked for a leave of absence, and failed to get it for a long time. Others could get what I could not. I finally succeeded in getting a leave of absence for ten days. Everybody knew that that would not last me until I could get where I wanted to go. I took it, though. When it got out I sat down and extended it myself, and they took offense at it, and discharged me for it. I was very glad of it.

Q. Were there any other charges than that?
 A. O, lots of them.
 Q. What were they?
 A. Forgery, bigamy, and so on, and I can remember I had an orderly sergeant in my company. I recollect that they charged him with being Mephistopheles and alleged that I was under his influence. It was a common report in that battalion, and it was known by everybody here that if we had ever gone into battle that at least two or three of the rifles in the battalion would have been aimed at Major White. He was one of those overbearing, domineering men that never consider the men under him; putting a ball and chain on his men was a common amusement for him. It was a wonder that he lived as long as he did. I will say this under oath, that I had nothing to do with the killing.

Major White (whom it was alleged Bowen had procured to be assassinated) preferred the charges before the court-martial. Smith, the negro witness, is a member of the colored body which styles itself "the Legislature of South Carolina." The part which he took at "Cainhoj" is thus described by the witnesses:

Mr. Jervey, in his testimony, (see pages 259 and 260,) says:
 Question. You are a member of the bar in the city of Charleston and a democrat?

Answer. I am, sir.
 Q. You are the gentleman who made the first speech at the Cainhoj meeting?
 A. Yes, sir; and the only speech there.
 Q. I want to ask you, sir, whether you saw Mr. Abram Smith, the republican member of the present so-called legislature, with any weapon in his hand during the disturbance which occurred there?
 A. I did, sir; I saw him with a pistol.
 Q. Where was he?
 A. He was standing on the platform from which we had spoken.
 Q. Just state what he did?

A. I saw him fire three shots toward a party of white men, about as far as from here to the corner of the room away from him, [about fifteen feet.] By the time he had fired the third shot, I myself placed my hand on my pistol and said to him, "Don't fire again or I will shoot you."
 Q. Did you see Mr. Walker in that neighborhood at that time?
 A. Yes, sir; he was standing near me, and I heard him make the same threat.

The witness White (see page 240) says:
 Question. Were there any men on the platform at that time?
 Answer. There was one man got upon the platform and fired his pistol three times.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):
 Q. Who was that?
 A. A man by the name of Smith. I asked afterward, and was told that his name was Smith.

The testimony of Mr. Walker corroborates these witnesses. After Cainhoj there was no more joint discussions. The republican leaders were troubled no longer by democratic speakers making appeals to the negroes. The massacre at Cainhoj, whether preconcerted or not, certainly had the effect of exciting the negroes and driving back into the republican ranks many who until that time were inclined to vote the democratic ticket. The race issue was raised, and the result can readily be imagined. In reference to this matter Mr. Walker says:

"From the incendiary character of the speeches of Cyrus Guillard and Abram Smith and other negro leaders, I have more than reason to believe that there was a determination, as soon as it was found out how popular Hampton was, to stir up strife, in order to create a race-feeling between black and white. At the beginning of the campaign I went out into Christ Church Parish and was listened to kindly by hundreds and hundreds of negroes, and had every reason to believe that the parish would give a large democratic vote. After Cainhoj, with the exception of two or three negroes in the village, there was scarcely a negro democrat to be found in the parish." (See pages 231 and 236.)

Having thus noticed the matter of joint discussions, their termination, and the effect of the same, we come to the matter of

RIFLE CLUBS.

There were quite a number of military organizations in Charleston County

which had existed for a number of years. They are spoken of by Mr. Barnwell in his testimony. He says, (see page 50:)

Question. What club was it to which you sent for assistance, or the members of which you sent to notify that if there was trouble you would like them to attend?
 Answer. The Carolina rifle club.
 Q. There is a social club called the Carolina Club. Is that the club?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Is it a recent organization?
 A. No, sir; it was organized seven years ago.
 Q. What was the purpose of the organization?
 A. Purely for social purposes, sir. Then, gradually, as they were not prevented by the State government, they grew into a sort of militia; that is to say, they came out in uniform, and even the United States troops used to turn out with us. Governor Chamberlain presented a flag to the Washington Light Infantry, which was an organization exactly like ours.
 Q. How large was that club?
 A. I think at that time it had about ninety men.
 Q. Had they an armory?
 A. I think so at that time, sir.
 Q. Are there other clubs of that character?
 A. Yes, sir; the Washington Light Infantry, the German Fusiliers, (that was founded in 1776, and re-organized after the war,) the Palmetto Guard, the German Hussars, the Washington Artillery, and quite a number of other clubs, sir, by quasi consent, were allowed to go on and parade; and gradually, as time went on, a rivalry sprung up between them. They got better uniforms, and they became the citizen soldiery, and were so addressed by Governor Chamberlain. They were the ones that welcomed the company from Boston, with whom they turned out here on the 28th of June.
 Q. What is the number of these clubs altogether?
 A. I do not think that they have had more than six or seven or eight hundred men altogether; but I cannot answer positively about that.
 Q. They are still in existence?
 A. I believe not, sir. They were disbanded.
 Q. Had they an order from the President or Governor Chamberlain disbanding them?
 A. From both, sir.
 Q. The organizations existed at the time of the 6th of September riot?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Did you see yourself and do you know the facts which you have stated?
 A. Yes, sir; I know all that I have stated. I have always qualified my statements, separating that which I knew from that which had been told me.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Were there any statutes allowing the organization of those rifle clubs?
 A. One or two rifle clubs had original charters and organized under them, and others organized under charters from the clerk of the court, whilst others organized as purely social organizations.
 Q. Did you understand that Governor Chamberlain recognized these clubs here?
 A. Surely, sir.
 Q. Was he a member of them?
 A. He certainly was an honorary member of one of them, and he was entertained by them, and addressed them as the citizen soldiery in my presence.

In addition to these well-known and long-established military organizations in the early part of the campaign, there had sprung up quite a number of local organizations. The white men in the different wards of the city and in the country precincts met together, chose their officers, and organized into clubs, each member owning the rifle or musket which he carried. The purpose for which the whites organized these clubs was twofold: First, in order to protect themselves and their families from violence at the hands of the blacks; and second, to afford protection to all negroes who might desire to attend democratic meetings or avow democratic sentiments. In determining the necessity for the existence of such armed organizations it must not be forgotten that the negroes greatly outnumbered the whites, and furthermore, that a vast number of the blacks were supplied with State arms, and banded together under the name of

"THE STATE MILITIA."

In speaking of the militia, Mr. Walker says, (see pages 219 and 220:)
 Chamberlain had surrounded us with his armed militia, and, as I understood it, there were different ward organizations for defense, and the Butler Guards were one of them.

Q. What is the State militia?
 A. So far as I have seen it, the State militia is, as a rule, with the exception of a few companies here in the city, composed of the most ignorant negroes that can be found throughout South Carolina. They are most thoroughly armed, and in their ranks there is not to be found a single respectable white man, with very rare exceptions.

Q. Then it was an organization authorized by the laws of the State, was it not?
 A. I believe it was. I have never examined the militia laws.
 Q. Now, the Butler Guards was a part of that local force voluntarily organized for defense against the legal military organization of the State government?
 A. My answer to that is this: I live in a little town in the country. That town has been threatened with being burned by the negroes over and over again in the last six months. The negro militia have assaulted white men over and over again. They have charged upon and attempted to kill me simply because I had a personal quarrel with one black man, and they have charged through the streets of Mount Pleasant with their bayonets fixed, charged upon unarmed white men and women simply because a white man had had a quarrel with a colored man. We had no means of defense. And down here even republican white men belong to these various military organizations, purely for purposes of defense.

Mr. Barker in his evidence (see page 70) says:
 "In Charleston the militia was entirely in the hands of the colored republicans; they were distributed about at the various precincts in small bodies and formed the nucleus upon which negroes rallied with such weapons as guns, sticks, clubs, and sticks with bayonets on the end of them, that constituted the armed force at different precincts on election day, and they frequently appeared at their meetings, before the election, threatening those who declared themselves at all on the democratic side."

Mr. R. J. Magill (see page 236) says:
 Question. Now I wish you would state, if you please to leave the Cainhoj matter, what occurred, if anything, at the John's Island meeting.

Answer. Well, sir, there were about twenty or twenty-five of us who went there. It was a joint discussion, and Mr. Bowen went with us. We had a five-mile tramp to the speaking place. We had been informed by Colonel Simonton that we must carry no rifles, because he had made an agreement to that effect. When we reached the place we found that the republican speakers had gone on with the meeting, and to our surprise we found two companies of militia drawn up in line with their muskets, and at least 30 per cent. armed with old swords and every conceivable weapon. Bowen ordered them to leave, and they marched down to a house twenty or thirty yards away, and there they stood during the whole meeting. The whole

time Colonel Young was making his speech a negro sitting in front of him in a cart covered him with his musket.

General Hunt, in his official report, makes the following significant statement. (See page 202.) The time of which he speaks was during the second Charleston riot. He says:

"In one case he found a negro who attempted to shoot a white man, and therefore disarmed him, the man objecting to give up his musket, as it was State arms. The musket was brought to the citadel guard-house."

It will be readily perceived upon a perusal of this and other testimony taken by the committee that the whites had some foundation for their fear of personal violence at the hands of the blacks. This fear, however, was not so much the incentive to the organization of these rifle clubs as was the desire on the part of the white people to afford protection to those negroes who desired to act and vote with them. Whether such protection was necessary will be better determined when we come to another part of this report. In the latter part of September or the beginning of October Governor Chamberlain issued a proclamation commanding these rifle clubs to disband. There can be no doubt that the letter of this order was complied with. The guns were taken from their armories by their individual owners, and in many instances the organization was abandoned. Some of the clubs retained their organization, however, but existed rather for social than military purposes. In some cases they retained their officers and had regular days of meeting. There can be no doubt that the individual members of these clubs held themselves in readiness to act in case of any great and sudden emergency, and when so called upon it was quite natural that they should act together, under competent officers, and with somewhat of military precision. Indeed they did so act upon several occasions after the date of the proclamation, notably in the case of the Charleston riots, one of which occurred upon the 6th of September, and the other upon the day after the election in November. The first of these riots is known as the "King-street riot," and awakened such alarm in the minds of the people that business was practically suspended throughout the city of Charleston for two days. This riot commenced upon the night of September 6. It originated in an effort on the part of the negroes to inflict violence upon others of their race who had been speaking at a democratic meeting. Attention is here called to the testimony of Thomas Lewis, a negro called by the minority on the committee. This testimony illustrates the condition of the mind of the negroes and the necessity that white men should afford protection to colored democrats.

The witness (see page 184) says:

Question. How long did he speak?

Answer. He spoke for an hour; but I wouldn't like to say all his remarks, though I can't.

Q. Well, what happened after his speech?

A. After his speech then the row commenced, and he was guarded home by a thousand white men, else he would have been killed that night, certain, because I had a pistol and I was going to blow his brains out myself, as he was coming out of the door, but a policeman stopped me.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. This man Rivers used very bad language about Mr. Bowen?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Governor Chamberlain?

A. Yes, sir; and even General Grant—uncommon and imprudent language, the awfulest language that he could use.

Q. He stated that they stole public money, and all such declarations as that, and you colored people did not propose to stand it any longer?

A. No, sir; we didn't propose to stand it any longer; we had been standing it long enough.

Q. You proposed to get up and blow his brains out, and if he were to get up again, and called Mr. Bowen, or Governor Chamberlain, or General Grant thieves, that you will go after him and kill him if you can?

A. Yes, sir; I will if I possibly can.

Q. And your purpose in following Rivers up the street was to kill him if you could?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if the white men had not been there around him, you would have killed him?

A. Yes, sir; he would have been a dead man.

By Mr. BANKS:

Q. Did you talk with these fifteen other men about what you were going to do?

A. Yes, sir. John Mitchell was one of them. He was a constable; and he will be here to make his statement. He's gone to bring some person to the jail now.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. You fifteen men understood each other pretty well?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you talked it over and you came to the agreement that any one of you would kill Rivers if you could?

A. Yes, sir; if we could.

Q. Did you have arms?

A. I did, sir.

Q. Did the other men have pistols also?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the understanding was that any one of you would kill him if you could?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BANKS:

Q. Did you see any other man shot that night?

A. Yes, sir; young Mr. Buckner. He is the man that Mr. Barnwell shot that night.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. From what you know of the sentiments of republicans here of your own color, do you think that they entertain the same feelings that you do?

A. I am certain of it, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. John Mitchell was one of your party, and he made this agreement with you?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you all agreed together to kill him?

A. Yes, sir, certainly; to kill him for his argument.

As has been stated, after the proclamation of the governor the rifle clubs disbanded. Nowhere does it appear that in the testimony, nor was it ever alleged, that these rifle clubs ever committed an act of violence. True it is that Mr. Cunningham, the mayor of the city, was (in his evidence) very bitter in his denunciation of these clubs, but even he admitted upon cross-examination that he did not know of an instance during the campaign where they resorted to violence. The committee are of opinion that the presence of the members of these clubs on the night of the 6th and the morning of the 7th of October prevented a continuance of what would have turned out to be a most bloody riot. The police force of the city of Charleston was unable to keep the peace. More than half of the members of the force were negroes, who, instead of seeking to prevent riot and bloodshed, were

at times themselves guilty of the most outrageous conduct. General Hunt in his official report, (see page 202,) in speaking of the riot of November 8, says:

"I sent for the troops to the citadel to hurry down, for I could now hear the firing and saw it was extending westwardly along Broad street. So soon as I reached the court-house, I found the firing was heavy near King street, and started toward it, when a policeman ran out of the station-house and asked me to come in there. Immediately three or four negroes on the north side came off the side-walk and told me to keep on if I desired, for that I "would be safe anywhere." I, however, at the request of the policeman, went to the station-house, where the officer in charge was getting out his men, and he appealed to me for assistance in such terms as led me to believe he felt himself too weak to control the riot. By this time a number of gentlemen, young and old, had arrived and offered their services to me. I informed the police officer that the troops were on their way, but if he desired the service of these citizens they were at his disposal. He said he would be glad to have them; they fell in with his force, and as I was giving some directions he interposed, saying in substance that the matter was in his hands. He then started off, when I almost immediately had complaints that the policemen were firing on and bayoneting quiet white people. The troops soon after arrived at the station-house, and additional armed white citizens also reported. Some one of the civil authorities, as I supposed, I do not remember who, then told me that it was essential that the latter should be sent back to their homes. I declined sending these armed men on the streets, but told him they would be placed where they would produce no bad effect, and directed them to take position behind the troops and to remain there, which direction they followed implicitly."

It will be observed that the whites during this exciting time were present striving to keep the peace.

The results which flowed from the proclamation of Governor Chamberlain disbanding all military organizations among the whites were most injurious. The negroes, who had hoped for protection, lost all heart, and felt that they no longer had the freedom of voting for the men whom they felt would look to their interests. In speaking of the effect produced by the proclamation of the governor, Mr. Mills (see page 131) says:

There was a very large number of colored men who had voted for their republicanism who were now anxious to affiliate with us, and who were now ready to enroll themselves in the democratic clubs, but the first requirement was that they should be assured of physical protection. They expressed extreme apprehension, especially out of the city, if they should enroll themselves in these democratic clubs; they were afraid of being maltreated.

Q. By whom?

A. By the colored republicans; their own republican party, and race, unless we could give them that assurance of protection. That matter was called very specially to my attention; so much so that I was the member of the committee that prepared and submitted to the committee an announcement to the colored people pledging our personal honor that we would give them all the protection that was in our power if they associated themselves with us. I think that Colonel Simonton has described much more fully than I could do the effect of that throughout the county. I think that what broke down or checked for the first time that disposition on the part of the colored people to enroll themselves (for it was growing and swelling as you always find those things; it was extending from the leading men to the subordinates, and they were getting a certain pride in the matter of membership in these clubs) was this: The first thing that militated against them was the proclamation of the governor ordering all organizations called rifle clubs to disperse, and treating as violators of law any bearing of arms publicly. I think from that time that the colored people lost heart and faith in the ability of the democrats to give them protection, because I think it is a matter capable of the most perfect demonstration that the order of the governor and the President, harsh as we considered it to be, was implicitly and absolutely obeyed. There was no violation of it in spirit or letter, and we therefore felt, and we recognized that these people felt, that they had not the same protection that they had before, because the militia of the State was composed exclusively of colored men. They retained their arms and carried them to the public meetings. I have myself been at a public meeting when the white men present had no arms visible and where the colored men marched up under arms. When the proposition was made to disarm them Bowen himself said they should march off the grounds. We said, "No; let them stay." We were afraid of no violence when we were in pursuit of a peaceable object.

Mr. Barker also says: (See page 68.)

After the proclamation of Governor Chamberlain and the proclamation of President Grant, the temper of the republican leaders and of their followers changed very much. There was in this county perfect good-nature in the conduct of the canvass, and we were progressing, as we thought, very well in the influence upon the colored people to vote the democratic ticket; but after that the whole temper of the campaign was changed, and the intimidation began, or increased, and up to the time of the election—

Q. Intimidation of whom?

A. By the colored people of the colored people. They did not intimidate any white people. They threatened the negroes in every way from joining the democratic party or showing any sympathy for the democratic party, or voting for the democratic party. The efforts of those who were competing with the republicans were entirely paralyzed. They appealed to race prejudices.

Q. Who did?

A. The republicans. They insisted upon their party allegiance. They treated them as deserters of their race and of their party, and of their political friends, and brought to bear upon them the most tremendous pressure—a combination of the Union League and the power of the political organization which followed the Union League.

Q. What was that power—the Union League?

A. Yes, sir; after the emancipation the colored people of this State generally were brought into the Union League, and they were bound over by very solemn formula and oaths to adhesion to that organization.

Q. What evidences have you seen of the fact that such an oath was administered?

A. The evidence of that came in different directions from negroes who expressed their sympathy with the white people with whom they lived, yet up to the point of voting against the republican party they said, "We cannot do that because we took an oath."

There is no doubt that the negroes were bound by an oath to support the nominees of the republican party. Attention here is called to the evidence of the negro witness "Prince Albert." This man was a somewhat prominent republican and was employed on election day as one of the "republican rallying committee." In his testimony (see pages 118 and 119) he says:

Q. Did you ever take an oath to support the republican party?

A. I swore the last time.

Q. When did you take an oath that you would support the republican party?

A. About three months ago.

Q. Who did you take the oath before?

A. Before Lieutenant-Governor Gleaves.

Q. And you swore before him that you would support the republican party?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. Where was the oath administered to you?

A. Down in Archdale street, across town, in our ward meeting.

Q. How many other negroes took the oath there?

A. So many that I couldn't commence to tell you; over six hundred, white and colored.

Q. How many white men?

A. More than I can remember. I aint got no particular remembrance of it.

Q. How many negroes?

A. Over six hundred. It is more than that, because they have had to take that oath every meeting that they called. Every meeting that was called was open for new members every night till the election.

Q. And then they had to take an oath to support the republican party?

A. O, yes, sir. They were not compelled, but they were asked.

Q. What was the oath; what did you swear?

A. The oath was this: "You do solemnly swear to protect and defend the constitution of the republican party, so help you God;" and I forget, there was some other things, such as don't give out no secretness of this club, but something or 'nother of that kind; I couldn't give it exactly, but it is something just that way.

Q. It was, in substance, that you would vote the republican ticket and do all you could to support the republican cause?

A. Yes, sir; that was as I understood it.

Q. You understood from the oath that when you took it you would be bound to vote the republican ticket, and you would be bound to do whatever you could for the republican cause?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that there were a great many negroes that were sworn in the same way?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Every negro that came to the club would have to sign this oath?

A. I didn't say that they would have to sign this oath, but they signed the constitution.

Q. Did most of the negroes in Charleston belong to these clubs?

A. The majority of them did.

Q. Did all of these republican clubs have the same kind of an oath?

A. It is very likely that all had the same oath. I never visited all the ward meetings. I visited wards 2, 3, and 4, and they all had the same oath.

Q. There was also a provision in the oath that you would not betray any of the secrets of the club?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under this oath that you took you would have felt yourself bound to vote for any person who might have been nominated on the republican ticket?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It did not make any difference who it was?

A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. JONES:
 Q. Was not that part of the oath?
 A. Yes, sir; all the nominees of the republican party. We made up our minds to vote the straight ticket and all the names on that ticket.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):
 Q. You say that the lieutenant-governor was there?
 A. Yes, sir; he administered the oath.

Q. How many negro men were there connected with your club?
 A. I can't remember exactly, but according to the number which was registered there in the ward, it run up between six hundred and seven hundred.

Q. And every one of those six or seven hundred men took the same oath that you did?
 A. Yes, sir; he took the same oath in my presence every time that I was there.

Q. They would not allow any one to belong to the club unless he took that oath?
 A. No, sir.

Q. Were these meetings held in secret?
 A. No, sir; they were public meetings. Anybody could come, but if they didn't feel a desire to take any part with us, he was requested to go out. He could come in as a visitor, but when the time came for particular business we asked him to go out. When we got through initiating new members, then we opened the door and they came in again.

Q. What was the initiation?
 A. Only to take that oath.

Q. What was the nature of the business what was done in these clubs?
 A. Why, the business that was done in this club was only to state who the officers, &c., should be whom you got to vote for, and to not let any member go out on the street and have any public discussion about what took place in the club.

Q. You were not allowed to tell outside that you took the oath?
 A. You could speak about taking the oath, but you wasn't to tell what the oath was.

Q. Who was the president of your club?
 A. The president was Aaron Williams.

Q. Was he a white or a colored man?
 A. He was a white man.

Q. What was his business?
 A. I don't know his business.

Q. Is he in office?
 A. No, sir; he didn't occupy any position in this city.

Q. Have you worked any since you were discharged, except the day that you worked for the rallying committee?
 A. I worked five hours one afternoon.

Q. Who was that for?
 A. That was for a Mr. Michael, on the southern wharf where the Dictator, the Florida boat, lands.

Q. Is Mr. Michael a democrat?
 A. I don't know whether he is a democrat or republican.

Q. Do you know of a great many republican negroes in Charleston working for democrats?
 A. Yes, sir; there are a great many working for them now.

Q. You never heard any oath administered to these men since the election? You never saw any white men administer it?
 A. You never took an oath, but they wanted you to take an oath.

Q. That one man?
 A. Those three that I went to.

Q. Did they want you to take it?
 A. No, sir; they only spoke to me concerning it; but my employer did, and I said to him that he couldn't get my vote if he was to give me \$5,000 cash in my hand and \$20 a day. He said, "No intimidation; no intimidation."

Q. You would not violate this oath that you took in this club if a man came to you and gave you a hundred dollars a day?
 A. Not for a thousand dollars a day. According to the oath they couldn't do anything to you; but at the same time to be truthful as a truthful man I wouldn't take \$2,000 a day.

Q. In other words, in taking this oath that the lieutenant-governor had administered to you, you felt as a matter of conscience that you could not vote anything but the republican ticket without violating your oath and violating your conscience?
 A. Yes, sir.

Before leaving this matter of the general conduct of the election, the committee desire to call attention to, and condemn, an abuse which existed, namely, the employment and use of

DEPUTY SHERIFFS.

Mr. Bowen, the sheriff of Charleston County, just prior to the election appointed a large number of persons styled "deputy sheriffs." The appointment of these persons was without warrant or authority of law. They were all republican negroes, and were placed at the polls throughout the city of Charleston on election day, and were invested by Bowen with the power to make arrests. This power did not seem to be in any way limited, nor was it subservient to any higher authority. The liberty of the citizen was only subject to their caprice. On the day of election these men assembled in large numbers at the polls, wearing badges, and exhibited the utmost partisan malignity. Reference is here made to the following testimony; Mr. Mills, after the election, prepared a written protest, which he published. This protest he produced before the committee and made it a part of his testimony. One part of this protest was as follows, (see page 132:)

"That there were present at the aforesaid voting precincts large numbers of persons claiming to be deputy sheriffs, and wearing badges so designating them, (such pretended deputy sheriffs having been appointed by the sheriff of the county in direct violation of law, and being without any lawful office or authority,) who, pretending to act under color of such office, did, by intimidation and threats of violence, prevent and stop many persons from voting the said democratic ticket, by which unlawful violence and intimidation of said pretended deputy sheriffs the result of the election was changed."

In his testimony (see page 133) Mr. Mills says:
 By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):
 Question. The statements which you have read from the paper, if I understand you correctly, are read from a copy of a paper which you filed with the board of county canvassers, after the election?
 Answer. Yes, sir; based upon affidavits, many of which I took from known and reliable witnesses. I was appointed one of a committee composed of George Lamb Buist and Randolph Siegling, besides myself, to draft this paper.

Q. Are you satisfied of the correctness of that statement, at this time?
 A. In the main, I am. I do not know that I can establish each one of those precincts. As I have stated, I have drawn that on the plan of an indictment, but I have no doubt of the truth of those general statements.

Q. Are you satisfied that those deputy sheriffs of whom you have spoken served to decrease the democratic vote and increase the republican vote?
 A. I have the most decided impression on that point. Perhaps it may be well to state that that is a hobby with me—opposition to those deputy sheriffs—for I have been at it every election that we have had since 1868; I have always opposed it.

Q. State what effect they had?
 A. They acted as party-rallyers, while they worked clothed with a badge which gave them a certain official authority. They were partisan, and violently partisan.

Q. Were there any democrats appointed?
 A. No, sir. At the last election in Charleston that was prevented by the commissioners of elections. In the municipal election the commissioners of election were charged with the entire duty of preserving the peace, and our commissioners therefore controlled the sheriffs; while in the general election our commissioners of election have no such power.

Q. Was there anything in the law which authorized the appointment of these deputy sheriffs?
 A. In my judgment, there was nothing; they were appointed in open violation of law.

Q. By whom were they appointed?
 A. By the sheriff of the county.

Q. Who is the sheriff?
 A. Mr. Bowen, who was the candidate for re-election, and also a candidate for presidential elector.

Q. And a prominent republican?
 A. The head of the republican executive committee of the county.

Q. Were they all appointed from one party?
 A. All from one party.

Q. And that the republican party?
 A. Yes, sir; and I think I may say all colored people, or nearly so

Mr. Barker (see page 70) says:
 "They were aided on election day by a large force in the city of Charleston and elsewhere—constables, or rather deputy sheriffs—who were ignorant colored people, wearing badges of office under the appointment of Bowen, the sheriff of the county, and exercising the power of arrest at will of any one that they chose, without reference to the committal of any offense. They were assisted by the same class of persons, wearing the badges of deputy United States marshals, under the appointment of Mr. Wallace, and the exercise by these two sets of persons, who were entirely partisan, all appointed on one side, was always directed against the democrats, and it created a thorough and entire intimidation of that portion of the colored vote which was at all disposed to vote the democratic ticket. The exceptions were men of rare courage, or those who were under the absolute protection of individual white men. The militiamen, who had arms from the State, furnished by republican military commanders or militia officers, in numerous instances presented themselves at the polls in armed force, and controlled the voters to a very large extent."

The witness Patrick Philip Toole (see pages 150 and 151) says:
 By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):
 Question. What is your age?
 Answer. Thirty-five, sir.

Q. Where do you reside?
 A. In this city, sir.

Q. How long have you resided here?
 A. Since 1864, I think, just a few days after the evacuation.

Q. What is your business?
 A. Milling; I have a planing-mill and lumber-yard.

Q. Where is your mill?
 A. On the west side of Charleston, sir; on the Ashley River, right opposite here.

Q. Have you an office?
 A. Yes, sir; I have two stores, or salesrooms, in Hayne street, Nos. 20 and 22. We make doors, sashes, and blinds, and everything connected with buildings, besides building buildings.

Q. From what State did you come here?
 A. From New York State, sir.

Q. Were you born there?
 A. No, sir.

Q. Where were you born?
 A. I was born in Ireland.

Q. How long did you reside in New York State?
 A. Well, I have been there since 1846. I was about three years old when I came over. I am not quite thirty-five, but will be that age the early part of next year.

Q. Were you in the Army?
 A. I was, sir; in the Federal Army.

Q. How long did you serve?
 A. One year, sir.

Q. In what brigade?
 A. Well, sir, I was in two or three brigades. I was in the Sixty-fourth New

York, Colonel John Cochrane's regiment. Major Schaler, of New York, was our lieutenant-colonel. We were known as the "Chasseurs."

Q. What are your politics? Have you been voting any stated ticket or not?
A. I have voted generally a split ticket until this last election.
Q. When Governor Chamberlain ran before, whom did you vote for?
A. I voted for Green. Green was a reform republican. Before that I had voted for Moses.

Q. Were you at the polls on election day?
A. I was there part of the time.
Q. How long were you there?
A. I was there probably an hour or so in the morning and about two or three hours in the afternoon.

Q. Please state what poll you voted at?
A. I voted at the first precinct, ward 4, I think.
Q. Now state what occurred, if anything.
A. Well, sir, we were running the mill that day, and I told my hands, as I generally did, to make it as short a time as possible in voting: that I was going to vote about eight or nine o'clock, and if they wanted to vote they could come along and vote with me. Some of them did, and some of them staid behind. There was one of our men who was arrested after he voted.

Q. Was he a white or colored man?
A. He was a colored man named John Hall.
Q. What did you employ him at?
A. At laboring work in the yard.
Q. Now detail to us all the circumstances of the arrest; what was said by him and all the circumstances attendant upon the case.

A. When we got in line to vote, this man Hall stuck very close to me and looked very much frightened, and on my looking around to see the cause of it, I saw several colored men opposite to him, near him, making gestures and looking at him, and so on. Seeing that he was somewhat alarmed, I told him to stand still and not be afraid. After he voted, he was taken possession of by those deputy constables or sheriffs.

Q. Did he vote the democratic ticket?
A. Well, I could not say that; I suppose he did. He was accused of voting the same ticket that I did, which was the democratic ticket. He was accused before and afterward of voting the democratic ticket.

Q. After he had voted what occurred?
A. He was taken possession of and was going to be arrested by those black deputy sheriffs. I got between them and tried to reason with them about the folly of arresting him.

Q. What did they say and what did other colored men say, if anything?
A. Well, they said that he voted the democratic ticket, and that he did so under my request. They made an attempt to take him out of the line, however, before he got to the ballot-box, those same men did. You see you had to stand off the length of this room [twenty-five feet] from the ballot-box.

Q. What else did they say about his voting the democratic ticket?
A. They got very violent. They were all armed with clubs and sticks, and so on; and the white men there said he should not be arrested. The majority of the blacks, seeing a few take hold of him, were encouraged to interfere, and there would have been a general fight if I had not begged them to stand back and let the man be arrested. Before that, however, the deputy United States marshal told these constables to stand back and let the man alone; that if he did vote the democratic ticket they had no right to arrest him. Those deputy sheriffs took him away from the marshals altogether, and just at that period a fight was very imminent, and I begged the marshals to let him go and let him be arrested to quiet the crowd and keep off a fight. I did it for peace sake. Of course I got cursed just as much as he did.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. What did they do with him?
A. They took him to the city jail.

By Mr. BANKS:

Q. What was the charge against him?
A. That he was under age. They accused him of being only eleven or twelve years of age. So they took him to jail, and from there he was sent before the United States commissioner.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. You followed him down, did you?
A. Yes, sir; I went with him.
Q. What occurred before the commissioner?
A. Well, the commissioner held some whispered conversation there with the attorney-general of the State, this man Stone. Later on the attorney-general called the commissioner out of the room where we were, into the hall, and had some conversation with him out there, I suppose, and he came in and looked at us two or three times, and the commissioner finally came in and asked this man some question in regard to his name and age, and so on, and asked me if I would be responsible for him; that is, to have him whenever the commissioner would call for him; and I told him I would. After giving that verbal guarantee they let him go and reminded me that they would hold me responsible for the man.

Q. Have they called on him to answer since?
A. No, sir.
Q. Was he twelve years old?
A. Well, he was doing a man's work and receiving a man's wages. I considered him a man. I hire him for a man, and pay him for a man.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Do you think he is twenty-one years old?
A. I think he is over twenty-one.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. Has he whiskers?
A. Yes, sir; he has some hair on his upper lip.
Q. This man alleged that he was only twelve years of age?
A. Eleven, I think.
Q. That was the deputy sheriff?
A. Yes, sir. During all that time there were threats made by those surrounding him, and he was pointed out to the crowd.

Q. What effect did this action of the deputy sheriff's in this case, and the general course which they pursued during the day, have upon the negro voters, that you know?
A. We had to send this man and one other colored man who voted the democratic ticket down back of the mill under a guard. We had to beg the white men on the place to take them down.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Why?
A. We were afraid they would be torn to pieces. Some evenings later I let them go to go home, and kept my eye on them as far as I could.
Q. From what you saw at the polls of the action of these deputy marshals and others advocating the interests of the republican party, would you consider it safe for a colored man to vote the democratic ticket?

A. No, sir; I would not. I do not suppose there would have been a colored man in Charleston who would have voted the democratic ticket that day if there had not been whites at their back. The supposition was that I voted it, and I was cursed myself for voting it. I was among them when they acted in this manner.

Q. What was the action of the deputy sheriffs whom you saw during the hour that you were at the polls in the morning and the two hours that you were there during the afternoon? And I ask this without reference to the case you have given.

A. Well, the deputy sheriffs were interfering: bringing these men up to vote the republican ticket. That seemed to be their duty. They were all armed with clubs of some kind or another—either a rough-hewn piece of stick or something else. They were anything but peacemakers.

Having thus considered some of the leading matters connected with the general conduct of the election, the committee direct attention to a matter bearing upon which a large amount of testimony was taken, and the importance of which will at once be perceived. The matter referred to is the

INTIMIDATION OF DEMOCRATIC BY REPUBLICAN NEGROES.

From all the testimony taken the committee are satisfied that had the negroes been permitted to vote as they desired the result would have been the election of the democratic electors. A reference to the testimony cannot fail to satisfy an unbiased mind that such would have been the result. In the "low country," both before and upon the day of the election, almost every kind of violence was resorted to in order to prevent negroes from voting the democratic ticket. Threats were first employed, and where they failed to produce the desired effect the most cruel and barbarous measures were resorted to; negroes were stripped naked, beaten with whips and clubs, and in some cases cut with knives or razors, their only offense being that they had resolved to vote the democratic ticket. The negroes, maddened by the report circulated by unscrupulous party leaders that if the democratic party should be successful in electing its candidates they would again be reduced to slavery, were like so many ferocious animals. At some of the voting-precincts the voters were nearly all negroes. Upon election day they assembled at the polls armed with shot-guns, rifles, muskets, swords, knives, bayonets on sticks, and almost every other conceivable weapon, shouting, cursing, and threatening; swearing that they would (to use their language) kill any "damned democratic nigger that offered to vote." As the negro voter approached the polls he would be set upon by these armed men. If he had a democratic ticket in his hand it was taken from him, a republican ticket substituted, and the voter marched up to the ballot-box with clubs brandished over his head and compelled to deposit his ticket in the presence of his assailants.

It was by such means that the voice of the people was stifled and large majorities rolled up for the men who have brought ruin and disaster upon every business interest in South Carolina, impoverished her people, made her treasury bankrupt, banished from the faces of her children the smile of hope and left in its stead a settled gloom and despair. Testimony was taken as to the actions of the negroes at the following precincts, Charleston County, Red-top Church precinct.

The following extracts from the testimony will indicate how the election was conducted there. (See pages 13, 14 and 15.)

A. M. LATHAM sworn and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. Cochrane):

Question. What is your age, sir?
Answer. Forty-nine.
Q. Where do you live?
A. I live in South Carolina.
Q. How long have you lived in South Carolina?
A. Since 1851, sir; twenty-five years.
Q. Where were you born?
A. I was born in Scotland, sir.
Q. Is there a precinct in Saint Andrews Parish known as Red-top Church precinct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you engaged in any business in that precinct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What?
A. Mining phosphates.
Q. How long have you been engaged in business there?
A. I used to plant rice and cotton there since 1868, but for the last three years I have been mining phosphates.
Q. Did you go to the Red-top Church precinct on last election day?
A. I did, sir.
Q. What time did you reach the polls?
A. Before six in the morning.
Q. Before they opened?
A. Before they opened.
Q. What time did the polls open?
A. Six o'clock.
Q. Where was the voting conducted?
A. At Red-top Church; in the church.
Q. What position, if any, did you occupy on that day?
A. I was democratic supervisor of election.
Q. At that place?
A. Yes, sir; at that place.
Q. At the time the polls opened about how many negroes were there?
A. There might have been from a dozen to eighteen.
Q. Well, sir, did others come?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Singly or in bands?
A. They came occasionally in bands and sometimes singly.
Q. Were they armed; and, if so, with what?
A. Most of them had bludgeons; some had guns.
Q. Did you see any one with bayonets?
A. I saw some bayonets tied on poles or sticks.
Q. How many managers of election were there?
A. Three.
Q. How many colored men?
A. Two of them were colored men and one was a white man.
Q. Two colored republicans and the white man was a democrat?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And was there a republican supervisor?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Was he white or black?
A. He was a white man.

Q. Well, sir, I wish you would go on now and state from that point, in your own language and without questions from me, what occurred during the day, giving the events, as near as you can, in their order.

A. About, I should say, a few minutes after I entered the church and the polls were opened, the box was examined by the people to see that it was all right. I proposed to the managers of election that but one person should be admitted to the church at a time, for the purpose of having a fair election; and the managers agreed that it was right enough, and requested the marshals to clear the church. By that time there were a great many in the church, and the people would not go out, so the

managers didn't insist upon it. The church then became filled with people who crowded all around the box.

Q. What kind of people?
A. Colored people; all colored people, sir.
Q. Did they surround the box?
A. They were all around the box, close to it, and packed all around it; and a short time after that there was a boy came up to vote by the name of Jenkins, and I challenged the vote.
Q. How old was he?
A. He seemed to be about sixteen years of age—perhaps from thirteen to sixteen—and the crowd became very unruly at my objecting to his vote.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. You challenged the boy on account of his age?
A. I challenged his age, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. Well, sir, proceed.
A. The crowd became very unruly about my expressing myself as dissatisfied with the vote, and they brought forward his father, and his father said that he was in his twenty-first year. I told him that that would not do; that he must be twenty-one years and out, and proceeded to swear his father; and they got perfectly obstreperous.
Q. What did they do?
A. They crowded all around me with sticks and hollered, "Take him out; bring him out;" and, of course, I was unable to challenge any more.
Q. Did the boy vote?
A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Did you protest against it?
A. I did, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. Were there any others?
A. There were many others, sir, but I could not protest after that; it was as much as my life was worth. Some democratic negroes came in to vote then, and among others my foreman, James Grant. He voted and showed his ticket.
Q. What ticket did he vote?
A. The democratic ticket; and the people became very much annoyed about that, apparently, and were for assaulting him; indeed, they expressed themselves so violently that they frightened the man. He wanted to go away, and he slipped out, and no sooner did he get out than they got after him, and they run him about two hundred yards.

Q. Were you present when any further difficulty occurred?
A. I was not present when they caught the man.
Q. Did you see Grant the next day?
A. I did, sir. He was very much cut up.
Q. What was his condition?
A. When I saw him he was lying in bed, and he told me he was unable to turn over.

Q. How many cuts were there about his head?
A. Well, sir, I think there may have been three or four. There certainly was one very bad one on the brow and head, and a very bad one across the top, and another in the back of his head; probably three or four cuts.
Q. Were there any other injuries or wounds about his person?
A. He was very badly cut in the knee, stabbed with a knife. I saw the cut. It was a very bad one.
Q. Any other cuts?
A. Another cut in the arm.
Q. Now, go back to the polls and tell us what followed after Grant ran out.
A. After that some little time went by before another man came in to vote—Peter Lucas.

Q. Was he a colored man?
A. He was a colored man and a pronounced democrat. He had been in my service for years and had always voted the democratic ticket. Well, they got after Lucas as he was going in, and they marched him up to the door with bludgeons over him, and he came to me and asked me what he should do. I remarked to him that I thought he had better sit down a little while and not vote at present; just to wait a little while. He was afraid to stay, and went and put in his ticket. He then went out and they got after him again.

Q. Did you see Lucas the next day?
A. I saw him the next day and his head was tied up, and he told me they had all but killed him.

Q. He was cut up, you say?
A. His head was tied up, sir.
Q. Well, now, what further occurred at the polls?
A. Well, sir, at a later period in the day the negroes were around the church all the time, and men and women cursed me. I was kept in the church from six in the morning till eight or nine at night. I could not get out.

Q. What more, if anything, was done?
A. There was a man by the name of John Brown, a democratic negro, got into the church with me in the morning, and he could not get out; and one man came up there and cursed him for a son of a bitch and that he wanted to knock his brains out. He didn't come into the church, but he came over to the door.

By Mr. BANKS:

Q. Did you see him?
A. I saw him and heard him.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Whom did he curse?
A. He cursed Brown.
Q. Who was Brown?
A. He was a democratic negro. He was afraid to vote and never voted.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. Do you know of democratic negroes coming up?
A. Several; a number that told me they were going to vote the democratic ticket were brought up by men, one on each side, with bludgeons. These men came up to the door with them, and told them if they didn't vote the republican ticket, what they would do, and they stood at the door and saw them vote the republican ticket. Men voted the republican ticket that I am satisfied would have voted the democratic ticket if they had been left alone; they told me so afterward.

Q. How many colored women were there about there?
A. There were thirty or forty armed with bludgeons. There was hardly a woman that hadn't a bludgeon, and they were, if anything, worse than the men.
Q. Was there any incident occurred between a negro woman and yourself that day?

A. There was. One of these women took a gun and aimed it in the window. It happened to go to the window and some one called out, "Look at that woman; she is about to shoot you, sir." I looked out and they had just taken the gun from her by that time.

Q. How many democratic votes were there at that poll altogether that day?

A. Four white men and nine negroes voted the democratic ticket—13 votes.
Q. How many republican votes?
A. Two hundred and ninety-seven; in all there were 310.
Q. How many white men were there about the polls on that day?

A. Five.
Q. Who were they?
A. There was one republican supervisor, one democratic manager; there was myself, democratic supervisor, and two others.

Q. Were those two others white democratic voters?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you state whether either of them was detained through fear in the church?

A. Yes, sir; one young man was detained there as long as I was. He remained there the whole day from six in the morning until eight or nine o'clock in the evening.

Q. He was afraid to go out?
A. Yes, sir; I went to the door two or three times, and whenever I saw the crowd surging toward the church I had to get in again.

Q. You made several efforts to get out?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. But was driven back by the threatening attitude of the crowd?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you would state whether there was great noise and confusion there during the day?

A. A great deal, sir, and the wildest intimidation I ever saw anywhere.

Q. What did the intimidation consist in?

A. There was a band of men marching backward and forward, beating drums, hallooing and screaming, and carrying on with the women in front of the men. I saw a company of men there, with forty or fifty in it probably, and mostly all armed apparently, half of them with bright, shiny rifles, and the others with bludgeons, sticks, and bayonets.

Q. Were these colored people?
A. Yes, sir; all colored people.

Peter Lucas, colored, voted the democratic ticket. He gives the result, as follows, (see page 19.):

Question. What, if anything, did they have in their hands?
Answer. Clubs, sir. I saw them coming and I knew then they were coming after me, and I ran across the swamp and they run me down and cotted me, and then they fetched me up at the Red Top again, at about two hundred yards from it, and then they stripped off my jacket down to my vest and gave me about one hundred and fifty lashes with grubs, a switch about as big as my thumb, and they let me go, and in that time a gang of women was seen coming down from the Red Top after me again. Then I run and got away from them.

James Grant (colored) testifies as follows, (see pages 20 and 21.):

Question. Without any questions from me, I want you to go on and state in your way, from the time you voted, what was said or done to you during the day.

Answer. After I got in and voted my ticket, the place where I put my ticket in the box was so crowded that I jumped out of the window; the window was always open. I went out and took a ticket out of my pocket—

Q. What ticket?
A. Democratic, sir; the same that I voted.

Q. How many democratic tickets did you have?
A. I had a good deal, sir. I didn't count them. After I had voted my own and I took the tickets out of my pocket, a young man came up to me that time by the name of Simon Bennett. Simon Bennett said to me, "The crowd is very strong around the door, and if anybody votes the democratic ticket he will be put to death," and says he, "If I can't vote the ticket I won't vote at all." I says, says I, "If you can't vote as you choose fold your ticket up close and show it to no man, and then you can put it in the box; don't show it to no man till you get up to that box." At that time he was standing with me, a little way from the church, and then he commenced walking with me, and I had my ticket in my hand, and the crowd burst right out behind me, and we considered the crowd was coming to get the ticket. I wheeled around and I says to Bennett, "Do you think that crowd is after me?" He says, "I don't know." By that time the crowd was nearly up on me, and I heard one man in the crowd say, says he, "Catch the son of a bitch," and as I looked behind me Simon Bennett broke off and run, and I broke off and run, and then we run down the road a little ways, and we turned the fork of the road that goes up to the O'Hare's plantation. As we turned the fork we saw a crowd coming across the field to cut me off.

Q. Part followed after you and the balance cut you off?
A. Yes, sir; after I turned the fork I seen the crowd cutting me off, but they didn't have closed up on me yet, and I wheeled round and saw that they had me in a ring; then I run round in the ring trying to break out and get away; then the crowd that had cut me off closed up on me, when one man, by the name of Solomon Lyon, struck me and knocked me down.

Q. Where did he strike you?
A. He struck me right in the head. He struck me two blows; one blow staggered me and the last one, in the back of the head, knocked me down.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. What did he strike you with?
A. A green-gum club. As he knocked me down I jumped up and he knocked me down again.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Q. Where did he hit you that time?
A. All in the same spot, sir. Then I jumped up again and Ben Manigault flew up and says he, "Kill the son of a bitch; he voted the democratic ticket." One man says, "No; don't kill him." Sol Lyon says, "Kill the son of a bitch; he is nearly done died. Kill him at once." I says, "O, do, boys; don't kill me," and I jumped up, and Ben Manigault struck at me again, and as Ben struck at me he fell with the force of his own blow and I jumped up and run toward the bank to get to the road, and Lyon says, "Kill him, kill him; don't leave him; he's nearly dead now," and he runs up and strikes me on the head again.

Q. What with?
A. The same club, and I grabbed hold to the grass on the dam and crept across the dam and run cross the road, and Rebecca Bennett, she run down the road screaming, and I says, "O, do, darling, save me; save me;" and she run toward me, and she hugged I and I hugged she, and she threw me down, and she was on top of me trying to cover me with her clothes.

Q. I see a long scar on your forehead. How did you get that?
A. Ben Manigault, sir, gave me that.

Q. Was that the last time he struck you?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, now, what did they do, if anything, after Rebecca Bennett threw herself over you and tried to protect you?
A. Sol Lyon struck me a lick then on the right side of the head, and in that time Rebecca, she cotted me and I cotted she, and she threw me under her, and they caught up my leg which was sticking out a piece from her dress, and beat me on my leg, and one of my arms was out, which I cotted she with, and they beat me on my arm too, and some one, to break my hold on she, cut my arm.

Q. How many times?
 A. Two times, sir; cut right to the bone.
 Q. Suppose you let us see your arm. [The witness exhibited his right arm to the committee and displayed two long cuts near the elbow. The witness also exhibited the cuts on his head, one on the forehead on the top and one at the back of his head, which were not entirely healed.]
 Q. Were you cut any place else?
 A. Yes, sir; on my knee.
 Q. On the knee of what leg?
 A. The left leg.
 Q. Was that a deep cut?
 A. Yes, sir. You know that cap you can twist about on your leg, they cut down to that; and whatever they was cutting it with, slipped, and it went down side of that bone, and went in there. They sawed right across the cap, and the cap went one side and slipped down. That is the chief pain I've got now, and the doctor says it'll be over six months before I can walk good on it, sir.
 Q. You are lame now from that wound?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Go on and state what occurred after you were cut.
 A. Rebecca she was on top of me, and she covered up everything except this right arm and left leg, and they cut that; and one woman she came up and struck me in the head, and Rebecca she was hollerin', "Do manster; don't kill him; don't kill him."
 Q. You say a woman came up and struck you?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Well, now, after she struck you, what occurred?
 A. Julia Madison, she came up and struck me.
 Q. What occurred after that?
 A. After that, Rebecca was then hollerin', and they said, "Kill the woman and get the damned nigger out; kill him, for he voted the democratic ticket."
 Quite a number of other witnesses, both white and colored, were examined as to the occurrences at this precinct. Reference is made to their testimony without further quotation.

CLUB-HOUSE PRECINCT.

(See pages 1, 2, and 3.)

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Question. Where do you reside?
 Answer. I reside in Charleston.
 Q. What is your business?
 A. I am a lawyer by profession.
 Q. Have you any business in Saint Andrew's Parish?
 A. Yes, sir; I am the owner of some phosphate-mines in Saint Andrew's Parish; mining phosphate rock.
 Q. What is your age?
 A. Thirty-seven.
 Q. How long have you resided in this State?
 A. All my life, sir. I was born here, and except a temporary absence in Europe a year or two, I have always been a resident of the State.
 Q. In what voting-precinct are your works situated?
 A. Well, I do not know the name of the precinct; the place where the residents of the parish vote is called the "Club-House precinct."
 Q. Will you state whether you went to the Club-House precinct on the morning of last election day?
 A. Yes, sir; I went up to my place the evening before and spent the night there, and arrived at the precinct about six o'clock, perhaps a few minutes before six, on that morning.
 Q. The morning of the election?
 A. Yes, sir; the morning of the election.
 Q. Whom did you go to the election with?
 A. I went in company with Mr. E. T. Legare, who owns a place there a short distance from mine.
 Q. When you reached the polls, how many negroes were there?
 A. They were just assembling. They were scattered about the roads in the neighborhood, coming in. I suppose perhaps some fifty or so had arrived. I did not estimate the number very accurately, but there were a good many already there.
 Q. (By Mr. JONES.) How many had arrived there?
 A. I did not make a very careful estimate of them. About fifty were around there; it was early, and they were just coming in from all directions. I passed a good many on the road coming down. They were walking and I was riding.
 Q. (By the chairman, Mr. COCHRANE.) You say there were fifty negroes at the polls when you got there?
 A. Perhaps about that number.
 Q. Well, did the negroes continue to come in?
 A. They continued to come in pretty rapidly after that.
 Q. From the same direction or different directions?
 A. From different directions.
 Q. Did they come singly or in bands?
 A. Generally in batches; sometimes one or two; generally more than that.
 Q. What were they doing?
 A. They were just drawing toward the voting-precinct.
 Q. I want to know what they were doing.
 A. At the poll?
 Q. No, sir. In coming in, were they making any noise of any kind?
 A. They occasionally yelled, whooped, hooted, and blew horns about the country, but at that early hour the noise was not very great.
 Q. Well, sir, in the course of two or three hours, how many negroes were there?
 A. Well, after that time they began to come in rapidly; and on one or two occasions, I recollect, in large numbers. One body came rushing down the road at a great rate, yelling and whooping, and all armed, a sort of a company. They just came rushing down the road with a great noise.
 Q. How were they armed?
 A. They were armed mostly with muskets, most all of them with bayonets on them. Others around the polls were armed with all sorts of things.
 Q. Did you see any shot-guns?
 A. I do not remember seeing any; perhaps one or two shot-guns, and some had dilapidated rifles.
 Q. Any clubs?
 A. Clubs, bushes, sticks, old swords, and old bayonets. It struck me that they had a considerable variety of implements with them.
 Q. Do you recollect seeing a negro with a club fixed in any special way?
 A. I noticed one that struck my attention. It was a large oak wooden club, with nails driven in different directions through it, so that the nails would project on the outside, the head being left out about a half inch, with the spikes projecting all around the club. It was a very singular-looking weapon.
 Q. Did you see him shortly after you came to the polls, or how long after?
 A. I did not see him or notice him until shortly before we left.
 Q. What, if anything, did you hear him say?
 A. He passed by Mr. Legare and myself, and was swinging this club in one of his hands. As he passed, he made a rather obscene remark.
 Q. What did he say?
 A. Well, he says, "If I hit any democrats with this ting, and it don't kill him, Christ will never—"

Q. Now, when a negro would be approaching the polls to vote, what would these negroes standing about the polls do, if anything?
 A. They stood around talking and moving about a great deal, going to and fro; and usually, when any new-comers would arrive, they would run down to meet them—half a dozen of them, perhaps—with whatever weapons they might have in their hands. Those who had clubs and arms would run down to meet these new arrivals, and crowd around them, and ask them if they were all right, and such questions, if they had the right ticket, and perhaps carry them tickets, and then they would come up together.
 Q. During this time, how were they acting? Were they quiet or disorderly?
 A. They were not quiet. There was great exhibition of excitement among them. There was no very positive disorder, because there was no opposition. There was no fighting, because there was not a single negro who voted the democratic ticket, and there was no collision between anybody.
 Q. You say not a single negro voted the democratic ticket?
 A. At least not up to the time I left.
 Q. How long were you there?
 A. I was there about three hours.
 Q. Until about nine o'clock?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Do you know of any negroes who wanted to vote the democratic ticket?
 A. There were some at my place, who were employed there, who desired to vote the democratic ticket, but very few of them came to the polls. One or two desired to vote the democratic ticket, but were afraid to. One I remember particularly.
 Q. What was his name?
 A. The one I have in my mind was named Kent.
 Q. Well, what, if anything, did you hear said to Kent?
 A. He was standing near me, and I observed that he appeared to be very much frightened. He did not stand with the others. He stood to one side, looking very uncomfortable and uneasy, but I did not speak to him because I was afraid I would attract attention to him, and I did not want to do that. There was one man there who had voted, and as he was going off he turned around and called out to somebody in the crowd, "Mind now and watch Kent for me."
 Q. Well, how did he vote after that?
 A. He voted the republican ticket.
 Q. How many negroes do you suppose were there at one time while you were there?
 A. I think that the negroes increased in number in the time I came; some came and went away. They were coming and going all the time, but probably there might have been from one hundred to one hundred and fifty at one time. They were a good deal scattered about the woods.
 Q. How many of these did you see armed with guns?
 A. I suppose about one-third were armed with guns; perhaps a little more.
 Q. How many with bludgeons?
 A. Well, perhaps as many more, sir. Probably, including all varieties of things, a little more than half of them were armed.
 Q. How many democratic votes were polled while you were there?
 A. I think there were seven white men there, and each one of them polled a democratic vote.
 Q. How many negroes had voted?
 A. Well, they voted pretty rapidly, sir. I did not attempt to count them.
 Q. Give us your estimate.
 A. There may have been one hundred and fifty, sir.
 Mr. Legare, another witness, who was present at this precinct, testifies as follows, (see page 8):
 Question. What was the general demeanor of the negroes assembled at that poll?
 Answer. I will tell you the plain truth, sir. I have been through the war, and I have been in some pretty close places, but I never felt so uncomfortable in my life as I did that day. If I had undertaken to carry a democratic negro up to vote that day I believe he would have been mobbed, and I would have been mobbed for carrying him up.

FOUR-MILE CHURCH PRECINCT.

(See pages 38 and 39.)

JOHN S. HORLBECK SWORN and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):

Question. What is your age?
 Answer. Thirty-two, sir.
 Q. Where do you reside?
 A. I reside in the city here.
 Q. Do you do business in Christ Church Parish at Four-mile Church precinct?
 A. I do business in Christ Church Parish, three miles above that place.
 Q. How long have you resided in Charleston?
 A. All my life, sir.
 Q. Were you born in South Carolina?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. What business are you engaged in?
 A. I am planting, and making bricks.
 Q. Will you state whether you went to Four-mile precinct on election day?
 A. I did.
 Q. Last election day?
 A. Last election day.
 Q. About what time in the morning did you get there?
 A. I suppose I got there about a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes before the polls were opened.
 Q. How long did you remain there?
 A. I remained there until after they closed.
 Q. How many negroes were there when you first went?
 A. About fifty negroes.
 Q. Will you state whether they were armed with anything; and, if so, what?
 A. The men had clubs of various descriptions, and of the women some had clubs and some sticks or poles with bayonets stuck on the end of them. There were from fifteen to twenty women there at the time the polls were opened.
 Q. State whether any more negroes arrived.
 A. During the day they arrived pretty rapidly. Within two hours after the polls were opened the main batch were there.
 Q. How many were there?
 A. At least two hundred and fifty.
 Q. They would keep coming and going, I suppose?
 A. Well, in the country the negroes would vote early in the morning, and they rushed to the polls all together, and as a general thing they all leave together. At the election prior to this, when the evening came on, and when the votes were counted, I don't suppose there were twenty present.
 Q. How was it at this election?
 A. Well, a great many were there when the polls closed.
 Q. What, if anything, did you hear these negroes say there that day?
 A. When the voting commenced early in the morning, I heard one say that he would "like to see the first negro that would vote the democratic ticket here to-day."
 Q. You say they were armed with clubs?
 A. Yes, sir; with clubs.

Q. Well, did you hear any threats?
 A. I heard similar threats to that during the day.
 Q. Did you hear anything said by the negro women?
 A. The women were very boisterous and noisy at times, pulling the negroes off the stand and examining their tickets when they went up to vote, saying what they would do if their husbands were to vote the democratic ticket, and that "he better not do it." In one instance I saw one woman shake a club in the face of a man that was there and curse him for a red-bearded son of a bitch. She did it two or three times, following him about the grounds. I told him he had better go away, and I got him off after a while. He said he was afraid she was going to knock him.

Q. When the polls closed what occurred?
 A. Well, I can't say when the polls were closed, but when they were about closing—it was about dark in our climate here and I was not allowed inside of the voting-place—it was cold outside, and I was sitting beside a small fire, and after a while I saw guns commence to appear. There were but three white men left there at that time, at least on the outside. I am not speaking of those in the building—the board of election officers. I suppose about half a dozen came out; there were more negroes there, but half a dozen came out with arms and said, "We would like to see anybody come within fifty yards of this place to-night," and I said to my partner, "There is no chance of seeing a fair vote," and we got in the buggy and rode off. The polls were closed a half an hour when we left.

Q. With reference to these crowds of negroes who stood about the polls during the day, I wish you would state what they did as voters would approach.
 A. Well, when voters were coming down the road four or five or a half a dozen of their committee would rush after them and give them tickets and ask them if they were all right. In some instances, when they did have tickets they took them away from them. None of the colored men then dared to vote the democratic ticket openly; they did it clandestinely, and to this day they dare not say they voted the democratic ticket.

Q. How many negroes voted the democratic ticket?
 A. Fourteen.
 Q. How many white persons?
 A. Seventeen or eighteen.
 Q. How many republicans voted there?
 A. About four hundred and sixty or seventy. There was one white republican vote cast.

Q. From what you saw there, I wish you would state whether, in your opinion, it would have been safe for a negro to have voted the democratic ticket?
 A. Well, sir, I will tell you; the negroes generally look upon a white man as being a man that will vote the democratic ticket anyhow, but I do not think it would have been safe for a white man to have boasted there that day that he voted the democratic ticket, or any other man there.

Q. Would it have been safe for any negro, not hiding his ticket, to have gone up and put it in the box?
 A. It would not, and the reason I say that is this, that, to my knowledge, there were at least fourteen or fifteen hands on my place that had become members of a democratic club, and I was satisfied before the poll opened that we should have seventy-five votes.

Q. What did you base that expectation upon?
 A. From general conversation with the people about my place, and with others that belonged to the club. I think there were that many that would have voted the democratic ticket.

Q. Did the negroes, prior to the election, seem to be dissatisfied with the manner in which they had been governed?
 A. Very much so. I remember in one instance of being at a democratic barbecue, where there were a hundred and fifty negroes, and they appeared to be very well pleased with what they heard there. Of course they didn't all promise to vote, but a good many told me that they would.

Q. And you attribute their not voting to these negro men being there at the polls, armed, and acting as they did?
 A. I would suppose that was the reason; they were afraid to do it. I know of an instance where a boy, up to the night before, said he would vote the democratic ticket at that poll if he died in his steps; but the next day he didn't do it.

Q. He voted the republican ticket?
 A. He did. I saw him vote it myself. I was not two feet from him when he put it in.

Q. You spoke of fourteen negroes who voted the democratic ticket, and you said that to this day they are afraid to own it?
 A. They are afraid of being knocked down, or bruised, or killed. In fact, I really hesitated about bringing a great many witnesses that could have been brought, for fear of violence after they got back.

Q. You hesitated for fear that if they appeared and made statements before the committee there would be violence offered them?
 A. Yes, sir.

Frederick Randall, a colored man, who voted at this precinct, testifies, (see page 42:)

Question. Did they carry the gun along?
 Answer. Yes, sir.
 Q. What did they do when they got to the poll?
 A. They dragged me to the polls shamefully.
 Q. Where did you get your ticket?
 A. They had the tickets at Mr. McCant's avenue, and when they got up there they presented this ticket, and said, "This is your ticket and you have got to vote it." George Gray said that to me and he stuck to me until I put that ticket in the box.
 Q. It was a republican ticket, was it?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. And they did not leave you until you put it in the box?
 A. Never an inch, sir, until it was put into the box by me.
 Q. What did the crowd of negroes do that were standing up there when you came marching up with these three men?
 A. They were always sticking right around there, and there was a great crowd around there hurrahing.
 Q. What ticket did you want to vote that day?
 A. The democratic ticket, sir.
 Q. If they had not marched you up in that way, what ticket would you have voted?
 A. My intention was to vote the Wade Hampton ticket.
 Q. So you would have voted that ticket if they had not scared you?
 A. Yes, sir; I would have done it.

Mr. WILLIAM R. WHELLOCK (see pages 77 and 78) says:
 Question. Were you at the polls in the precinct on election day?
 Answer. Yes, sir.
 Q. What time did you go there?
 A. About half past six.
 Q. What time did you go away?
 A. I left there about five o'clock in the afternoon. I went home during noon-time to dinner.
 Q. Just tell us whether the negroes at that poll were quiet or otherwise during the day.

A. I saw a number of negroes with arms and guns; there was hardly one there without a club, or a knife, or some old bayonet, or something of that kind.
 Q. Did many of them have clubs?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Were there few or many negroes there.
 A. From three to four hundred during the day all the time.
 Q. Did you hear any threatening at all of democratic negro voters?
 A. I did. I heard a number of them say if any negro voted the democratic ticket they would kill him.
 Q. Did you hear any cursing?
 A. I did.
 Q. Loud talk?
 A. A great deal of it.
 Q. Were negro women about?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. How many?
 A. I should say twenty that were prominent. There were more than that there, but the others were peaceable and quiet, and the fifteen or twenty were noisy and violent. They were armed with knives, or bayonets, or clubs.
 Q. What kind of knives?
 A. What you would call a butcher-knife. One woman in particular, that I knew, had a large butcher-knife stuck in her apron-belt.
 Q. What were they doing?
 A. Parading the road there and making a good deal of loud talk.
 Q. Did they say anything at all about negro democrats?
 A. Yes, sir; they said if they knew any negro who voted the democratic ticket that they would kill him or that they would pound him, and different expressions.
 Q. There were other negro women there that were quiet?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. Do you know of any minors voting there?
 A. I know one, sir.
 Q. Who was he?
 A. His name is Orphelus Grant. He goes by two or three different names, but that is what he is called more than by any other; sometimes he is called Jenkins, sometimes he is called Rankin.
 Q. What was his age?
 A. Eighteen.
 Q. How do you know?
 A. I know that when I went on to the place he was a boy eight years old, and it has been ten years since I went there.
 Q. Do you know any negroes who had expressed their intention of voting the democratic ticket prior to the election?
 A. Yes, sir.
 Q. How many?
 A. Quite a number; at least twenty-five that I know of particularly.
 Q. Well, did they vote it?
 A. I should judge not; there could not have been more than sixteen that voted the democratic ticket at that precinct.
 Q. Do you know why?
 A. Well, they said they were afraid to vote it.
 Q. Was this afterwards?
 A. Yes, sir; they said so afterwards; and a great many of them said before that they were afraid to vote it openly.
 Q. Since the election did any of them tell you they were afraid?
 A. Yes, sir; three of them told me so this morning. They promised me last evening that they would come here before this committee; but they dared not come. They told me that they thought it would not be safe for them to go back on the place again. One of them told me that he would come if I said so, but that he would never go back to the place again. I told him he had better stay where he was. I spoke of those three for the reason that their testimony would have been important, because all three of them were assaulted by the negroes at different times.

By Mr. BANKS:
 Q. Did you see it?
 A. No, sir; I only have their word for it.

By the CHAIRMAN, (Mr. COCHRANE):
 Q. Do you know of any influence prior to the election being used by republican negroes to prevent democratic negroes from voting?
 A. I have often heard them threaten if they did vote what would be done to them. They would threaten to whip, to pound, or to kill them, and so on; there would be different expressions.
 Q. What is your business?
 A. I have charge of a plantation called Woodland, in that parish, and conduct that—settling the estate of my former partner, Alexander Knox. I was with him six years. I have been North for the last three years, and they sent for me last May, at the time of his death, and I came down here to settle the estate, and have been conducting the business since.
 Q. I will just ask you, sir, whether these negroes are intelligent or a very ignorant class of people?
 A. Well, the majority of them are an intelligent set of laborers.
 Q. I am speaking now of their intelligence, not of their capacity to work.
 A. Well, none of them are capable of reading or writing at all. They cannot write their names or read, and I don't know of but one or two on that plantation that could do so.

By Mr. JONES:
 Q. You are not a native of this State?
 A. No, sir; I am not.
 Q. Where were you born?
 A. In Massachusetts.
 Q. How long have you lived in this State?
 A. It has been ten years since I first came. I staid here six years and then went away, and was gone three years and a little more. It was in the spring of 1867 when I came here.
 Q. How many negroes have you had employed on the Woodland plantation?
 A. We have settled on that place, men and women together, about one hundred and fifty. There are not as many as that there now, but when I was here formerly they had that many.
 Q. How many have you there now?
 A. During the busy season, in the summer, there are a hundred and fifty because we plant a number of vegetables and employ a great many laborers.
 Q. Have you been a democrat ever since you have been in this State?
 A. No, sir.
 Q. Do you belong to the republican party?
 A. I do.
 Q. You voted the democratic ticket at the last election?
 A. I did.
 Q. How long have you been with that party?
 A. I think that I voted the democratic ticket a year ago—the State democratic ticket.
 Q. Have you belonged to the republican party up to two years ago?
 A. Yes, sir.

At this point the committee call attention to the report of General Hunt, (see pages 200 and 201.)

"Captain Randolph states that he found neither marshal nor deputy at Beaufort, and that it was reported to him that the United States supervisor was stopped on his way to the polling-place, and upon showing his papers to the negroes, who stopped him, had them taken from him and destroyed and was obliged to fly for his life.

"Lieutenant Adams reports that at Strawberry Ferry a company of colored men, about forty in number, were marched to the polls with arms, under a leader, said to be John Lowery, (colored,) though no riot or disturbance occurred.

"Lieutenant Baldwin states that no disturbance connected with the elections occurred on John's Island; that leading citizens informed him and he believed this was due to the presence of the troops.

"Lieutenant Edgerton reports that no disturbance occurred at Adams Run, and that he has every reason to believe that the presence of the troops prevented a serious one taking place at the polls.

"Lieutenant Jefferson, immediately on his arrival at Walterborough, on the evening of the 6th, in a conference with the United States marshal, Commissioner Glover, the intend of the town, and the leaders of both political parties, learned that while they had no apprehension of disorder at Walterborough they believed there would be trouble at Blue-house polls. Acting on this, he marched early next morning to that place, and says he has no doubt that their arrival prevented serious trouble. In the last three cases these officers report that the danger arose from the disposition of the republican negroes to interfere with those of their own color who desired to vote the democratic ticket."

There was a good deal of evidence taken by the committee in regard to the conduct of the election in Georgetown and Colleton Counties. In the former of these counties occurred the

LABOR STRIKES

among the negroes, which for a time created great excitement. The leaders in these strikes were also prominent republican politicians, and several of the witnesses testified that the strikes were gotten up not because the negroes wanted or needed higher wages, but for the purpose of precipitating if possible a conflict between the whites and blacks. It appears from the evidence that upon one occasion when the strikers, led by a prominent republican negro named Jack Wineglass, came into the field where the negroes were at work, they proceeded to beat the democratic negroes but suffered the republicans to escape. There was also a great deal of intimidation of democratic negroes in the

CITY OF CHARLESTON.

The testimony of Rivers, the negro who spoke at the democratic meeting on the evening of the King-street riot, is very full upon this subject.

Mr. Barker (see pages 69 and 70) says:

Q. Now, sir, I wish you would state what influence was exercised by the colored men over their colored brethren who might desire to vote the democratic ticket?

A. The younger and bolder of the negro men, those who were more disorderly and were not men of families, and not men of quiet dispositions, were generally the material that were organized to be active agents in the business of intimidation, first in the labor movement and afterward the political intimidation. Boys of seventeen and the more desperate side of the disorderly element of the negro population of older years constituted the body of those who were active in the matter. They went about threatening any negro who would dare to go with the white people, or who would dare to go with the land-owners, or who would not vote the republican ticket, and they were assisted very powerfully in their work by the negro women who were under the influence of the negro preachers, who are generally republicans. The negro preachers were in many instances active politicians. The Rev. R. H. Cain, who is the editor of the *Missionary Record*, in the city of Charleston, and the republican Congressman-elect from this congressional district, is the strongest man known among them, and the most incendiary. In the early part of the campaign he held a meeting, at which I was not present, but the proceedings of the meeting were published in the paper, at which meeting he appealed to their race prejudices and to those feelings of antagonism to the white people which started the inflammatory element in the campaign. With him were several others, and among them a man, also a negro, who was present at the speaking at this Strawberry meeting, named Hunter. Those people exercised a sway over the women. This sway was increased solely, I suppose, from the fact that the element was so completely ignorant. The combined influence of the religious teachers and the political teachers and leaders carried the most absolute sway over the colored people in this seaboard country. It was so strong that nothing could resist it. Their sway antagonized all the efforts which were made by the opposite side who represented the capitalists, the property-holders, the intelligence, and the general character of the community. There were many touching instances of the struggle between kindly feelings on the part of the colored man in favor of those whom he had lived with all his life and the sway of this party and race obligation which was brought to bear upon him. Those who showed any disposition at all to come over to the democratic side were denounced as traitors to their party and their race. Their political leaders told them that if they went with the white people and with the land-owners, they were voting to put themselves and children back into slavery, their lives were threatened, and exclusion from churches and the social sympathy of their people—everything was brought to bear upon them. Intimidation was exercised more and more as the canvass went on up to the day of the election, and at the time of the election.

Colonel Simonton (see pages 127 and 128) says:

Question. Were these all among the colored people?

Answer. Yes; I doubt whether there was any break in the whites. I found they were very kindly disposed at first. They thought that we were contending only for honest government in the State; that we were trying to see if they would not assist us in driving away from the strongholds of power men who had settled among us, as we thought, simply for office, and they were very kindly disposed, indeed. I received promises of support from nearly every man that I talked to, and those promises were kept up until the Sunday before the election. I do not know what influence was used on that day; that is, I do not know of my own knowledge what influence was used. I do know that the very strongest efforts were made in every pulpit and county, and on Sunday evening and Monday nearly every one of these men either communicated to me in person or sent me a message that he did not dare to carry out these promises; that it was as much as his life was worth.

Q. Well, sir, proceed.

A. Well, sir; the result of the election proved that the apprehensions were correct, because they voted in a solid mass against us. The votes of this county were almost altogether upon the line of freeman on one side and freedmen on the other. Those who had been emancipated by the war went against us almost in a solid body and whose condition was not altered by the war voted with us. At every poll from which I heard during that day there was no difficulty at all, and white men and men who had been free voted the democratic ticket; there was no trouble about it. But in every instance in which a freedman attempted to vote he was resisted and prevented, and either did not vote at all or voted the republican ticket.

Q. What, in your judgment, would have been the result of the election if there had been no intimidation and the negroes had been allowed to vote as they saw fit, and according to their own judgment?

A. I think, sir, that if this extraordinary influence to which I have referred had not been brought to bear upon the colored people that the worst result for us would have been a majority in favor of the republican party of about 2,000 to 2,500 votes in the county. I am satisfied that if we could have gone among them from the beginning and not been driven off by these discussions that we would have carried the county.

Q. Do you know many democratic negroes who voted the democratic ticket prior to the election and who were prevented at this election?

A. I can tell you this: I had in my possession lists of democratic colored clubs all over the county. There were three democratic clubs on John's Island, numbered in one club about forty-five, in another about sixty, and in another possibly about fifty, say one hundred and fifty in all. Well, they were in constant communication with me. I had no agency in getting up the clubs at all, but they had volunteered their services and had come over, and they saw me every day. Well, we got out of those clubs of one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty men 6 votes. There was a democratic club at the Red Top Church, in Saint Andrew's Parish, which at one time numbered over sixty-five. I don't think that we got 3 votes at the Red Top Church on the day of election. I know that the president of one of my clubs in Saint Andrew's Parish was assaulted the Sunday before election and badly cut up, and we had to vote him in Charleston.

Q. Who was that?

A. A man named Parker. We had in the parish of Christ Church, where this little village of Mount Pleasant is situated, nearly seventy-five active men, co-operating with the democratic party—all colored men, and of those seventy-five we did not get 20 votes on the day of election. In Saint Thomas and Saint Dennis, as far back as the month of June, I had a very active and lively democratic club that was increasing in its membership, but after the Cainhoy affair every man resigned and voted the republican ticket. In Saint James Santee, the outlying parish in this county, round a little village called McLellansville, we had a majority of voters who were avowed democrats. I had the parish thoroughly canvassed.

By Mr. JONES:

Q. Do you remember how many voters there were in that parish?

A. I will not be positive, but I think there are from six to seven hundred, and we did not get a vote on the day of election. * * * In my own house there was a man between whom and myself there has existed the kindest of feelings, and he was spoken to on the day of the election. I think it was the most piteous scene I ever saw in my life. This servant is a thorough gentleman; his manners are just as good as those of any man you ever saw, and my wife said to him: "Colonel Simonton is a candidate for the senate, and you have been here so long with us that I take it for granted you will vote for him." Well, he hesitated, and then she turned to one of us and said: "Francis feels a little uneasy about voting. Go with him to the polls. I am satisfied that he will vote for us." The negro stood in the middle of the floor and the tears rolled down his cheeks as he replied: "Mrs. Simonton, I would die for master; I would give my wife and children up for him, but I dare not go out of this gate; it would be at the cost of my life."

Mr. Miles (see page 134) says:

Question. If the negroes had not been intimidated or molested, but had been permitted to vote according to their own best judgment in the last election, what, in your opinion, would have been the result in this county?

Answer. We carried the city, as it was, by a small majority. I believe that the result would have been that we would have carried the city by, say, 2,500 majority, and we would have diminished the vote in the county very considerably, so that probably the entire republican majority of the county would have been brought down to about 2,500.

Q. Suppose you had been allowed to go out among the colored people—when I say "you" I mean the democratic speakers—and freely speak to them, without threats or violence having been used, from the commencement of the campaign to the conclusion of it, what effect would that have had, in your opinion?

A. It would have had a very decided effect, I should judge, from the professions that were made. It would have given us a large accession of voters.

There was of course throughout the investigation some conflict of evidence. Many ignorant negroes appeared before the committee ready to testify to anything which would tend to relieve them and the leading white and black republicans from the censure and odium which their conduct merited. But the committee has based the conclusions at which it has arrived upon the testimony of unbiased men, and men of character, relying upon negro evidence only when it was sufficiently corroborated. They are fully justified in their conclusions by the weight of the evidence.

The committee also call attention to the large

INCREASE OF THE VOTE IN CHARLESTON COUNTY.

Mr. Barker (see page 70) says:

Question. About what is the population of this city and district?

Answer. The population of Charleston City, I believe, is estimated about fifty thousand, and the population of the county has been variously estimated at eighty thousand, including the city. I don't think that any accurate census has ever been taken since the war.

Q. Do you remember the votes given in the county altogether?

A. Twenty-three thousand, I think, were about the figures in round numbers, of which 15,000 were stated to be republican and 8,000 democratic.

Q. Well, sir, what do you suppose would have been the vote of this county and city if none of this intimidation which you have described had been exercised over the people?

A. I should suppose that the best judgment upon that subject could be formed from the previous vote. I think that the legitimate vote of the county would not be more than 15,000 or 16,000.

Colonel Simonton (see page 129) says:

Question. Your attention had not been called to the extraordinary large vote according to the population at the last election?

Answer. O, yes, sir; I have always been satisfied that our vote was four or five thousand beyond its legitimate number.

Q. What led you to form that opinion?

A. The vast increase of the vote in the city over two years ago. I think that the legitimate vote of Charleston was thrown before eleven o'clock on the day of election, and that every other vote that went into the box after eleven o'clock was illegitimate. It is impossible to stop repeating in a population like ours.

Q. Why do you think it is impossible to stop the repeating?

A. Well, sir, if you have had much experience with colored men, you will know that you cannot tell one colored man from another, especially if you see him for the first time. You cannot tell a negro man from a negro woman if they are dressed in the same clothing.

Q. You think that is the reason chiefly?

A. That is one reason, and a very good reason. We have no check on that at all. There is no registration in this State to fix the residence of a voter, and then it is a class of population that floats from one ward to another.

Q. They are not required to vote in the same ward?

A. No, sir, they are not required to vote in the ward of their residence at all.

Q. Do you know of any boats passing repeatedly that day from Charleston here to the islands and up the river landings in the same county?

A. Early in the morning a very large number of voters, or rather a very large number of men who could vote, passed from Charleston and went over in Christ

Church Parish across Cooper River. A large number came from the direction of James and John's Island in Saint Andrews, on Ashley River, and if you were to examine the vote down in the last poll in this city at the Union Star engine-house in ward 2 you would find that an enormous vote was polled there early in the morning.

In the protest which Mr. Mills published just after the election, and which he made a part of his evidence, the following paragraph appears, (see page 133:)

"That gross and unparalleled fraud was practiced in the casting of the vote of said county, large numbers of persons under age having been allowed by the managers to vote at every precinct, and many voters having illegally and fraudulently voted repeatedly at the different voting-precincts, the total vote in said county purporting to have been cast at said election amounting to 4,000, or more than there are qualified voters resident in said county, and that such fraud and repeating and voting of minors and other unqualified voters was practiced by the republican party, which was opposed to the democratic party, the supporters of these petitioners, by which fraud and repeating and illegal votes the result of the election was changed."

There was a good deal of testimony taken as to what was known as the

PREFERENCE POLICY.

It had been alleged that the whites had banded together under a compact not to employ any negro who did not vote the democratic ticket. The committee are satisfied that some individuals in the city of Charleston did discharge republican negroes because of their politics, but they are also satisfied that this policy was limited in its scope and confined to comparatively few persons. A number of witnesses (perhaps eight or ten) appeared before the committee and testified that they had been discharged from employment because they were republicans. It was also proven that one of the democratic daily papers (the News and Courier) advised the adoption of this policy, and that at various public democratic meetings resolutions were adopted to like effect. But while this is true, the evidence shows that the policy referred to was not adopted to any great extent.

In speaking of the matter, Colonel Simonton says, (see pages 128 and 129:)

Question. I want to ask you whether you know of any system having been adopted by the whites to discharge colored men in their employ unless they agreed to vote the democratic ticket?

Answer. The matter was brought up in the committee of which I was a member. It had been suggested by one or two persons, and I think one of our newspapers, that no man should be employed unless he was a democrat. The question was propounded to us by the owner of a very large wharf property, who employed a very large number of negroes, and who wanted from the committee an expression of their opinion with regard to that policy, and the committee, after a very full discussion, refused to countenance any policy of that kind.

Q. Do you know whether any such policy was adopted to any extent?

A. I think that such policy was inaugurated partially. Some gentlemen who employed negroes determined to employ none but negroes who promised to vote with them; but I am satisfied that it was not carried out to any extent at all. It was the result of individual action upon the part of some persons. * * * I had an opportunity myself of advising a gentleman who has charge of Mr. Adger's wharves with reference to this same policy. Mr. Adger has four large wharves, and he does as much business as any cotton-factor in the city. The chief wharfinger came to me to consult me as to retaining a colored man who is an ardent republican. I asked him if he had anything to do with the King-street riot. He said no. I asked, "Is he a loud-mouthed politician, discussing on the wharf openly?" He said, "No; but he is an open and avowed republican, a bitter opponent of the democratic party;" and I advised him not to discharge him.

Q. I will ask you at this point if there were any republicans, loud-mouthed republicans, who were talking constantly and losing their time, who were discharged?

A. In some instances men were discharged who were connected openly with the riots that I have spoken of—men who openly and constantly express their sympathy with the people who were engaged in those riots and defended them. They were discharged not because they were republicans, but because we supposed they were endangering the peace of the community. I do not think if those riots had not taken place that you would have ever heard of any man's discharge because of his political sentiments.

Mr. Mills (see pages 133 and 134) says:

Question. I will ask you now whether you know of any system having been adopted by the whites of discharging from their employment negroes who would not vote or pledge themselves to vote the democratic ticket?

Answer. I can add but very little to what the chairman of the committee testified in my hearing on that subject.

Q. You have heard the testimony of Colonel Simonton?

A. Yes, sir; it is entirely correct upon that subject. I would state in reference to the matter just spoken of, that I was one of the committee who prepared a report in which we called attention to the laws of the United States for discharging men for political opinions, and the result was a resolution of the executive committee that we decline to give any such advice as that; that the employment of labor was a matter of individual and personal judgment; that the grounds upon which they would employ or would not employ must be left to individuals entirely. I would state that there was a good deal of talk and a good deal in the newspapers about it, but the old adage, "Much cry, and little wool," would apply.

CONCLUSION.

Your committee report, in conclusion, that at no time during the canvass was there any intimidation or attempted intimidation upon the part of the white people. All through the excitement of the campaign, although violence and lawlessness greeted them upon every side, although riot and bloodshed surrounded them, although they saw inoffensive men shot down without provocation or excuse, and no courts of law to punish the offenders, yet amid all they showed a moral heroism which must ever command the highest respect and admiration. In speaking of the immunity from punishment enjoyed by criminals, Mr. Walker says, (see page 224:)

"I made the deliberate charge against Cyrus Guillard of murdering Mr. Simmonds, and presented the charge before a trial justice, who told me it was useless to attempt to arrest Cyrus Guillard, because in the first place the sheriff had already refused to execute warrants for him, and because, also, if arrested, the republican leaders (this was an appointee of Governor Chamberlain who told me this) would not permit the trial to be other than an abortion. Cyrus Guillard was carried around by Mr. Bowen to every political meeting that I ever attended. Mr. Bowen would always get up and make a very conciliatory speech and Guillard would always follow him with a very incendiary one; he would do all he could to stir up the negroes."

Such is the condition of the people of Charleston, a city once the home of learning and the dwelling-place of beauty and of chivalry.

All that was bright and beautiful has given place to desolation and decay. The light which shines elsewhere is denied to this people; the liberty enjoyed by others is not vouchsafed to them; the law which through the North stretches its protecting arms around the person and property of every citizen, however humble, affords no protection to the broken-hearted people of South Carolina. Gropping amid the darkness, they are looking for the dawn, looking for the time when they will be relieved from the yoke and burden of rulers who are aliens to their soil, and when they will be relieved from a thralldom worse than death.

ALEXANDER G. COCHRANE.
THOS. L. JONES.

Report of the subcommittee of which Hon. JOHN F. PHILIPS was chairman.
Hon. MILTON SAYLER, Chairman.

Sir: The undersigned, constituting a majority of the subcommittee, beg to report that, in pursuance of the resolution of the whole committee, the subcommittee proceeded to the city of Charleston and investigated, as fully as was possible in the time allowed, the conduct of the election, and the incidents and circumstances bearing thereon, in the counties of Charleston and Beaufort.

WHALEY'S CHURCH.

There were 600 votes cast at this precinct, of which only 18 were democratic. Ten or twelve covered the whole number of white men voting at this poll. The weight of the testimony established the fact that this poll was not free, fair, and open. The conduct of the colored republican voters is indefensible, and, on principle, ought to vitiate the entire vote. Republican voters came there in companies armed with guns, and the great body of these 593 republican voters were armed with clubs or bludgeons of such a character as to make them formidable weapons. Here as elsewhere their chief opposition seemed to be against the right of any colored man to vote the democratic ticket. Both before and at the election they made violent threats of severe personal injury, extending to the taking of the life of any colored man who should vote that ticket. Some colored men so disposed to vote were deterred by these threats from voting at all; and in two or three instances colored men were assaulted and set upon in full view of the polls for casting democratic votes. The law of the State prescribing the manner of conducting such election was violated in letter and spirit. For instance, it requires the voting to be by ballot, which "shall be so folded as to conceal the contents, and shall be deposited in the box by the voter," the evident object and intent of the law being to secure a candid expression of the voter's will by enabling him to vote a concealed ballot; whereas the evidence shows that the republican tickets here as at every poll were printed in red ink, with a large eagle plainly discernible through the paper when folded, the only exception found to the character of this ticket being in the city of Charleston, where the "crowing cock" and the representation of a hustings meeting and artillery salutes were printed conspicuously on the back of the ticket. At this (Whaley's) poll especially the voter was required by the outside crowd and the republican managers of the election who administered the oaths to hold up the ticket in his right hand while taking the oath, so that the character of his ticket was known to all. The democrats were not allowed to challenge, so that some minors voted, while the republican rallying committee thronged the poll and examined the ticket of almost every suspected voter, and took away from them the democratic tickets. A number of colored men testified before the committee that they went to the polls with the desire and purpose to vote the democratic ticket, but on account of the violence and threats of the large number of colored republicans they were forced to vote the republican ticket. Mr. Hard, the white democratic manager of election, a gentleman of intelligence and high character, and other white witnesses of equal credibility, testified that between four and five o'clock p. m., an hour and a half before the poll closed, one of the companies of colored republicans marched around the poll, sang "Hold the fort," and fired off their guns, the captain giving the command to reload at once. There is on this point a conflict of testimony as to the time of this occurrence—whether it transpired before or after the closing of the polls—the weight of the evidence, in the judgment of the majority of the committee, being in favor of the position that it occurred about 4.30 p. m.

BIGGIM CHURCH.

At this precinct, about 400 votes were cast, of which the republican ticket received 360 and the democratic ticket 40. This poll was almost a counterpart in its management and the conduct of the republican voters of Whaley's Church. There were about twenty-five whites, a part of whom brought guns with them. The colored republicans were at the polls in companies, armed with guns and clubs, and drilled during the voting, with guns in their hands, around the house in which the election was held. Threats and intimidation prevailed to an alarming extent. One negro orator at a public meeting threatened that if the democrats succeeded to wade knee-deep in blood, declaring that the negroes held the white people at their mercy, for they would draw the trunk doors that held in check the waters, and flood and destroy the rice-fields. Colored men were threatened with corporal punishment and loss of life should they vote the democratic ticket. Numbers of them were thus deterred from either exercising their right of suffrage at all or compelled to do so against their judgment. There was in this neighborhood a democratic club in which there were about sixty colored men, but they became so alarmed on account of threatened violence and proscription that they voted the republican ticket.

STRAWBERRY.

At this precinct the republican ticket received 360 majority. About twelve guns were seen at this place in a buggy. These are supposed to have been the property of white voters, of whom there were about fifty. The colored republicans were armed, and voted with guns in their hands. Captain William Lawrence, after voting his company, marched them off in the direction of Mount Holly precinct, but whether they voted there again is only a matter of conjecture. Access to the poll at Strawberry lay through a gateway, where the republicans leaned their guns against the fences while they deposited their ballots, and though there was here a larger colored democratic vote than at the other precincts named, many of them were intimidated from voting the ticket of their choice. George Sass seems to have been the ruling spirit among the colored people. The evidence shows him to be ignorant, vicious, and proscriptive. Before and at the election his threats were bloody and dreadful. He threatened to flood the rice-fields, and at the polls he declared "that every colored man who voted the democratic ticket was a marked man." He took democratic tickets from voters. Some were frightened into voting the republican ticket, and others were prevented from voting at all. A democratic manager who challenged minors was threatened with being "knocked in the head." One Baalam Barnard, a colored witness introduced by Judge LAPHAM, gave testimony that conveys a faint conception of his gross illiteracy and fierce untamed nature. He best illustrates the lack of individuality in the average colored voter in this section, and how in squads, and under a discipline not to be interfered with, they are voted by their quasi-military commanders. He brought up his company, one hundred and twenty strong, and after stacking arms and supplying them with tickets, he proceeded at their head to the poll, and when a white man named Rhett attacked the rear of this column with offers of democratic ballots, Baalam opened his mouth and said he must not bribe his men, "For I commands these mens!"

FOUR-MILE HOUSE.

Preceding the election the same threats were made here as elsewhere against colored men who should vote the democratic ticket, and one man, John Johnson, was set upon after the election by colored republicans and beaten in a most brutal manner with clubs for the offense of voting the democratic ticket. Dill's Bluff precinct is but a repetition of Four-mile House, and

MOUNT HOLLY.

was worse. Between 250 and 300 votes were cast here, all republican save 25 or 30. The republicans were armed with guns in hand all day of election, and a company came up armed and cheering, which is believed to be the same company which left Strawberry precinct, the witnesses being mistaken merely as to the hours of arrival and departure. Guns were fired off by these guardians of elections within fifty yards of the polls. Voters were dragooned and brought to the polls under threats of death and the mob law, and through fear were coerced to vote against their convictions.

CHARLESTON CITY.

in the allotment of work between the subcommittees, was assigned to that of which Hon. A. G. COCHRANE is chairman; but one witness, P. G. Fitz Simmons, a gentleman of unusual intelligence and great probity, residing at Biggin Church, examined by us, details an incident which gives some idea of the temper of the colored people in this city and the terrorism they exercised over those of their race who were disposed to quit the republican party. He went to Charleston before the election, with his democratic club, to attend a political meeting which was to be addressed by General Hampton, candidate for governor. There were some sixty colored men in this club. In Charleston these men were so taunted, jeered at, and threatened by the swarms of colored republicans that they could not be gotten out to the meeting, but they remained in the room where they were quartered all day, huddled up as if struck with panic.

BEAUFORT COUNTY.

The conduct of the election in this county was investigated by this subcommittee as thoroughly as was possible in the time allowed.

MITCHELLEVILLE PRECINCT.

Four hundred and seventy-six votes were polled here, of which only 10 were democratic. There were, perhaps, twelve or thirteen white men who voted here during the day, but after the morning there were only three or four whites left on the ground. The evidence shows that the conduct of the colored republicans was threatening and riotous to a degree that gave them complete and undisputed control of the ballot. W. S. Drayton, a white man and one of the managers of the election, testified that John McFall was set upon by the mob and driven to seek protection of the managers for distributing democratic tickets. He undertook to read the riot act to them, or the law of the United States, denouncing such conduct at an election for Federal officers. The mob denounced the law as a "damned democratic paper." Told Drayton to go to hell; called him a son of a bitch, and told him if he would come out of the house they would break his head. He appealed to one of his co-managers, Peoples, an old colored man who preached to these people at times, who made an ineffectual effort to quiet them, and was compelled to seek refuge in the house, where he denounced their conduct as shameful. McFall was set upon by negro women, who seem to have attended the polls in this and Charleston County. He was assaulted and beaten with sticks and clubs until his life was in imminent peril. He escaped on condition that he should quit the grounds within ten minutes, not to return until after six o'clock p. m. He took refuge at a farmhouse, half a mile distant, where he was followed by a mob of men and women, with "banners flying," yelling and hooting. He was saved from them by being locked up in an outhouse by the colored tenants to whom he applied for protection. W. F. Wilder, a prominent republican, and a recent appointee of Mr. Chamberlain to the office of treasurer of Beaufort County, undertook to extenuate this ill-treatment of McFall by attributing it to the fact that he had attempted to practice an imposition upon the republican voters by distributing democratic tickets with the devices of the republican tickets. The only evidence in support of this allegation is the statement of the witness, Wilder, that McFall admitted to him that he had given out some of these tickets, but stated at the time that they were democratic tickets. We have no testimony of the witness, McFall, as to the truth of this statement, for he had been examined by the committee and gone home before we had any intimation of Wilder's charges. But the committee submit the following facts disclosed by the evidence, in refutation of the conduct of those voters being attributable to such provocation: First, their insulting and threatening conduct toward the two managers, Drayton and Peoples; second, they assaulted another white man, Mr. Politzer, and declared to him and Cline, another white man, "This is republican ground, and no democrat shall vote here;" third, they threatened to kill the whites on the island, and said they would cut to pieces any colored man who voted the democratic ticket; fourth, a white man who had been a sailor, on asking if he could vote there, was assaulted by the colored men as soon as it was discovered that he wished to vote the democratic ticket; fifth, McFall testified that he was personally told by a friendly colored man on arriving at the polls that if he intended to vote the democratic ticket he had better do it before they, the colored men, got there. On their arrival the crowd began at once to curse him as a democrat, declaring that they did not believe in any damned rebel son of a bitch who had owned slaves coming there to vote the democratic ticket, and that they "would root out every white skin on the island." This witness further says that they would not allow any democratic speaker to come to the island; sixth Mr. McIntire, a white democrat, who had a store near the polls, at whose house McFall staid the night, after the election, was shot by an assassin in the night, the shot being fired through a window into his store. Fortunately he was not killed, but he has since been shot and killed. McFall was driven away and made a prisoner; the sailor left, and so did Politzer; McIntire went to his store; and when the witness Wilder says it was all peaceable after eleven o'clock it is plainly seen that it was the peace of resignation which the wolf proclaims when the keeper is gone and the unsuspecting flock is huddled at his mercy.

PARIS ISLAND.

One hundred and fifty-five votes were polled at this precinct, of which 143 were republican and 12 democratic, and only 6 white votes. The proceedings at this place were characterized by the grossest abuses and the most intolerant spirit. The few colored men who did vote the democratic ticket did so early, before the republicans got in. The republicans were boisterous and tumultuous. They snatched democratic tickets from colored men, dragged them away from the polls, and after handing them republican tickets dragged them back to the polls and made them vote. They utterly ignored and disregarded the United States supervisors of election and United States deputy marshals. They thronged the inside of the house where the managers and ballot-box were, yelling, singing, threatening, and declaring that to be a republican island and vowing to run every democrat off of it. They would force open the hands of colored men and tear up their democratic tickets. Their party zeal was stimulated and their patriotic ardor fired by an appeal to their appetites made by Congressman SMALLS in a bouctious dinner furnished by him, at which no unfed democrat was allowed to satisfy his hunger.

W. H. Niver, a white witness, testified that he was a native of the State of New York and had lived in Beaufort County since the war, pursuing his trade as a carpenter. He had always voted the republican ticket until this year, when, to use his own language, he "could not stand it any longer." He states that tickets were forcibly taken away from colored democrats, and when they did vote they had to do it slyly and slip off home. He was twice assaulted and beaten with fists and clubs in the presence of the officers, and when asked if he had the mob arrested, said, "No; because there was no law or justice in that county." By the sixth section of the election law of this State it is provided "that the polls shall be opened at such voting-places at six o'clock in the morning and closed at six in the evening, and shall be kept open between these hours without intermission or adjournment." The evidence shows that this poll was not opened until seven a. m. and was closed at four p. m., and though it does not appear that there were any applications to vote after four p. m., the fact that it does appear that it was important for some to vote early if they wished to vote at all shows the policy of the law and the necessity of its observance, and the non-observance of which legally vitiates such election.

GREY'S HILL PRECINCT.

There were 467 republican and 9 democratic votes polled at this precinct, and only 2 white votes. The election here was characterized by violence and intimidation on the part of the republicans. The United States supervisor of election, a white democrat, was assaulted, his commission taken away from him and

turned up. They laid claim to the poll as republican property, and threatened to kill any man who voted the democratic ticket. The other white man, B. Van Ness, was one of the managers. He is a native of New York, and had served as a Federal soldier in General Kilpatrick's command. He was sent from the town of Beaufort to act as manager at this precinct, because there was no white man in it who could act. He says the negroes began their clamoring early about democrats voting there. That they were after the supervisor with clubs, and told him (Van Ness) if he went out of the house they would knock his damned brains out. They declared no democrat should vote there, and if any negro voted the democratic ticket they would beat his brains out and bury him in the sands. He sent to Beaufort for troops to protect the polls, but without avail. It is attested by the minority to show that the occasion of the assault upon Mr. Porteous, the supervisor, was the distribution by him of democratic tickets bearing the devices of the republican tickets. The only witness to sustain this is one F. D. J. Lawrence, colored, of Beaufort, whose *personnel* and method as a witness gives little weight to his credibility. He says he left Beaufort the morning of the election at 5.30 a. m. for Grey's Hill, and arrived at 6.30 a. m. On driving up he found a commotion over this simulated republican ticket found in the hands of Porteous, who was then holding them, mixed up with republican tickets. He is flatly contradicted by his own party friends. Congressman SMALLS testified that he sent this witness from Beaufort to Grey's Hill, distant seven miles, between eight and nine o'clock a. m., after he discovered this simulated ticket in circulation at Beaufort. William Lawrence, the colored manager, says it was two or three hours after six o'clock when F. D. J. Lawrence got there, and all the witnesses, three in number, introduced by the minority contradicted this swift witness, for they state that it was one Hamilton, a colored republican, who could read well, who had those tickets, and the colored men assaulted him, as they allege, for faithlessness to the party; but the white witnesses say the negroes assaulted Hamilton because as chairman of the republican committee he scratched his ticket and voted for one Judd. The evidence shows that Porteous had the straight, undisguised democratic tickets, and that there was no complaint made of him on account of the distribution of tickets. In respect to this matter of the tickets, it may be remarked that the republican party in this county plainly violated the law in the character of their tickets. They were printed in red ink, with the flaming eagle, so that when folded it was plainly distinguishable by the crowd; and in view of the hazards attending the casting of a democratic vote by a colored man, if the simulated ticket was circulated, it may have been the means of enabling him to run the gauntlet of the inquisitorial guards of colored republicans thronging the way to the ballot-box. There was at this poll a third white man, Pat. Hammond, who said he intended to vote the democratic ticket, but he "did not like the looks of things," and he left without voting.

ABRAM P. JENKINS.

The experience and treatment of this colored man constitute a strong indictment against the spirit of lawlessness and proscription prevalent among the colored republicans of Beaufort County. He was a candidate on the democratic ticket for the Legislature, and was the object of a ribaldry and persecution calculated to drive from his convictions a man of less moral courage and heroic fortitude. The evidence shows a specimen threatening letter received by him before the election, containing threats which were subsequently executed. He was cursed and abused; his house was assailed by night and bombarded with brickbats; the democratic club attended by him was invaded and broken up by colored republicans, and these same men interfered with and interrupted the democratic meeting addressed by General Hampton at the town of Beaufort, when the colored democrats tried to stop them, the republican policemen arrested and put in jail the colored democrats, and the chairman had to break up the meeting. At Woodlawn precinct, where he attended the election, there were only 8 democratic votes cast out of 330, although there was a democratic club on this island with fifty-five colored members. On the day of election they were threatened with expulsion from the island. They were compelled to approach the polls through a gate and show their tickets to republican patrols. This precinct was carried by the conservatives two years ago. After the election this man Jenkins was waylaid at night on his way from church where he had gone with his family. He was beaten by a man named Polite, *alias* Barnes, a colored barber, who had threatened to do so prior to the election on account of his politics. He was beaten in a most brutal manner; his face, eyes, nose, and mouth were frightfully battered and smashed, and for weeks he was a creature of suffering and an object of pity. No better illustration of the administration of civil law in South Carolina could be given than in its application to the just cause of this shamefully abused citizen. He applied to the civil magistrate of the town for a warrant for the arrest of his assailant, and was referred to the United States commissioner.

There was a second party aiding this assault by his presence. The United States commissioner recognized the party for his appearance before the United States grand jury at Charleston, which, as has been shown since the committee left there, ignored the bill against Polite, *alias* Barnes.

PETER JOHNSON.

This colored man was threatened before the election for his democratic tendencies, and on the day of election at Lawton Church he voted the democratic ticket. Afterwards he was taken out from his house at night and most cruelly and barbarously whipped with a rawhide. The trial justice issued a warrant for the apprehension of the criminals. They were arrested by the constable and his posse, when the prisoners were rescued by a band of negro men and women, the men being members of a State militia company, armed with guns and bayonets furnished them by the State. One of the assaulting party was killed and one of the constable's posse, Mr. Shuman, a white man, was killed and left on the ground. The top of his head was shot off, and the negroes, with savage fiendishness, pulled out his brains with cotton-stalks, and his body was bayoneted and bruised. Another of the posse, Mr. De Loach, a white man, was shot and struck with a gun-stock, until the hammer was buried in his shoulder. He survives, but his condition is critical. The perpetrators of these outrages are said to be in jail, but they have not been tried.

PETER JONES.

a colored man, details the conduct of the so-called rice-strikers, from Colleton County. They passed from plantation to plantation, interrupting labor and compelling the laborers to join them under threats of the cowhide. They whipped this man Jones and told him he must not vote the democratic ticket, and threatened to shoot him on the day of election. He determined to vote the democratic ticket for the first time because Governor Chamberlain did not protect the people from these mobs. They disregarded the officers of the law. They cowardly the deputy sheriff who attempted to arrest them and the trial justice who issued the warrant. He attended the election at

GARDNER'S CORNER.

where 19 democratic votes were cast in a total of 618. There were thirteen whites at this poll. The history of this poll is but a recital of republican violence and intimidation. They waylaid the road and catechised colored men. They took Jones's horse from him and kept it several days. He swears that, to his personal knowledge, some twenty men were deterred from voting the democratic ticket. Republicans attended a democratic meeting to participate, and, to prevent trouble, the democrats abandoned the meeting to them. The election at Lawton Church and at Lawtonville precinct was but a repetition of those already detailed in matters of force and violence. A company of armed militia was at the latter place and voted the republican ticket as handed them by their captain. This company paraded and hurraed at the poll.

THOMAS E. MILLER

is a republican, with a slight tinge of negro blood, and a member of the Mackey legislature. He was examined by the minority, and his evidence was mainly directed to the details of a quarrel between himself and a family by the name of Ellis. To this he sought to give a political coloring, but the majority of the committee find that this quarrel originated in a trial before a justice of the peace early in the summer, before the canvass had fairly begun in the State, and was wholly personal in its character. He attempted to convey the impression that he was driven from his home by a body of armed white men that came to his house. In this he was guilty of a palpable misrepresentation and a willful misrepresentation of the whole truth. The facts really are that for offensive language used at the justice's trial in respect to the Ellises he was unjustly assaulted and beaten after starting home, and to oblige him, as he declared that he would not again attend at this place of trouble, the trial of another cause in which he was concerned was appointed at or near his house, and the occasion of the assembling of the crowd near his house was to attend this trial. There were a few guns and fowling-pieces among the colored people and whites assembled. He represented in his testimony that he was driven from his home. He was a tenant. His occupation was that of a politician, in which he had been engaged for four years. He left this place and went a short distance to Grahamville, in the same county, where he owned land and where all of his relatives lived. He was back in the neighborhood of Lawtonville through the summer. He spoke there and was elected to the Legislature, and afterward seems to have turned his personal quarrel to good political advantage.

THE INCREASE OF THE VOTE IN BEAUFORT COUNTY

at this election is something remarkable.

The vote of this county in 1874 was 6,854. In 1876 it was 9,878, an increase of 3,024. The census of this county for 1870 gives the population at 36,098, which gives a ratio of 1 vote for every 3½ of the inhabitants. The evidence, instead of giving any explanation of this voting phenomenon, rather tends to show that the population of the county is staid—without influx or efflux. Hon. Mr. SMALLS in his testimony undertook to parry the force of this suspicious fact against the integrity of the election here by saying that it was but little more than the vote of 1870. We present a tabulated statement of the votes of this county since and including 1870:

	1870.	1872.	1874.	1876.
Republican	6,142	4,995	4,778	7,604
Opposition	994	1,445	2,076	2,274
Majority	5,143	3,550	2,702	5,330
Total	7,141	6,440	6,854	9,878

The increase of the vote of 1876 over that of 1870 is 2,737. When it is borne in mind that in 1870 the famous war was fought between Bowen and De Large, candidates for Congress, and that two noted republican politicians of this county, Williams and Langley, were sent to the penitentiary for stuffing ballot-boxes, the force of Hon. Mr. SMALLS's explanation is hardly perceptible.

THREATS TO DISCHARGE EMPLOYÉS.

The minority of the committee constantly endeavored to establish the fact that attempts were made to influence the votes of colored laborers by threats of dismissal from the service of democratic employers. The question was asked of nearly all the white men and many of the colored men examined as to their knowledge of such threats, and all, with two or three exceptions, contradicted the imputations. The witness Miller said he heard one white man justify the measure and heard one colored democratic orator in a speech say that if he were the white employers he would do it, inasmuch as the colored men arrayed themselves against the whites. He and a colored witness named Wheeler, a lawyer of recent immigration from Philadelphia, claimed to have seen numbers of families from the upper country hunting homes since the election, but had no personal knowledge as to the fact of their discharge on political grounds. Two colored men in the city of Charleston testified to having been discharged for political reasons, one before and the other since the election.

INTERFERENCE AT POLITICAL MEETINGS.

At Charleston the minority introduced and examined two witnesses relative to the democratic clubs interfering in armed force during the early part of the canvass and demanding an equal division of the time with the republicans at meetings called by them at Edgefield and an adjacent county. The investigation of the affairs in that locality was left to the subcommittee sitting at Columbia, which was near those counties; and why this evidence was introduced at Charleston, two hundred miles away, with no reasonable means of introducing rebutting testimony, is not apparent. Especially is this a matter of criticism when the principal witness introduced is Mr. Thompson, the editor of the republican paper, owned in part by Mr. Chamberlain, and his organ at Columbia, and who left there one night while the subcommittee was there in session, testified in Charleston, and returned to Columbia the next night. The affairs of that county we properly remit to the proper subcommittee.

NO VIOLENCE ON THE PART OF DEMOCRATS.

It is a matter to be observed that in all the evidence taken by this committee touching Charleston and Beaufort Counties not one single instance is in proof of any threat made or violence offered by any democrat at the polls. The polls were completely under the official and physical control of the republican party. The county commissioners, who constituted the canvassing board of the county, are the appointees of the governor of the State and his partisans, some of whom were themselves candidates for office, as in the case of Timothy Hurley, of Charleston, who was a commissioner and a candidate for presidential elector on the Hayes ticket. He canvassed his own vote and retained the custody of the ballot-boxes of the county, just as the State canvassing board were in part candidates for the highest State offices.

THE PRECINCT MANAGERS

are the appointees of the county commissioners. The character and qualifications of these managers can only be appreciated by seeing and interrogating them. Two of them are invariably colored men and republicans. They are generally unfit and incompetent for such an important trust. Many of them can neither read nor write and are grossly ignorant. Many of them are mere boys in appearance, twenty-one or twenty-two years old, without property, and heedless of responsibility. To these the custody of the ballot-boxes and returns were committed after the election to be delivered in three days to the commissioners of election. The ballots are not numbered, so that it is impossible to determine in the case of the substitution of a ballot whether the voter deposited or somebody else.

REGISTRATION.

Section 3 of article 8 of the constitution of the State provides that "it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to provide from time to time for the registration of all voters." It was adopted in 1868. The Legislature of the State has never obeyed this mandatory provision of the constitution, though as shown by public

documents demand has time and again been made upon it to enact a registration law. Voters are allowed to vote at any precinct in the county or at any ward in a city, and with the difficulty of identifying the colored voters, owing to their similarity in appearance and lack of individuality, the facilities for repeating are at once apparent.

CONCLUSION.

In view of the facts developed by the evidence, we are warranted in stating as our solemn conclusion that had the law been observed and enforced in Charleston and Beaufort Counties so as to secure and protect the voters in the free, honest, and untrammelled exercise of their right of suffrage, the result of the vote cast in these counties alone would have been such as to have destroyed the majorities claimed by the State board of canvassers to have been given in the State to the Hayes and Wheeler electors.

J. F. PHILIPS.
JOHN R. EDEN.

REMOVAL OF DISABILITIES OF ROBERT H. CHILTON.

Mr. TUCKER. I ask unanimous consent of the House to introduce for passage at this time a bill (H. R. No. 4681) for the removal of the political disabilities of Robert H. Chilton, of the State of Georgia. There is a petition accompanying the bill.

The bill, which was read, provides (two-thirds of each House concurring therein) for the removal of political disabilities imposed upon or incurred by Robert H. Chilton, of the State of Georgia, under or by virtue of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. CONGER. Let the petition be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned, Robert H. Chilton, respectfully asks for the removal of all his disabilities under or by virtue of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. He was an officer in the United States Army and resigned in 1861 and took a commission in the army of the Confederate States, whereby he has incurred disabilities which he prays may be removed by act of Congress.

ROBERT H. CHILTON.

There was no objection, and the bill was read a first and second time, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed, two-thirds concurring therein.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. WARD. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to state to the House that at the last session I presented a joint resolution (H. R. No. 14) authorizing the appointment of commissioners to ascertain on what terms a mutually beneficial treaty of commerce with Canada can be arranged, which is as follows:

Resolved 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 to appoint three commissioners, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to confer with other commissioners duly authorized by the government of Great Britain, or whenever it shall appear to be the wish of that government to appoint such commissioners, and to investigate and ascertain on what basis a treaty of reciprocal trade, for the mutual benefit of the people of the United States and the Dominion of Canada, can be negotiated; and to report the results of their investigations to the President of the United States.

The subject was made a special order for the third Tuesday in May after the morning hour, and from day to day thereafter until disposed of, not to interfere with the regular appropriation bills. I opened the debate on that day; but during the last session the appropriation bills and other legislation prevented a discussion and further action on this important resolution. I now find the time of the present session has been so much occupied by the presidential count and will be hereafter by the general appropriation bills that it will be impossible for me to bring that joint resolution before the House for consideration and action, and therefore I now request by unanimous consent I may be allowed to print in the RECORD as part of the proceedings the remarks I intended to submit in closing the debate on that subject if it should have taken place.

Mr. KASSON. I understand the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JOYCE] desires the same privilege shall be extended to him.

Mr. KELLEY. I desire also to have leave to print a rejoinder if I should find it necessary.

Mr. JOYCE. That is what I wish to do.

Mr. WARD. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, as gentlemen would of course have debated the question when it came up and should be allowed the privilege of publishing what they have to say.

Mr. JOYCE. It was understood by the gentleman from New York and myself that I should have an opportunity to answer him when the matter came up for consideration.

Mr. KELLEY. I expected to participate in the debate, and if part of it is to be printed without being uttered, I do not see why my views should not also be spread upon the record.

Mr. CONGER. My colleague, Mr. DURAND, (who is absent from the House on account of sickness,) has a report and some remarks on this subject which he also should be permitted to print, and I ask the same privilege for myself.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair may be allowed to make a suggestion in this regard, perhaps it would be better for the five gentlemen desiring permission to print their remarks upon this subject to withhold their request for the present and make some arrangement for the order in which the remarks may appear.

Mr. KELLEY. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the subject will keep until the next Congress, and therefore I shall object to any printing.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I hope not; as some members asking

to have their remarks printed, which cannot be delivered for the want of time, may not be here at the next session of Congress.

Mr. KELLEY. I am perfectly willing that the debates should be printed, if both sides can be printed together.

The SPEAKER. That is the request; that each side may have opportunity to print its views on the subject.

Mr. BRADLEY. I suggest that motion be enlarged so that every member desiring to be heard on the pending bill, and not having the opportunity, may have the privilege to print his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that motion is in order. He understands the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his objection?

Mr. KELLEY. Certainly, I withdraw my objection if the understanding is the privilege shall be accorded to both sides.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, then, to the five members who have been indicated having the privilege to print in the RECORD their remarks on the subject indicated.

Mr. HENDEE. I desire also to be included in the privilege to print.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman will be included with the others in the privilege accorded to print remarks in the RECORD.

NAVIGATION OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.

Mr. RUSK, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4682) to carry out the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the further security of the navigation of the Mississippi River," approved March 3, 1876; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

HENRY VOELTER.

Mr. BANKS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4683) for the relief of Henry Voelter; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT TAX BILL.

Mr. NEAL, by unanimous consent, from the Committee for the District of Columbia, reported back the bill (H. R. No. 4554) for the support of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, with amendments by the Senate, and moved that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate and ask for a committee of conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. NEAL moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LITTLE HELL GATE.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4684) to declare Little Hell Gate not a navigable channel and to accord the assent of the United States to the filling up of the same; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

L. M. NORTHCUTT.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4685) for the relief of L. M. Northcutt, of the county of Kenton, State of Kentucky; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

LIEUTENANT THEODORUS B. M. MASON.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent to report back from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for present consideration, the joint resolution (S. No. 17) authorizing Lieutenant Theodorus B. M. Mason, of the United States Navy, to accept a silver medal from the King of Italy.

Mr. PIPER. I object.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR 1876.

Mr. VANCE, of Ohio, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, (the Senate concurring.) That there be printed 300,000 copies of the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for 1876; 224,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 56,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 20,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. VANCE, of Ohio, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ELIZABETH SHERRILL.

Mr. VANCE, of North Carolina, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 4686) granting a pension to Elizabeth Sherrill, widow of Ute Sherrill, a soldier of the revolutionary war; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN W. SKILES.

Mr. CABELL, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. No. 4411) for the relief of John W. Skiles; which was referred to

the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

NEW TERRITORY OUT OF BLACK HILLS.

Mr. KIDDER, by unanimous consent, presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, to Congress, remonstrating against the establishment of a new Territory out of the Black Hills; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial is as follows:

A memorial to Congress remonstrating against the establishment of a new Territory out of the Black Hills.

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, would most respectfully represent:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in your honorable body creating a Territory out of the section of country known as the Black Hills;

And whereas said section of country is situated in Southern Dakota and adjacent to the fine agricultural lands of the Missouri River Valley;

And whereas said section of country is within one hundred and thirty miles of the Missouri River, a great natural highway and the most practicable outlet for the products of said country, and by far the nearest route by which the Black Hills can be reached;

And whereas the population of said country is transient, being miners, and the extent of the mineral resources has not yet been established;

And whereas a bill has passed the Senate of the United States creating the Territory of Huron out of the northern portion of Dakota, and the southern portion, including the Black Hills, will not have an area as large as most of the Western States;

And whereas the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota has already passed laws establishing courts, organizing counties, laying out roads from the Missouri River, and appropriating money for the improvement of the same;

And whereas your memorialists in view of the facts do not deem it to the best interests of the people of the Black Hills or the Territory of Dakota that a new Territory should be created of the Black Hills: Therefore,

Your memorialists would most earnestly pray that such new Territory be not created.

Approved February 10, 1877.

JOHN L. PENNINGTON,
Governor.

RE-IMBURSEMENT OF SETTLERS ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. KIDDER also, by unanimous consent, presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, to Congress, asking that settlers upon the lands set apart by executive proclamations of January 11, 1875, and May 20, 1875, be re-imbursed for their improvements made thereon; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

RAILROAD FROM YANKTON TO BLACK HILLS.

Mr. KIDDER also, by unanimous consent, presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, to Congress, asking for a grant of land to aid in the construction of a railroad from Yankton, via Bon Homme and Springfield, to the Black Hills, Dakota Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF DAKOTA.

Mr. KIDDER also, by unanimous consent, presented a joint resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, relative to changing the time of meeting of the Legislative Assembly, and for an extra session in 1878; which was referred to the Committee on the Territories.

NAVIGATION OF RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. KIDDER also, by unanimous consent, presented a memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota, asking for an appropriation to improve the navigation of the Red River of the North; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

Mr. HARDENBERGH, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with an adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. No. 4180) to declare the true intent and meaning of an act entitled "An act to relinquish the interest of the United States in certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco, California," and moved that the same be laid on the table and that the accompanying report be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ELI BASKINS.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with an adverse recommendation papers in the case of Eli Baskins, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteers; and the same was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

HENRY G. HEALY.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with an adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. No. 4495) for the relief of Henry G. Healy, late lieutenant-colonel of the Sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers; and the same was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

LIEUTENANT C. A. CUTLER.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with an adverse recommendation the bill (H. R. No. 3164) for the relief of Lieutenant C. A. Cutler; and the same was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think I should limit the suspension of my motion to allowing bills and other matters to be introduced for reference. If general business is allowed to come in it would occupy the whole day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana objects to further business by unanimous consent, except the introduction of bills, &c., for reference.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I enter a general objection.

Mr. WOOD, of New York. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution for reference to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects absolutely.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now move that the rules be suspended, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill. And pending that motion, I move that all general debate on the bill be limited to five minutes.

The motion to limit debate was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole was also agreed to.

So the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. BUCKNER in the chair,) and proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. No. 4680) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the bill making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, and all general debate upon this bill is limited to five minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that by unanimous consent the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill by paragraphs for amendment.

The following paragraph was read:

For printing and binding for the State Department, \$15,000; for the Treasury Department, \$180,000; for the War Department, \$72,000; for the Navy Department, \$39,000; for the Interior Department, \$135,000; for the Agricultural Department, \$9,000; for the Department of Justice, \$6,000; for the Post-Office, \$105,000; for the Congressional Library, \$15,000; for the Supreme Court of the United States, \$20,000; for the Court of Claims, \$10,000; and for debates and proceedings of Congress, \$694,000; and of the sums hereby appropriated for the several Departments, the courts, and for the debates and proceedings in Congress, there shall only be used for the several purposes herein provided the sums specified, and the unexpended balances shall not be used for any other purposes; and there shall be taxed against the losing party in each and every cause pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, or in the Court of Claims of the United States, the cost of printing the record in such case, which shall be collected, except when the judgment is against the United States, by the clerks of said courts respectively, and paid into the Treasury of the United States, but this shall only apply to records printed after the 1st day of October next.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I offer the following amendment, to come in at the close of that paragraph:

For compiling, under the direction and supervision of the Postmaster-General, a history of the Post-Office Department from its origin to the present time, including a catalogue of the Postmasters-General, with a brief account of their services, the history of the reduction of postage to its present rates, ocean postage, international postage, railway mail service, appliances for the use, security, and celerity of the mails, and such other matters as will show the progress of our national postal system.

Mr. HOLMAN. I make the point of order upon that amendment that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the amendment comes within the rule which prohibits new legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. The amendment has reference entirely to the Post-Office Department, and I do not think it can be considered new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Then I offer the following amendment to come in after the words "for the Post-Office, \$105,000:"

Provided, That a sum not exceeding \$2,000 of this item of appropriation may be used, under the direction and supervision of the Postmaster-General, for compiling a history of the Post-Office Department from its origin to the present time, including a catalogue of the Postmasters-General with a brief account of their services, the history of the reduction of postage to its present rates, ocean postage, international postage, railway mail service, appliances for the use, security, and celerity of the mails, and such other matters as will show the progress of our national postal system.

Mr. HOLMAN. I make the same point of order upon that amendment that I made upon the last. It is subject to the point that this is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I desire to ask the gentleman who has charge of this bill a question. I see that there is an appropriation for the printing of the Agricultural Department of \$9,000. Is there a provision anywhere in this bill for printing the report of the Agricultural Department for the year 1876, just ordered this morning by the House?

Mr. VANCE, of Ohio. The appropriation is sufficient to cover the printing of that report.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Very well.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

To purchase of the proprietors of the Congressional Globe all the stereotyped plates, the bound and unbound volumes of the said Globe and the copyright of the same, together with the fire-proof building, (located in the rear of the building situated on Pennsylvania avenue and known as the Globe office,) \$100,000.

Mr. CONGER. I make the point of order that that is new legislation.

Mr. PIPER. I rose to make the same point of order, and to move to strike out the clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, that this is new legislation and therefore the clause will be stricken from the bill.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

For life-saving and life-boat stations:

For salaries of ten superintendents and one assistant superintendent of the life-saving stations at the following points, namely: On the coasts of Long Island and Rhode Island, \$1,500; and on the coast of New Jersey, \$1,500; assistant to the superintendent on the coasts of Long Island and Rhode Island, \$500; for superintendents on the coast of Massachusetts, on the coasts of Maine and New Hampshire, on the coasts of Virginia and North Carolina, on the coasts of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, on the coasts of Lakes Erie and Ontario, on the coasts of Lakes Huron and Superior, and on the coast of Lake Michigan, and for superintendent for the houses of refuge on the coast of Florida, each \$1,000, \$8,000; in all, \$11,500.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend that paragraph by striking out in the last line "\$1,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,500;" so as to make these salaries \$1,500 instead of \$1,000.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for superintendents on the coasts of Long Island and Rhode Island \$1,500, and on the coast of New Jersey \$1,500, and it provides for the superintendents of life-saving stations at all other places a salary of only \$1,000. There is no reason for the distinction whatever. The superintendents on the lake service especially have from four to seven stations, some as far as seven hundred miles apart, which their duty requires them to visit frequently during the whole season of navigation, and especially during the season of storms. There is no reason for the distinction. There is a reason why these officers who have charge of the life-saving stations for which we are making appropriations of over one and a half million dollars should be competent men, and they should be well paid for that most laborious service for which they are engaged. I think all those gentlemen here, and that embraces almost the entire delegation in Congress who have commerce in their States or commerce in which their States are directly or indirectly engaged, have a direct and vital interest in passing this amendment, in order that the life-saving stations, which after years of labor we have procured for part of the Atlantic coast and on the Pacific coast where there were none, and especially for the great lakes, where there were none until this last year, should have competent officers upon these stations. If there are any places of this description where the salary should be small, it should be at those points where the three or four stations under the superintendent are close together and easy of access, and yet these are the ones which are given by this bill not only \$500 a year greater salary but have assistants to aid them in their labor. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. We have followed the estimates. I think it is the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations that the amount here named is sufficient for the service performed.

Mr. CONGER. Let me reply to that. I doubt its being the opinion of the committee. I know it is not the opinion of some of the members. It is an old appropriation increased in two cases.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let us have a vote.

The question was taken upon the amendment of Mr. CONGER; and upon a division there were—ayes 29, noes 58.

Before the result was announced,

Mr. CONGER said: No quorum has voted, and I feel compelled to call for a further count.

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

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 38, noes 72.

Mr. PIPER. No quorum has voted, and as this is an important matter I insist upon a quorum voting.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers will retain their places, and members who have not voted are requested to vote, so that the committee may not find itself without a quorum.

The tellers continued the count, and reported that there were—ayes 53, noes 96.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read the following: For one hundred and fifty keepers of stations, at \$200 each, \$30,000.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend the clause just read by striking out "\$200" and inserting "\$750." I desire the attention of the committee for a moment while I make a statement upon this subject.

Mr. HOLMAN. I make the point of order that the law fixes the salary of these station-keepers, and an increase would be a change of existing law, and therefore is not in order.

Mr. CONGER. The law fixes this salary, as it does every other salary, by a clause in an appropriation bill. This whole system was introduced by being ingrafted upon an appropriation bill. That is the way in which all these salaries have been fixed, by provisions in

appropriation bills. And under the rule salaries may be increased in appropriation bills; the rule is not changed in that respect. The Chair will recollect that the object of the new rule was that salaries might be decreased in appropriation bills. It was never questioned that salaries might be increased in appropriation bills. I ask for a ruling on the point of order, and then I will submit some remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CONGER. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the character of the duties performed by these officers. They are called here "keepers of life-saving stations." They are the local superintendents of the stations; they are the captains of the boat-crews who manage the life-boats, who use mortars that send the ball and rope from the shore to the sinking ship; who go out in the storm at the peril of their lives every time that they attempt to save the lives of others. These "keepers of the life-saving stations" give the word of command, exercise the discretion, the care, the prudence necessary to be exercised by the captains of these crews.

The committee will see that the second paragraph proposes to pay \$40 a month to every sailor employed in these crews; \$480 a year. But it is proposed to pay to the man who is their captain, their leader, the experienced man, the only valuable man, \$200 a year the year round. I have conversed with four of these general superintendents of life-stations, and I learn that neither on the Atlantic coast nor on the lakes are they able to find men fit for the performance of these duties who will take these offices, who will be captain of the crews of these life-boats and go out in the storm to save life for the sum of \$200 a year. It is a mockery, a paltry device.

When these officers were established they were merely resident on shore, living in the house, keeping possession of it; they had no other duties to perform. But now under the law they are captains of the crews, they are efficient officers of the service, and there is a reason why the compensation should be increased.

The officer in charge of this bureau, Mr. Kimball, than whom there is not a more faithful or a more careful officer in the service of the Government, in his annual report and in a special report to the Committee on Appropriations, has made the statement that this increase was absolutely necessary in order to make the service effective.

Mr. HOLMAN. If I had had time to look up the statutes, of course the point of order which I made upon this amendment would have been sustained. The law fixed the salary of these officers at \$200 a year; not of all these persons, because some of them have been provided for incidentally in appropriation bills. But the original law of 1873 establishing this system fixed the salary at \$200 a year. I have the law before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair relied upon the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONGER] that these salaries had been fixed in the appropriation bills.

Mr. CONGER. Is this point of order to be opened again? If so I want to be heard upon it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I refer to the matter in order to show that this salary was fixed in 1873 and it has been deemed sufficient ever since. It is estimated for on this basis by the Secretary of the Treasury this year and it is now sought to be increased. The law as found in sections 4242 and 4243 of the Revised Statutes is as follows:

SEC. 4242. The Secretary of the Treasury may establish such stations on the coasts of Long Island and New Jersey—

The law provides afterward for other stations—

for affording aid to shipwrecked vessels thereon, and may make such changes in the location of the existing stations, and make such repairs and furnish such apparatus and supplies, as may, in his judgment, be best adapted to the preservation of life and property from such shipwrecked vessels.

SEC. 4243. The Secretary of the Treasury may appoint, at each of the stations established under the provisions of the preceding section, a keeper, at a compensation not exceeding \$200 a year, and a superintendent, who shall also have the powers and perform the duties of an inspector of the customs for each of the coasts therein mentioned; and he shall give such keepers and superintendents proper instructions relative to the duties to be required of them.

That was the act of 1854. The act of 1873 provides that—

The Secretary of the Treasury may appoint a keeper for each of the ten life-saving stations on the coasts of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and Block Island, Rhode Island, whose compensation shall be at the rate of \$200 per annum, and may employ crews, &c.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will understand that the law has fixed the compensation at \$200; and the Secretary of the Treasury estimates on that basis; but in spite of these estimates, which we have strictly followed, the gentleman from Michigan proposes to increase the salaries of these keepers of life-saving stations, who, I understand, are employed only a small portion of the year. That is all I have to say.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. Even what the gentleman has just read from the Revised Statutes is taken from an appropriation bill—a bill like that which we are now considering. But, sir, there are only ten stations referred to in that provision. There are more than one hundred and fifty stations besides those to which that provision refers—stations established by new laws to which that provision has no reference. The stations to which that provision refers are specified local stations at places where officers have their homes and pursue other business. Since the adoption of that provision the law has been enlarged by the establishment of more than one hundred and fifty life-saving stations, a large portion of which are on desolate coasts, far removed from habitable ground, and where no other avocation can be followed.

Besides that the law has increased the duty of these men by making them captains of crews. Under the former law they were merely occupants of houses to take care of the property. While the duties of these officers have been enlarged, their compensation has not been increased.

I repeat that the chief of the bureau in charge of this service, Mr. Kimball, has in his annual report recommended an increase of pay to these keepers who are by law made captains of crews. He has sent a special urgent communication to the Committee on Appropriations, asking them to bring it to the attention of the House, which they have refused to do. It is time that the committee should report to this House what the Department recommends on questions in which the property and lives of citizens of the United States are at stake every hour, and not smother such communications in committee. I know this to be true because I have seen the report.

Mr. HOLMAN. All I have to say is that the appropriation in the bill is in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury. We have reported every dollar which he recommended to be appropriated for this purpose. I call for a vote.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. CONGER, it was not agreed to.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend by striking out "\$200" and inserting "\$500." I desire to continue my remarks.

Mr. HOLMAN. I renew my point of order upon this amendment. My point is that by express provision of law, not by simple appropriation in an appropriation bill, these stations have been established and the salaries fixed at \$200 per annum. It will be observed that the gentleman's motion applies to all the life-saving stations, of which there are one hundred and fifty-five. As to a part of them the salary by express law is fixed at \$200, while as to the others the compensation of \$200 is fixed by simple appropriation. As to the latter I do not contend that the salaries are fixed by law.

The act of 1873 provides as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury may appoint a keeper for each of the ten life-saving stations on the coasts of Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and Block Island, Rhode Island, whose compensation shall be at the rate of \$200 per annum, and may employ crews of experienced surfmen at such stations and for such periods as he may deem necessary and proper, and at such compensation as he may deem reasonable, not to exceed \$40 per month for each person to be employed.

Now, inasmuch as some of these salaries are fixed by law at \$200, I submit that the gentleman's amendment, so far as it applies to these, is out of order as changing existing law and not in the interest of economy.

Mr. CONGER. I will not ask for the ruling of the Chair upon the point of order. I withdraw my amendment and move to amend by inserting the following:

For one hundred and fifty keepers of stations at \$500 each, where the salary of said keepers is not otherwise provided for by law.

Now I desire to go on and make some remarks.

Mr. HOLMAN. I concede that this amendment is in order.

Mr. CONGER. I was saying that the officer of this Government who is more especially in charge of the life-saving stations has within the last four weeks made a special report on this subject, in addition to his report as transmitted to this House with the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury; and he has thus urged Congress to make an appropriation sufficiently large to pay a salary of \$750 to light-station keepers, to whom new duties have been assigned and who have to perform the most perilous service in connection with these life-saving stations. The committee have not seen fit to adopt that motion, and therefore I ask for a vote on the proposition to increase it to \$500 where not otherwise limited by law. I tell gentlemen to-day there is not a practical, useful captain of crews on all our coasts or all our lakes who will not take that paltry salary for exposure of his life night and day, in storm and tempest, to save the lives of others during the year. Their lives are worth too much to be paid for by a government like ours with the paltry sum of \$200, when the very men they command, their crews, are paid by law \$40 a month each while they are asked to serve for \$200 a year, having all the responsibility, all the care, the greater danger, the greater knowledge, the greater skill. I submit to the House if the millions of dollars which have been spent in this magnificent effort to save the property and the lives of our citizens endangered on our coasts be worth preserving, then this most effective arm of the service should be paid a reasonable compensation.

Now I will not dwell on that. If this does not convince the mind of every man who is in favor of life-saving stations and has a desire to preserve life and property, that some change should be made in the salaries of these officers, then I know not what language can.

Mr. HOLMAN. A single word. It is well known, Mr. Chairman, these persons are only employed during the stormy season of the year; perhaps not to exceed a month during the whole year are they actively employed. The Secretary of the Treasury, who is as well informed on this subject as the gentleman from Michigan—the Secretary of the Treasury with all the facts before him does not recommend an increase of this salary.

Mr. CONGER. I move to amend by striking out the last word. I assert here, as I have before, that the Secretary of the Treasury does recommend the increase of this salary. He indorses the report of the chief of the bureau of life-saving stations, Mr. Kimball. Mr. Kimball has made two distinct, separate reports on this subject, and this committee not only fails to bring forward these reports for us to see

or to report upon them, but the gentleman has now the effrontery to deny what I have asserted, saying the Secretary of the Treasury has never recommended an increase of the pay of these officers. Sir, there is a point where impudence becomes sublime, and my friend from Indiana has reached it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. There is a point where insolence becomes ridiculous and most shameful in any legislative body, and the gentleman from Michigan has reached it.

Mr. CONGER. Then I have reached my friend from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. But I wish to say this: I have stated to the committee that the Secretary of the Treasury in his estimates to Congress does not recommend this increase and the Committee on Appropriations have simply followed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury. I now call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

The question recurred on Mr. CONGER's amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 56.

Mr. CONGER. I demand tellers on this. I wish we could have the yeas and nays, so gentlemen might be put upon the record.

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir; we will stand by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CONGER. I think we will have them some time before we get through.

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

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 86. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the support and maintenance of convicts transferred from the District of Columbia, \$8,000.

Mr. PIPER. I move to strike that out for the purpose of understanding why \$8,000 is required to be appropriated to transport convicts from the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOLMAN. The convicts in this District are sent elsewhere to penitentiaries in the States, and are of course supported by the Federal Government. This appropriation is merely for that purpose. It is an annual appropriation.

Mr. HALE. It has always been made.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PIPER. To what penitentiaries are these convicts sent?

Mr. HOLMAN. Generally to the penitentiary in Albany, but sometimes to the penitentiary of Maryland.

Mr. PIPER. I will withdraw my motion to strike out, and move to reduce the appropriation to \$4,000. There must be a great many convicts in this District to cost \$8,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. That will answer my purpose. I wish the gentleman would provide in his amendment for charging the remaining \$4,000 for the District of Columbia. Of course I cannot antagonize him when he is in an economical mood, but I shall be glad to inquire of the gentleman from California whether he has any information on the subject which would justify any such reduction?

Mr. PIPER. I have no information, and that is precisely what I rose to secure from the gentleman from Indiana; that is, how many convicts are transported from this District to other penitentiaries in the several States, and what it costs *per capita* to transport them? Of course the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows all the details of this business, and I should like to be informed before I vote why the means of the Government are required to this extent for this purpose.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to foretell the number of persons who will be convicted in this District in the next fiscal year. The number, of course, necessarily varies in different years. The proper Department of the Government thinks that \$8,000 will be required. If the gentleman from California will propose to appropriate \$4,000 out of the public Treasury and let \$4,000 be chargeable to the treasury of the District, I think there will be no objection to that.

Mr. CLYMER. In view of the fact that nobody has been convicted in this District for a long time, I think it might be well to reduce the amount. [Laughter.]

Mr. DURHAM. It occurs to me that if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will examine the annual report of the Attorney-General, he will find that an appropriation of \$4,000 is ample. If I understand the report of the Attorney-General for last year, he only claims to have expended an amount falling short of \$3,000 during last year in the transportation of criminals.

Mr. HOLMAN. That may be true; but \$8,000 is his estimate for this year. I think it will be safe to accept the amendment of the gentleman from California.

Mr. DURHAM. I have here the language of the Attorney-General in his last annual report. He says:

The law requires the warden to transport to the penitentiary at Albany, New York, the prisoners sentenced by the criminal court of this District to that prison, and to the Reform School of this District such boys as may be sentenced by the courts to that institution.

In discharging that duty the warden has transported ninety-nine convicts to the Albany penitentiary at an actual cost and expense of \$2,397.23.

The amount, therefore, is not quite \$2,500.

Mr. HOLMAN. I apprehend that the gentleman has not a state-

ment there of the entire expenditure. We had to make this year an appropriation for a small deficiency. I think, however, it will be safe to make the amount \$4,000.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$4,000" and inserting "\$12,000."

I am pretty well satisfied that the criminal docket of this District will be very largely increased instead of diminished during the coming year. Our habit in the last two years of bringing every scoundrel in the country to testify before our investigating committees will lead to this. We have brought here blackguards of each denomination and thieves of every stripe and station; and unless gentlemen who have charge of the administration of the affairs of the District will see to it that they are sent back to the countries from which they come, to be placed in penitentiaries at home, they are altogether likely to be sentenced here and to reach the penitentiary from this District. I am pretty well satisfied, therefore, that the amount reported does not exceed what it is the part of wisdom to provide; and if to be disturbed at all, I would rather increase than diminish it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist on his amendment to the amendment?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I withdraw it.

The question being taken on Mr. PIPER's amendment, it was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read the following paragraph:

For payment of the necessary expenses incurred in defending suits against the Secretary of the Treasury or his agents for the seizure of captured or abandoned property, and for the examination of witnesses in claims against the United States pending in any Department, and for the defense of the United States in the Court of Claims, \$25,000.

Mr. HALE. I offer the following amendment which was agreed to by the Committee on Appropriations, but has not been inserted in the bill:

Add after the paragraph just read the following:

To enable the Clerk of the House to have prepared for the Public Printer 50 copies of the summary reports of the Commissioners of Claims in cases reported to Congress as disallowed under the act of March 3, 1871, of which 25 copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the Senate, and 25 copies for the use of the House, \$1,000.

That is the customary appropriation, which has been by an oversight dropped out of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Reform School of the District of Columbia:

For the superintendent, assistant superintendent, matron, two teachers, for medicines and physicians' fees, gardener, farmer, baker, night-watchman, seamstress, laborer, and laundress, and four female servants, and for fuel, clothing, and incidentals, \$10,000.

Mr. PIPER. I move to amend by striking out "\$10,000" and insert "\$3,000." I think some explanation should be made before we are asked to make such an appropriation in gross as this.

Mr. HOLMAN. This amount of \$10,000 for this Reform School, which is a Reform School for boys, is the appropriation we have been making for a great many years. We have no information which would justify us in reducing that appropriation.

Mr. PIPER. I see that one item is for a "gardener." I suppose the people to be reformed might do the gardening of the school if they were properly employed.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Government owns a piece of land there that is in cultivation. These boys who are being reformed have of course to be provided for. There is a small market garden in connection with the institution, as we are informed, and this appropriation includes \$720 a year for a gardener. I presume the boys are employed, though I am not certain of that fact.

Mr. PIPER. I will modify my amendment and move to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$9,500." The boys can certainly do the gardening.

Mr. CONGER. Before the gentleman from California insists on his amendment, I wish he would specify where this great saving which he proposes comes in; whether it applies to the gardener or to one of the four female servants or to incidentals.

Mr. PIPER, (in his seat.) The gardener.

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman remarks privately that it applies to the gardener. He should have set forth to the world that he means gardener, so that the reduction may not fall upon one of the female servants or other employes. My friend from the golden land of California is accustomed to look upon all these appropriations very carefully. He has never been dazzled with wealth there, nor will he squander this \$750 on one of the employes in this Reform School unless it be absolutely necessary; but he should specify what he means in the amendment lest evil fall on one of the female servants. I call upon him to specify.

Mr. PIPER. I specify the gardener.

Mr. HARRISON. I have the floor and I yield my time to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. CONGER,] whom we would all like to hear further elaborate this subject. [Laughter.]

The question was taken on Mr. PIPER's amendment; and it was not agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

Capitol extension: For work on the Capitol and for general care and repair thereof, \$40,000.

Mr. PIPER. I move to amend that paragraph by striking out \$40,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$30,000. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is also chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I would like to know what extension is being constructed on this Capitol. This appropriation is "for extension of the Capitol and for other purposes." Now the gentleman is so well informed about the details of every Department of this Government that it gives me great pleasure to hear any explanation by him as to the appropriation of the people's money to the various purposes of the bills which he reports to the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. The estimate for this purpose was \$60,000. We have reduced the amount \$20,000 and I hardly think the amount can be safely reduced below that.

Mr. ATKINS. This is for taking care of the entire building, and not to make additions to it.

Mr. PIPER. The words used are "Capitol extension."

Mr. ATKINS. Last year we appropriated \$60,000 for this purpose and this year we propose to appropriate \$40,000; that is all.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for a vote.

Mr. PIPER. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. I offer the following amendment, to come in at that point. After the word "thereof" insert the following:

And for putting an elevator in the south wing of the Capitol, under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, \$50,000.

And strike out \$40,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think that is new work entirely, and that the amendment is subject to the point of order, that this is an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

For improving the Capitol grounds and paving the roadways and footwalks of the Capitol grounds, \$100,000.

Mr. PIPER. I move to amend that paragraph by striking out \$100,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$50,000. I have, since I have been a member of this House, paid particular attention to the improvements about the grounds of the Capitol. Whether this appropriation is intended for the public grounds about the city or for the grounds around the Capitol building, I am not sufficiently informed to say, but if this appropriation is intended for the purpose of improving the grounds around this Capitol, it is an extravagant appropriation and should be reduced to \$50,000. I have observed the character of the workmen employed about these grounds and I know something of the character of this work. I have employed men for years and years in work of this description in large numbers, and assuredly I could finish a Chinaman eighteen years old who would do more work than any six of the men I have seen about these grounds during the last two years. It constitutes an asylum for loafers, for beggars paid out of the public Treasury, under the pretense that they are doing work around these grounds. Consequently if this appropriation is for the grounds about the Capitol \$50,000 is more than ample for them, for there is hardly a man who can do a day's work or even half a day's work.

Mr. HOLMAN. The estimate for this purpose was \$200,000. The committee has reduced it one-half, and although \$100,000 is certainly a large sum to appropriate for such a purpose, the gentleman from California [Mr. PIPER] must remember that the filling in and improvement of the grounds west of the Capitol will require a very considerable outlay of money. There must be some fountains established to perfect the plan, and I do not see well how this expense can be avoided.

I do not think that there is any reason why \$200,000 should be appropriated, but I think, perhaps, that \$100,000 is not an excessive appropriation, and I hope that after the present year it will be found entirely compatible with the public interest to reduce the appropriation down to \$25,000 a year, unless, indeed, Congress enters upon the system of improving the western front, which has been recommended by the gentleman employed by the Government to present plans for the improvement of the grounds around the Capitol. I hardly think it would be safe to reduce this appropriation below \$100,000, although I know it is a very large sum for such a purpose.

Mr. PIPER. How much money, in the aggregate, has been appropriated for the improvement of these grounds?

Mr. HOLMAN. O, well, there have been several hundred thousand dollars appropriated; indeed, including the appropriations for the grounds east of the Capitol, the amount has swollen up to millions. This is the smallest appropriation which has been made for this purpose for a great many years. I believe the appropriations for the present fiscal year were \$125,000. We have put the amount for the coming fiscal year at \$100,000.

Mr. PIPER. Is it not a fact that the stone used around this Capitol is imported from Canada, or Scotland, or Sweden, or some other place remote from the United States?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think that almost all the public buildings in the United States are constructed out of materials from remote points. Canadian stone, from the coast opposite Maine, is used in the construction of the custom-house at Chicago, and, I believe, also on the buildings at Cincinnati and Saint Louis, and a large portion of the granite and marble used about the Capitol has been imported from remote points.

Mr. FOSTER. Where else would it come from?

Mr. PIPER. I insist upon my amendment.

The question was put on the amendment; and on a division there were—ayes 6, noes 26.

Mr. PIPER. As this is a question of \$50,000 of the people's money, which my friend from Indiana is especially careful of, I think I must insist that there shall be a quorum. [Cries of "O, no!"] Very well, sir; I will let it go.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. I offer the following amendment:

For the improvement of the heating and ventilating apparatus of the House of Representatives, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol, the sum of \$33,000; and that the board of United States officers convened by request of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to advise with it on the subject, be requested to advise the Architect of the Capitol in the premises; and that hereafter the subject of ventilating and heating the House of Representatives be placed under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

This morning the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds by a unanimous vote directed me to draft a bill and prepare a report on the subject of the ventilation of this Hall. I will bring that bill before the House as soon as I can get an opportunity to do so.

For the last twelve months a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has had under careful consideration the subject of ventilating this Hall. We have had in consultation with us a board of United States officers consisting of Professor Henry of the Smithsonian Institution; Mr. Clark, the Architect of the Capitol; Mr. Shuman, in the employ of the Architect of the Treasury Department; Dr. Billings, of the United States Army, and one or two others. We have had before us a large number of experts from the different cities of the United States who have been seeking to have their plans adopted.

During the last summer Dr. Billings visited Europe, where he examined the heating and ventilating apparatus of the House of Commons and the House of Lords in London, of the opera-house in Vienna, the best ventilated building in the world, and also other buildings. After very careful examination and study of this subject, this board within the last few days have submitted to us their report. That report this morning was adopted by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and as I said I have been directed by that committee to draft a bill to carry it into effect. As the bill will require some little change in the law, I will bring it to the attention of the House as soon as I can do so. In the meantime, in order to have an appropriation for the purpose, I have moved this amendment.

I have been asked to state what is the plan. It is utterly impossible in a five-minute speech to properly explain it. It does not change the present system of ventilation in this Hall. We have found that it would be utterly impossible, without an expense of from \$100,000 to \$200,000, to change the present system of ventilation. But by perfecting the present upward system of ventilation, by removing from beneath the floor of this Hall about a million of brick which clog up the flues, by bringing the stack of heating apparatus or radiators from far off in the corner of the building by the room of the Committee on Naval Affairs and placing it under this Hall, near the center, by changing the ventilators here and giving each member the direct control of the ventilation of his own seat, it is believed that we will be able to secure a thorough ventilation of the House.

I have the plan in the committee-room, not knowing that the House would go into Committee of the Whole on this bill.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARRISON. Is my time up?

The CHAIRMAN. The five minutes time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HARRISON] one question.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield to me to finish my statement?

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. After my question. The gentleman says it is not proposed—

Mr. CONGER. I rose to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. That is my object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to rise to ask a question after the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HARRISON] had expired.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I rose also to oppose the proposition. I have a right to yield for my question to be answered, have I not, provided it comes out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not recognized the gentleman.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I had hoped that the Chair would recognize me.

Mr. CONGER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HARRISON] sometime since very kindly offered to yield his time to me, because he thought I had superior knowledge of a certain subject. I may say that my friend from Illinois, something like the subject which he is discussing here, goes back and forth from one subject to another as the wind, which blows where it listeth and we know not whence it cometh or whither it goeth. [Laughter.] So it is with my friend's discussion on this subject.

The gentleman has for two years by direction of the House been charged with this windy subject. The House knew instinctively who could best take charge of such a subject as that [laughter] and they selected my friend. He has been struggling all that time to obtain

some knowledge, some information by which he could enlighten the House as to the means of ventilating this Hall better than it has been heretofore ventilated. I know he is better prepared than I am to discuss that subject; and with all the grace possible I yield to him the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman. I think there is no man in this House, who needs fresh air more than he. [Laughter.] Sir, in olden time, when the gentleman from Michigan was a baby, he had a sweet smile upon his face. When he came here it was wreathed in smiles; it was lovely to look upon. [Great laughter.] But now see the effect of bad ventilation upon him: always sour, always vinegary.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious subject. [Renewed laughter.] I think the House is sufficiently prepared to vote on my amendment. It is utterly impossible, as I have already said, in a few moments and without the plan before me, to explain it. If gentlemen wish an explanation, I will endeavor to give it, if I can be allowed the time. [Cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"] Then I have got consent and I will take advantage of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONGER and many others. "Go on!" "Go on!"

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the report of this committee of officers be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second report of the board of United States officers convened by request of the subcommittee on public buildings and grounds to advise with regard to the ventilation of the House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 2, 1877.

The board find that the measures which have been taken to give an increased supply of fresh air to the Hall of the House of Representatives, in accordance with its recommendation in its previous report, have been followed by good results, and that the test of actual experience, during both cold and warm weather, has shown that the Hall can be satisfactorily heated and ventilated with the system now employed, namely, that of upward currents, and that this can be done without causing discomfort to the occupants.

The recommendations of the board heretofore presented were intended to meet the great want existing, namely, that of an increased supply of air, without the production of unpleasant draughts, and also to remove or mitigate certain sources of impurity which were found to exist in the basement of the building.

These recommendations have been only in part carried out, owing to the want of funds, for, although the sum estimated for by the board, namely, \$8,000, was duly appropriated from the contingent fund of the House at the close of the last session, yet it appears that this appropriation was only partially available, since the contingent fund was exhausted.

For this reason it has been found impossible by the Architect to provide the means for that increased supply of fresh air to the galleries which the board consider as necessary.

The board has collected information as to the practical results obtained in large halls of assembly in this country and in Europe by the systems of heating and ventilation adopted, and, from these as well as from the observations and experience of its members, it has arrived at certain conclusions as to what should be done looking to the permanent arrangement for heating and ventilating the south wing of the Capitol, which may be stated as follows:

1. That it is not desirable to change the present or upward system of ventilation of the Hall of the House of Representatives for any system of so-called downward ventilation, and it is not possible to apply any so-called natural system of ventilation, by means of windows and openings in the ceiling and walls only, to a large assembly Hall like this.

2. That while the quantity of fresh air which can now be supplied to members on the floor without causing unpleasant draught is probably sufficient under ordinary circumstances, it is desirable that there should be means to increase it when needed.

3. That the supply of air to the galleries should be largely increased, and that there should be means provided for furnishing cooler air to the galleries than is supplied to the floor of the hall.

4. That the system of brick flues beneath the floor of the House should be removed and galvanized iron flues substituted so far as necessary.

5. That a duct should be constructed to bring the fresh air required for the use of the House to the injecting fans from a point on the lower terrace and through an ornamental shaft about thirty feet high.

6. That an attempt should be made to regulate the amount of moisture in the air supplied and to cool the air in warm weather.

7. That for this purpose, as well as for other reasons, the course of the present fresh-air duct should be changed, and the heating-coils removed from their inaccessible and inconvenient position, and that the point for admission of fresh air beneath the floor shall be central instead of in one corner, as at present.

8. That additional means of ventilation should be supplied for the upper lobbies.

9. That an attempt should be made to so arrange a system of outlets for foul air in the roof that the wind can only produce an increased flow of air.

If this can be done successfully the exhaust fans now in use will become available for ventilation of the basement and lobbies.

10. That means of communication by a system of electric signals be provided between the floor of the House and the engine-room.

11. That the whole matter of heating and ventilation of the south wing of the Capitol should be placed under the control of one person who is to be held responsible for their proper working. Under the present system, or rather want of system, the board do not believe that any apparatus can be made to work satisfactorily.

If it is desired that the board shall continue to interest itself in the heating and ventilating of the House, and in the devising of the best means of carrying out its recommendations, it is extremely desirable that the person who is to have charge of the apparatus when completed should be in some way associated with the board, not only to carry out the experiments and observations which it may deem necessary, but to become familiar with what is to be done, and with the apparatus and machinery decided to be best adapted for doing it.

12. Plans have been prepared by the Architect of the Capitol for the alterations recommended, and these are herewith submitted. The total cost of making these changes, and of putting the heating apparatus in good order, including the purchase of 20,000 feet of new steam-pipes, is estimated at \$33,000.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH HENRY,

Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, President of the Board.

THOS. L. CASEY,

Lieutenant-Colonel Corps of Engineers, Member of the Board.

EDWARD CLARK,

Architect United States Capitol, Member of the Board.

F. SCHUMANN,

Civil Engineer, Member of the Board.

JOHN S. BILLINGS,

Surgeon United States Army, Secretary of the Board.

Mr. HARRISON. I believe, Mr. Chairman, I had unanimous consent to finish my remarks on this subject.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have no objection, of course, to the gentleman proceeding; but I believe the five-minute rule cannot be waived in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, obtained the floor, and yielded to Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the plan as suggested here is to get fresh air from a spot out on the terrace, removed from the walls of the Capitol. The cold air, instead of being driven by the fans to the far corner of this building, will be carried to the stacks which will be placed immediately under the Hall and very near to the center. Then the flues under this floor, which are now of brick, and in which, as I have stated before, nearly a million of brick are placed, will be removed. At present this brick-work absorbs the heat; and when it has become heated it is utterly impossible for the engineer to cool it in less than about half an hour. On the other hand, when these bricks become cold, it is utterly impossible to heat them in less than a half an hour. These brick flues will therefore be removed, and will be replaced by flues of galvanized iron. Around this Hall will be a system of ventilation through which the heated air will come. Under each desk will be a ventilator under the control of each member, so that he can prevent draughts from coming directly upon himself, while he cannot prevent the general influx of air around the room.

In addition to this, these officers recommend the attachment of what is called a cold-air duct to one of the engines, by which, when the House becomes too much heated, cold air can be rapidly thrown in and mixed with the warm air, so that the air may come into the Hall thoroughly tempered.

We believe that this system will be a success, though of course to a certain extent it will be an experiment. We have had before our committee men from nearly every city of the Union, wishing to get a contract for perfecting the ventilation of this House. The estimates submitted are in no instance less than \$85,000. We submitted all these plans to this committee of experts; we consulted with them; and they have come to the conclusion that the plan they propose to adopt is a feasible, practicable, and economical one.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the gentleman to say that it was necessary to have the brick-work underneath removed in order to perfect our system of ventilation. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think that the tobacco-juice and all other sorts of filth now going into these flues ought to be removed?

Mr. HARRISON. The whole substructure under here will be removed and cleaned; and then the system will be so changed that refuse tobacco and other impurities cannot be thrown into the flues.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to inquire further whether it is possible to keep out these impurities under the present system of ventilation, which undertakes to carry the foul air upward.

Mr. HARRISON. It is thoroughly practicable; at least we believe it is so, or we would not recommend this plan.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I have a profound respect for the opinions of the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HARRISON.] I always bow my head with deference to gentlemen who offer theories in regard to ventilation. But after two years of experience in regard to this matter—experience in the very midst of the operation of this system—I think that my experience is worth more than the theories of these gentlemen who propose to ventilate this House. And I do not offer my experience alone. I state what every gentleman on this floor must know to be the fact, that around this Hall on the outside are openings for the reception of the pure air which is to be forced into this Hall by driving-fans. This pure air comes over refuse tobacco, cigar-stumps, apple-peelings, and all sorts of filth which the boys from the street see fit to throw into those holes. After the air has been heated it reaches this Hall through these openings here in the floor, and all the foul particles that can be evaporated by this heated air are evaporated, and in this condition the air comes in here for us to breathe. Can anything be more destructive to life or health or comfort than to be confined in such an impure atmosphere?

Again, it is a well-known fact that the air which we breathe out of our lungs is much heavier than the natural air. By the exhaust fans which draw the air upward we undertake to carry off the carbonic-acid gas through the ceiling, to take it out at the roof of the house instead of at the bottom of it. To accomplish this unnatural and life-destructive work we are asked to appropriate the sum of \$33,000.

Now, as I understand the gentleman, he does not propose a new system of ventilation. He proposes to continue the old system; and what is it? It is simply to bring this air to us from the outside through the old channels, with the exception that the little holes at the rear of our seats shall be closed. There is to be a register under each desk, which each member may open or shut at pleasure; but if it be the pleasure of two-thirds of the members to close those registers, then the persons in the galleries will have to endure the draught where air is forced in upon them.

Mr. HARRISON. If the gentleman had listened to the report, he would have learned that the gallery will have a system of heating for itself. There are to be flues carried into the gallery.

Mr. WHITE. Notwithstanding the remark of the gentleman, it is nevertheless the truth that these officers propose to get the pure air into this House by bringing it over the same impurities over which it has always been brought in. They propose to continue the same

old plan of pumping the foul air out of this House through the roof, and as it goes upward we naturally get bad air to breathe. We have never yet had pure air in this Hall. You can taste it the minute you get inside the corridors around this Hall. We not only get no natural air, but we get no natural light in this Hall.

I was about to offer an amendment to improve the ventilation of the House at the moment the gentleman from Illinois rose. But if it is proposed to put it into the same old system, to make the same old system more perfect, we will only get more of the bad air we have been getting all along, and I will oppose the amendment and I think the House should vote it down. I ask the amendment be again read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me the ventilation of this Hall since the improvements at the last session was quite complete, and we could scarcely hope, even by large appropriations of money, to materially improve that ventilation. Gentlemen have observed this: when the Hall is crowded with people, galleries and all, that the atmosphere seems to become oppressive. But this subject of ventilation is one of such interest that the Committee on the Public Buildings and Grounds, with great unanimity—with entire unanimity with the exception of my views—have favored this appropriation of \$33,000. Now, inasmuch as we have appropriated a larger sum than is imperatively required for the improvement of the public grounds, I ask to insert that provision in the bill, if the House shall determine to adopt it, in another form. The bill now provides for the improvement of the Capitol grounds and for paving the roadway and footwalks in the Capitol grounds, \$100,000. I move to add to that, "provided, however, that a sum not exceeding \$33,000 of this appropriation be used for the improvement," &c., then using the language of the amendment moved by the gentleman from Illinois. I have consulted with such members of the Committee on Appropriations upon the floor, and believe they acquiesce in this proposition. Gentlemen will discover when we come to add up the items making up this appropriation bill it will be found to involve a very large sum of money in the aggregate, and therefore it seems to me no appropriation should be made in this instance increasing those appropriations beyond what is imperatively required. We are satisfied this \$33,000 can be deducted from that \$100,000 without any embarrassment of the public interest, or without necessarily postponing the completion of the public grounds.

Mr. WHITE. I now ask that the amendment be read as it will stand if amended by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept that as a modification of my own proposition.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire very much to vote for an appropriation for the ventilation and heating of this Hall, but I shall never vote a dollar for a system of ventilation which is absurdly wrong-side up. It has been demonstrated, I believe, in some portions of the country, that heated air drawn into the top of a large hall, and the foul air thrown out by pumps at the bottom, give free ventilation. It is known to every gentleman, I suppose, that all the air which we breathe forth from our lungs, all the air thrown out from our bodies, is vitiated and loaded with foul matters. It descends to our feet, and if it be allowed to rise to our lungs we breathe it over and over. When we can let our air in at the top, properly warmed, properly heated, and draw the foul air out by strong pumps at our feet, we will be constantly breathing free air; and until that system is adopted there can be no ventilation and no introduction of pure air into this Chamber which will answer the purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. How do you mean, sir?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I understand they propose to force in heated air at the bottom and force out foul air by some process. I believe if gentlemen will take pains to investigate this subject they will come to the conclusion that any system of ventilation such as is now proposed is absolutely wrong-side up and will not work.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and a message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced the passage without amendment of an act (H. R. No. 2690) to refund to the mayor and city council of Baltimore certain moneys illegally assessed and collected for internal-revenue tax.

It further announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. No. 1185) to ratify an agreement with certain bands of the Sioux Nation of Indians, and also with the Northern Arapaho and Cheyenne Indians.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HARRISON. I move to strike out the last word, in order to reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that this committee has studied this question, and believe what is proposed is not wrong-side up.

A great many persons think that it is the easiest and simplest thing in the world to ventilate a large hall. Men who have been living in a small house, with a large fire-place and windows, where they can move from point to point, and when their backs are freezing turn round and warm their backs, or when their feet are cold can put their feet to the fire, imagine that that system can be brought into this huge establishment. They think also that if we could only get the sun-

light—if we could in some way strike out these walls and admit the light of heaven—all would be right. Now, suppose that we were to attempt to strike out these walls. In the first place, strike these down and this vast superstructure, this roof which they support, would fall in upon us. But suppose it could be done safely, we would then throw the atmosphere of this House against the outer walls which are cold where it would become rapidly congealed and fall and cause numerous currents.

But, then they say, "Give us the light of heaven." Why, sir, in the Supreme Court, where they had the light of heaven, they could not stand it and have erected a screen to enable the lawyers who sit there to look at the judges. I do not know but the want of that light of heaven has been the cause of some late decisions; but I will not say anything on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, it is an utter impossibility to connect natural and artificial ventilation together. The two things are as oil and water that cannot be mingled. And if you have natural ventilation with outside windows and large fire-places, then you must have gentlemen moving from point to point, their faces burning and their backs freezing. You could not possibly by any natural system of ventilation heat this room in such a way that men could sit here during the day and keep themselves comfortable. In other large halls such as the great exchanges where men meet to discuss sales for half an hour or so they knock out the roof; but they stand while they are there. They cannot sit; men who sit still must have an equal heat upon them. Where men are moving about it is another thing.

The question was before the committee whether we could have a downward system of ventilation. We found it utterly impractical. Some say, "You do not exhaust the air." The facts are that we can carry out of this building twice as much bad air as we can get fresh air in. Gentlemen say, "Why do you not let the fresh air in?" Fresh air can get into this room in two ways. One is through the shafts which heat and temper it; the other is by opening the doors of this Hall. What would be the result of opening the doors? Draughts would come in through the open doors of the galleries, there would be a rush of air in the gallery, the bad air in rising is immediately cooled, and falls back upon us, and we have to breathe it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLYMER. The subject of the ventilation of this Hall is one full of interest to every member of this House and to the public who are in the habit of visiting it. It is a fact, and indeed a lamentable one, that very large numbers of those of us who are obliged to be here continuously have had our health seriously impaired by the foul condition of the air of this Hall. Therefore there seems to me to be a pressing necessity to adopt some means whereby this evil may be remedied. This being apparent, it is our duty to adopt some plan which will unquestionably secure the end desired. The trouble about that proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HARRISON,] who seems to have studied the subject with care and to have a general idea as to what we should have, is that he is unable to offer us any guarantee whatever of the success of his plan. The committee of which he is a member has called in the advice of experts, and we have before us their positions as to what will be the result of the plan proposed by them. But after all they are mere suppositions, and I fear that if we spend this large amount of money we will not be any better off in this respect next session than we are this session.

Now, sir, there is a member of this House, one whose pursuits and habits in life have compelled him to make this subject of ventilation a study, one who has given it more thorough investigation, and one who has dealt with it more practically than any other person in this House and to a larger extent perhaps than most persons in the country whose lives are devoted to subjects of this kind. I have his word that if this House should authorize him—and he is amply responsible for all he offers to do—he will guarantee the perfect and entire ventilation of this Hall so that no man on the floor and no persons who occupy the gallery need complain of it. If we will say that he shall do this, he will never ask of this Government one dollar unless he makes the ventilation perfect and complete. I confess that I would prefer to embrace an offer of this kind, coming from a responsible person, one who understands the subject, rather than try what at best is alleged to be a mere experiment, for the result of which we have no guarantee in the assertion either of the gentleman who proposes it or of those for whom he speaks.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that it is an experiment.

Mr. CLYMER. The gentleman will pardon me; he certainly stated in the speech which he made in the early part of this discussion that he could not guarantee its success.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course I cannot guarantee its success.

Mr. CLYMER. I propose to have it done by some one who will guarantee its success and who will take the risk, and if it be not successful we will not be called on to pay a large sum of money for that which will be utterly worthless.

A MEMBER. To what member of Congress did you refer.

Mr. CLYMER. Hon. Mr. HEWITT, of New York.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ATKINS. I desire to ask the gentleman a question. It is this: If the vitiated atmosphere in this Hall is not produced by the oil-shops, the slop-shops, and cooking-places, and all that kind of thing below us, where?

Mr. HARRISON. No, sir. So far as the vitiated atmosphere, the atmosphere that is deleterious to health is concerned, that has nothing to do with it; but the unpleasant odors in the outer halls are due to that cause.

Mr. ATKINS. I want to say to the gentleman that there are some rooms below this Hall which are used for oiling machinery, and in which there is a great deal of paint, and the atmosphere from those rooms passes right through this Hall and into the committee-rooms.

Mr. HARRISON. That is an entire mistake. The gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. ATKINS. I am told so by the engineer of the House.

Mr. WHITE. I move to strike out the last word. I object to the amendment as it now stands for two reasons. The first one is that I am opposed to an appropriation of \$100,000 for the improvement of these Capitol grounds. The second is that this amendment, which proposes to give \$33,000, out of the \$100,000 appropriated to the Capitol grounds, for the improvement of the ventilation of the House, would perpetuate a system which has been tried and found wanting. I am aware that very much of this bad ventilation can be attributed to the incompetent engineer that has charge of the heating apparatus of the House. I believe that if we had competent officers the ventilation would be much better; but never, until, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested, this carbonic-acid gas goes in the direction that nature intended it should go—by making it heavier than the natural air—downward, instead of upward—shall we have a complete system of ventilation in this Hall.

I want to say a word to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HARRISON,] who I regret has taken occasion to remind me of the fact that I am used to standing around log-cabin fires in the backwoods, simply because he happened to be born in the "Blue Grass" region of Kentucky and I was not so fortunate as to be born there, and because his subsequent life has been spent in Chicago, where he could see great buildings and the powerful machinery for their ventilation, and smell the Chicago River. It was never my lot to do that.

Now I want to call the attention of the House to this fact, and it is a fact, that we cannot have this carbonic-acid gas go upward before our faces without having to breathe it. You may say we breathe it in a very much diluted state and in a way that we get very little of it. But no man can tell, no scientist can tell how much or how little it takes of the foul gases that have once been breathed out of the lungs, if breathed in again, to make a man an invalid. The only proper way is to have a system of ventilation that lets the air go out at the bottom and brings in the pure air at the top. This amendment to give \$33,000 for the ventilation of this Hall does not propose to do that. It proposes to continue the old system and make a stronger draught to force in more air at the bottom. Yesterday I was cold and wanted a fire made in the cloak-room, but the servant told me that it was utterly impossible to build a fire because the draught down the chimney (which was occasioned by the draught in the House) was so great that the fire would not burn. I want to know whether under this appropriation of \$33,000 we shall not increase the draught down the chimneys so as to make it utterly impossible to have fires in the grates lighted at all. I object to the amendment and appeal to the House to vote it down.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. As my name has been mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLYMER] I feel constrained to say a word, but the House will see the condition to which I am reduced by the air of this House. I am absolutely unable to make myself heard. I have been under the doctor's care for the last ten days, and I am assured, and I am conscious of it myself, that there is no other cause for it but the impure ventilation of this House.

Now there are no difficulties in the way of ventilating any hall. It is a subject perfectly well understood. There are two systems of ventilation: the one is by the introduction of pure air at the top and the abstraction of impure air at the bottom, and there is the reverse of that system, the introduction of the pure air at the bottom and the abstraction of impure air at the top. They are both in successful operation in many places in this country and also in Europe.

The former system, that which takes the impure air out at the bottom and introduces the pure air at the top, is the system of General Morin, the eminent director of the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers in Paris. That system has been very largely applied in many public buildings and is invariably successful.

The other system, the system of abstracting the impure air at the top and introducing the pure air at the bottom, is the system in use in the British houses of Parliament, and in many buildings in this country, and it also works very well. As one instance of its admirable working, I can point to the Cooper Institute building in New York City, which has a larger hall than this, which is supplied with fresh air at the bottom and parts with its impure air at the top. The air is forced in and out at such a rate that in two minutes' time every particle of air in the hall can be changed.

The simple secret of the whole matter is that you cannot ventilate unless you get the air. The trouble in this Hall is that you do not get the air. All that it is necessary to do here is to get the air into this Hall, and if the openings are sufficiently large, (and I have no doubt they are, but if they are not they can very readily be made so,) the impure air will pass out.

Just imagine that this Hall is filled with material; it is not a vacant space but it is filled with material substance. This impure air

at the bottom must be taken out, must be pushed out of this Hall. If enough air does not come in in time to change it sufficiently to render it safe for life, then the impure air is not pushed out at all, but is left here as a solid mass, as it were, and being heavier than the pure air it sinks to the bottom and we breathe it.

Now if gentlemen think that any member of Congress can ventilate this Hall, they must be like those who think that every man can be a farmer. The proper understanding of the subject of ventilation is an art. I venture to say that those gentlemen who have signed this report are competent experts and know all about what they propose to do; and I have no doubt that if permitted they will accomplish the desired result.

What I wanted to call the attention of the House to is the error which some gentlemen seem to have fallen into, that successful ventilation depends upon the adoption of one or the other of these systems. Good ventilation may be had by either of them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to strike out the last word, and I yield my time to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. HEWITT.]

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I was merely going to add that what is required to get out the impure air from this Hall is a ventilating flue properly heated, so that the pressure which is brought to bear from the engine shall enable this impure air to pass readily out of the room. Of course it will be very easy to apply the system practically to this room; there is no trouble about it. The suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLYMER] was the result of an accidental conversation only. I have no desire to undertake the ventilation of this Hall.

Mr. CLYMER. I did not suppose the gentleman had.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I think it would be entirely improper for any member of Congress to undertake to do any such thing. But I do say, with my experience here for these two sessions, finding that my health is being undermined, and knowing that my usefulness is being destroyed, knowing that my constituents and, I believe, the constituents of every gentleman in this room do not desire that our health shall be impaired, but on the contrary have the greatest possible interest in preserving our health and maintaining our usefulness—knowing all that, I did say that if nothing else could be done I would be glad, and would feel that I had rendered some service in my day and generation, if I could be permitted at my own expense to ventilate this Hall, and I would not expect to be paid back from the public Treasury. And I say now that if gentlemen in this Hall cannot otherwise protect themselves from this bad atmosphere, and will allow me to confer this benefaction upon my country, I may consider it the greatest opportunity of my life, at my own cost and expense, to provide for the proper ventilation of this Hall.

Mr. WHITE. I will offer an amendment that will cover that.

Mr. SPRINGER. I propose to resume the floor for the remainder of my time. I offer as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] that which I send to the Clerk's desk, and after it is read I will thank the Clerk to read the amendment as it will be if my amendment should be adopted.

The Clerk read the amendment to the amendment; which was to strike out all after the word "Capitol," down to and including the word "premises," and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "Upon plans to be furnished by Hon. ABRAM S. HEWITT, and in such manner as he may direct;" so that the amendment, as amended, will read:

Provided further, That a sum not exceeding \$33,000 of this appropriation may be used for an improvement in the heating and ventilating apparatus of the House of Representatives, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol upon plans to be furnished by Hon. ABRAM S. HEWITT, and in such manner as he may direct; and that hereafter the subject of ventilating and heating the House of Representatives be placed under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I sincerely hope that this amendment will not be adopted. It would put me in a very false position. I simply state my belief that this commission is composed of men who are quite competent to do this work and that it will be well done by them. I say further that, if it should fail to be properly done by them, I will be willing to accept any responsibility that may be imposed upon me by this House; but it would be very unjust to put that responsibility on me now.

Mr. SPRINGER. I withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to offer a substitute.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope that after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FORT] is heard the debate on this paragraph will cease by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. I object. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is no objection to offering an amendment, but we want the debate to stop.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to explain the amendment.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman, experience has taught us that one of the best systems of ventilating this House is the plan of issuing tickets to the galleries. It reduces the number of bellows that are operating upon the atmosphere there, and, in reference to one portion of the gallery, it changes very much the character of the individuals who are engaged in that business. Formerly I fancied, when I approached one portion of this gallery, that I could feel the impurities pouring down upon my head almost as perceptibly as I would water tumbling over a precipice. The trouble has been that the amount of

fresh air coming into the Hall has often been insufficient for the number of persons in attendance.

Mr. HARRISON. I said that last year.

Mr. FORT. And the difficulty is not altogether with the number of persons. The character and condition of the persons occupying the gallery have very often a great deal to do with the condition of the atmosphere that pours down upon our heads from a certain gallery in this House.

This consideration proves to me conclusively that impure air must descend. It is impossible to make the impurities in the atmosphere go upward except by an atmospheric current. Hot air will rise as a balloon will rise; cold air will go downward as a cannon-ball goes downward. But the impurities in the atmosphere will not rise unless carried up by a current. We must have currents.

In my judgment nature can ventilate this Hall cheaper and better than all the machinery which gentlemen can apply. What we most want is to have pure air come in around this Hall; and without attempting to resort to machinery or mechanical contrivances we must spend a great deal of money in order to get sufficient quantities of air into this Hall to supply such an audience as we often have here when the galleries are full. The remedy must in a great degree consist in bringing in pure air and letting the impurities pass out with the current. As the gentleman from New York said, you can drive out impure air, but you must do it with a current. Impure air, even though heated, will not rise unless you have a current.

Mr. WHITE. I move to amend by inserting the following:

That the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEWITT] be, and is hereby, accepted by the House.

We have been told by the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. HOLMAN] that it appropriates a very large sum of money. Yet we are asked to give \$100,000 for the improvement of the pavements, walks, and grounds around this building. Seeing that it is more necessary to improve the inside of the cup or platter than to polish the outside, the gentleman has kindly consented that \$33,000 of this \$100,000 should be appropriated to the ventilation of this Hall. The proposed mode of improvement is admitted to be a theory—the vision of some scientist or of several perhaps. It is also indorsed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, [Mr. HEWITT], who says he believes the system proposed in the report will be a success. But it is not denied that the plan is simply an experiment. Now the gentleman from New York has kindly offered to take this experiment upon his own shoulders. He has led us to believe that these charges about the great amounts of money which the democratic party spent in the late election did not touch him; that he is left whole with an abundance of means; and he proposes to benefit his race by improving the ventilation of the Hall occupied by the representatives of the people. I say allow him to do it. If you do not you will have upon your heads the curse of having given \$33,000 to carry out a mere experiment, the money expended upon which will prove to be worse than thrown away. I say, allow the gentleman from New York to come in and take this responsibility upon his own shoulders. If he fails, his name will go down to history as a failure; if he succeeds, posterity will honor him. But in either event the Government will save \$33,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I rise to oppose the amendment. I am sorry to say I do not know whether my friend from Kentucky [Mr. WHITE] meant this for a joke or not. If he did, it was a good one. If he meant it for a castigation of the gentleman from New York, I think that gentleman can afford to let it go. The bray will come back and break upon his own ears, not upon those of the gentleman from New York.

Now I want to say one word. This is a serious matter. They say that this proposition is an experiment. The Senate, sir, has exactly the same plan we have here and it is a success, only the Senate's Hall being smaller, the flues adequate, and the ducts large enough, they get a sufficiency of air. Go to the Senate Chamber, and when you open the door you will find the current of air coming out of the Senate into the corridor. Stand at yonder door or any one of these doors in this Hall, and the current comes from without. Here we have to put screens before our doors to prevent gentlemen who sit in the neighborhood of them from being made sick. In the Senate the air comes in warm and tempered, and presses out, and so strong is it that when you go into the corridor of the Senate you will feel the pure air coming toward you. Why is that? The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WHITE], bred away up in the mountains of Kentucky, where in the houses when the chinks drop out the air pours in and they have health, where a back-log is put on and turned around like you would turn a turkey on a spit—

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman mean to say I was born in the "pea-vine region" of Kentucky, for if he does—

Mr. HARRISON. I was born there myself if you were not, and if you were you ought not to be ashamed of it. Now, in getting the foul air out, the exhaust of this House is so large that instead of having air coming from below and pressing out we have to keep the air from the corridors. The exhaust of this House is one hundred and eighty thousand feet a minute, whereas the air driven in only gives about forty or fifty or sixty thousand feet when severely pressed. The consequence is that with the exhaust-fan run to its capacity or in the neighborhood of its capacity the air from the corridors rushes in and

makes draughts. Our proposition is to give the ability to the atmosphere from without to be brought into the stacks, the radiators heated and tempered, and then when it gets impure to pass out.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not take his seat without yielding to me after what he has said.

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. BANKS. Before debate is closed I wish to be heard.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move by unanimous consent all debate on the pending paragraph be considered as closed when the gentleman from Massachusetts has completed what he has to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and that will be considered as agreed to.

Mr. BANKS. Now, Mr. Chairman, while the proposition of the gentleman from New York is a very liberal one, yet it seems to me if the ventilation of this Hall is to be perfected, the Government is able, and ought to take upon itself the expense and responsibility of it. Therefore I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I certainly will if the gentleman from Massachusetts will yield a moment to me to say a word.

Mr. BANKS. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky before my time has expired.

Mr. WHITE. But I wish to say it now, and say it to the gentleman from Illinois who referred to me in his five-minute speech—I only want one word.

Mr. BANKS. Very well; I will yield to the gentleman for one word. Say it now before the time is gone.

Mr. WHITE. I say the gentleman from Illinois in taunting me with being born in the hills of Kentucky, in the "pea-vine district," instead of the "blue grass" or lower silurian limestone region of Kentucky, as he was, is unkind in this—

Mr. HARRISON. I take it all back if the gentleman feels so bad about it.

Mr. WHITE. I am not ashamed of the "pea-vine" district; I am proud of it. But if I had lived so long by that sweet-smelling river Chicago, as the gentleman has, then I could live on anything and would not need any ventilation, and therefore I do not wonder he introduces such an abominable system after he himself has lived there so long.

Mr. BANKS. Now, Mr. Chairman, the difficulties we encounter in this Hall in regard to ventilation were imposed upon us by scientific men. We had scientific men from all parts of the world. The architects of the British houses of Parliament were here, and spent a whole year, and whatever scientific men could do they have done for us, and about as much as any scientific men will do hereafter. The difficulty is, this is an iron box within a stone box. There are twenty-five or thirty feet between the outside walls of this Chamber and the outside walls of the building; and no natural light and no natural air ever did or ever can come into this Chamber. How can it be made a suitable place for the daily assembling of from four hundred to fourteen hundred people? I do not believe bringing currents of air into this Chamber from the outside can remedy the difficulty; nor do I believe these currents of air can be disposed of so as not to be dangerous to members of the House and to the ladies and others seated in the galleries. There is a current of air that is strong enough to sweep away an ordinary person in some parts of the gallery where the wives and children of the members daily congregate; and if you bring in air enough to make a ventilation for all these people, you will have a force of the currents that will be just as dangerous to those who encounter it as the foulness of the air itself.

But as the committee has considered the subject maturely, and as I know the gentlemen who have charge of the inquiries into this matter are well acquainted with the subject, and as the expense of the experiment will be trifling, I hope it will be made; and that if it fail we will then do what is necessary to be done, bring this Chamber to the air and light of heaven, which are better than any scientific man ever made, better than that which the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. HEWITT] proposes to make or can make. Let us go to the outside and bring in the air and light of heaven, which the Cooper Institute, to which he refers and whose ventilation he approves, enjoys, and with which every building on the face of the earth is accommodated where there is a free and pure air. Meanwhile I am willing to vote for the report of the gentlemen who have examined this matter.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I wish to explain, in regard to the great hall of the Cooper Institute, that it has no access to the outer air. It is a tight box, into which the air is forced by power and out of which the air goes by a ventilating flue. It is a case in point. The great hall of the Cooper Institute has no access to the outer air except that forced into it by power.

Mr. BANKS. The hall of the Cooper Institute is used for two or three hours in an evening, fifteen hundred or two thousand people congregating in it and going away after an hour or two. I have no doubt that fresh air can be supplied in the way the gentleman speaks of for a limited time, but we are here from four to six hours every day.

Mr. WHITE. I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HARRISON] as modified on the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN.]

Mr. WHITE. I hope the gentlemen who have this matter in charge

will divide the amendment so that we can vote on the \$33,000 for ventilating, and then afterward on the other matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order.

Mr. WHITE. My object is that no part of the \$67,000 proposed in this amendment may go to the improvement of these public grounds.

Mr. HOLMAN. Move to reduce the appropriation of \$100,000.

Mr. WHITE. I move to reduce the \$100,000 to \$33,000. I do it for the reason—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order. The gentleman will put his amendment in writing.

Mr. WHITE. I offer the following amendment:

Strike out "\$100,000," and insert "\$33,000."

The question being taken on Mr. WHITE's amendment to the amendment, it was not agreed to.

The question being taken on Mr. HARRISON's amendment as modified, there were—ayes 48, noes 14; no quorum voting.

Mr. WHITE. I call for a further count.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. WHITE and Mr. SPRINGER were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 84, noes 39.

Mr. WHITE. A quorum has not voted. I do not, however, make a point on that, but shall ask for a vote in the House.

So further count not being called for, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. I offer the following amendment.

After the word "grounds" insert the following:

And for putting an elevator in the south wing of the Capitol, to be done under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am compelled to insist upon the point of order that this is new work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. Will the Chair allow me to say that this differs from my former amendment? This stands on precisely the same footing as the amendment just adopted. It is not subject to the objection made to it by the gentleman from Indiana. It makes no additional appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair misunderstood the object of the amendment. It is in order.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. It is a most extraordinary fact that the American Congress should have spent tens of millions of dollars on this building which we occupy; that we should have adorned it with the most elaborate frescoing found anywhere on the continent; that we should have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in beautifying it architecturally; and that we are now spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in buying additional grounds and beautifying them; and yet that we should be denying ourselves the most common comforts that modern civilization has produced.

Every public building of any importance, every hotel that is put up in any city on the continent, every store in which a large amount of business is transacted, every factory which is built in the country, every large edifice which is erected for the purpose of being rented, four stories high, is provided with an elevator. It has become a necessity. It is not one of the luxuries of life, like those for which we have expended here so many millions of dollars, but is one of the ordinary comforts of life. But yet we deny ourselves this convenience and comfort; for we are, in this building, like people in a fourth story. This is substantially the fourth story, although we call it the second; for each flight of stairs is equal to two flights in an ordinary building. Ascending to the second story of this building is equivalent to ascending to the fourth story of any ordinary building. And yet we deny to ourselves the convenience and comfort of an elevator in getting to the second floor of this building. We deny the same conveniences to every person that attends this House. There is not a hotel in this country in which one-quarter of the number of ladies go up stairs daily as ascend to these galleries every day, and yet we deny to our mothers, our sisters, our wives, and all the ladies of this country the necessary convenience which an elevator affords to them. We have an elevator at the other end of the Capitol, and the additional expense of running this elevator will be nothing. I call the attention of the House to the letter of the Architect of the Capitol, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

Mr. ATKINS. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HOLMAN. I raised a question of order on this proposition, and in the midst of the confusion I presume the Chair did not understand it. It was that this is independent legislation on an appropriation bill. It is entirely immaterial whether it appropriates money or not. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and it does not reduce expenditures, but conceding that it reduced expenditures it would not be in order. It is independent legislation and not in the line of retrenchment. Rule 120 of the House is very imperative on this subject. This bill is certainly large enough not to be loaded down with independent provisions.

Mr. SPRINGER. The one hundred and twentieth rule has reference to amendments which change existing law, and if an amendment changes existing law it must be in the line of retrenchment to make it in order. But this amendment does not change existing law, and therefore that rule does not apply to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is in order.

Mr. CONGER. Then I rise to oppose the amendment, and I yield my time to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. LEAVENWORTH.]

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. I call for the reading of the letter.

The Clerk read the letter, as follows:

ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, UNITED STATES CAPITOL,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1877.

SIR: In reply to yours of the 29th instant, I beg leave to state that I have examined the south wing of the Capitol in reference to the location of a passenger elevator.

In my judgment, the most suitable place is at the south end of the eastern corridor, near the entrance to the room of the Committee on Appropriations, and convenient to the bronze stairway.

The estimated cost of the elevator, together with that of changing the position of doorway where necessary in the rooms in each story, is as follows:

For elevator	\$6,000
For carrying steam-pipe to elevator	300
For constructing well-hole and tiling floors to correspond with present patterns	2,500
For changing doorways in rooms and painting the rooms, rendered necessary by the change	500
	9,300

The cost of running an elevator will be but little beyond the salary of the attendant.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

EDWARD CLARK,
Architect of the United States Capitol.

Hon. E. W. LEAVENWORTH.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the only expense which is involved by the amendment now offered is not an expense in addition to the appropriation; it merely defines the mode in which a portion of the appropriation shall be expended, and when the elevator has been put in there is the entire expense. You already have the engineer; you have the engine also; you have all the conveniences; you have the power, and it is only necessary to apply the power to the elevator. That is all the additional expense there is. The entire additional expense which would be involved in running the elevator would not amount to \$3 a day.

I am myself running an elevator in the city of Syracuse, and it is run in addition to heating the building with steam. I have in my hand an estimate from the engineer who runs the elevator and warms the building with steam, in which he estimates the entire additional expense of running the elevator at \$2.54 a day, giving all the items of expense. I say that the additional expense of running this elevator would not exceed \$3 a day, and that it would be the greatest public convenience that could be added to this building.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I only wish to say that the elevator at the other end of the Capitol, which, after great hesitation, we allowed, has cost the Government not less than \$5,000 a year from the year that it was first established, including the many alterations that have been made, the engine, the engineer, and the conductor. And in view of the large sum appropriated by this bill the Committee on Appropriations ask the House to vote down this amendment.

Mr. BANKS. I move to strike out the last word. The proposition presented is certainly well worth the consideration of the House. There is no portion of their labor more worrisome upon members of this House than that of getting here during a large portion of the year, and especially during a large portion of the long session.

Now the elevator since it was first invented has of its own force been adopted in almost every public building in all parts of the country. I know perfectly well the man who invented it and without any effort to give it popularity it has now been adopted and is being adopted in all the public buildings, in all the hotels, and in a great many private houses in this country, and will be ultimately in other countries. Now where there are so many persons obliged to come here, upon what theory or reason can it be said that they shall be compelled every day to walk up and down these four flights of stairs which we are obliged to travel, many of us, from other causes which have been spoken of here, in ill-health and many advanced in years? It seems to me that this is one of the absolutely necessary expenses that we should incur.

Now, what has been said by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] may be strictly true. It may cost \$5,000 to run the elevator at the other end of this building, but it does not cost \$5,000 nor \$1,000 to run the elevators that are used in hotels, in stores, and in commercial establishments, and there is no reason in the world why it should cost more than \$1,000 at the outside to run an elevator for a year at this end of the Capitol. I hope the House, in consideration of the advantages and comforts to be derived from an elevator and of the thanks they will receive from those men who will follow them in the performance of their duties here, will vote for this appropriation. I withdraw the formal amendment.

The question was then taken upon the amendment moved by Mr. LEAVENWORTH, and upon a division there were—ayes 67, noes 70.

Before the result of this vote was announced,

Mr. LEAVENWORTH said: No quorum has voted, and I call for a further count.

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

The committee again divided; but before the result was declared, Mr. CONGER said: I suppose consent will be given to have a vote taken on this amendment in the House, and then we can go on with the bill.

Many MEMBERS. O, no.
The tellers completed their count, and reported that there were—
ayes 63, noes 75.

Mr. LEAVENWORTH. I do not insist upon a further count.
No further count being called for, the amendment was accordingly declared to be not agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read through the portion relating to the Capitol extension.

Mr. HOLMAN. With a view of asking the House for an evening session, as it is now half past four o'clock, I will move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHICKASAW NATION.

Mr. THROCKMORTON, by unanimous consent, presented the following petition; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD:

The undersigned, Benjamin F. Overton, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, and Thomas W. Johnson and John E. Anderson, citizens of said nation, having been constituted delegates of the said nation, pursuant to an act of the national legislature hereinafter set forth, respectfully submit the following statement and memorial:

In the years 1832 and 1834 the Chickasaw Nation, then occupying their ancient lands, in the State of Mississippi, entered into four treaties with the United States, whereby they sold to the United States all of their lands east of the Mississippi River, and agreed to emigrate to territory west of that river, and the United States agreed to dispose of the proceeds of sales of their lands in Mississippi in accordance with the following stipulation:

"The funds thence resulting, after the necessary expenses of surveying and selling and other advances which may be made are repaid to the United States, shall, from time to time, be invested in some secure stocks, redeemable within a period of not more than twenty years, and the United States will cause the interest arising therefrom annually to be paid to the Chickasaws."—7 Statutes, 382, 385, 454.

In 1852 the United States and the Chickasaw Nation entered into a treaty, which contains the following provision:

"ARTICLE 5. The Chickasaw Nation desires that the whole amount of their national fund shall remain with the United States in trust for the benefit of this people, and that the same shall on no account be diminished. It is therefore agreed that the United States shall continue to hold said fund in trust as aforesaid, and shall constantly keep the same invested in safe and profitable stock, the interest upon which shall be annually paid to the Chickasaw Nation: *Provided*, That so much of said fund as the Chickasaws may require for the purpose of enabling them to effect the permanent settlement of the tribe, as contemplated by the treaty of 1834, shall be subject to the control of their general council."—10 Statutes, 975.

By the treaty entered into April 28, 1866, between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations it is provided as follows:

"ART. 10. The United States re-affirms all obligations arising out of treaty stipulations or acts of legislation with regard to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, entered into prior to the late rebellion and in force at that time not inconsistent herewith, and further agrees to renew the payment of all annuities and other moneys accruing under such treaty stipulations and acts of legislation from and after the close of the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June, in the year 1866."

"ART. 40. All the rights, privileges, and immunities heretofore possessed by said nations, or individuals thereof, or to which they were entitled under the treaties and legislation heretofore made and had in connection with them, shall be and are hereby declared to be in full force so far as they are consistent with the provisions of this treaty." (14 Statutes, 774, 779.)

The interest on said trust fund, amounting at present to \$67,967.84 per annum, has always been paid to the Chickasaw Nation by the United States, except the sum of \$297,890.25, which accrued prior to July 1, 1866, of which no part has been paid. The amount so unpaid is correctly set forth on page 170 of the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1875, as follows:

"Estimates have repeatedly been submitted to Congress for arrears of interest due the Chickasaws accruing on Arkansas and Tennessee bonds prior to July 1, 1866, amounting to \$297,890.25; but Congress has as yet failed to make the necessary appropriation. The amount of this indebtedness on the part of the United States to the Chickasaw Nation has been fully admitted by the Interior and Treasury Departments, and sustained by the opinion of the late Attorney-General Ackerman. No explanation can be made to the Chickasaw people of the course of the Government in thus annually ignoring a claim concerning whose equity there is not the least dispute."

In the year 1866 a petition for the payment of said interest was presented by agents of the Chickasaw Nation to the Congress of the United States. But it came to the knowledge of Congress that the following contract had been entered into between said agents and Hon. J. H. B. Latrobe, and that the most of the money nominally stipulated to be paid to said Latrobe was in fact to be paid to said agents for their own use:

We, the Chickasaw delegation, having full power to act, do agree that for and in consideration of the services of Hon. J. H. B. Latrobe, of Baltimore, Maryland, rendered us in making a treaty with the Government of the United States, that if the unpaid back annuities belonging to the Chickasaw Nation are recovered and paid to them, the said J. H. B. Latrobe shall be entitled to and be paid one-half part thereof.

We further agree to advance the said J. H. B. Latrobe \$100,000 out of any money the Chickasaw legislature may think proper to appropriate, which may have been obtained under said treaty, so as not to interfere with the funds necessary to carry on the Chickasaw government.

The said \$100,000 agreed to be advanced to the said J. H. B. Latrobe is to be deducted from the one-half part of the back annuities due the said J. H. B. Latrobe, provided the same is recovered under said treaty, and provided also that if the said treaty should be altered or amended so as to materially impair the interests of the Chickasaw Nation, as now secured thereby, the compensation stipulated to be paid to the said Latrobe is to be reasonably modified accordingly, but the amount agreed to be advanced to the said J. H. B. Latrobe not to be less than \$100,000. It is further agreed that one-half of the proceeds realized and coming to the Chickasaw Nation out of the leased district shall be paid to the said J. H. B. Latrobe, provided the Choctaws and Chickasaws agree to grant the freedmen the forty-acre lots, and other stipulated privileges, and receive the \$300,000, after deducting the amount or price of the forty-acre lots allowed said freedmen according to article — of treaty.

In testimony whereof we have heretofore subscribed our names and affixed our seals.

[SEAL.]

WINCHESTER COLBERT.

[SEAL.]

his
EDMOND + PICKENS.

[SEAL.]

mark.
ROBT. H. LOVE.

[SEAL.]

HOLMES COLBERT.

[SEAL.]

COLBERT CARTER.

Witness.

W. S. MITCHELL.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, TISHOMINGO CITY,
CHICKASAW NATION, INDIAN TERRITORY.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Latrobe contract, (so called,) the original of which may be found on file in the office of national secretary at the city of Tishomingo, Chickasaw Nation.

Given under my hand and seal of office, this the 27th day of January, A. D. 1877.

[SEAL.]

JOSIAH BROWN,

National Secretary, Chickasaw Nation.

And the petition presented by said agents was rejected.
On the 23d of September, 1874, the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation enacted the following statute:

"Whereas Robert H. Love, Holmes Colbert, Colbert Carter, Edmund Pickens, and Winchester Colbert were commissioned in the year 1865 to visit Washington City, District of Columbia, during the session of Congress, 1866, with full and efficient powers to reconstruct or enter into new treaties with the United States, or any authorized agents thereof, necessary and proper, in their judgments, to obtain full guarantee and securities of all the rights, interest held by the Chickasaw Nation, or individuals thereof, under former treaty stipulations with the Government of the United States, whereby the happiness and interest of the Chickasaw people may be advanced;

"And whereas said commissioners did between themselves with a fraudulent view entered into an informal contract giving to J. H. B. Latrobe, esq., of Baltimore, one-half of all moneys collected or caused by him to be paid to the Chickasaw people, then withheld by the United States Government; also, one-half of the \$300,000, after deducting the amount or price of the forty-acre lots allowed said freedmen, should the Choctaws and Chickasaws adopt and give each freedman forty acres of land under the treaty of 1866.

"And whereas the commissioners on the part of the Chickasaw Nation did, upon false representation, obtain from the Chickasaw Legislature, November 14, 1867, the sum of \$100,000, giving to J. H. B. Latrobe \$16,000, and divided the remainder among themselves, D. H. Cooper and John T. Cochran, deceased, and also an equal share of the 50 per cent. of all back annuities, that said Latrobe may collect on the said informal contract one-sixth of said moneys collected being J. H. B. Latrobe's share for services rendered in behalf of the Chickasaws: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, That the informal and fraudulent contract made and entered into by and between the Chickasaw commissioners and J. H. B. Latrobe, esq., of Baltimore, Maryland, and all laws and parts of laws giving or granting authority to any and all contracts made by and between the Chickasaw commissioners and J. H. B. Latrobe, their agents and attorneys, are hereby repealed, repudiated, rescinded, and declared null and void.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, That the governor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish a copy of this act to the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of the Treasury, and Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the city of Washington, District of Columbia; and that this act take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Approved September 22, 1874.

B. F. OVERTON,

Governor of the Chickasaw Nation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, TISHOMINGO CITY,
Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original act of the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, the original of which may be found on file in the office of national secretary, at the city of Tishomingo, Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

Given under my hand and seal of office, this the 29th day of January, A. D. 1877.

[SEAL.]

JOSIAH BROWN,

National Secretary Chickasaw Nation, I. T.

On the 4th of October, 1874, the following act of the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation was duly approved by the governor:

An act repealing certain acts, appointing commissioners to visit Washington City in charge of Chickasaw interest under any treaties existing between the United States and the Chickasaw people.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, That the act appointing commissioners Holmes Colbert and George D. James to Washington, &c., (see Chickasaw printed law-book, page 102,) appointed and continued as commissioners, with full powers to represent the interest and welfare, under any treaties existing between the United States and the Chickasaw people, approved November 14, 1867, by Cyrus Harris, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted That the act appointing Holmes Colbert commissioner to settle claims at Washington, District of Columbia, appointed commissioner for and in behalf of the Chickasaw Nation, and the individual members thereof, in order to carry out the object referred to in the preamble (see Chickasaw printed pamphlet law-book, page 10) approved October 24, 1867, by Cyrus Harris, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Be it further enacted, That the act authorizing the governor to appoint a commissioner to settle up the unfinished business of Holmes Colbert, deceased, with the Government at Washington, and to take charge of and carry out the programme begun and commenced by the said Holmes Colbert without alteration or amendment, and fully authorize to receive and accept the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for all moneys and awards due, and to settle with and pay over to the widow of Holmes Colbert, or his administrators, &c., (see Chickasaw manuscript law, passed the legislature, and approved May 8, 1872, by Thomas J. Parker, governor of the Chickasaw Nation,) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. Be it further enacted, That all appointments and commissions heretofore granted under the authority of the Chickasaw Nation, giving full powers to represent the interest and welfare of the Chickasaw people at Washington City or elsewhere, shall cease and be of non-effect from and after the passage of this act.

SEC. 5. Be it further enacted, That the governor be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a certified copy of this act bearing the great seal of the Chickasaw Nation to the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Treasury, and Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Washington City, District of Columbia, and that they be requested to reject all persons heretofore commissioned in the interest of the Chickasaw people.

Approved November 7, 1874.

B. F. OVERTON,

Governor of the Chickasaw Nation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, TISHOMINGO CITY,
Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original act of legislature of the Chickasaw Nation, which is now on file in the office of national secretary, at the city of Tishomingo, Chickasaw Nation.

Given under my hand and seal of office this the 29th day of January, A. D. 1877.
[SEAL.] JOSIAH BROWN,
National Secretary of the Chickasaw Nation.

On the 2d of November, 1876, the following act was duly approved:
An act appointing delegates to visit Washington, District of Columbia.

SEC. 1. *Be it enacted by the legislature of the Chickasaw Nation*, That the governor of the Chickasaw Nation be, and he is hereby, authorized and requested to appoint and commission two persons to visit Washington City, District of Columbia, during the next session of Congress, with full and efficient power to represent the interest of the Chickasaw people in all things touching their interest and welfare, under any treaties existing between the United States and the Chickasaws, wherein the interest and happiness of the Chickasaws may be advanced.

SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted*, That the governor of the Chickasaw Nation be and he is hereby authorized to accompany said delegation to render all assistance necessary in the prosecution of all claims held against the Government of the United States, and, if necessary, to employ counsel to assist in recovering all claims which may be justly due the Chickasaws by treaty stipulations or otherwise.

SEC. 3. *Be it further enacted*, That any and all awards by the United States on back annuities, orphans, and incompetent claims, or any other claims of a national character, shall be paid over to the national treasurer of the Chickasaw Nation, taking his receipt therefor, and giving him an exhibit and statement of the source from whence derived, together with such other items of information as may be necessary and advantageous to the nation. And it is hereby made the duty of the national treasurer to lay all exhibits of moneys received by him before the legislature or any authorized committee for their information and action.

SEC. 4. *Be it further enacted*, That the said delegates are hereby required to protest against any and all territorial forms of government which may be introduced into the United States Congress for the purpose of extending the same over the Indian Territory against the express sentiments of our people. And they are further required to report the proceedings of their mission in full to the next session of the legislature. And for such services they shall each receive the sum of \$1,000 out of any money now in the hands of the national treasurer, and the auditor of public accounts is authorized to issue his warrants accordingly.

Approved November 2, 1876.

B. F. OVERTON,
Governor of the Chickasaw Nation.
EXECUTIVE OFFICE, TISHOMINGO CITY,
Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original act of the Chickasaw legislature, which is now on file in the national secretary's office at the city of Tishomingo, Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

Given under my hand and seal of office this the 24th day of January, A. D. 1877.
[SEAL.] JOSIAH BROWN,
National Secretary of the Chickasaw Nation.

In pursuance of said last-mentioned act the undersigned, Benjamin F. Overton, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, has commissioned Thomas W. Johnson and John E. Anderson, both citizens of the Chickasaw Nation, to perform the duties imposed by said act.

The undersigned, therefore, on behalf of the Chickasaw Nation, respectfully ask the Congress of the United States to provide for the said arrears of interest, now due to the Chickasaw Nation from the United States, amounting, as aforesaid, to the sum of \$297,890.25, by an investment of the sum of \$300,000 in bonds of the United States, to be held in trust for the Chickasaw Nation by the United States, and the interest thereon to be paid semi-annually to the Chickasaw Nation; and by an appropriation of the sum of \$97,890.25 to be paid in money into the treasury of the Chickasaw Nation.

B. F. OVERTON,
Governor of the Chickasaw Nation.
THOS. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN E. ANDERSON,
Commissioners.

WASHINGTON, February 21, 1877.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BANNING. I ask unanimous consent that a session of the House be held to-night for the purpose of considering the pension bills only that are on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RUSK. I hope the gentleman will not confine his request to the Private Calendar, but will include all reports from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, just as was done when the order was made for a session last evening.

Mr. BANNING. Very well, I will modify the motion so as to include reports from the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. The use of the words "reports from the Committee on Invalid Pensions" would embrace all reports from that committee, and the Chair inclines to think it would embrace a general bill.

Mr. RUSK. The committee has no general bill to report.

Mr. BAGBY. That was the language of the order made for a session last night.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BANNING.] It is that when the House takes a recess to-day it shall be until half past seven o'clock this evening, and that the session of this evening shall be exclusively for the consideration of reports from the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Reports of a private nature.

The SPEAKER. That will be understood.

Mr. HOLMAN. If gentlemen who are interested in these pension bills would consent that to-morrow night be set apart for the purpose of considering them, and allow the Committee of the Whole to finish to-night the sundry civil appropriation bill, that would greatly promote the public business.

Mr. BANNING. I know a number of gentlemen who have left the Hall supposing that there would be a session to-night for the consideration of pension bills only, and many of those gentlemen are interested in such bills. I believe that if we have a session to-night for the purpose of proceeding with the consideration of the sundry

civil appropriation bill, there will be no quorum here and nothing will be accomplished. I hope the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] will withdraw his objection to my proposition, and let us have a session to-night to consider these private claims, many of which should have been passed upon long ago.

Mr. HOLMAN. Many gentlemen are insisting that the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill shall be finished at the earliest moment, shall be concluded to-day. Inasmuch as it is of the greatest importance that that bill shall be passed as soon as possible, I feel constrained to submit the motion that the House now take a recess until half past seven o'clock this evening, with the understanding that we will then proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. If the House shall determine otherwise, of course I will defer to the wish of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman understands that if there be a session this evening the appropriation bill will come up as unfinished business.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly; and so many gentlemen ask that we shall go on with the bill at once and complete it that I feel constrained to make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman practically objects to the assignment of this evening for pension bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; but I practically ask that to-morrow evening be set apart for pension bills.

Mr. BANNING. Then if the gentleman does not object, I call for the regular order, which is upon my motion.

Mr. HOLMAN. The House can show by its vote what it wants. I think, in view of the late period of the session, the Committee on Appropriations should insist upon the business from that committee being first considered and disposed of.

Mr. ATKINS. I would ask my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HOLMAN] if he thinks a bill of this importance should be considered without the presence of a quorum?

Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia. We can have a quorum here by sending for members.

Mr. ATKINS. There are many millions of dollars involved in this bill, and it should not be considered unless a quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to take a recess until half past seven o'clock this evening, the effect of which will be to bring up at that hour the unfinished business, being the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. KNOTT. I move to amend that motion so that the House will now take a recess until ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion of Mr. KNOTT was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand exactly whether the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] desires that the pension bills shall be considered to-night or to-morrow night.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that to-morrow night be set apart for pension bills, and that the House shall consider the appropriation bill to-night.

The question was then taken upon the motion of Mr. HOLMAN, and it was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair announces the result of the vote just taken, he asks unanimous consent to present for reference certain executive communications.

There was no objection.

W. W. LIVINGSTON.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the Adjutant-General on the petition of W. W. Livingston, brevet lieutenant-colonel United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NAVIGATION AT ENTRANCE OF BRAZOS HARBOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report on obstructions to navigation at the entrance of the harbor of Brazos Santiago, Texas; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SURVEYS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, inclosing an estimate of appropriations for surveys in North Carolina; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

NAVIGATION OF THE MISSISSIPPI.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the board of engineers on the security of navigation of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. JONES, of New Hampshire, for one week.

To Mr. J. H. BAGLEY, for three days on account of sickness.

To Mr. ANDERSON, for ten days on account of sickness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. FOSTER for the

withdrawal from the files of the Forty-third Congress of papers in the case of J. W. Douglas, there having been no adverse report.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKS obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks on the Florida election; and Mr. PHILLIPS of Missouri, Mr. COCHRANE, and Mr. RAINEY leave to print remarks on the South Carolina election.

Mr. CONGER. It is understood, of course, that this leave is granted subject to the rule that no personal language shall be indulged in.

The SPEAKER. Wherever unanimous consent is granted to print remarks in the RECORD it is understood that no personal matter of any sort is permitted to be embraced in such remarks.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, is it the understanding that the session this evening shall be for the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill alone, and that no other business is to be considered?

The SPEAKER. The motion was simply to take a recess until half past seven o'clock. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] desires to press the sundry civil bill, he will of course be recognized.

Mr. FOSTER. Had not that better be understood?

The SPEAKER. That bill comes up as unfinished business.

Mr. SAYLER. Will not other business be in order this evening?

The SPEAKER. Any business which may be in order under the rules can come in. It will be a regular session.

Mr. HOLMAN. I give notice that immediately upon the assembling of the House at half past seven, I shall ask that we go into Committee of the Whole on the sundry civil bill.

The result of the vote on the motion of Mr. HOLMAN for a recess was then announced; and accordingly (at four o'clock and forty-five minutes p. m.) a recess was taken until half past seven o'clock.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House re-assembled at half past seven o'clock p. m.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BUCKNER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURVEYS OF PUBLIC LANDS.

For survey of the public lands and private land claims, \$50,000: *Provided*, That the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended in such surveys as the public interest may require, under the direction of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and at such rates as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, not exceeding the rate herein authorized: *Provided*, That no lands shall be surveyed under this appropriation, except, first, those adapted to agriculture without artificial irrigation; second, irrigable lands, or such as can be redeemed and for which there is sufficient accessible water for the reclamation and cultivation of the same not otherwise utilized or claimed; third, timber lands bearing timber of commercial value; fourth, coal lands containing coal of commercial value; fifth, exterior boundary of town sites; sixth, private land claims. The cost of such surveys shall not exceed \$10 per mile for standard lines, (and the starting point for said survey may be established by triangulation,) \$7 for township and \$6 for section lines, except that the Commissioner of the General Land Office may allow for the survey of standard lines in heavily timbered land a sum not exceeding \$13 per mile.

Mr. BELFORD. I move to amend by striking out in the first line of the paragraph just read "\$50,000" and inserting "\$300,000."

I have not much hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment proposed will prevail, for the reason that matters appertaining to the State of Colorado have not been favorably regarded by this House; and yet I would not be doing justice to the people I have the honor to represent if I failed to lay before this body the requirements of the public service in that State. In 1874 Congress fixed the rates for surveying the public lands in Colorado as follows: \$15 per linear mile for standard lines, \$12 for township and \$10 for section lines, and for heavily timbered lands at augmented rates not exceeding \$18 per linear mile for standard, \$16 for township, and \$14 for section lines, the total appropriation amounting to \$50,000. At the second session of the Forty-third Congress \$60,000 were appropriated. At the last session, when we entered upon the great era of retrenchment and reform, the rates of surveying were reduced from fifteen to ten dollars per mile for standard lines, from twelve to seven dollars for township, and from ten to six dollars for section lines. The result was that in Colorado but little surveying was done last season. Every year the settlements made in my State are reaching farther to the westward. Supplies in many instances have to be carried for great distances on pack-mules. Public surveys such as the subdivision of townships cannot be made at the reduced price, \$6 per mile. It requires the following men to form a surveying party: Two rodmen, two chainmen, one compassman, one cook, two axmen, and two men to attend camp, stock, &c. We pay men \$40 per month and board, equal to \$2 per day. The surveyor gets \$10 a day. Therefore, to pay expenses it becomes necessary to run five miles per day, which no set of men can do in the mountains where the principal Government work will be done in the future. Large settlements are being

formed on the Bear and Grand Rivers, and yet I am told not a foot of the land has yet been surveyed.

It is impossible to run lines through the thick groves of aspen and young pines, when you have to cut a road for man and beast, at \$6 per mile. It is no excuse to say that, because much of the surveyed lands on the plains remain unoccupied, new surveys should not be extended to points made necessary by new settlements. Again applications for patents for mineral lands cannot in some instances be made, because the United States surveys have not been extended to the mineral lands; the law requiring a survey for a mineral patent to be connected or tied to some known corner of the public surveys. To do this in many instances would impose an enormous expense on the applicant, who by law has to pay the expenses of the survey for location and patent, as it would require a line to be run in some instances from three to thirty miles in length. Again the State of Colorado, by virtue of the enabling act, is entitled to a large amount of land to be selected from the body of the State, the proceeds to be applied to supporting public institutions. A bill is now pending in this House granting ninety thousand acres for the endowment of an agricultural college, and another in the Senate making a grant for the endowment of a school of mines. Should these bills pass, additional surveying will be necessary. I therefore think that the amendment should prevail, and that at least \$60,000 should be appropriated for a survey of the public lands in Colorado.

Mr. HOLMAN. The statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELFORD] in regard to the amount of lands surveyed in Colorado is correct. I have before me the statement of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, showing that on the 30th of last June there were 13,516,376 acres of surveyed lands in the Territory of Colorado, unsold; an area as large as the great State of Indiana, in which I reside and which comes well up to the average of the States of this Union. The whole amount of lands surveyed and unsold at the date I have mentioned reached the enormous aggregate of 175,876,165 acres; a territory equal to seven such States as Indiana. Yet we are told that this policy of surveying lands in advance of settlement for the benefit of speculators is a proper thing for this Government to do. That is the whole effect; it simply enables the rapacious speculator to go in advance of settlement, select the best tracts of land and enter them.

Mr. PIPER. The gentleman speaks of surveying the public lands for the benefit of speculators. Now I wish to ask him what lands in the West can be bought by speculators?

Mr. HOLMAN. Any of them that have been offered for sale.

Mr. PIPER. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman. No land is sold except for homestead settlement.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am aware that that principle prevails universally in the State of Nebraska; I am aware that it was a fundamental principle in the organization of the Territory of Dakota; but I do not understand the principle to be of universal application.

Mr. PIPER. It is of universal application.

Mr. HOLMAN. Time and again I have struggled on this floor to have that principle adopted as one of universal application, but I have uniformly failed.

The Committee on Appropriations have deemed it sufficient to appropriate \$50,000 for these surveys, having two objects in view: first, that in such cases as that mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado, where settlement was found to be drifting into channels where the lands had not been surveyed, a proper allotment of the money could be made for surveys so as to answer fully the purposes of settlement.

Mr. BELFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to call his attention to one fact which he seems to have overlooked?

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BELFORD. And that is this: I have stated that I concede the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana to the House the other day was correct; but he seems to have overlooked the fact that the surveys to which he alludes were upon the east side of the mountains. These settlements have crossed the main range of the mountains and are now pushing their way to the main rivers in Colorado. The lands east of the mountains, except upon the banks of the streams, cannot be cultivated, as they are not susceptible of irrigation.

Mr. HOLMAN. We wish to meet cases like that and therefore have recommended an appropriation of \$50,000 to meet just such emergencies.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HENDERSON. I move to strike out the last word and yield my time to the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. BELFORD.]

Mr. BELFORD. The gentleman says he gives \$50,000 for the purpose of surveying the public lands. I say out of that appropriation, according to the distribution made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office last year, the State of Colorado will not receive more than \$2,000. If the gentleman will turn his attention to the act enabling our people to form a State government, he will find under that act we are entitled to so many hundred thousands of acres of the public land, to be selected by the State, for the purpose of erecting public institutions, and yet there is no money appropriated to survey those lands and enable the State to make its selection. If Congress in 1874 deemed it proper to appropriate \$50,000, and in 1875 to appropriate \$60,000, that is, if the public necessity of that section of country required it, I cannot imagine why Colorado should be limited in this distribution simply to \$2,000; for that is what it will

amount to if this law passes as reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to another thing, and that is this: in this bill he has not only limited the amount of the general appropriation, but he has also limited the amount which shall be paid for surveys, that is, \$6 for surveying a section line per mile. If the gentleman lived in that country, he would find that it is absolutely impossible to survey through the Rocky Mountains for \$6 a mile. Why? It requires first, two rodmen, two axmen, one compassman, one cook, two men to take care of the stock and the camp, and you pay these men at the rate of \$40 per month and the surveyor \$10 per day. So, then, Mr. Chairman, they have to run a line five miles every day or they cannot pay expenses; and yet we have been acting upon that basis in this great era of retrenchment and what I call false economy, because it is an economy which uniformly operates against the development of western interests and in favor of eastern interests; and our people are to be prevented from making a permanent lodgment in that country which they have opened up simply because this great Government denies the means of surveying the public lands and bringing them into market.

I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to another fact with which he seems not to be familiar. I represent a mining country. Whenever a man takes up a claim upon the public domain there, the law requires he shall connect his location with the lines of the public surveys. Suppose a miner takes up a claim to-day and has it surveyed. He may have to run that line at his own expense from three to thirty miles before he can secure a patent of his mine; and yet will the gentleman retard and hinder the development of the mining interests because of his wild devotion to his pea-nut system of economy? Economy does not consist so much in saving the pennies as in a wise and just application of the public funds of this nation to the development of its great vital and material interests.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOLMAN. The double object—as I was attempting to remark when I yielded to the gentleman from Colorado—the double object in reducing the amount of this appropriation for surveys is, first, to cut off speculation in the public lands; for the object of heavy appropriations is in the interest of speculation, either through the pre-emption law, or otherwise according to the laws of the Territories—

Mr. PIPER. I do hope the gentleman will not persist in misrepresenting this matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman let me consume my own time?

Mr. PIPER. But I do think you ought to correct your statement.

Mr. HOLMAN. Secondly, the object is to put an end to the very profitable jobs in making these public surveys; and there that object is especially had in view. And thirdly, to put an end to this system of surveyors-general and bring this whole subject of the survey of the public lands directly under the control of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, subject to the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LANE. Will the gentleman pardon me if I interrupt him?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LANE. Then why not strike out all the appropriations for salaries of surveyors-general?

Mr. HOLMAN. I will answer the gentleman, if he will allow me. I have but five minutes' time.

The appropriation made this year for the surveyors-general and their clerks and their offices is simply to enable them to finish up their work, and it is designed for no other purpose. For I take it for granted, from the light now thrown on this subject before Congress, that the next Congress will at once revise and reform this entire system.

Mr. MAGINNIS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Indiana one question. What work possibly can the surveyors-general allow to run over this fiscal year? Are they not obliged to complete their work out of the last year's appropriations?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not understand what the gentleman means. These are appropriations, as he knows, for the next fiscal year; and we are all aware that the business of all these surveyors-general's offices is behind-hand and that it is necessary to make some small appropriations to enable them to complete their work. That is all there is about it.

Now, sir, I do not know why the gentleman from Colorado, with thirty and a half millions of acres of unsold lands in his State, should be so eager for the expenditure of money in his State. We are informed, sir, by disinterested persons in all the Territories that the appropriations heretofore made were unwarrantably made and were a mere squandering of the public moneys and a squandering of them in the interest of speculators; and for one I am anxious to see that brought to an end. We think the appropriation of \$50,000 is sufficient. We have had occasion to consider carefully the interests of every State and Territory in which public lands are located and have reported what we consider a sufficient amount for that purpose.

[Here the hammer fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

Here the committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had passed, without

amendment, a bill (H. R. No. 901) for the relief of J. E. Robertson & Co., of Indianapolis, Indiana.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. No. 4187) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. HENDERSON. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. PIPER. I renew it.

I am surprised at the tenacity with which the gentleman from Indiana persists in refusing both last session and this session to make any appropriations for the purpose of surveying the public lands of the country. So far as the Territories are concerned, I personally know but little about them; but the State of California contains about one hundred millions of acres of land; and of that vast area only twenty-seven millions have heretofore been surveyed during the last twenty-eight years. It is true that much of the land that has been surveyed there is desert land that cannot be settled upon except at great expense and is totally useless except by irrigation. It is true that all the lands that have been surveyed in the State of California have not been settled upon; nor will they be for the next century probably; but is that any argument in favor of this system of preventing the other lands from being surveyed? Not at all. The fact is it is the true policy of this Government to survey all the public lands; that when the settler goes into the wilderness and sets himself down to create a home and settles upon the public land he may know the section, or half section, or quarter section upon which he settles. Without this he is groping about in the dark. He knows not where he is or where he may be.

As to this pitiful sum of \$50,000 to be applied to the survey of the public lands of the United States, why, sir, it is beneath notice. I admire the grand and towering intellect professed by the gentleman who happens to be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Of course I admit that he absorbs all the knowledge of the United States in that grand cranium of his. But as regards this one little thing, his great mind has not condescended to contemplate it justly and truly. If we are to make any appropriation whatever, we should make an adequate one that will accomplish the purpose intended, instead of frittering away this \$50,000 to be simply wasted here and there, in this Territory and that, and to accomplish no good whatever. Consequently I submit to the committee that, if we appropriate one cent, we should appropriate \$300,000, that it may subserve a public purpose.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise only to say that the surveyed lands unsold in the State of California amount to the startling aggregate of 21,402,906 acres, and yet the gentleman is crying for more.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate upon this paragraph cease at this time.

Mr. PIPER. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. ATKINS. I wish to make a single statement. The gentleman from California [Mr. PIPER] stated a moment ago that nothing was appropriated at the last session of Congress for the surveys of the public lands. I hold in my hand the act of Congress of last session which appropriated \$325,000 for the survey of the public lands, and yet the gentleman from California says that nothing was appropriated.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. PAGE. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will withdraw that motion; I want to say a word upon this question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would be willing to withhold my motion until the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. STEELE] had been heard, but I ask that after they are heard debate shall cease upon this paragraph.

Mr. MAGINNIS. I notify the gentleman from Indiana that if there is not a quorum present all his efforts to cut off debate in this way will not succeed.

Mr. HOLMAN. O! well, then I insist on my motion. My object in moving to rise was that the House might go to other business, as I see we cannot proceed with this bill without a quorum. I must insist on my motion that the committee rise.

The question was put on Mr. HOLMAN's motion; and on a division there were—ayes 57, noes 38.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HOLMAN. At the time of making the motion that the committee rise, I thought that perhaps the House would prefer proceeding with other business, but it has been suggested to me that perhaps we had better proceed with this bill. I move therefore that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the sundry civil appropriation bill, and pending that motion I move that all debate upon the pend-

ing paragraph shall cease in fifteen minutes after the session is resumed.

The motion to close debate was agreed to.

The question was then taken on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; and it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. BUCKNER in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on the pending paragraph by order of the House has been limited to fifteen minutes.

Mr. PAGE. I was not in here when the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELFORD] offered his amendment, but I desire to say a very few words in advocacy of the amendment offered by him. The Forty-third Congress made an appropriation of between six and seven hundred thousand dollars for the surveys of public lands in the States and Territories where there are public lands. Congress at the last session reduced that amount to \$300,000. There was an appropriation in the Forty-third Congress of \$70,000 for surveys of public lands in the State of California alone. There are to-day over seventy million acres of public lands unsurveyed in the State of California alone, and yet the gentleman from Indiana urges that because there are 21,000,000 acres, I believe he stated it, of lands that are surveyed and have not been occupied in that State, the surveys of public lands ought to stop.

Mr. Chairman, there are not to-day in the State of California of good agricultural lands that have been surveyed 20,000 acres that are not occupied. I make the statement from my own knowledge. I hope therefore that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will prevail and that an additional \$250,000 will be given that it may be distributed among the several States and Territories where these unsurveyed public lands are. It seems to me that it is not a good policy for this Congress to pursue, to cut down the appropriations for surveys of the public lands. When these lands are surveyed and opened to settlement they are paid for under the pre-emption laws at the rate of \$1.25 per acre. The State of California contributed to the Treasury of the United States three quarters of a million of dollars from the sale of public lands in the year 1875. Three quarters of a million of dollars were paid by the settlers on the public lands into the Treasury of the United States, and I ask the gentlemen composing this committee that they will not insist upon this mere pittance to be distributed among the States and Territories where there is such a large quantity of unsurveyed public lands.

The Territories of New Mexico, Wyoming, Dakota, Idaho, and the States of California and Oregon contain large quantities of public lands that should be surveyed and put into market. I say it is bad policy for Congress to adopt the principle of cutting down the appropriations for this service to the small amount here recommended. I am glad that my colleague [Mr. PIPER] has seen fit on this occasion to withhold his support from the Committee on Appropriations. I believe it is the first time he has done so either during this session or the last session of Congress, except on one or two occasions perhaps when he has refused to give his support to that committee in their ruinous process of cutting down appropriations.

Mr. STEELE. I certainly hope this amendment will be adopted. The Committee of the Whole must see, if they know anything at all about this subject, that the appropriation here recommended of \$50,000 is entirely inadequate for the necessities of the public surveys. There are sixteen States and Territories in which there are land districts and for which estimates were submitted by the Department, and the House was thus informed that surveys were necessary in the ensuing fiscal year in all those sixteen States and Territories.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] speaks of these surveys being made in the interest of speculators. That gentleman certainly ought to know, even if he does not, that there have been no lands offered at public sale or in any other manner than under the homestead and pre-emption laws for very many years, and that all these surveys are made in the interest of settlers.

The gentleman says that there are in these States and Territories many thousands and millions of acres of public lands already surveyed and unoccupied. That is true; yet I know of hundreds of people living in my Territory to-day who have no title to their lands, simply because there has been no survey of the public lands on which they are settled. The tendency has been to survey lands where it was easiest and cheapest to survey them. But the Committee on Appropriations last year made a limitation in that regard which answered a very good purpose. They appropriated last year \$300,000 for surveys, which was an inadequate sum. But we ought to have at least that same appropriation although inadequate, made this year for the purpose.

In regard to my Territory, for instance, the Senate has agreed to a proposition of the House which opens up for settlement the Black Hills country so called. Now there never has been a survey made in that country. There are thousands of people there, and last year there was taken out of that country, before it was opened up to legal occupancy, at least three millions of dollars of gold. That country is now open to settlement; there is a necessity for surveys there, and those surveys must be made. And it is not economy to refuse the necessary appropriation to survey and thus open to settlement what promises to be the richest mineral region ever discovered on this continent.

If the appropriation for this purpose is limited to the amount named in this bill the Territory of Wyoming cannot get over \$2,000 for surveys of the public lands during the next fiscal year. I telegraphed this afternoon to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in reference to this matter. I ask the Clerk to read his answer to my dispatch, in order that this committee may see what kind of economy it is that gives \$112,950 for office work and only \$50,000 for surveys.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1877.

Hon. W. R. STEELE:

The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill provides for salaries of surveyors general and their clerks \$39,450. Contingent expenses of their officers \$23,500 more, or an aggregate of \$112,950 for office work, under a proposed appropriation of \$50,000 only for surveys. Such appropriation would be utterly inadequate. It would be better to abolish the entire system than to make such an appropriation.

J. A. WILLIAMSON,
Commissioner.

Mr. STEELE. If we have these departmental offices for any purpose at all it is to inform the representatives of the people what are the necessities of the Government. The Commissioner of the General Land Office tells this House that to make an appropriation of \$50,000 for this purpose is so inadequate that we might as well abolish the whole system.

Mr. MAGINNIS. Mr. Chairman, the dispatch just read shows in the most perfect light the absurdity of the action proposed by the Committee on Appropriations in this bill in reference to the surveys of public lands. The salaries of the surveyors-general, the appropriations for clerks in their offices, for incidental expenses, for office rent, &c., amount to more than \$110,000; while, according to this bill, the amount appropriated for surveys is but \$50,000. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations give \$110,000 for the machinery with which to do \$50,000 worth of work. That may be economy, but it looks to me more like willful and wasteful extravagance.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAGINNIS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is not the gentleman aware that in every one of the offices of these surveyors-general there is an accumulation of work that must be disposed of? They are all asking for clerical force for that purpose, and before abolishing the offices, which it is proposed to do, it is very proper that the business shall be brought down to a given time.

Mr. MAGINNIS. The question of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is a very pertinent question. But I am thoroughly convinced and undertake to say that there is no large amount of back business in any of these offices. None at all that ought not to be carried to completion by means of previous appropriations. These appropriations of \$110,000 for all this machinery is needed for no other purpose under the sun than to expend the \$50,000 which it is proposed to appropriate for surveys.

The gentleman says there are millions of acres of surveyed public land not yet taken up. That is so; a part of them is in Florida, and part in Indiana, a part in Michigan, and a part in several of the other States of this Union; lands not desirable. Does the gentleman mean to say that settlers shall not go on any land which has not been surveyed; that none of the lands in the newly settled portions of our country, where mines are discovered and colonies settled, shall be opened up to settlement because there have been no surveys there recently; that these must wait until all the surveyed land is taken? Certainly he cannot insist upon any such argument as that. I undertake to say, in the language of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, that to make this appropriation of \$50,000 is simply foolishness, and you had better abolish the whole system and close your public lands against settlement than to cripple the Land Department in this wasteful way.

I ask unanimous consent to have certain letters printed in connection with my remarks.

There was no objection. The letters are as follows:

HELENA, MONTANA TERRITORY, January 24, 1877.

DEAR SIR: As the time is now approaching for Congress to make the appropriations, I thought that I would write to you and give you my experience in running a surveying contract under the prices and regulations established by Congress last year.

The prices established were \$8 for standard lines, \$7 for township, and \$6 for section lines. The first regulation was that "the settled parts of the country should be surveyed first." Under these instructions I was assigned a contract which extended from Camp Creek on the Big Hole River to Hot Spring Creek on the Deer Lodge River. Five townships were supposed to be full, or that all parts of them could be sectionized, and others were fractional, or only a part of them could be surveyed. I had to go seventy miles to my work, and commenced on September 29, the appropriations having been made very late. I found the ground to be very rough, with a great deal of brush on the streams, and much triangulating to be done on the river (Big Hole)—all of which prevented any swift progress. The townships which were supposed to be full proved to be fractional, so that I could only run about one-half of each. The exterior boundaries of these townships had been run several years before by another surveyor. The courses had been obliterated by time and the cattle, and as I had to connect with the courses, I had to re-run many of the lines and re-establish the courses. In this way, and for that purpose, I reran with compass and chain upward of twenty-two miles, and re-established a number of courses for which work, under the regulations, I do not receive one cent; yet it was absolutely necessary in order to enable me to do my own work correctly.

About two weeks after I commenced work bad weather set in, with rain, snow,

and keen, piercing winds, and continued until I came in about a month later. I worked frequently with four inches of snow on the ground and the thermometer at zero, and the wind (the worst part of it) blowing.

It was, as may be supposed, very cloudy, and I had to do much of my work with the needle and not with the solar compass; and as I found that the variation changed constantly I had to run by back sights and fore sights, which consumed a great deal of time, and prevented my running as many miles in a day as I would otherwise have done. But it was unavoidable in order to do my own work rightly.

I was out about one and one-half months. I did about eleven hundred dollars' worth of work. I was forced to come in without entirely finishing my contract in consequence of a severe fit of rheumatism in consequence of the exposure I was subjected to, hardly as I am. After I came in I was one month in preparing my notes and maps for the office. So that altogether I was two and one-half months in doing the \$1,100, in consequence of circumstances beyond my control. After paying off my men, and paying all the other expenses connected with the contract, I find that I am ahead about \$152; or, in other words, that for my time and trouble I received the munificent reward of \$61 per month—a little more than a day-laborer's wages!

The work which I did was a necessary one, because there were many settlers in this region and it was necessary to have it done in order to enable them to enter their land. I supposed when I took the contract that I might make \$5 a day, but I did not do it.

Had I remained at home I could have obtained enough mineral patent surveying to have paid me much better, without disturbing a dollar.

I paid my men \$50 per month, and for their full time; otherwise I could not get them to go. I had to pay high for provisions, and had to pay freight from Deer Lodge on most of it.

There are also other considerations; the surveyor is required by the new regulations to judge whether land is worthless or not, whether it can be irrigated or not; if it cannot he is not to survey it. He is to judge whether the timber is merchantable or not; if it is, he is to survey it, (if in the township,) and if he does, he will come out in debt on his contract; and the oath which he subscribes at the end of his notes is of the most stringent character, "that he has performed his surveys exactly according to instructions and in the specific manner related in the notes, and that if any falsehood should be discovered he will suffer the penalties of perjury," &c.

Another thing. About three years ago, in consequence of some bad corners having been made by some surveyors, and a great fuss being made over it by people in Deer Lodge, an order was issued by the Commissioner that every corner should be minutely described; every stone and pit, with its length and breadth; every stake, length, breadth, thickness, and every mark made on it, must be described most minutely. The consequence is that the plainer and more elaborate you make the corner in the field the more trouble you have in describing it in the notes.

To illustrate this, I subjoin the old and the new forms for a corner:

Old form.

Eighty chs. "Set a post for corner to sections 13, 14, 23, and 24 with pits and mound, as per instructions."

New form.

Eighty chs: "Set a post diagonally 4 feet long, 3 inches square, with chained stake 12 inches in the ground for corner to secs. 25, 26, 35, and 36, marked R. 2 W., T. 2 N., sec. 25 on N. E., sec. 26 on N. W., sec. 35 on S. W., and sec. 36 on S. E. faces, with 1 notch on south and east edges; dry pit, 18 in. sq. 12 in. deep, in each of the 4 sections, 54 ft. dist. and raised a mound of earth 2 ft. high, 44 ft. base."

This regulation has more than doubled the size of the notes, and thus, while our pay is diminished *two-fifths*, our responsibilities and labor are *more than doubled*. Moreover all this additional labor and responsibility is a heavy burden to the conscientious surveyor, while it is none at all to the dishonest one. The latter knows that there is no inspection of the work; that the surveyor-general has no power to inspect it, unless he does it at his own expense, and consequently he can do fraudulent work and it may not be discovered for years. It is just as easy for him to make the notes so as to pass, and swear to them, as to do the bad work. He makes money by it, while the honest surveyor loses by his honesty.

As matters stand now, with the stringent regulations and the low pay, it makes a man's interest and conscience *clash*, and when that is the conscience generally takes a back seat. Every man who wants to do his work right will be driven out, and the public land surveys will be a scandal to every one.

I have taken pains not to exaggerate anything. I have tried to put down every thing truly. The pay is not sufficient for this country and ought to be increased. Where the ground is rough it is impossible to make anything. I have endeavored to make this plain, so that you could understandingly speak to the Committee on Appropriations about it.

Hoping that you will excuse me for writing such a long letter,

I remain, your obedient servant,

WALTER W. DE LACY,

United States Deputy Surveyor, Montana Territory.

Hon. MARTIN MAGINNIS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA, January 29, 1877.

DEAR SIR: In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the last session, I noticed that when the item in the appropriation bill making appropriation for the survey of the public lands of the United States was reached, you took a very prominent part in the debate, and that you endeavored to keep up the amount appropriated to the several surveying districts so as to meet the wants and necessities of our rapidly increasing frontier population. You seem to have been about the only member (judging from the RECORD) who was there attending to the interest of their constituents, or who stood up squarely in defense of the rights of our *great West* in this matter of appropriations for the survey of our public lands. * * * Your course when this item was before the House was remarked on by all who had any occasion to be interested in this matter of public surveys. In vain we looked for some evidence of the presence of our members when this matter was before the House. If they were there they appear to have been silent.

Now the important part you took last year, and the interest you seemed to take in this matter of surveys, is my excuse for writing to you to call your attention to one feature of last year's appropriation, or rather to one provision contained in the bill, which is clearly against the best interests of every surveying district and the surveying service. Heretofore it has been the custom for the different surveyors-general to make estimates for their several districts in advance of the appropriations, and as a basis for recommendations for appropriations by the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The Commissioner revises these estimates of the surveyors-general, and recommends whatever he sees fit for each district, after looking over the wants of all the districts; and the appropriations are then made upon the recommendation of the proper committee, and stated sums appropriated to each district. This has been the plan heretofore; each district gets a certain specified amount. It may be small, but they are sure of something. Now last year the House for some reason struck out this provision giving to each surveying district a certain specified amount, and in place of it appropriated a gross sum for all, to be divided up among the districts by the Commissioners, by and with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Now what the House was trying to do, or in what way they expected to better matters by putting the appropriation in this shape, I for one am unable to see, since the amount appropriated is still based on recom-

mendations or estimates of the Commissioner, as it was heretofore. He still gets his data from the surveyors-general, and in making up his estimates recommends the amount they recommended, or a greater or a less sum, just as he sees fit.

If the Commissioner does his duty of course every surveying district gets just the proportion it is entitled to under his estimate, and so they did when specific amounts were appropriated to the several districts. I believe it was charged that money was used for surveying worthless or unproductive land in some instances. Now, if the Commissioner would recommend appropriations for the surveys of this character under the *old* system, what is there to prevent him in dividing up the appropriation under the new system, from giving those districts where this barren land is situated their full share of the appropriation? There is nothing. He can just as easily divide it up so that money will be used in surveying barren land as he can recommend *that* amount to be appropriated. If he thinks a district has no land worth surveying he ought not to recommend an appropriation. If an appropriation is made and it is left with him to be divided up among the several districts such districts will get nothing, which is just what he recommended. This is just what will happen if the Commissioner does his duty. True, an injunction was laid on the Commissioner by Congress that the money should not be used in surveying non-productive land; and the Commissioner in apportioning the amounts to the several districts laid this injunction on the surveyors-general, but did not, as far as I am informed, attempt to designate what was productive or non-productive. He simply left it in the hands of the several surveyors-general to say what should be surveyed. Now why all this could not be brought about under the old system of appropriating specific sums to the several districts I cannot see. Congress has entire control over the matter. They can appropriate whatever they see fit. If they cannot depend on the Commissioner's estimates they cannot depend on his apportionments. I say whatever is appropriated let it be appropriated to the districts in the old way, and let the surveyor-general appoint his own deputies in the old way, and free from the dictation and interested interference of the Commissioner and his friends.

The fact of the matter is that the provision contained in last year's appropriation for surveys, providing that the whole amount should be at the discretion of the Commissioner, and by him divided up as he sees fit, is that it opens up a big field for fraud and injustice, and is as well calculated to prostitute the surveying service as anything can well be. If the Commissioner sees fit what is to prevent him from robbing some of the districts of their just proportion and putting it in other districts? There may be cases where his interests may incline him to do this very thing. Under the old system the appropriations were entirely out of his reach as far as the disposition of the contracts was concerned. The surveyors-general could let the contracts to whom they chose. It seems to be the opinion that under the operation of last year's appropriation bill the Commissioner could have not only given whatever he liked to each of the districts, but he could have taken the letting of the contracts into his own hands, and have let every one of them to men living out of the districts interested, and to his own personal friends, and over the heads of the surveyors-general. We know that this is the way they have always done where money has been placed in their hands for the survey of Indian reservations; their friends generally get the contracts, and some nonentity, who knows no more about surveying than he does of the mysteries of eternal life, does the work; and such work I hope the survey of our public lands may never get to be such a damnable fraud and swindle as this surveying Indian reservations has become under the system of letting contracts from Washington. If it does it will be only when the contracts are let by the Commissioner to persons who have no interest in the country and whose only object is to get out of the country as soon as they can and draw their money.

I say the way the appropriation was made last year would furnish an excuse for the authorities at Washington to deprive some of the districts of their fair shares of the appropriation, and also for letting the contracts over the heads of the surveyors-general, to any persons they choose. It was expected by every one who saw the shape the appropriation of last year was in that the contracts would either be let at Washington or that the surveyors-general would be dictated to in regard to whom the contracts should be let to.

If the democratic House put the appropriation of last year into the Commissioner's hands in order to cut off the patronage of surveyors-general, I do not see as they have improved the thing very much by placing it in the hands of the Commissioner; for if he has the disposition of the funds I presume just as much of it will be used for republican campaign purposes as was used by the surveyors-general.

The fact of the business is that where the surveyors-general appoint their own deputies they generally do it from qualified surveyors living in their own districts. These surveyors are general qualified for their business and make it a point to acquire a good reputation and do good work. Most of them intend to make the States or Territories where they survey their homes. They consequently are interested in having surveying well done. They live in the districts where the work is done; they outfit there; they spend the money they get for surveying there; and consequently are of some benefit to the district at large. Whereas if the contracts are let in Washington non-residents get the whole benefit of the appropriations, they do not spend a dollar more than they are obliged to in the country, but endeavor to carry all they can out of it. But this is a small matter beside the injury they do a country by sending into it an incompetent lot of surveyors from abroad who have no interest in and who care nothing for the country, and whose only object is to get through the work just as easy as possible and draw their money.

As proof of this, look at the way Indian reservations have been surveyed, or rather, have not been surveyed; for in the majority of cases you cannot find where they have been at work, unless you follow them up before the dew is off the grass.

Probably the old way is not free from some objections. The surveyors-general may not always let contracts as they should. They may appoint more from one political party than they do from the other. They may even appoint a political friend more on account of his politics or friendship than on account of any peculiar qualification he may possess as a surveyor; but still, as a general thing, in Minnesota and Dakota, the surveyors-general have conducted themselves very fairly, and have appointed about as many deputies from one party as another. I am a democrat, myself, but I do not know as my politics ever entered into consideration when I applied for surveying. I think the disposition is to get the best class of men that can be got for deputies, and always to patronize their own districts if they can find the proper men to do the surveying; which is certainly for the best interests of the districts, for reasons before given.

I am satisfied the interests of the surveying service and the interests of the country at large will be best subserved by the return to the old way of making the appropriations. They can make them as small as they see fit, and they can provide that money shall not be used in surveying barren, unproductive land, but whatever is appropriated, let it be certain, stated, specified sums to the respective States and Territories, and not put it in such shape that the Commissioner can defraud some of the Territories or districts out of what is due them, and also put things in such shape that he can let the whole amount of the appropriation to whoever he chooses to. I am sure no State or Territory having a surveying district is interested in having any such provision in the appropriation bill as was in there last year. I know their interests are right the other way; and I hope when the proper time comes you will strike at it as gallantly and remorselessly as you did at certain other features of last year's bill. If the democratic members understood just the way they are opening the door for fraud and the prostitution of the whole surveying service, it seems to me they would not insist on such an amendment to the bill this year. I hope whatever the appropriation for surveys may be, you will insist that it shall be made direct to the districts and be disposed of by the surveyors-general in the old way. I hope you will pardon my assurance in presum-

ing you will read this long communication. I hope, at least, you will read so much of it as to give you an idea of the nature of the objections to placing the appropriations for surveys entirely in the hands of the Commissioner of the General Land Office or Secretary of the Interior.

Very respectfully,

GEO. G. BEARDSLEY,
United States Deputy Surveyor.

Hon. MARTIN MAGINNIS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. DUNNELL. I desire to put a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He said a moment ago that the \$50,000 appropriated in this bill for the survey of public lands looked to an entire change in the method of surveying those lands.

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNNELL. I want to ask the gentleman whether the Commissioner of the General Land Office has recommended any change of policy in that respect?

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; he has not.

Mr. DUNNELL. Then allow me to ask by what authority does the gentleman state that there is to be a change?

Mr. HOLMAN. If any recommendation in the interest of economy ever came from that office, I am not aware of it.

Mr. DUNNELL. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

Mr. HOLMAN. If any recommendation proposing a re-organization of the land system ever came from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, I am not aware of it.

Mr. DUNNELL. Until a short time ago I was not aware of the small amount which this bill proposes to appropriate for the survey of the public lands. I indorse most heartily everything that has been said by the gentlemen from the Territories as well as the remarks of the gentlemen from the State of California and Oregon. I think it a very poor policy to cut down largely the appropriations for the survey of the public lands. I cannot understand the wisdom of such a policy. This vast public domain ought to be gradually surveyed, especially in the mineral districts, where the advantage to the Government from these surveys in the development of the resources of the country, would far exceed any cost which may be incurred in this way.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Idaho, [Mr. FENN.]

Mr. FENN. An appropriation of \$300,000 was asked for these surveys. In the Territory of Idaho, with more than 90,000 square miles, only about one-twelfth has been surveyed. This bill proposes to appropriate \$50,000, of which Idaho will receive possibly about \$1,500 or \$1,800. In the northern portion of that Territory is a large tract of as fine agricultural land as the sun ever shone upon. But this land is covered by the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad; and men who are anxious to go there and settle are unwilling to occupy those lands until they know whether they are settling upon the odd-numbered or the even-numbered sections. Thus, for want of Government surveys, they are excluded. By this pitiful system settlement is not only retarded but totally kept out of that country.

I will say further that in our Territory not one foot of timber land has ever been surveyed. The people of our Territory have settled upon those rich valleys. There are mining interests there—

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. BELFORD to strike out \$50,000 and insert \$300,000, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 42, noes 54.

Mr. PAGE. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether he will not accept an amendment making this appropriation \$200,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of a portion of the members of the Committee on Appropriations I will move to increase this appropriation to \$100,000, with the understanding at the same time that there shall be an amendment offered to the next paragraph, so as to transfer the business of the surveyors-general in the several States and Territories to the Commissioner of the General Land Office. With that understanding, I move to amend by striking out \$50,000 and inserting \$100,000.

Mr. PAGE. We do not agree to that.

Mr. BELFORD. I move as an additional amendment to add to the paragraph these words:

For surveys of the public lands in Colorado alone, \$50,000.

Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe debate has ceased on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the paragraph is exhausted under the order of the House.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to appeal again to the chairman of the committee. I ask that he will consent to make this amount \$150,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. My motion was \$100,000. I am not authorized to assent to any larger sum.

Mr. PAGE. Will the gentleman allow a vote to be taken on \$150,000?

Mr. HOLMAN. The Committee on Appropriations have carefully examined this subject, and are satisfied that \$100,000 is ample.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California move an amendment?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir; I move to make the amount \$150,000.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. PAGE, there were—ayes 55, noes 45.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for tellers.

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

Mr. LANE. An appropriation of less than \$150,000 would be totally inadequate to accomplish anything.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 63, noes 58.

Mr. HOLMAN. I raise the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. PAGE. I suggest that we have a vote in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon the presence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think there should be a quorum on this question.

Mr. POPPLETON. I raise the question that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum being insisted on, tellers will resume their places and the vote will be taken over again.

Mr. PAGE. It is evident there is no quorum present, and I hope the gentleman will not insist as it will delay the appropriation bill. If there was any prospect of a quorum being present, perhaps it would be well enough to insist on it.

Mr. LANE. I hope we will be allowed to vote in the House on this appropriation.

Mr. THORNBURGH. I do not think there is any necessity for taking the vote over again, as under the circumstances perhaps the demand for a quorum will not be insisted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. If a quorum is not insisted upon, then the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. POPPLETON. I raised the question of the absence of a quorum distinctly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana who had the floor and insisted there was no quorum, the Chair understood, withdrew his demand for the presence of a quorum and therefore the amendment was declared to be carried.

Mr. POPPLETON. The gentleman from Indiana had not the floor at the time I insisted on the presence of a quorum. When the gentleman from Indiana did not insist on a quorum I took the floor and did insist on a quorum. I have the right to insist upon it and do insist upon it.

Mr. ATKINS. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did not insist.

Mr. HOLMAN. It was the gentleman from Ohio who insisted on the presence of a quorum. I did not press the point, but the gentleman from Ohio did.

Mr. PAGE. It is evident there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] will take their places as tellers and the question will be again submitted to the committee on the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe it is generally accepted that \$100,000 will be a reasonable appropriation. I believe the gentleman from California is content with that.

Mr. PAGE. I do not desire to break up the committee, and therefore am willing to accept \$100,000.

Mr. LANE. I trust the gentleman will not agree to anything of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the amount of \$100,000?

Mr. LANE. I desire to say in behalf of the State of Oregon, which has a large amount of unsurveyed public land, that I do not consent to a reduction of the necessary appropriation to \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order, as debate is exhausted.

Mr. LANE. I am willing to agree that a vote shall be taken in the House on the appropriation of \$150,000 for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. LANE. I insist, then, there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARRIS, of Virginia. The demand comes too late.

Mr. LANE. The demand has been made all the time that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again submit the question, is there objection to \$100,000?

Mr. POPPLETON. I object, and insist there is an amendment pending which has not yet been withdrawn or acted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will again be taken on the pending amendment. Tellers will resume their places, and all gentlemen in the House are requested to vote on one side or the other.

Mr. POPPLETON. Is the vote to be taken over again?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes 55.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is no quorum voting, and I move the committee rise.

The motion was disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. No quorum appearing on the last vote, the Chair directs under the rules the roll be called, in order that the names of the absentees may be reported to the House.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

Messrs. Abbott, Adams, Anderson, George A. Bagley, John H. Baker, Banks, Bass, Beebe, Blackburn, Bliss, Boone, Bradford, John Young Brown, William R. Brown, Buttz, William P. Caldwell, Carr, Cason, Chapin, Cook, Cox, Crapo, Crouse, Davy, Denison, Dibrell, Dobbins, Douglas, Durand, Eden, Egbert, Ellis, Evans, Faulkner, Field, Frye, Fort, Frye, Garfield, Gause, Gibson, Gunter, Hale, Robert Hamilton, Hartridge, Hathorn, Haymond, Hays, Hendee, Henkle, Goldsmith W. Hewitt,

Hoar, Hoge, Hooker, Hopkins, Hoskins, House, Hubbell, Humphreys, Hunter, Hutton, Harbut, Hyman, Jenks, Frank Jones, Thomas L. Jones, Kasson, Kelley, King, Lamar, Franklin Landers, Lapham, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Levy, Lord, Luttrell, Magoon, MacDougall, McFarland, Miller, Milliken, Money, Monroe, Morgan, Nash, New, Norton, O'Brien, Odell, Packer, Payne, Phelps, William A. Phillips, Plaisted, Platt, Powell, Pratt, Purman, James B. Reilly, Rice, John Robbins, Roberts, Miles Ross, Rusk, Sampson, Savage, Schumaker, Sheakley, Singleton, Slemons, Southard, Sparks, Stenger, Stephens, Stone, Stowell, Swann, Tarbox, Teece, Thomas, Tucker, Turney, Van Vorhes, Wait, Charles C. B. Walker, Alexander S. Wallace, John W. Wallace, Walling, Ward, Watterson, G. Wiley Wells, Wheeler, Willard, Alpheus S. Williams, Charles G. Williams, James Williams, Wilshire, Alan Wood, jr., Fernando Wood, Woodburn, Woodworth, and Young.

During the call of the roll,

Mr. DURHAM stated that his colleague, Mr. BLACKBURN, was sick and not able to be present.

The committee then rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called, and directed him to report the names of the absentees to the House to be entered upon the Journal.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a quorum present?

The SPEAKER. One hundred and forty-six members have answered to their names, which is a quorum.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. KNOTT. I move we take a recess until ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not the rule the committee shall resume its session without a motion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks a motion to take a recess is in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. But a quorum having appeared, does not the committee resume its session as a matter of course?

The SPEAKER. When the committee rises no quorum appearing, a motion to adjourn or a call of the House is in order, but the House finding a quorum present does not preclude the motion to adjourn, and, the House now being under the operation of the electoral law, a motion to take a recess until to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

Mr. KNOTT's motion was disagreed to.

The committee then resumed its session, Mr. BUCKNER in the chair. The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PIPER] increasing the amount to \$150,000.

Mr. PAGE. That amendment was adopted. It was so announced from the Chair.

Mr. HOLMAN. Before the vote is again taken, I again propose that the amount be fixed at \$100,000. I trust there will be no objection to that.

Mr. LANE. I certainly do object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 58, noes 62.

Mr. WIGGINTON. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. LANE. I call for tellers.

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

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 67, noes 66.

Mr. PIPER. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. HOLMAN. To meet the views of gentlemen who are urging this matter, I will agree that a vote be taken in the House on \$125,000.

Mr. LANE. I cannot, in justice to the people I represent, consent to anything less than \$150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum not having voted, the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LANE. The point is not made that a quorum has not voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is made on the other side of the House.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANE. I will say this, that I will consent as far as I am concerned—

The CHAIRMAN. The call of the roll cannot be interrupted.

The call of the roll was proceeded with, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

Messrs. Abbott, Adams, Anderson, John H. Baker, Banks, Bass, Beebe, Blackburn, Bliss, Boone, Bradford, John Young Brown, William R. Brown, Buttz, William P. Caldwell, Carr, Cason, Chapin, Cook, Cox, Crapo, Cronse, Danford, Davy, Denison, Dibrell, Dobbins, Douglas, Durand, Eden, Egbert, Ellis, Evans, Faulkner, Field, Frye, Fort, Frye, Garfield, Gause, Gibson, Gunter, Hale, Robert Hamilton, Hart-ridge, Hathorn, Hammond, Hays, Hendee, Henkle, Goldsmith W. Hewitt, Hoar, Hoge, Hopkins, Hoskins, House, Hubbell, Humphreys, Hunter, Hutton, Harbut, Hyman, Jenks, Frank Jones, Thomas L. Jones, Kasson, Kelley, King, Lamar, Franklin Landers, Lapham, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Levy, Lord, Luttrell, Magoon, MacDougall, McFarland, Miller, Milliken, Money, Monroe, Morgan, Nash, New, Norton, O'Brien, Odell, Packer, Payne, Phelps, William A. Phillips, Plaisted, Platt, Powell, Pratt, Purman, James B. Reilly, Rice, John Robbins, Roberts, Miles Ross, Rusk, Sampson, Savage, Schumaker, Sheakley, Singleton, Slemons, William E. Smith, Southard, Sparks, Stenger, Stephens, Stone, Stowell, Swann, Tarbox, Teece, Thomas, Tucker, Turney, Van Vorhes, Wait, Charles C. B. Walker, Alexander S. Wallace, John W. Wallace, Walling, Ward, Watterson, G. Wiley Wells, Wheeler, Alpheus S. Williams, Charles G. Williams, James Williams, Wilshire, Alan Wood, jr., Fernando Wood, Woodburn, Woodworth, and Young.

During the roll-call,

Mr. ATKINS said: I desire to state that my colleague from Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG, is detained at home by sickness.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, according to order, had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, and having found itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, and now reported the names of the absentees to the House.

The SPEAKER. The roll-call discloses the fact that 148 members have answered to their names, being a quorum.

Mr. HOLMAN. The hour is somewhat late, and I hardly expect that we will accomplish anything more this evening than we have already accomplished. I therefore move that the House take a recess until ten o'clock to-morrow.

The question being taken on Mr. HOLMAN's motion, there were—ayes 83, noes 40.

Mr. PAGE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The question being taken on ordering the yeas and nays, there were 18 ayes.

Mr. FOSTER. Count the other side.

The negative vote being counted, there were 99 noes.

So (the affirmative not being one-fifth of the whole vote) the yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly (at nine o'clock and thirty minutes p. m.) took a recess until ten o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by Mr. CLYMER, as Speaker *pro tempore*, at ten o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 22.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union and resume the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. WALLING. I trust the gentleman will yield to me for one moment. I desire to introduce a bill for present consideration to which I think there will be no objection. It is a bill to extend the time for stamping unstamped instruments. The provisions of law relating to this matter expired by limitation on the 1st of January and it is necessary that this bill shall at once become a law.

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois. I have no objection to the reference of the bill to the Committee of Ways and Means. There is now pending before that committee a bill having this object in view.

Mr. WALLING. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WOOD,] himself advised this course.

Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois. I think the bill should take the usual course.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the bill is not before the House.

The question being taken on Mr. HOLMAN's motion, it was agreed to.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. BUCKNER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the special order, the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening the pending question was on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. PIPER] to strike out \$50,000 and insert \$150,000 in the paragraph appropriating for survey of the public lands and private land claims.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is manifestly not a quorum present. I ask that by unanimous consent the provisions in regard to public lands be passed over until there is a quorum.

Mr. DUNNELL. That proposition includes all the clauses in regard to the public lands?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

There being no objection, the paragraphs in relation to the public lands were passed over for the present.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

For fitting up the Armory building for storage of articles belonging to the United States, including those transferred from the international exhibition, and expense of watching the same, \$2,500.

Mr. CLYMER. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to offer the following amendment, to come in immediately after the paragraph just read:

Botanical Garden;

For painting and repairs of the building and fences, \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

Geological and geographical surveys:

For the continuation of the geological and geographical survey of the Territories of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, by Professor F. V. Hayden, \$50,000, to be immediately available.

For the completion of the geographical and geological surveys of the Rocky Mountain region, including the preparation and publication of maps, charts, and other illustrations necessary for the reports of said survey, by J. W. Powell, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$20,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. PIPER. I move to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. LANE. I rise to a point of order. I understood that all these paragraphs relating to surveys of public lands were to go over.

Mr. HOLMAN. The surveys of public lands proper; these are explorations.

Mr. LANE. I regard these as the most proper surveys of public lands that are made, and I would not have consented to let the others go over unless these were embraced in them.

The CHAIRMAN. It is for the gentleman from Indiana to say what items he intended to go over.

Mr. LANE. These are the most important surveys we have.

Mr. HOLMAN. Which? These explorations?

Mr. LANE. Yes, sir; I have no hesitation in saying that, so far as conveying information as to the character of the soil and the country, these are the most important surveys we have.

Mr. HOLMAN. My friend from Oregon [Mr. LANE] knows that these are not surveys of public lands, but simply explorations.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I would suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that he could dispose of these items far more easily in a full House than he can now.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think we can dispose of them now. I am willing that they should be stricken out *pro forma* and then we can have a vote in the House.

Mr. PIPER. This is an appropriation of \$50,000 for the purpose of exploring the country in and about the Rocky Mountains. There has been a good deal of money expended for that purpose already, and if any good has come from it I have yet to learn it. Sir, I am very much surprised to see that, while the surveys of the entire public lands of the United States the Committee on Appropriations have seen fit only to appropriate \$50,000, they appropriate the same sum for this useless purpose. I will venture to say that there is no gentleman on this floor who can point one single item of advantage to the people or to the nation that has accrued from these explorations. It is true they take a great many stereoscopic views which are circulated about this House; in fact I have quite a box of them myself. They are very nice things for young gentlemen to amuse young ladies with, but I believe that is the only thing they are useful for, and I think that, in view of the depleted state of the Treasury and the vast burdens of taxation which the people have been enduring, this appropriation should be stricken out and the money applied to some purpose that will be of some benefit to the people of the country.

Mr. LANE. I desire to say that I regard this character of surveys of the utmost value. I do not think the gentleman from California [Mr. PIPER] has given the matter that consideration which it deserves. It is from this character of surveys that we are able to ascertain the nature of the soil, the surface, character of the earth, its altitude, its fitness for cultivation, and its general geological character. I regard these surveys as of incalculable value, and I trust the amendment of the gentleman from California will not, on his mere suggestion that this is work of no importance, be permitted to prevail. I repeat that I know that these surveys are of inestimable value.

Besides, sir, I have no doubt that this work in the end will be in the interest of true economy. When we know, as we can by this system, the nature and character of the earth, we can intelligently determine that which should be surveyed. The money appropriated for such purpose could then be properly utilized. Such land as would be the subject for settlement would thereby be selected for survey, thus saving the expense of surveying lands unfitted for cultivation. Under the prevailing system the cost of surveys exceeds the revenues derived by the Government from the sale of public lands. I apprehend, also, that one result of this character of work will be to change our present system of surveys, unnecessarily expensive, and the adoption of the geodetic system, a change I deem of the utmost importance.

Mr. ELKINS. I move to strike out the last word. The people I represent are about as much interested in the surveys of the Rocky Mountains as anybody, but what they want is surveys of the public lands, and do not want ornamental and scientific surveys. The Committee on Appropriations recommend in the bill before the House only \$50,000 for surveys in nine Territories and seven States, and the same amount for Hayden surveys. Now I am opposed to this distinction of the two surveys; that of the public lands is far more practical and important to the home-seeker and people on the frontier. I have yet to learn the first instance where any valuable results have been derived from the Hayden's surveys, such as the discovery of mines. The information they furnish may be accurate enough—I do not challenge that—but what practical good are they at present? Who reads their reports? None but scientific men can understand them; the people on the frontier care nothing about geodetic points, isothermal lines, and the Silurian system; they want homes, farms, and mines, and therefore desire the public domain surveyed.

Mr. LANE. It gives you a general and accurate description of the country.

Mr. STEELE. We should never have heard of New Mexico but for these explorations.

Mr. ELKINS. As I said before, I would rather encourage the surveys of the public lands.

Mr. HOLMAN. A single word, and then I shall ask that debate be closed on this paragraph. In my judgment the practical value of these explorations is, for the present, simply the fixing of geodetic points, with a view to the surveys of the public lands in the future,

and especially the ascertaining the character and extent of our mineral resources. But I suggest that by unanimous consent the two paragraphs relating to these surveys be stricken out for the present *pro forma*.

Mr. ELKINS. Let them be stricken out altogether.

Mr. HOLMAN. We have all heard this subject argued a thousand times, and we understand it perfectly well. At a time when the Government has ample resources I think it would be well enough to have these surveys; I think scientific surveys are always valuable; but at this time I think this expense should not be incurred, except where imperatively required for the public service. I think we all understand this matter, and I trust these paragraphs will be stricken out.

Mr. STEVENSON. I object to that.

Mr. CLYMER. I rise to oppose the motion to strike out.

Mr. ELKINS. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. CLYMER. I regret exceedingly that my colleague from Pennsylvania, [Mr. TOWNSEND,] who, in the Forty-third Congress, was chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, is not present, for the reason that during that Congress a very careful and elaborate examination was made of this subject of the surveys of the Territories under Professor Hayden and Lieutenant Wheeler. That committee spent much time taking the testimony of officers of the Army, of persons interested in the Territories, of other persons who were familiar with the subject, and gathering information from officers and professors connected with nearly every institution of learning in this country. And I think it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that there were no more important surveys progressing under this Government, or that could be projected by any government, than those made by Professor Hayden and Lieutenant Wheeler.

I think there is not a Delegate from the Territories who will not assent to that opinion, who will not say that to have the whole surface of their Territories surveyed, the character of their soil ascertained, and its aptitude for certain productions ascertained, their mineral deposits and general topography fully set forth, would be of vast service. When gentlemen say that no one ever knows what has been done by these surveys, I reply to them that these reports go into the hands of the young and intelligent of this land; they are disseminated through our institutions of learning, and by these means we are educating the men who are to take our places in the future, and who out of this vast territory, this *terra incognita* of to-day, are to carve thriving and populous commonwealths in the future.

I say it is not unworthy to spend money for such purposes, and that it would be false economy to refuse to do so. There is no more useful or interesting subject than the making of these surveys. And if you come to the mere question of value to the people and the Government, there is no expenditure which will repay them so richly as to discover what we possess in our Territories as regards soil and mineral products.

I trust this committee will not strike out these items, for if it is done now, when we come into the House with the bill we will be compelled to act upon it without any opportunity for debate. I do not propose that a question affecting the prosperity of this country in the future so vitally as this shall be disposed of when its advocates are not upon this floor. I trust, therefore, that this committee will at least debate this subject so long as to thoroughly ventilate it, and then if they choose to strike out these paragraphs I will have nothing to say.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. Both sides have been heard. For the purpose of progressing with the bill, as it is manifest that whenever we come to this question of surveys it is impossible to make much headway until there has been debate, I ask unanimous consent that the two paragraphs relating to surveys be passed over at least until a quorum is present.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. PIPER. I object.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HOLMAN. With a view to harmony, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole resumes its session the pending paragraph and the next succeeding one be deferred until the close of the bill be reached, when they can be recurred to as unfinished matter.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, to resume the consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. BUCKNER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, the consideration of the

paragraphs under the heading, "geological and geographical surveys" is passed over for the present.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read the following paragraph:

Subtreasury and post-office, Boston, Massachusetts: For purchase of additional land condemned by the courts of the State of Massachusetts, including interest and expenses incident, \$181,554.

Mr. PIPER. Simply for the purpose of having an explanation, I move to strike out this paragraph. I wish to know what this money is intended for.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Government authorized the condemnation of four pieces of land, constituting together one plot, for the extension of the Boston subtreasury and post-office public building. The Government has paid already for two of those four pieces of land. The other pieces have been condemned for public use by the courts of Massachusetts, and the sum of \$181,554 is required to pay for them, being the amount of those condemnations.

Mr. PIPER. I withdraw the amendment.
The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Custom-house and post-office, Cincinnati, Ohio: For continuation of building, \$325,000.

Mr. BANNING. I offer the following amendment:
Strike out "\$325,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

I wish to say a word or two upon this subject. I see that the Committee on Appropriations have given to Cincinnati \$325,000, and that they have given to Chicago and Saint Louis each \$400,000. I think, Mr. Chairman, that true economy for this Government consists in finishing those buildings that are now being built, and stopping the payment of rents. We are paying at Cincinnati more than enough rent for extra buildings for the pension, the revenue and other offices, to pay the interest on the additional amount I ask in this amendment. We need the buildings there. Our Chamber of Commerce yesterday instructed my colleague [Mr. SAYLER] and myself to ask for this. I hold in my hands the report of Mr. Hannaford, the architect of this building, explaining its condition, which I shall ask to have read. I want to say to this House that in giving this amount to finish this building you will not only use good economy and get all the officers of the Government under the roof of safe Government buildings, but you simply give to us at Cincinnati what we pay to this Government in less than two weeks' time. We pay more than \$10,000,000 at Cincinnati; more than any other city; more than any State, except the State of Illinois and the State of New York. We are building one of the largest buildings, and you give us less money than you give for the buildings in other cities. I say it is not fair, it is not right, it is not just; it is not caring for the business of the Government as it should be cared for to thus delay and hinder the completion of necessary buildings by insufficient appropriations.

I hope I will be allowed enough time to have read the report of the architect of our building, and that this amount will be made what was asked for, in order that this building may be completed at an early day. I ask that the architect's letter be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the letter. Before the reading was concluded the hammer fell.

Mr. RICE obtained the floor and yielded his time to Mr. BANNING.

Mr. BANNING. I am much obliged to my colleague. I desire to have the rest of the letter read.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not think that that is in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. RICE. I believe I have the floor, and I yield my time to my colleague, [Mr. BANNING.]

Mr. BANNING. I ask the Clerk to proceed with the reading of the letter.

The Clerk continued and completed the reading of the letter, which is as follows:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF CONSTRUCTION,
UNITED STATES CUSTOM-HOUSE AND POST-OFFICE,
Cincinnati, February 20, 1877.

SIR: I desire again to address you in regard to the proposed appropriation for the construction of the custom-house and post-office at this place. It is reported that the proposed appropriation is only \$325,000. This amount I can assure you is but a mere pittance, and a mockery of the real necessities of the building. In this connection I would state for your information that the building is now in that condition to warrant a liberal appropriation and an energetic prosecution of the work.

The subbasement and basement stories are substantially completed. The granite of the exterior walls is set to a height of three feet above the level of the first floor. The basement and first floor beams are laid, and the superstructure during the next nine months could be carried to the level of floor of third story if the appropriation would allow of its being done. The amount proposed, \$325,000, is only sufficient for the constructional necessities of the building in its several departments, outside of and in addition to the cost of cutting the granite. At the present date, two stories, first and second, and possibly a small amount of the third story, is cut. As before stated, we propose to set the granite of the first and second stories during the coming nine months, but this will exhaust the appropriation, leaving nothing to expend on the cutting of granite. It necessarily follows that the year 1878 will be a time of forced idleness in the history of the construction of the building for lack of cut granite.

The appropriation now proposed should be sufficient to not only carry on the actual construction of the building, but to also carry forward the granite cutting, that the completion of the building will not be delayed for lack of the cut stone. To this end the appropriation should be \$750,000 at the least.

As you are aware, no city in the Union is in more pressing need of the building than Cincinnati. Neither is there any other more fairly entitled to consideration of its needs than Cincinnati. This fact is in strange contrast with the proposed appropriation for Chicago and Saint Louis, which is reported as \$400,000 each. The appropriations of last year show similar unjust discrimination against this city.

Feeling, as you do, as great an interest in the welfare of this building as myself, I am confident that you will excuse my importunity in this matter of appropriation.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL HANNAFORD,
Superintendent.

Hon. H. B. BANNING,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BANNING. I am surprised that my friend from Indiana, who I know is an economist, should have endeavored to cut off the reading of this letter, written by the architect of that building, which gives us full information about the building and tells us just what is wanting. He ought to be willing that we should have information upon this subject and that the House should vote understandingly. We have it shown here that this building is now up to the first story, and that if we get this amount of money it can be pushed to the third story this year.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the House should give this amount. There is every reason why my friend from Indiana, who sought to cut off this information, should agree to give at least as much to Cincinnati as he gives to Chicago or Saint Louis. I hope the House will consider this matter and give the amount asked. That it will treat this matter as we would treat our own business, and push on the building and complete it. This penny-wise economy makes nothing for the Government, makes nothing for the party; hurts the Government, hurts the party, and hurts the men who exercise it.

I desire now to modify my amendment. I asked for \$500,000; I shall now fix the amount at \$400,000, the same amount that is given by this committee to Chicago and the same amount that is given to Saint Louis. I do think there is every reason why we should have just as much as either of these cities has. We pay more for the support of the Government. Our building is quite as much needed. And by reason of inadequate appropriations heretofore our building is not as near completion as the buildings of those places. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as opposed to the amount given to Chicago or Saint Louis. I think each of these cities should have had the amount asked for by the Secretary to continue the work. I believe our appropriations should be such that each of these buildings might be finished at an early day. True economy consists in finishing them quickly.

Mr. PIPER. I would like to ask the gentleman what amount of money has been expended already upon the building at Cincinnati?

Mr. BANNING. I do not know the exact amount. It is about three million dollars.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KELLEY. I understand that debate is exhausted on this amendment; but if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BANNING] will withdraw it, I will renew it.

Mr. BANNING. I withdraw it.

Mr. KELLEY. I renew it. Mr. Chairman, I cannot help thinking that the policy of the Committee on Appropriations in reducing appropriations for buildings already begun and for the completion of which much of the material has been purchased and prepared, is a mistake. Such a policy seems to me not economy, but unwise expenditure. For the building now under consideration the stone for two stories has been paid for and is cut. During the whole of the long period while labor upon these buildings is suspended, there is a contingent force, I think it is called, under pay; there are clerks, superintendents, &c., who are receiving large pay per diem during the eight months of the year in which nothing is doing. Interest is being lost on the money expended; rent is being paid for offices and rooms which would be dispensed with if these buildings were completed. I believe that true economy, the saving of money in a period of three years that it may take to complete all the buildings now under way, would be accomplished by making appropriations large enough to keep the work going all the year, so that the twelve or fifteen thousand dollars expended on the contingent force might go into the buildings instead of being paid to those holding sinecure positions.

I will unite with the committee in resisting the purchase of any new lots and the commencement of any new buildings; but I do insist that sound economy requires liberal appropriations for these purposes at this time. Wages are low, material is low, and now, when our people are out of employment, when it would be in the long run economy to make such appropriations, when it would give work for the support of families now idle and so far stimulate the public revenues, I say it is not economy but wastefulness to reduce the appropriations. I therefore renew the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and shall cordially support it.

Mr. SAYLER. Is debate still in order on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BANNING. I withdraw the amendment that my colleague may renew it.

Mr. SAYLER. I renew the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee at any length in the discussion of this question. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] who has just taken his seat, that it is not good economy to impede the ordinary progress of these buildings; that more harm is done by allowing the walls of these buildings to stand uncovered from winter to winter than can possibly be compensated by the reduction of appropriations proposed by this committee. In my judgment there should have been appropriated for each of these buildings at Chicago, Saint Louis, and Cincinnati respectively, the amount of the estimate

of the Supervising Architect. It would have been better economy to have given for each of them the half million dollars necessary for the successful prosecution of the work during the next year, so that the usual force in the service of the local architect might have been kept steadily employed. To give a smaller sum compels the architects necessarily to carry on their work with less energy and efficiency and less real economy.

There is no reason for making a distinction between Cincinnati, Saint Louis, and Chicago. In saying this I do not wish to drag Chicago and Saint Louis down in their building enterprise, but only to lift Cincinnati up. The buildings in these three cities are of about the same size, as gentlemen from the cities will testify. They are expected to cost about the same amount of money. I believe that the estimates for the ultimate cost of these buildings is very nearly the same in each instance, and there is no reason why this distinction should be made as against the city of Cincinnati. I hope, therefore, that the committee will not hesitate to increase the amount of this appropriation from \$325,000 to \$400,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The Committee of the Whole rose informally, when a message from the Senate by Mr. SYMPSON one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. No. 4472) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government, for the year ending June 30, 1878, and for other purposes.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any of these gentlemen advocating this increase are serious. I do not believe that they desire to have money appropriated out of the public Treasury for the benefit simply of their respective localities. It seems to me that a gentleman whose constituents are interested in a particular appropriation of money is less able to judge fairly and impartially of the merits of that appropriation than those whose constituents are to bear the burden without receiving the benefits. I admit that it is desirable for the cities themselves that large sums of money should be spent there; but in this way the public burden is unnecessarily increased.

I admonish gentlemen that this bill already appropriates \$14,900,000. The corresponding bill twelve years ago was deemed oppressive when it made an aggregate appropriation of \$7,000,000. I trust that gentlemen, at least on this side of the House, will bear in mind that the appropriations recommended by the Committee on Appropriations are enlarged to the very last extent of the capacity of our Treasury to bear the burdens.

I wish to state the reason why the appropriations proposed for Cincinnati are not so large as those recommended for Chicago and Saint Louis. Cincinnati has very good public buildings, built, I believe only about twenty years ago. It has an excellent court-room, a good post-office, room enough for a sub-treasury. Its public buildings are solid and substantial, and would have answered for the purposes of that city for many years to come.

Mr. SAYLER. The gentleman from Indiana will allow me to correct his statement.

Mr. HOLMAN. In what?

Mr. SAYLER. The Cincinnati post-office building is entirely insufficient for the discharge of the public business, and they are compelled to rent the basements of adjoining buildings. They are carrying on a great part of the business now in rooms unfit for men to be placed in, and utterly inadequate to the purpose.

Mr. BANNING. And they are constantly renting buildings outside.

Mr. SAYLER. Yes, they are renting buildings outside constantly.

Mr. HOLMAN. I know if the building was as large as this Capitol they would rent outside buildings.

Mr. SAYLER. No they would not; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HOLMAN. This building was good enough fifteen or twenty years ago, and is good enough now, but our public officers are so accustomed to palatial residences elsewhere that they are not willing to put up with what was sufficient and convenient a few years ago.

Chicago is an exceptional case. There are no public buildings there, and we are now paying some \$70,000 a year rent. This building in Cincinnati has already cost \$3,000,000, that is, the appropriations will be \$3,000,000 up to this time. There are yet in the Treasury, or were on the first day of this month, \$27,500 of money—that much money yet to be expended; so that the appropriation of \$325,000 will run the whole amount to be expended hereafter, appropriated already, and to be appropriated by this bill, \$352,500 for a single building in the city of Cincinnati.

Mr. BANNING. Let me ask the gentleman from Indiana a question?

Mr. HOLMAN. My time is rapidly passing away.

Mr. BANNING. I wish the gentleman to correct one statement.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is it?

Mr. BANNING. Does not the gentleman know from the report I sent him in the room of the Committee on Appropriations that the \$27,500 which was the unexpended balance on the 1st of this month will all be exhausted on the last of this month under existing contracts?

Mr. HOLMAN. We have to depend upon the only reliable information we can obtain from the Treasury Department, and we are in-

formed from that Department there were unexpended on the 1st of the present month for this purpose \$27,500.

Mr. BANNING. That is not a fair answer.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have no doubt there are outstanding contracts. We appropriated \$250,000 last year and we now run that up to \$325,000 this year, and yet gentlemen make demands for a still larger appropriation.

Mr. SAYLER. Let me ask the gentleman whether he does not know—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired and debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. SAYLER. I desire to say a word in response to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. SAYLER. I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. One speech has been made in favor of the pending amendment and one speech against it.

Mr. SAYLER. I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CHITTENDEN. The gentleman withdraws the amendment and I renew it.

Mr. SAYLER. I cannot allow myself to be taken off the floor in that manner. I believe I had the ear of the Chair, and was recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman if he makes the proper motion.

Mr. SAYLER. I have withdrawn my amendment, and will now renew it.

I only want to correct an impression which might be created by the last remark of the gentleman from Indiana, and it will only take a moment for me to do it. The gentleman stated we had \$250,000 appropriated for this building last year, and of that on the 1st of this month \$27,500 remained. If the gentleman will look at the estimates of last year, he will find a year ago we had \$250,000 appropriated, and had remaining unexpended from the previous fiscal year between two and three hundred thousand dollars; and it was for that reason we submitted at the time to the appropriation of only \$250,000, or rather agreed to it, because that gave us nearly \$500,000 for the current year, which is about the amount necessary.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why did not the gentleman fight it then?

Mr. SAYLER. We did fight it then because it was not as much as we ought to have had; and I undertake to say if more money had been appropriated the building would have been in a better condition and the work would have been better done than it has been. And it will not do for the gentleman to create the impression upon this committee that \$250,000 was only employed last year and \$27,500 of that was left over to the 1st of this month unexpended, because we had really some \$500,000 last year and ought to have that amount this year.

Mr. CHITTENDEN. I do not mean in what I have to say to damage whatever reputation I may have here for being a strict economist, but I should be glad if the gentleman from Indiana and every other gentleman present who favors his policy in regard to these public buildings would listen to me for a single moment. I assume those gentlemen have during their life-time been engaged in constructing buildings of a private character, and, if they have, they certainly know that the largest possible extravagance consists in prolonging the period of construction.

Now I take the ground in full view of my belief that this Government during the next five years will have great difficulty in equalizing its revenues and expenditures. I take the ground that in respect to this public building in Cincinnati, and those at Chicago, Saint Louis, and Philadelphia, the strictest economy requires their completion at the earliest possible day. That is not only true on general principles, but it is especially true at this time, in view of the idle labor, the cheapness of material, the clamor for work, and a certain duty that the Government owes the people under existing circumstances. The gentleman proposes to go on and appropriate \$300,000, more or less, to build a story perhaps of the building at Cincinnati. Instead of that he should ascertain the entire amount required for the completion of that building and that is the sum to appropriate. The dallying policy of feeding out the least possible sum which the Committee will consent to give for the construction of these buildings has been pursued long enough. They should either be abandoned or completed.

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to those who have been engaged in private building or in public building, to say whether there is recorded in the experience of any such men anything that does not confirm the position I take in regard to the matter. The true policy for the Committee on Appropriations is to examine the public buildings which have been begun and cannot be abandoned, to ascertain the total sum of money required to complete them, and to appropriate that sum of money. There is no other policy that does not follow closely after that of the great Tweed ring of New York, which is historical now, in building the court-house. They began by appropriating \$500,000 more or less, have spent about \$12,000,000, and there the building is; it has been from fifteen to twenty years in process of construction and it is not yet completed. And such in effect is the policy of the gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I favor the amendment.

Mr. BANNING. In order that the amendment may be understood

I will state that it proposes to appropriate \$400,000 for the building at Cincinnati, being the same amount which is appropriated for the buildings at Chicago and Saint Louis.

The question was taken on Mr. BANNING's amendment; and on a division there were—ayes 68, noes 27.

Mr. HOLMAN. No quorum has voted, and as this is a very extraordinary proposition I must insist on a quorum.

Mr. BANNING. Why, the gentleman objected to our call for a quorum a little while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana demand tellers?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir. I demand tellers.

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

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 82, noes 35.

Mr. HOLMAN. No quorum has voted, but I will not insist upon a further count, but will ask for a vote in the House.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

Post-office and court-house, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: For continuation of building, \$325,000.

Mr. O'NEILL. I move to strike out "\$325,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000" for the building at Philadelphia, and I do it for the same reasons which apply to the case of the Cincinnati building.

Mr. HARRISON. Before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] commences I desire to say that the Clerk read with such rapidity that I missed a paragraph preceding this, where I had an amendment to offer. If the Clerk reads with that rapidity it is impossible for us to catch up with him.

Mr. HOLMAN. I object to going back.

Mr. ATKINS. I must say, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HARRISON,] that I think he does the Clerk great injustice.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question before the committee.

Mr. ATKINS. I must say that there are two or three paragraphs between the last one voted on and that in regard to Chicago and the one now before the House, and if he did not offer his amendment it was on account of his own inattention, and not through any fault of the Clerk.

Mr. HARRISON. I was here attending and watching an opportunity to offer the amendment.

Mr. ATKINS. Then how can the gentleman explain that he allowed three paragraphs to be read beyond the one to which he desired to offer an amendment?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he agree that this amendment shall be put on the bill now and that we subsequently have a vote in the House upon it, as we have done in regard to the item for the building at Cincinnati. I do not wish to embarrass this bill, and I do not make this proposition for an increase of appropriation for the Philadelphia building merely on account of locality. The building and completion of a proper post-office is for the advantage of every one. It is not merely local. In Philadelphia, with our large population and large business interests, we are now suffering from the disadvantage of a very small and inconvenient building.

Now the gentleman may say he has cut down this bill to the amount of fourteen and a half millions of dollars from the estimates made, but at the same time time by adding \$150,000 for an increase of the appropriations for the buildings at Cincinnati and Philadelphia he is not burdening the bill very much in consideration of the convenience of the business people. The estimate made, as I think I have understood at the Department, was originally \$750,000 for each of these buildings. That estimate was corrected in the Treasury Department, and then a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury put, I think, the estimate for the Philadelphia building at \$500,000.

Now we will have to be content if we can have an appropriation for this building of \$400,000, as that is the amount just voted for Cincinnati. While these buildings are in progress of erection and the wants of the community in this respect are so well known, I do not see why the gentleman should hesitate to permit this amount to be appropriated. I certainly do not want to vote for any extravagant appropriations, but I do want such an appropriation for a building which is necessary as will enable this building to be completed within a reasonable time. The delay of a day is a great injury to the business interests of the country.

Now, although I represent here a district in which one of these buildings is located, I can assure this committee that I am not actuated merely by a desire to obtain some advantage for the locality in which I reside. We need this new building in Philadelphia, and we want it completed as soon as possible. It has been lingering along for years. A great error was committed when so small an appropriation was made for the present fiscal year. I endeavored during the last session to have \$750,000 appropriated, but democratic economy decided that \$350,000 was enough.

Mr. HOLMAN. Do I understand the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. O'NEILL] to say that there are no public buildings in that city?

Mr. O'NEILL. No, sir; I made no such statement. What I stated was this, that I was not influenced by motives of local interest, but that we had a post-office which was exceedingly inconvenient and entirely inadequate for the business of Philadelphia.

Mr. HOLMAN. Philadelphia has public buildings that under ordinary circumstances will answer for many years to come. We propose by this bill to appropriate the same amount that was appropriated for this purpose last year, \$325,000, and I consider that that is sufficient.

A great deal has been said recently about corruption and dishonesty in the administration of this Government. That has been the staple commodity of politicians upon the stump in this country. Yet gentlemen must know that so long as these lavish appropriations are made for the erection of palatial buildings, buildings that are far beyond the wants of the communities for which they are provided, corruption and dishonesty in the expenditures of the Government are inevitable.

I have heard a great deal said upon this side of the House upon the necessity of retrenching down to the necessities of the public service. Yet with the appropriation for the Cincinnati post-office increased \$150,000 beyond the amount contained in this bill when it was reported from the Committee on Appropriations, I can hardly hope to resist this general tide of extravagance and bring the appropriations back even to the old order of things, about which such indignation has been excited all over the country.

I think that \$325,000 is a very ample appropriation for the post-office in Philadelphia. Yet we find all the gentlemen who have public buildings in process of erection in their cities or towns acting in consort with each other to force up these appropriations to the highest point. But a few months since the people of the country were denouncing this extravagance in public expenditure. No purity in the administration of the Government can be possible while such lavish appropriations are made. It is the very magnitude of the sums which are placed under the control of your public officers that excites that unfortunate cupidity which brings with it corruption and dishonesty and saps the very foundation of this government. Yet gentlemen propose to add hundreds of thousands of dollars to this bill which, when it came into the House, proposed to appropriate within a fraction of \$15,000,000.

Mr. CHITTENDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. CHITTENDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] if he has not within his own experience discovered that it cost \$2 to be five years in erecting a building where it would cost \$1 to erect it in two years, when it can be properly completed in that time?

Mr. HOLMAN. O, yes; I heard that argument brought forward here twelve years ago; just that strain of argument was begun at that time. It has resulted in the demoralization of the public service, in the wide demoralization of the service. The same argument would justify the paying the public debt at once, of loading down the people instantly with burdens which in a time of great depression would crush out the business interests of the country. That argument is used to justify the erection of these imperial palaces, costing two or three times as much as is required, for the public service. These palatial structures are beyond the wants of the service and in violation of the good faith of a plain Government like ours. I ask for a vote on this proposition.

Mr. HARRISON. I move to strike out the last word, and I do it because of the imputation thrown out by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] when he charges cupidity upon members here because they desire wise appropriations, and not foolish ones.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman misapprehends me.

Mr. HARRISON. Do not interrupt me now.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman misinterpret me and then refuse to let me be heard? I said the appropriation of these large sums of money excited that cupidity which is sapping the foundations of this Government.

Mr. HARRISON. Very good. I have been before the Committee on Appropriations and urged them to give us, in Chicago, an appropriation that would enable us to complete our building. They refused to do so, and call it economy. I say it is rural folly, fit only for the gentleman's own little district.

We have in Chicago now a building which has already cost the Government \$4,000,000. Admit that it was folly to commence the erection of such a building; it is there. Chicago is the first post-office in the country in respect of newspaper delivery; it is the second post-office in America in regard to letter distribution; it is the third post-office in America in respect to the income derived from its registered-letter department.

What have we in Chicago in the way of public buildings? The internal-revenue department, taking in \$3,000,000 a year, is located in a tinder-box, rented from a man who stands high in his party and who gets his \$28,000 a year for rent. We pay other rentals, amounting in all to \$70,000 a year. What do we get for them? That great city, which was burned up a few years ago, is now compelled to rent at an enormous rental mere tinder-boxes, and the gentleman calls that economy. Sir, the gentleman looks at the estimates sent in here; but he has never figured—I dare him to say on this floor that he has figured—what is absolutely necessary. When an estimate comes in he cuts it down. He is like the man mentioned by Thackeray who bought an old hat for threepence, but found out afterward that it could have been bought for twopence, and was miserably ever after-

ward. [Laughter.] That is not economy, Mr. Chairman; it is the very essence of wastefulness.

We have our great post-office, our internal-revenue department, our custom-house in those tinder-boxes. And what was the gentleman's policy last year? We asked an appropriation that would have enabled us to make a contract for putting a roof on the building now in course of construction. He refused it, and beat us on this floor. The result was that the architect could not make a contract, and the building is there idle; the roof could not be put upon it; and another year must pass before it can be completed. Yet the gentleman calls this economy. The whole amount necessary to finish that building would not cost the Government \$45,000 a year in the shape of interest on its obligations; yet the gentleman goes on and lets us pay a rent of \$70,000 to \$80,000 to men who lobby here with the Departments to have their buildings rented by the Government. The gentleman calls this economy! Sir, it is folly. There is no economy in it. Gentlemen may go before the country with an appearance of economy; but I say to the gentleman that there is brain enough in this country to distinguish real from false economy; and the people are not going to be fooled by a mere appearance. We have injured ourselves by this sort of policy; we have injured the party. A few districts may approve such a system; but the country in general pronounces it folly. We are called imbeciles, because we are in some localities paying from \$70,000 to \$100,000 rent when bonds sold at 4½ per cent. would finish the buildings, and the interest upon those bonds would not exceed \$45,000 a year. Are we going to conduct this Government so differently from the business of a private institution?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana. I arise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Chicago, [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. Chairman, I discover that there has been an onslaught made upon the Committee on Appropriations and that in some instances they have been induced to consent to appropriations far beyond the proper demands of the public service. I refer in particular to the appropriation made here yesterday for the public grounds around this building—an appropriation of \$100,000. If these grounds belonged to a private individual and were to be improved in like manner, it would be done for \$10,000 or \$20,000.

Now gentlemen representing large cities come in here and insist, as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that they are suffering for want of great public buildings. Sir, when the letter-carrier system was adopted it was done upon the ground that there would be no necessity for large post-office buildings, which is true; we do not need them and it is a waste of the public money to build them. Yet now, when letters are carried from the post-office and delivered to the business man at his counter, gentlemen here argue that they require large buildings and are suffering for the want of them. Sir, the only object is to get ornamental public buildings in their respective cities. There is no necessity at all for such structures. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will be sustained upon this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I reside in a city where this letter-carrier system is in operation. I have been in favor of it, have always voted for it. But, sir, there is no crowd around the post-offices in our large cities, and no need of large buildings. The letters are distributed there to all business points. I hope the committee will be sustained.

The amendment to strike out the last word was withdrawn.

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment to strike out the last word. Sir, it seems to me a strange spirit pervading this House which, in the name of economy, leaves public works of vast importance if not absolute necessity with the prospect of being uncompleted for years, while the sum annually paid for ill-conditioned accommodations for the public service far exceeds the interest on the sum necessary for their completion. It would have been far better never to have commenced these structures than to allow them to drag on year after year in their present condition. But as they have been commenced, as their completion cannot be delayed without additional cost and loss to the Government, arising, among other things, from the necessity for their protection from exposure to the changing seasons and the deterioration incident thereto, the loss of interest on the sum already invested, the large rents paid for the necessary quarters for the various branches of the public service, it would seem to be but the part of wisdom and true economy to complete these buildings as speedily as possible. The amount appropriated in this bill is utterly insufficient for that purpose, and unless it be increased the Government will be the loser in the long run. I hope that members of this House, and more especially gentlemen more immediately representing sections of the country where these buildings are under way, will rise above the narrow, contracted spirit which seems to govern the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations like a nightmare, and will in the interest of public spirit, of wisdom, and true economy adopt this amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to oppose the pending proposition and call for a vote.

The amendment to strike out the last word was withdrawn; and the question recurred on the amendment of Mr. O'NEILL to strike out \$320,000 and insert \$400,000.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 54, noes 49.

Mr. EDEN. I make the point that there is no quorum. If this system of extravagance is to be inaugurated, I want it done with a quorum in the House.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. O'NEILL were appointed.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 67. So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. We will take a vote on this amendment in the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appraisers' stores, San Francisco, California, for continuation of building, \$50,000.

Mr. PIPER. I move to amend the clause just read by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting "\$100,000."

Mr. Chairman, the building for appraisers' stores for which the Committee on Appropriations have put in the bill \$50,000 is situated in the city of San Francisco. It is a building two hundred and twenty feet in length and one hundred and twenty feet in breadth, and is intended for various purposes; for the district and circuit courts of the United States, for the marshal's offices and all the other offices necessary for the conduct of the Federal judicial business of the ninth circuit of the United States. In addition it is intended for offices for collectors of internal revenue, for headquarters of the Army, &c. It will accommodate the appraisers of the port of San Francisco for offices and warehouses, with a warehouse capacity, I believe, of 18,000 tons in addition. The building is a plain brick structure, with no ornamentation whatever. It is now up four stories, and about ready for the roof. Upon it already has been expended, I believe, \$583,000. The amount necessary for its final completion, as estimated by the Government architect, is \$217,000.

For the offices and court-rooms which this building will accommodate when completed, the Government is now paying a rental of about \$24,000, independent of storage capacity and the offices occupied by the appraisers.

The present circuit and district courts for the ninth judicial district are now located in an old, broken-down building totally improper and inadequate for the purpose. It is a building which was shattered by an earthquake, is in danger on account of fire, and may be destroyed at any time. All the court records of the circuit and district courts are contained in that building. The entire records of the vast landed property of the State of California, derived from Spanish and Mexican titles, are located in that insecure building.

The Committee on Appropriations have seen proper to appropriate \$50,000 for the continuation and completion of this building, an amount which if this building were completed would be saved to the Government every year. Therefore I submit in the interest of economy, in the interest of the safety of the public records, in the interest of the public and the Government itself, this building should be completed at the earliest possible moment, and I ask that this committee will unhesitatingly vote to increase this appropriation to \$100,000, as I have proposed.

Mr. HOLMAN. This building is one of seven buildings which have been commenced and put in progress of erection in the city of San Francisco, seven separate and distinct buildings. The old building known as the Appraisers' store building in the city of San Francisco is now in use. This is a new and elegant structure, one for which we have already appropriated \$583,000, and the Committee on Appropriations think the appropriation of \$50,000 for that work is very ample. I now ask for a vote.

Mr. LUTTRELL rose.

The CHAIR. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I ask my colleague to withdraw his amendment and I will renew it.

Mr. PIPER. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I renew it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I agree with all my colleague has said in relation to the present appropriation. I believe that the appropriation reported in this bill should be increased to \$100,000 at least. This building is under construction. We have expended, it is true, a great deal of money, but we are putting up a first-class building there. The commercial interests of the country demand this building shall be constructed as speedily as possible. We are now paying enormous rents in San Francisco for public buildings, and why it is when we have the money we should withhold it, and not complete this building, I cannot understand. I know the building can be finished in a very few months, and we would thereby save every year as much money as is proposed to be appropriated in this bill. I hope the amendment will prevail. If the building is completed within the next year, it will be the means of saving as much as is now proposed to be appropriated. This cannot be done.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, noes 29; no quorum voting.

Mr. PIPER demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. PIPER and Mr. HOLMAN were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 94.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For court-house and post-office, Saint Louis, Missouri: for continuation of building, \$400,000.

Mr. STONE. I move to strike out "400" and insert "500," so as to increase the appropriation to \$500,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is almost impossible, it would seem, to convince members of this House of the absolute necessity and importance of adopting the amendment I have proposed. I consider the majority of this House have already settled by the votes given on this bill that they defer altogether to the wisdom of the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the wants of every section of this country. This building has been standing for several months for want of an appropriation. The only men employed about it are high-salaried men, the superintendent, the watchmen, and the foreman. The material is there on the ground, and the bone and sinew to put it up are there. All we want is the appropriation. I therefore ask gentlemen to vote for my amendment.

The question being taken on Mr. STONE'S amendment, there were—aye 26, noes 72.

So (further count not being demanded) the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph :

Court-house and post-office, Parkersburgh, West Virginia:
For completion of building, fences, grading approaches, and furniture, \$5,000.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I offer the following amendment :

Strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000."

I dislike to antagonize any report from the Committee on Appropriations as I have every confidence in that committee. But I desire to say that this appropriation is so wholly inadequate that I must ask that it may be increased. The city of Parkersburgh is the only place where by law the circuit court of West Virginia can hold its sittings. The court now uses the court-house of the State, which is otherwise occupied much of the time, and the court is often subjected to inconvenience in holding its sessions.

There have been now appropriated about \$200,000 for this building; and the Supervising Architect has reported that it will require \$20,000 more to complete it. The unexpended balance is not enough, I understand, to do the painting and the glazing, and to furnish the fastenings of the doors and windows, &c. The building is uninclosed. I take it that it is very bad policy, after so much money has been expended, to allow the building to stand in an unfinished condition, exposed to the weather, unpainted, and without fastenings to the doors and windows. The building is absolutely needed for post-office and court-house purposes. I hope it will be the pleasure of the committee to sustain the amendment I have offered, and give the \$20,000 which are asked for.

Mr. HOLMAN. The amount of money on hand for the building at Parkersburgh is \$11,000. That was the amount on the first day of this month. The building is well on to completion and it may require possibly about \$15,000 altogether to complete it. It is a building that perhaps my friend from West Virginia will agree ought not to have been erected. It is being erected at a very large cost and is not one of those buildings that is imperatively required for the service of the Government.

But lest we may have put this appropriation too low, with the consent of the members of the Committee on Appropriations around me, I will move to make the amount \$10,000; so as to make the entire appropriation for furnishing the building and completing its internal works, \$21,000. I feel very confident that my friend from West Virginia will find that very ample. I ask him, therefore, to modify his amendment by making the amount \$10,000.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. If the gentleman will put the amount at \$15,000, I will accept that.

Mr. HOLMAN. We think \$10,000 very ample.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. Very well; I accept it, and modify the amendment so as to make the amount \$10,000.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph :

Court-house, custom-house, and post-office, Evansville, Indiana: For completion of building, \$20,000.

Mr. FULLER. I offer the following amendment :

Strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$49,000."

For the information of the Committee of the Whole, I desire to have a letter from the superintendent of the building read.

The Clerk read as follows :

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF CONSTRUCTION,
UNITED STATES CUSTOM-HOUSE, POST-OFFICE AND COURT-HOUSE,
Evansville, Indiana, January 29, 1877.

DEAR SIR: Will you please inform me as to the prospect of the passage through Congress of the appropriation for the above-named building, included in the Treasury estimates for the present session. The balance yet subject to appropriation under the act of January 16, 1873, as amended by the act of June 23, 1876 is \$50,000 in round numbers, perhaps really only \$49,000. The total appropriation is limited to \$200,000, exclusive of the cost of site, which has cost about \$99,000. Total appropriations previous to this session, \$250,000.

There have been expended on the building proper, and for expenses connected therewith, (not including the real estate or site,) about \$57,000. The building is nearly ready for the roof, and there is more than enough money already appropriated and subject to requisition to pay everything due on existing contracts, place the edifice under roof, and make everything ready for the interior finish. In my opinion, the structure can be completed within the appropriation of \$200,000, except perhaps the iron fencing, sidewalks, and other outside work, which is generally done by extra appropriations. This is also the case, I believe, with the movable furniture. The authorities at Washington, I know, have steadily determined and

endeavored to complete the building within the limits authorized by law, and doubtless will succeed.

So far as I am concerned, it is my earnest desire that this may be done, and that our city may have a good, substantial, handsome edifice, that will supply all her requirements in this regard for a generation or so to come. If Congress at this session will appropriate the \$49,000 or \$50,000 balance of the whole amount authorized, I doubt not that this sum will suffice to complete the building by the early spring of 1878 in a very satisfactory manner.

Hoping to receive early and favorable information from you in regard to the appropriation now pending, and thanking you for the interest heretofore manifested and the influence exerted by you in this behalf, I remain,

Very respectfully and truly, yours,

JAMES H. MCNEELY,
Superintendent.

Hon. BENONI S. FULLER,
Representative First Congressional District, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HOLMAN. As the hour of twelve o'clock has arrived, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUCKNER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 4682) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions, &c., were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated :

By Mr. DE BOLT: The petition of the officers and directors of the Merchants' Exchange, of the Board of Trade of Saint Louis, and of the letter-carriers of said city, that the pay of said carriers be increased, to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FENLEY: A paper relating to the establishment of a post-route from Volusia, on the Saint John River, to Leesburgh, on Lake Eustis, via Yallaha, Florida, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOUSE: The petition of school directors of Davidson County, Tennessee, for the donation of Ash barracks in said county for school purposes, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAPHAM: The petition of Edgar Parker and other citizens of Geneva, New York, for the repeal of the bank-tax laws, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUTTRELL: The petition of the Vinicultural Society of Saint Helena, California, for the amendment of the revenue laws relating to the importation of foreign wines and liquors, to the same committee.

Also, the petition of Milton S. Latham and others, of California, that if a subsidy be granted for a mail between the United States and China it be a semi-monthly mail, and the subsidy applicable alike to the Pacific Mail Steamship Company and the Occidental and Oriental Steamship Company, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCCRARY: Papers relating to the petition of W. A. Britton, late marshal for the western district of Arkansas, for compensation for certain services performed by him, to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWELL: The petition of J. R. Budd and 33 other citizens of Wayne County, Pennsylvania, for cheap telegraphy, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PURMAN: The petition of Amos Hunt and 35 other citizens of Washington City, District of Columbia, for the extension of the Capitol grounds and the erection of library and Supreme Court buildings, to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, the petition of citizens of Falls Church, Virginia, of similar import, to the same committee.

By Mr. JAMES B. REILLY: Four petitions, three from citizens of Pottsville, Pennsylvania, the fourth from citizens of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, for aid in the construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad, to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

By Mr. SAVAGE: The petition of T. Worthington, of Ohio, that he be granted a pension until paid for civil services, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: The petition of Abbie G. H. Todd and 93 others of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Massachusetts, and Daniel G. Todd and 63 others, for legislation restraining the manufacture of intoxicating liquors and the importation thereof into the United States to such an amount only as shall be required for medicinal and mechanical purposes in the arts, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions, one from Thomas Pickett and 36 others of Beverly, Massachusetts, the other from the Asiatic Bank of Salem, Massachusetts, and numerous bank officers of said city, for the repeal of the bank-tax laws, to the same committee.

By Mr. WARD: The petition of ship-owners, merchants, and underwriters of the port of New York, against crippling the usefulness of the United States Coast Survey by curtailing the usual appropriations for its support, to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WELLS, of Missouri: The petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of Saint Louis, Missouri, for the repeal of the bankrupt laws, to the Committee of Ways and Means

By Mr. WIGGINTON: The petition of John W. Burrows and 125 others, for a mail-route from Mariposa to Hites Cove, Mariposa County, California, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Delaware: A paper relating to the establishment of a post-route from Lewistown to Rehobeth, Delaware, to the same committee.

IN SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 22, 1877—10 a. m.

The recess having expired, the Senate resumed its session.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to make sundry reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. PADDOCK in the chair.) The Chair must rule that reports are not in order. The understanding of the Senate is that no business shall be transacted between the hours of ten and twelve. That is the agreement made by unanimous consent.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So much the worse for the people who labor under disabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont move that the Senate take a further recess until twelve o'clock?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, sir; I do not make any motion to interrupt public business at this stage of the session.

Mr. CHAFFEE. I move that the Senate take a further recess until twelve o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate took a recess until twelve o'clock.

The Senate re-assembled at twelve o'clock m.

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

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

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SPEAKER KERR.

Mr. McDONALD. I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, at the close of the morning hour, I shall ask the Senate to take up the House resolution respecting the death of Hon. Michael C. Kerr, late Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DISABILITY BILLS.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There may be memorials to be presented, but I ask unanimous consent to make a few reports at this time as I wish to leave the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report back all the disability bills that we have been able to examine. I first report the petition of John R. F. Tatnall, praying for the removal of his political disabilities, adversely. He appears by the books of the Treasury Department to be a defaulter to the Government. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 3859) to remove the political disabilities of Manning M. Kimmell, late of Cape Girardeau County, Missouri, we report adversely for the same reason. He appears to be a defaulter to the Government. That I move to have indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 4149) to remove the political disabilities of Lloyd I. Beall, of Virginia, we report adversely, for he appears to be a defaulter to the Government. I move that that be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 4207) to remove the political disabilities of F. E. Shepperd, of Virginia, we report adversely because he was dismissed from the Navy instead of having his resignation accepted. There are a good many cases of this character that I think when we can have an opportunity to look at them again at the next session we ought to modify the rule upon which we have acted and bring in the most of these cases; but at present, following the rule that we have had at this session, we feel obliged to report against these cases, but without prejudice, so that we can probably change the rule as to almost all of them at the next session. This bill I move to have indefinitely postponed for the present.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The petition of Dr. H. W. M. Washington praying for the removal of his political disabilities we report adversely upon, for the same reason. There is nothing that touches the honor of any of these gentlemen, and I am now speaking according to the rule that we feel obliged to follow so far. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Also the bill (S. No. 1137) to remove the political

disabilities of Charles L. Scott, of Alabama, because there is a House bill pending before us on the same subject, which, when we come to act upon it, will be disposed of. I move that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (S. No. 1138) to remove the political disabilities of Henry Myers, of Georgia, we report adversely, because he appears to be a defaulter to the Government. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 4437) to remove the political disabilities of Frank S. Armistead, a citizen of West Virginia, we report adversely, because he appears to be a defaulter to the Government, and in a very large amount. The others are not defaulters in very large sums. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 4439) to remove the political disabilities imposed upon John H. Forney, of Calhoun County, Alabama, by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States we report adversely, because he appears to be a defaulter to the Government. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 4448) to remove the political disabilities of A. W. Burnet, of South Carolina, we report adversely because he was a member of a State Legislature and has already been relieved by the act of the 22d of May, 1872, volume 17 of the General Statutes, page 142. He is not under disabilities at all now. I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask that the committee be discharged from the petition of J. L. M. Curry, praying the removal of his political disabilities. It is said to be a petition. It is only a letter and we are unable to get any information to find out what he was or why he was, if I may so say.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to state to the chairman of the committee that Mr. Curry was a member of the Thirty-seventh Congress.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We could not find anything about him. We had only before us a letter.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That letter is addressed to me, and as it contains the request to have his disabilities removed, I thought it would be sufficient. If the Senator will make no report on that case I will have the petition presented in a proper form.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well, I withdraw the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report is withdrawn.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Upon the bill (H. R. No. 4475) removing the political disabilities of Joel S. Kennard, of Savannah, Georgia, we report adversely because he appears to be a defaulter to the Government. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Upon the bill (H. R. No. 4204) to remove the political disabilities of William Sharp, of Norfolk, Virginia, we report adversely for the simple reason that he was dismissed. There is nothing that affects his honor, but he falls within the rule I have spoken of. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (S. No. 1237) to remove the political disabilities of H. H. Lewis, of Baltimore, Maryland, we report adversely. He was dismissed from the Navy instead of having his resignation accepted, and we feel obliged to report against him. There is nothing that affects his character at all that we know of at the present time. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The bill (H. R. No. 223) to relieve A. B. Conrad, of Virginia, of all political disabilities, we report adversely. He was dismissed from the Navy instead of accepting his resignation, and he falls within the same category, but there is nothing that affects the morality of his conduct that we know of. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The petition of W. E. Wysham, of Baltimore County, Maryland, praying for the removal of his political disabilities, is also reported adversely for the same reason, that he was dismissed from the Navy instead of having his resignation accepted. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the same report in regard to the bill (H. R. No. 2811) to remove the political disabilities of C. H. Williamson, of New York, who was dismissed. I move its indefinite postponement.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the same report as to the bill (H. R. No. 3151) to remove the disabilities of John Johnson, of the county of Granville, and State of North Carolina, who was dismissed. I move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I make the same report upon the bill (H. R. No. 3264) to remove the political disabilities of C. H. Kennedy, of Vir-