

Marysville, Berry County; Gaines, Lewisburgh, Port Allegany, and Tioga and McKean Counties, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Of J. C. Faris and 103 members of Post 96, Grand Army of the Republic, of Mount Ayr, Ringgold County, Iowa.

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of soldiers of Birmingham, and of soldiers, sailors, and citizens of Blain, Perry County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BELDEN: Of Jacob Schwarz and 24 others, veteran soldiers and sailors of Syracuse, N. Y., and of Nathan Wright and 14 other soldiers and sailors of Cardiff, N. Y.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Of Daniel W. Barber and others, ex-soldiers of Wayne County, and of A. R. Teft and others, ex-soldiers of Plymouth, Mich.

By Mr. DE LANO: Of Post No. 383, Grand Army of the Republic, of Candor, Tioga County, New York.

By Mr. McSHANE: Of ex-soldiers and sailors of Nebraska.

By Mr. MAISH: Of ex-soldiers and sailors of Adams County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. NELSON: Of soldiers and citizens of Minnesota.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Of Laren Kent Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Omaha, Gallatin County, Illinois.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of 109 citizens of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BURROWS: Of citizens of Michigan.

By Mr. DARLINGTON: Of 151 citizens of Chester County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. HERMANN: Of 54 citizens of Marion County, Oregon.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Of citizens of Birmingham, Ky.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 1, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

WILLIAM SACKMAN, SR.—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill 465, entitled "An act granting a pension to William Sackman, sr."

The beneficiary named in this bill served from December 24, 1861, to February 29, 1864, in the Fifth Regiment of the Missouri Militia Cavalry.

He was discharged on the day last named for disability. His certificate of discharge states his disability as follows:

"Palpitation of the heart and defective lungs, the disability caused by falling off his horse near Fredericktown, Mo., while intoxicated, on detached service, in the month of September, 1862. Not having done any duty since, a discharge would benefit the Government and himself."

It appears that a claim for pension was filed in the year 1881, in which the claimant alleged that—

"At Fredericktown, Mo., about the 10th or 12th of April, 1863, he had three ribs broken by falling from his horse while surrounded by guerrillas."

It will be seen that while the certificate of discharge mentions a fall in September, 1862, no allusion is made to any fracture of ribs, while the claimant alleges such an injury occurred in April, 1863.

In 1885 the surgeon who made the medical certificate attached to the discharge, in answer to an inquiry made by the Commissioner of Pensions, says:

"I have to state that I remember the case very distinctly. I made the examination in person, and was thoroughly acquainted with the case. I read the statement on which the application for discharge was based to the man, and he consented to have the papers forwarded as they read. The application for pension is fraudulent, and should not be allowed."

I have omitted references made to the habits of the soldier by this medical officer.

Of course much reliance should be placed upon these statements made by an officer whose business it was to know the exact facts, and who made his certificate at a time when such facts were fresh in his mind. There is no intimation that the surgeon who made the statement referred to was inimical to the soldier or influenced by any unjust motive.

The attempt to impeach the record thus made is based upon affidavits made by a number of the soldier's comrades, who testify to his character and habits, and only three of whom speak of an injury to the soldier caused by falling from his horse. Two of these affiants allege that they were with the claimant on detached duty when his horse took fright and ran away with him, injuring him so that he could not rise and get on his horse without assistance.

So far as these affidavits are before me no date of this occurrence is given, nothing is said as to the character of the injuries, and no reference is made to the condition of the soldier at the time. The third affiant, who speaks of an injury, says that it occurred while on duty on the march from Pilot Knob to

Cape Girardeau, in the year 1862 or 1863, and that it was caused by the soldier's being thrown from his horse. He says further that the soldier was not intoxicated at that time.

No mention is made that I can discover of any fracture of the ribs except in the claimant's application for pension made in 1881, seventeen years after his discharge, and in a report of an examining surgeon made in 1882.

With no denial of the soldier's condition, as stated by the surgeon, on the part of the only parties who claim to have been present at the time of the injury, I can not satisfy myself, in view of the other circumstances surrounding this case, that the allegations contained in the claimant's discharge are discredited.  
GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, April 30, 1888.

MARY SULLIVAN—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 838, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary Sullivan."

On the 1st day of July, 1886, an act was approved which is an exact copy of the one herewith returned. In pursuance of that act the beneficiary's name was placed upon the pension-rolls.

A second law for the same purpose is, of course, unnecessary.  
GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, April 30, 1888.

BRIDGES IN NORTH CAROLINA.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2345) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River, Black River, and the Northeast River, in the State of North Carolina; which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute.

Mr. RANSOM. I move that the Senate non-concur in the amendment of the House and request a conference on the disagreeing votes.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. RANSOM, Mr. VEST, and Mr. SAWYER were appointed.

ENOS J. SEARLES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 738) granting a pension to guardian of Enos J. Searles, of Clermont County, Ohio, which was, at the end of the bill, to add "and pay to his legally constituted guardian for him a pension of \$18 per month;" so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Enos J. Searles, of Clermont County, Ohio, late private Company L, Fifth Ohio Cavalry, and pay to his legally constituted guardian for him a pension of \$18 per month.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask the Senate to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. EVARTS presented the petition of Rev. W. P. Hazleton and 25 others, citizens of the Twenty-fifth Congressional district of New York, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Kings County, New York, Department of New York, praying for an appropriation for the erection of a monument at Fort Greene, in the city of Brooklyn, to the memory of the prison-ship martyrs; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PAYNE presented five petitions, signed by 110 ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Ohio, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8180) to regulate the liens of judgments and decrees of the courts of the United States, reported it with amendments.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Sarah J. Foy, praying to be allowed a pension, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2829) granting a pension to Sarah J. Foy; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2476) granting a pension to Charles F. Urban;

A bill (S. 2611) granting a pension to Charles Craft;

A bill (S. 2352) granting a pension to John F. Keran; and

A bill (S. 2596) to increase the pension of John A. Doyle.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2606) granting a pension to John B. Timberman, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2569) granting a pension to Robert Theodore Howard;

A bill (S. 2365) for the relief of James A. Armstead; and

A bill (S. 2362) granting a pension to Jackson Myers.

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

A bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to Lydia Hawkins;

A bill (S. 2656) granting a pension to the widow and minor children of Patrick Frawley;

A bill (S. 2638) granting a pension to Mrs. Emma Dill; and

A bill (S. 2629) to pension Bartola Thebant, a soldier in the Florida Seminole Indian war of 1849 and 1850.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2659) granting a pension to Antony Schomacker;

A bill (S. 2660) granting a pension to Spencer West; and

A bill (S. 2626) granting a pension to Catlena Lyman.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 41) granting a pension to Mrs. Octave Pavy;

A bill (S. 252) for extension of pension to Mrs. Ann Leddy; and

A bill (S. 1042) for the relief of Ann Leddy.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2631) granting a pension to Clarence Brown;

A bill (S. 2630) granting a pension to N. H. Guyton; and

A bill (S. 2573) granting a pension to George H. Boyd.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Isaac Fowler, praying to be allowed a pension of \$8 a month, submitted an adverse report thereon, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2700) granting increase of pension to Allen Blethen; and

A bill (S. 1822) granting a pension to Ann E. Cooney.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1940) to provide for the construction of a public building at Sterling, Ill., reported it with amendments.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1255) granting arrears of pension to Sarah E. Bra-shier, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred a petition of 24 citizens of Samoth, Massac County, Illinois, praying that Hugh B. Glass be granted an increase of pension, and the petition of Dr. Frederick Robinson, praying to be allowed an increase of pension, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the committee were discharged from their further consideration.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Hein;

A bill (S. 2052) for the relief of Bridget A. Murphy;

A bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to Martha V. Coleman; and

A bill (S. 1319) granting a pension to Anna Slater.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Johanna Dorman Smith, praying for the passage of an act granting an increase of pension to her minor child, Mary Elvira Dorman, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2830) granting increase of pension to Elvira M. Dorman; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a Department of Labor; and

A bill (S. 375) to restrict the use and sale of opium in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 653) defining the positions and salaries of assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments:

A bill (S. 2277) to provide for the extension of the public building at Lynchburgh, Va.; and

A bill (S. 2278) for the improvement and enlargement of the public building at Petersburg, Va.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. COKE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2831) for improving the

mouth of the Brazos River, Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GRAY introduced a bill (S. 2832) for the relief of General William F. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Casper Blanke, of Portland, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2834) granting a pension to Rebecca Craig; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2835) granting a pension to James Taggart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2836) granting a pension to William E. Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2837) for the relief of John S. Logan, assignee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Mower; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2839) for the relief of Barker, Williams, and others; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORRILL introduced a bill (S. 2840) to establish an educational fund and apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands and receipts from certain land-grant railroad companies to public education, and to provide for a more complete endowment and support of colleges for the advancement of scientific and industrial education; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire that the bill shall remain upon the table, and I propose to submit some brief remarks in explanation of it.

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

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2841) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Edwards; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 2842) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Welsh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2843) granting a pension to J. D. Greer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2844) granting a pension to Squire Burns; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2845) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CALL. I introduce a joint resolution, and in introducing it I ask the Committee on Epidemic Diseases to give to it immediate consideration. The reports of the Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service exhibit a somewhat alarming apprehension in regard to the prevalence of yellow fever in a mild form in some portions of the United States. I therefore ask that the committee give immediate attention to the bill.

The joint resolution (S. R. 78) appropriating \$100,000 for the prevention and extirpation of yellow fever in the United States was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). The bill will be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases, if there be no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases; and I now give notice that a bill reported, perhaps a month ago, from that committee looking to the establishment of certain quarantine stations upon the coast, I shall on Friday next ask the Senate to consider.

#### AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPOONER. I send to the desk an amendment which I propose to offer to the sundry civil appropriation bill. I ask that it may be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance; and I wish to say in reference to it that it is the direct-tax-return bill precisely as it passed the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance, if there be no objection.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN CLASSIFIED SERVICE.

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

*Resolved*, That the Civil Service Commissioners be, and they are hereby, directed to send to the Senate, at as early a date as is practicable, a complete list of all persons who have, under certifications from the Civil Service Commission,

received probationary appointments to positions within the classified service, in Washington, since March 4, 1885; also a complete list of all persons who have received absolute appointments within the classified service in Washington since March 4, 1885.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1148) to grant a right of way to the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad Company through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2605) relating to the anchorage of vessels in the port of New York; and

A bill (S. 2671) to create and organize the county of Latah.

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

A bill (H. R. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek in the city of Michigan City, Ind.;

A bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler;

A bill (H. R. 6232) for the relief of Nancy G. Alexander;

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.; and

A bill (H. R. 8343) to authorize the construction of a wagon and foot-passenger bridge across the Noxubee River, at or near Gainesville, in the State of Alabama.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further 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 (S. 1413) to increase the pension of James Coey;

A bill (S. 1433) for the registry of the barges Albert M., Condor, and Adalente;

A bill (H. R. 112) granting a pension to George Schneider;

A bill (H. R. 1070) for the relief of J. A. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 1158) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster-General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualties," approved March 17, 1882;

A bill (H. R. 1438) to authorize the Kansas Valley Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Fort Riley military reservation in Kansas, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3333) to authorize the city of Chicago to erect a crib in Lake Michigan for water-works purposes;

A bill (H. R. 3617) for the relief of John C. Adams, administrator of Joseph Adams, deceased; and

A bill (H. R. 4082) for the relief of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama.

#### SILVER BULLION.

Mr. STEWART. If the morning business is through I should like to call up a resolution that I heretofore offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART, April 30, 1888, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a statement of the amount of silver bullion offered to the Government each month since the passage of the act of February 28, 1878, under the provisions of said act, and by whom, and at what prices; and also the amount of silver bullion purchased each month during such period, and from whom, and the prices paid therefor; and, further, to inform the Senate if the quotations of India council bills in London enter into the determination to any extent of what is the market price of silver bullion in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, there are two theories of finance. One theory is contraction and a single gold standard at all hazards and under all circumstances. The other theory is the use of both gold and silver as a limitation of the quantity of money that shall be in circulation and such reasonable expansion as the precious metals will afford.

I do not propose to reflect upon the motives of the parties who are advocating either of these theories, but I wish to explain their acts and have them understood.

It has been alleged that there is a combination between the Treasury Department and the Bank of England which has existed since the passage of the Bland act, to depress the price of silver, to bring that metal into disrepute, and to force this country to a single gold standard.

It will be observed, and ought to be known of all men, that the United States, or rather the Treasury Department, and the Bank of England are the principal purchasers of silver bullion. In fact they purchase all except what is used in the arts.

The act of 1878 required the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase at least \$2,000,000 worth of silver bullion per month, not less than that, and not exceeding \$4,000,000 worth. It was contemplated by the act that circumstances would arise where it would be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase more than \$2,000,000 worth per month.

I propose to show that circumstances existed which made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury from the first to purchase \$4,000,000 worth per month. If that had been done silver would be at par to-day; we would have about \$300,000,000 more of circulation; we would not have shrinkage of values, hard times, paralysis of business, general gloom, and low prices of wheat and cotton. I shall show that it has been in the power of the Secretary of the Treasury from the beginning to rescue this country from the financial embarrassment under which it has labored for the last fourteen years.

The Secretary of the Treasury having this power has combined with the Bank of England against the people. The English Government collects its taxes in India in silver rupees—silver coin. It draws what are called council bills against the India revenue and sells them in the market. It has done that for many years. It also buys what silver is used in India and issues therefor council bills. It also buys with these council bills pretty nearly all the silver that is shipped to China and Japan, and consequently the price of silver depends upon these council bills. Whenever the Bank of England wants to put down silver it lowers the price of council bills. If anybody else attempts to ship silver to India the bank puts the council bills up so that the silver will be worth more in London than in India. Several have tried it and failed; it has been given up, and the world now has ceased to make any attempt to compete with the Bank of England in the purchase of silver for Asiatic consumption.

Then the United States and Great Britain, or rather the Treasury Department of the United States and the Bank of England, are the sole purchasers of silver, except what is used in the arts, and can put the price of silver where they please without regard to the laws of supply and demand. Before I am through I shall show why England puts the price of council bills down and puts silver down, and I shall show that she does it for the purpose of obtaining cheap breadstuffs from America and to give India the control of the cotton and wheat markets of the world, and also to enhance the value of bonds and other obligations for the payment of money.

With regard to the increase of these council bills since the passage of the Bland act I will give a statement from the American interests, of December 15, 1886, published by Dr. Ivan C. Michels:

#### INDIA COUNCIL BILLS.

In dealing with the silver question it is most important to take into account the amount of India council bills drawn by the India office in England upon the Government of India.

India sends to England an annual tribute of about £15,000,000 sterling, the tribute representing the expenditure on Indian Government account made in England. The manner in which these £15,000,000 sterling are transmitted to the India council is this:

The India council in England draws bills on the government of India, payable in silver at Calcutta, Bombay, or Madras. These bills the India council sells in the London market for so much gold. The purchasers are usually the Indian banks who have remittances to make to India. Thus a banker, wishing to send money to India, can either buy as much silver and ship it, or forward a mercantile bill on India, or an India council draft. An India council draft, therefore, is equivalent to so much silver deposited in India, and accordingly a strong competition always prevails between silver and India council drafts when remittances to India have to be made.

Since the coinage act of 1873, which was enacted by Congress for the benefit of Great Britain, the amount of India council drafts sold in London has shown a remarkable increase.

In 1873 the amount of council bills drawn on India amounted to 142,657,000 rupees, or \$68,475,360, while prior to that year, and for the six preceding years, the yearly average was only 82,876,029 rupees, or \$39,780,499, rapidly increasing year by year until the enormous sum of 2,077,833,226 rupees were drawn against India from 1874 to 1885, inclusive. If we consider that 2,077,833,226 rupees are equal to \$997,359,948.48, or at a yearly average of \$83,113,329.04, we find that the increase of drawing council bills on India has beyond cavil or dispute promoted the depreciation in the value of silver bullion.

Then the English commerce is left to itself. The imports England takes from India are much greater than the imports which India takes from England, and a part of the balance has to be paid for in specie, the rest being settled in indirect ways. But the increase in the council bills provided a competing remittance with silver; if a merchant in England wants to make a payment in Calcutta he has the choice either to buy council bills or send out silver, and of course so much less silver was sent. The effect is the greater because the government of India must bring their money home from India, and therefore must sell their bills, whereas silver bullion, like any other commodity, may go to many markets, and may be held when its price falls.

This is the reason for saying that the price of council bills rules the price of silver—not the price of silver that of council bills. It is the price which the more anxious seller must accept that for the moment predominates, and not that which the less anxious can wait for.

Trade in Great Britain has been languishing for many years. The demonetization of silver has precisely the same effect upon the agricultural interests of Great Britain as it has upon the agricultural interests of America. Their manufacturing interests are also depressed.

In 1886 Great Britain appointed a royal commission to inquire into the cause of trade depression. They took a large amount of evidence upon the situation and made a report about a year ago.

In 1887 another royal commission was appointed in Great Britain to inquire into recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals. I have read these reports, and I will give a summary of the result; and after that I shall read some of the evidence contained in those reports. But I will give first what was ascertained by the evidence, and I shall show to what the whole evidence tended.

The evidence confirms substantially the fact that the depreciation of silver has been the result of legislation and not of production; that the demonetization of silver by Germany and the Latin Union and the

United States has caused the fall in the price of that metal; that the depression of silver has produced depression in the price of all property from 33 to 35 per cent.; that the fall in prices, particularly of wheat, is very prejudicial to agriculture in England and the United States; but notwithstanding this, it is contended that the demonetization of silver has many advantages, so far as Great Britain is concerned, which overbalance the evil caused by it. They say that England is a creditor nation, and that the demonetization of silver enhances the value of bonds.

They say that England has paid tribute long enough to American cheap lands and cheap produce, and that it is essential for them to build up India. They say that they have already reached a point at which the wheat and cotton of India control the price of those staples throughout the world, and that manufacturers of England will ultimately be benefited by the development of the resources of India, because England has exclusive trade with India. They tell the manufacturers of England they must submit to the present depression of trade for future advantages, when the resources of India are developed by cheap silver. To the agriculturist they say: "If your burdens are too great we will give you a tariff on wheat and corn."

Their contention is that all the world is indebted to England; that she is a creditor nation, and commands the trade of the world. The whole world has to pay tribute to her. She has been compelled to pay tribute to America for breadstuffs and cotton; she proposes to develop the production of those articles in India, which can only be done by cheap silver. Notwithstanding the depression of trade, notwithstanding the ruin of her agricultural interests in England, she will adhere to the single gold standard, enhance the value of bonds by contraction, and develop the resources of India by cheap silver.

These are the general conclusions which the testimony before the royal commission tends to establish.

The Secretary of the Treasury has at all times since the passage of the Bland act contributed to the extent of his power to aid the Bank of England to depress the price of silver. In fact, he assumes that the arbitrary price fixed by council bills is the market value of silver, and purchases silver according to the quotation of council bills in London. He never has in a single instance exercised the discretion given to him by Congress to purchase more than \$2,000,000 a month, but has at all times purchased the least possible quantity, so as to leave as much silver as possible in the market and not interfere with the schemes of Great Britain to obtain cheap silver for the benefit of India.

I am aware that the system advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and to maintain which the whole power of every administration has been exerted since the demonetization of silver, is the policy of bondholders, creditors, and money dealers; that they are in favor of the single gold standard because it enhances the value of all obligations for the payment of money, and makes money dearer and property cheaper; that the present Secretary of the Treasury is acting with the financial combination to which he belongs. I have no fault to find with him personally. He is simply the agent put into the Treasury Department to carry out the views of the money powers who placed him there.

I now call attention to some English views developed by the royal commission.

Mr. R. H. Inglis Palgrave, Fellow of the Royal Society, was examined before the commission. He is a man of great learning. He exhibited some statistics as to the production of gold which I wish to call to the attention of those who desire to maintain the gold standard. He gave the yearly average of the production of gold, according to Dr. Soetbeer, which is as follows:

1851-1860.....	£28,650,000
1861-1870.....	26,600,000
1871-1880.....	23,000,000
1881-1884.....	19,500,000

Gold available for the supply of coin—estimates of yearly average, by Dr. Soetbeer:

1851-1860.....	£22,780,000
1861-1870.....	14,090,000
1871-1880.....	10,255,000
1881-1884.....	4,050,000

From the above tables it will be seen that the product of gold is constantly decreasing, while the amount used in the arts is increasing, and that the policy of the single gold standard is perpetual contraction and constant fall of the price of property and rise in the value of money.

The production of silver is not in excess of the present demand for that metal. Mr. David A. Wells, the life-long monometallist, has at last discovered that there is no danger of a flood of silver. In the May number of the Popular Science Monthly he says:

Something of inference respecting the economic changes of the future may be warranted from a study of the past. It may, for example, be safely predicted that whatever of economic disturbance has been due to a change in the relative value of silver to gold will ultimately, and probably at no very distant period, be terminated by a restoration of the bullion price of the former metal to the rates (50 to 61 pence per ounce) that prevailed for many years prior to the year 1873. The reasons which warrant such an opinion are briefly as follows:

Silver is the only suitable coin medium for countries of comparatively low prices, low wages, and limited exchanges, like India, China, Central and South America, which represent about three-fifths of the population of the world, or about a thousand millions of people. Civilization in most of these countries, through the advent of better means of production and exchange, is rapidly ad-

vancing, necessitating a continually increasing demand for silver as money, as well as of iron for tools and machinery.

Generations also will pass before the people of such countries will begin to economize money by the use to any extent of its representatives, paper and credit; under such circumstances a scarcity, rather than a superabundant supply of silver, in the world's market, is the outlook for the future; inasmuch as a comparatively small per capita increase in the use of silver by such vast numbers would not only rapidly absorb any existing surplus, but possibly augment demand in excess of any current supply.\* The true economic policy of a country like the United States, which is a large producer and seller of silver, would therefore seem to be, to seek to facilitate such a result, by removing all obstacles in the way of commerce between itself and silver-using countries, in order that through increased traffic and consequent prosperity the demand for silver on the part of the latter might be promoted.

The situation suggests what is reported to have been contemplated, namely, the formation of a syndicate like the so-called recent French syndicate in copper, for intercepting the current market supplies of silver by speculative purchases and vast holdings, with a view of compelling an immediate rise in the bullion price of this metal.

POWER OF ABSORPTION OF SILVER IN INDIA.

As to the imports of silver into India since the demonetization of silver in the United States, in 1873, the results are almost incredible.

According to the returns published by Hon. D. Barbour, financial secretary to the Government of India, hence an indisputable official authority, in his work on the "Theory of Bi-Metallism," on page 108, the imports of silver into India were: 1872-'73, 7,000,000 rupees, increasing in 1873-'74 to 25,000,000 rupees, and so on until in 1878, when the purchase of silver bullion in the United States was made by law at the "market value," it reached the enormous sum of 147,000,000 rupees.

The official "Blue Book" of the British Government for India, page 25, gives the following imports of silver into India:

	Rupees.
1881-'82.....	64,663,889
1882-'83.....	83,580,218
1883-'84.....	74,085,065
1884-'85.....	91,100,254
1885-'86.....	101,212,496

Total for five years..... 414,541,922  
 Equal to \$198,981,122, or at an average of \$39,796,225 per annum.

When we consider that during the same period of five years, 1881-'82 to 1885-'86, the production of silver in the United States amounted to \$236,400,000, and India alone was able to absorb \$198,981,122 worth, it is no wonder that the fight for the further depression of silver is so desperately carried on by the enemies of this country and to the profit of India and the British Government. The profit alone to Great Britain upon the imports of silver bullion at the average rate of \$1.10 per ounce for these five years amounts to \$30,681,122.

Nothing has been done in this country to relieve the contraction resulting from the demonetization of silver except the passage of the Bland act. On the contrary, every effort has been made by the Treasury Department, or rather the gold syndicate through the agency of the Treasury Department, to manipulate the currency for the benefit of speculators and dealers in bonds.

I have prepared statements showing the amount of circulation in 1865, 1879, and 1883, which show enormous and continued contraction. They are as follows:

1865.

Circulation of money in the United States June 30, 1865.

[From paper prepared by United States Treasurer for American Almanac, 1887, page 340.]

State-bank notes.....	\$142,919,638
National-bank notes.....	146,137,860
Legal-tender notes.....	432,687,966
Demand notes.....	472,603
One and two years' notes of 1863.....	42,338,710
Compound-interest notes.....	193,756,080
Fractional currency.....	25,005,829

Total currency..... 983,318,686

Add to this gold coined in United States—	
1860.....	\$4,354,576
1861.....	47,963,145
1862.....	30,036,808
1863.....	3,340,941
1864.....	2,888,267

Add to this gold and silver in circulation, Pacific coast (estimated). 40,000,000

Grand total..... 1,112,902,423  
 In United States Treasury June 30, 1865..... 858,309

Leaving in circulation..... 1,112,044,114

Population, according to census, 35,000,000, of which 11,000,000 were in the Southern States; hence 24,000,000 only. The amount per capita equals \$46.37.

\*According to statements submitted to the royal (English) commission on trade depression, "The quantity of pure silver used for coinage purposes, during the fourteen years ending 1884, was about 18 per cent. greater than the total production during that period; and there are other estimates which place the consumption at a still higher figure. It is to be remembered that the coinage demand is fed from other sources than the annual output of the mines. It is supplied to some extent by the melting down of old coinage. Allowing for this, however, the evidence of statistics goes to show that the coinage demand for the metal is, and has been, sufficient to absorb the whole of the annual supply that is left free after the consumption in the arts and manufactures has been supplied; and this conclusion is supported by the fact that nowhere throughout the world has there been any accumulation of uncoined stocks of the metal."—London Economist.

1879	
Circulation of money in the United States June, 1879, the period of resumption:	
State-bank circulation.....	\$352,452
National-bank notes.....	329,691,697
Legal-tender greenbacks.....	346,681,016
Silver certificates.....	2,466,950
Demand notes.....	61,470
One and two year notes of 1863.....	86,185
Compound-interest notes.....	259,000
Fractional paper currency.....	39,360,529
Paper currency, total.....	734,801,995
According to report of the Director of the Mint for 1879, page 198, Finance Report, the amount of gold and silver in the United States was:	
Gold.....	286,490,698
Silver.....	112,050,985
Total.....	1,133,343,678
In United States Treasury September 30, 1879, including bullion fund.....	\$145,108,037
Leaving in circulation.....	988,235,641
Population, 50,000,000—\$19.76 per capita.	
1888.	
Metallic stock in bullion and coin according to Report of Director of the Mint for 1887, page 82:	
Gold coin and bullion.....	\$654,520,335
Silver coin and bullion.....	352,993,566
Total.....	1,007,513,901
From this deduct estimate for loss, abrasion, etc.....	50,000,000
Revised grand total.....	957,513,901
Add legal-tender notes.....	346,681,016
National-bank notes.....	162,217,700
Representative of money in United States.....	1,466,412,617
From this deduct locked up in the United States Treasury.....	394,759,560
Total.....	1,071,653,057
Population, 62,000,000—\$17.29 per capita.	

RECAPITULATION.

	Per capita.
In 1865.....	\$46.37
In 1879.....	19.76
In 1888.....	17.29

The \$162,000,000 of national-bank circulation will soon be retired. The question is already presented as to what shall take the place of the currency so retired. The national banks want the public debt made perpetual in order that they may control the circulation. The people want both precious metals used and no more national-bank issues, and demand that the United States shall no longer surrender its sovereign power to issue money to private corporations.

The statement that the circulation is increasing is a sad mistake, as will be seen by the foregoing tables. It is constantly growing less per capita and dearer, while property is growing cheaper. Much of the money outside of the Treasury is hoarded, because confidence in business is destroyed, money is growing dearer, and property cheaper. Interest is also falling for want of confidence, and also because enterprising men dare not borrow money and invest it in property which is shrinking in value. Low rate of interest is an invariable indication that times are hard and confidence is weak.

Prudent men will not borrow money in times like these to engage in any kind of business involving the purchase of property. Everybody knows that money and obligations for the payment of money, where the security is undoubted, is the only profitable investment.

I propose now to give you English opinions of what we are doing. I will first quote from a remark made in June, 1886, at an important meeting of the British and Colonial Chamber of Commerce, in London, at which there was an animated discussion of the silver question and its bearings upon the commerce of India, by Sir Robert N. Fowler, M. P., a London banker and an ex-lord mayor, who said—

That the effect of the depreciation of silver must finally be the ruin of the wheat and cotton industries of America, and be the development of India as the chief wheat and cotton exporter of the world.

I will read a few more extracts from the testimony taken by the royal commission. I first read from the testimony of James Shield Nicholson, professor of political economy in the University of Edinburgh, and a very learned man, as his testimony amply attests. He says:

First of all, with regard to the fall in the gold price of silver, will you state what in your opinion has been the cause of that fall?

Briefly expressed, I should say it was due to the demonetization of silver by several nations.

That is to say, to a diminution of the demand?

Yes. I do not think—that is to say, that the change that has undoubtedly taken place in the supply would in itself have had any effect upon the ratio at all.

There has been some increase in the supply of silver?

Yes, so I understand; but still, judging from the effects, in former times especially, I do not think that the increase in production would have really had any effect in disturbing the ratio.

H. R. Grenfell, ex-governor and director of the Bank of England, was also examined and testified at great length, and displayed great learning and experience. He was asked many questions; I will read a few extracts from his testimony:

At present gold is worth about twenty times as much as silver, and you pro-

pose by law to give it fifteen and a half times the value of silver. Is not that going against the natural law?

Before you can say what the relative value of gold and silver is you must demonetize gold, and when you have done that you will have some other thing than the money standard to tell you what the relative value is. At the present time, the privilege of the law having been conferred on gold and taken away from silver, the ratio is 20 or 21 to 1, but you can not say what the natural ratio would be unless you demonetized gold first.

Again:

Well, then, since that time it is a fact, is it not, that the gold price of silver has gone down in the market?

Yes.

If that is so, how would you account for the fall in the price of silver?

Because the demand for gold has been much greater.

But is not this demand for silver a very large one?

The demand for gold is unlimited. By the Bland act that of silver is limited.

He calls attention to the Bland act. He explains the reason why the demand under the Bland act has not put up silver, because it is a limited demand. If there is any left over, of course it would affect the market quotation. The same witness again testifies:

I may take it, then, that you consider beyond doubt that prices are influenced by an expansion or contraction of the volume of legal-tender money, and that they would rise and fall with that volume?

Yes, that is my opinion.

You said, I think, that you agreed with Mr. Gibbs, generally speaking, in his evidence; therefore perhaps I need hardly ask you whether you trace the disturbance in values to the legislation of Germany and subsequent legislation abroad in demonetizing silver since 1873?

I consider the action of the closing of the mints to silver in France following on the demonetization in Germany was the main cause.

Then, as a matter of fact, in your opinion the entire scale of prices has been suddenly affected since 1873 by the fact of that foreign legislation?

Yes.

Again:

I think you said you had no fear whatever that the operation of the Bland bill was likely to be suspended?

From what I hear I think it is almost impossible that it should be suspended. But supposing it was suspended, do I gather from you that the effect of that suspension in your opinion would be to cause a still greater fall in the value of silver?

Certainly, and in the exchange with India.

And that all the evils which arise from the present system, in your opinion, would be proportionately increased?

Certainly.

Again:

I would ask you now, after looking at the figures that I have given you, to consider how you think it is that that scarcity of gold, or the increased demand for gold, in proportion to the supply, has arisen?

I would answer that I believe the scarcity of gold and the fall of prices to be absolutely convertible terms, and that there is no other meaning in the appreciation of gold and the fall in prices; they appear to me to be absolutely synonymous.

Then I would ask you another question, whether prices do not depend on the quantity of the commodities, as well as upon the quantity of gold?

That is quite compatible with the other; all I mean to say is that the two things are absolutely the same. The appreciation of gold and fall of prices are absolutely synonymous to me.

Again:

Q. The amount of gold and silver which has been dug out of the earth.

A. As long as the mints were ready to coin either metal it did not matter how the production varied.

Q. Then you think that it would have made no difference if the foreign mint regulations had remained as they were; that the production of silver in the world has increased from the date of the great gold discoveries from £8,000,000 to £25,000,000 a year, while the production of gold has fallen from £30,000,000 a year to about £20,000,000?

A. Upon the figures you give me prices ought to have risen under the old arrangements. The variations of the supply in quantity of gold and silver between 1873 and 1884 have varied much less than they did during the time that prices did not change at all.

Again:

Would the bi-metallic law, do you think, if it were introduced as we are proposing, would it have the effect of steadying that fall of wages?

I think it would create a greater demand for labor in the manufacturing districts, and I think it would stay the fall in the agricultural districts.

Again:

Then I gather your opinion to be that the action of Germany and other countries which have adopted the gold standard has affected the relative values of gold and silver by increasing the demand for gold and decreasing that for silver?

Yes, for the purpose of coinage.

Here is Mr. Gibbs, another ex-governor and director of the Bank of England, a learned man, and his opinions may be of some value:

Will you tell the commission how you understand the Gresham law to operate in practice?

If two kinds of money circulate in a country, the cheapest will drive out the dearest. That is the "Gresham law." But what is meant by cheapest and what by dearest is not always clearly understood, nor how the driving out is to be accomplished, nor what is the effect on the country so situated.

Then he goes on to explain that when one country uses more silver or more gold in its circulation than another country the coin will flow from one to the other; that which is undervalued will go to the country where it is overvalued.

Here is Professor Nicholson again, who was recalled:

I believe you are of opinion that a variation in the relative value of the two standards, such as has occurred in recent years, would give, for a time at any rate, an advantage to the producer in silver countries, and would especially affect industries in gold and silver countries which produce the same article for sale in the same markets?

It seems to me it would be so, unless silver prices rose.

The variation would specially affect industries in the gold and silver countries which produced the same article for sale in the same markets?

Yes.

Is it your opinion that this variation in the relation between the two standards in recent years has been sufficient to relatively stimulate production in the silver countries and to cause a corresponding depression in gold countries?

As far as I can gather, the prices in silver-using countries have not moved upwards, and therefore it would follow that the gold prices must have moved downwards, and so there would be a depression in the gold-using countries from that cause through the fall in prices.

I suppose this relative stimulus and depression would only be temporary, and must cease if silver ceases to fall relatively to gold.

Yes, so far as that cause is concerned.  
If silver continued to fall relatively to gold the stimulus and depression would continue as long as silver continued to fall?

Of course silver can not go on being depreciated forever; it must come to a stop some time, and then the stimulus and depression would cease.

And if silver rose relatively to gold you would have the opposite effect—a temporary stimulus in gold countries and a temporary depression in silver countries?

Yes, that seems to me to follow.

I now call attention to a witness who has visited this country, and who has given great attention to the subject of finance, named J. Barr Robertson, and I call particular attention to his testimony, because it is so pertinent to the question. He says:

Let me suppose now that two gentlemen each invested £100,000 in the period 1870-'74, but that the one invested in consols and the other bought an estate with a rental from crops corresponding to the purchase-money. To-day the owner of the consols has his £100,000 intact, with a purchasing power over commodities as compared with the time he made the investment of £143,000, and he has his £3,000 a year, with an increased purchasing power of £1,290. On the other hand, the owner of the estate could not sell it for £70,000, and yet if the volume of money had been kept up from 1876 till the present time, as it was from 1866 to 1875, there can be no doubt that his property would, under average circumstances, have been worth £100,000 to-day, and would have been yielding a corresponding rental. This amount of depreciation is due solely to the mediatization produced by a contracting currency, which has given to the owner of the consols part of the value of the other gentleman's estate.

The farmer and manufacturer have had to accept continually over the last ten years lower and lower prices for the benefit of the owner of obligations in figures, to whom the farmer, the manufacturer, and the producer generally had to gradually give up their wealth and become themselves impoverished.

A careful investigation of this question would probably show that the mediatization of wealth from the producing classes and those allied with them to the holders of securities and the possessors of mortgages, annuities, fixed incomes, etc., has taken place in the United Kingdom in the last twelve years to at least £2,000,000,000, equal to about \$10,000,000,000.

Suppose two gentlemen in the United States in 1863-'64 each invested \$10,000, one in a farm yielding net 6 per cent. per annum, and the other in United States bonds, at 50 cents on the dollar which would equal \$20,000 in bonds. The investment in bonds would have yielded \$1,200 per annum for, say, fourteen years, making \$16,800, and since the same was funded to the present time—ten years—\$800 per annum = \$8,000. Total interest = \$24,800. Principal \$20,000, 26 per cent. premium = \$25,200. Principal, interest, and premium to date of the bonds = \$50,000. The man who invested his money in the farm and was subjected at once to contraction and hard times for the purpose of enhancing the value of his neighbor's bonds, is very differently situated. By hard work he has barely made a living, and is in the best of luck if he has not been compelled to mortgage his farm to support his family, and the value of the farm for which he paid \$10,000 has been reduced by the process of contraction of the currency nearly one-half and could not now be sold with the improvements for more than \$6,000.

This process has been going on until the wealth of the nation has been transferred from the people to the various classes of bondholders.

I desire to reproduce an extract from the St. Louis Republican read in the Senate a few days ago by the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE]:

It would be instructive to have the exact figures showing farm mortgages in the United States. There is no Federal law nor general law in the States for collecting the statistics, and they can therefore only be estimated. A correspondent of the New York Times, writing from Gypsum City, Kans., taking for a basis the recent statement that one-half the farms in Michigan are mortgaged, makes the following estimate for the ten leading Western States:

In Ohio.....	\$701,000,000
In Indiana.....	338,000,000
In Illinois.....	620,000,000
In Wisconsin.....	250,000,000
In Michigan.....	350,000,000
In Minnesota.....	175,000,000
In Iowa.....	351,000,000
In Nebraska.....	140,000,000
In Kansas.....	\$200,000,000
In Missouri.....	237,000,000

Total farm mortgages in the ten States..... 3,422,000,000

This aggregate is so enormous that we are inclined to think the respective sums in the States are overestimated. Still, it is a well-known fact that in the older and more prosperous States of the West, every fourth or third farm is mortgaged, and, in the newer ones, two out of three are in that condition, and the bulk of these claims is held in the prosperous and rich industrial States of the East. The insurance companies of the little city of Hartford, Conn., own \$70,000,000 in Western farm mortgages; and the loan companies of Boston hold \$76,000,000 more. Here is \$146,000,000 in two cities to begin with, and it is certain that if complete returns could be had from all the nine industrial States the aggregate would be immense, probably one-half the assessed value of Western farms.

As the average annual net earnings of farming in the United States are only about 3½ per cent. on the capital invested, while the interest charged on these mortgages is 7 to 9 per cent., it is clear that the mass of farmers can not pay their debts, and that, sooner or later, their farms will fall into the hands of their creditors, and the great money-lending corporations of the rich manufacturing States will own fully one-half the Western States.

The above table must be an exaggeration, but the lowest estimate I have seen of farm mortgages in the Mississippi Valley was the enormous sum of \$1,200,000,000.

These mortgages are pressing very heavily. The national debt is a very

small part of the debt of this country. The United States has in it more bonds of railroads than any other country ever had. We have built railroads for the last twenty-five or thirty years with greater rapidity than any other country by our credit system with bonds. The people are compelled to pay on their freight the interest on these bonds; and by means of these railroad bonds and these mortgages and the national debt and State and corporation debts, and private debts, combined, more than half the property of the country has been transferred from the debtors to the creditors by the process of contraction, by the process of attempting to reach the gold standard. Just look at the colossal fortunes held by individuals in New York—look at the Vanderbilts and Goulds and others who have accumulated hundreds of millions by manipulation of money and the contraction of the currency.

I will introduce a few more extracts. I read from a gentleman who was examined before the royal commission, by the name of T. Comber, who was largely engaged in trade in Manchester and Liverpool and Bombay, and appears to be a man of great intelligence:

What are the reasons why the fall has specially stimulated the exports and imports of India and would not do so in other silver countries?

In my opinion it has given the Indian producer an advantage over his competitors in other countries in this way, as the exchange falls the rupee prices, other things being equal, rise. The cost of production which he incurs in consequence of the fixed settlement in India, or, in other words, the rent he pays, does not advance, and if he employs labor, the wages also are slow to advance, and as matter of fact they have not yet advanced as much as the produce has. Under those circumstances I think the producer in India is at a decided advantage over his competitors, whether in England or in America, and to that extent I believe that it has stimulated exports.

Again:

As matter of fact, has the Indian price risen?

Not much; but it is immaterial, I think, in his competition with other countries whether he has obtained a rise in price, or whether he has avoided a fall in price which his competitors have had to suffer. I should like to quote the Viceroy of India dispatch on that point, if you would allow me. It is dated the 2d February, 1886, paragraph 13. I think it is addressed to Viscount Cross: "We would call your lordship's special attention to the fact that the Indian cultivator of wheat and cotton appears to have actually gained, while the English and American producer of these commodities has suffered by the fall in the rate of exchange."

That is the view of the governing authority of the British mint. I now quote from Mr. H. L. Raphael, a bullion broker and financier, and a very sharp witness:

Statistics would hardly forward us, because I think that every one will allow that, perhaps with the exception of coffee, which, owing to a special cause went up last year very considerably from the fear of a short crop, every other article of food has been steadily and persistently declining; and this decline has been contemporaneous with the decline of silver. The cause of our agricultural distress, I believe, has been rightly ascribed to the competition of large tracts of land in the United States which pay no rent, but there is no doubt that, as regards the agricultural interest, the decline in silver has had a very damaging effect; in fact, it has been the finishing stroke to a long course of suffering, originating in the competition from free land in the United States. I do not question this agricultural distress being a serious matter for England, because in a political point of view it drives our laborers into towns, where they become enervated, and no longer form the back-bone of our fighting power.

However, it might be wise to take the duty off tea and put it on corn, but we are not here to discuss that matter to-day. I only mention this point to explain what appears to me to be the absurdity, that in order to give relief to agriculture to a certain extent, we should adopt a supposed cure, namely, bimetallism, which would raise the price, not only of wheat, but nearly every article 30 or 35 per cent. But take wheat alone, which we are obliged to import in enormous quantities, you would adopt a ruinous course for the sake of relieving our agricultural population which might be relieved just as easily, say, by taking the duty off tea and putting it on corn. But, however, whether you do that or not, in order to give a certain amount of relief, you propose to make the whole of the population pay considerably more for the food that they consume.

Now, the wealth of England, other than the accrued wealth, namely, the interest which she draws from her investments abroad, consists, as we all know, in her iron, her coal, and in the manufacture of iron and other metals, and in a great quantity of other manufactures, such as cotton, wool, jute, and the like. If, by adopting bimetallism and paying foreign nations dearer for our food, which would be the inevitable result, is there such a certainty that they would buy more of our manufactures? If we paid America 8s. per quarter more for her wheat and corn, is it so certain that she would take more iron from us in return? Her manufactures, as you know, have been so stimulated by protection, which on iron is 50 to 60 per cent., that to-day she can manufacture for her own use the sufficient quantity. But even if she is obliged to import, it does not follow that she will come to England because we paid her more for our food.

I think that is a very good lesson for Americans. Again, I call attention to the testimony of Mr. Herman Schmidt, a discount broker, and a very intelligent man. He says:

I do not quite understand your view of the origin of this disturbance and difficulty. You say that it was due to what is called, whether correctly or not, the demonetization of silver by the Latin Union and by Germany, that made the value of silver lower? The demonetization of silver caused one portion of the demand to be dried up, to be closed, and a demand which always existed at a certain ratio, and from that moment of course silver could fluctuate to anything.

Again:

Now, would you kindly explain to me in what way you consider that a fall in the price of silver affects the price of wheat in this country?

Because wheat can be imported into this country at so much less; can be laid down in this country at so much less.

He explains more at length how the fall in the price of silver benefits India, and builds up the resources of that country.

Here is the testimony of W. Fowler, author of a work on Appreciation of Gold:

I admit you have given a number of very powerful arguments against it.

That is against remonetizing silver.

I only want to arrive at the possible objections when it is done?

I think, also, that it would tend to discourage the exports from India, and

thereby lessen the power of India to take our manufactures, and so would materially injure a large class of our people. According to the argument that I understand you to have used to-day, you lay great stress upon this export bounty. If it be so, it leads to considerable increase of the exports from India, and therefore a large increase in the exports from England to India, and Mr. O'Connor says, if you have great export you must have great import, and that is the universal rule of commerce—goods go against goods.

One more extract and I am done, and to this I wish to call particular attention. It is the testimony of Mr. Daniel Watney, who has given special attention and written on the subject of the relations of the two metals, and I call the particular attention of Americans to this testimony. It is short and pointed:

Why should a bimetallic convention say, at 20 to 1, it would break down, if all the important nations joined in it?

I should have to suppose that everybody is wise to suppose that it would remain. I can not suppose that everybody is wise. Just think of the folly of the United States when they were a debtor nation in adopting a gold coinage. They knew nothing about currency matters; they did not know that it was going to increase their debt enormously.

Is the United States a debtor nation?

I call it so.

What leads you to suppose that?

Well, I believe there are enormous quantities of stocks held in this country for railways and all sorts of industrial enterprises for which dividends are received in this country. Besides, if you look at their imports and exports you will find that invariably they are a greater exporting than an importing nation.

You are aware that almost all her public debt is held in America?

Oh, but that is very small in comparison with the other debts of the United States, so I believe.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the effect of the demonetization of silver on some of our industries. I am aware of the fact that when I speak of its injury to the silver interest the enemies of silver appear to take great pleasure, and say, "Of course he is a silver man," and consequently I have left that question out of my argument invariably, and have confined myself to showing how it injures other interests; but I think that in the greatest silver-producing country in the world I might say one word against the robbery of the silver miners.

The silver miners of the United States have suffered a loss on discount by the demonetization of silver of over \$80,000,000. This terrible and unjust tax has been imposed upon them to satisfy the greed of the creditor class, and it is refreshing to note with what complacency opulent members of the gold ring endure the disasters which they have brought upon their neighbors.

In 1873 and prior to the demonetization of silver, the silver dollar, since its first coinage in 1793, was always at a premium; in 1874 it was at par. Since 1874 the losses to the silver miners were as follows:

Year.	Production.	Average price per ounce.	Loss.
1875.....	\$31,700,000	\$1.27	\$712,000
1876.....	38,800,000	1.26	1,126,000
1877.....	39,800,000	1.14	5,600,000
1878.....	45,200,000	1.18	4,254,000
1879.....	40,800,000	1.13	5,318,000
1880.....	39,200,000	1.11	5,678,000
1881.....	43,000,000	1.13	5,597,000
1882.....	46,800,000	1.10	7,200,000
1883.....	46,200,000	1.10	7,106,000
1884.....	48,800,000	1.09	7,951,400
1885.....	51,600,000	1.08½	8,327,000
1886.....	50,896,124	1.05	9,788,624
1887.....	50,389,950	.98½	12,022,950
Total.....	646,336,074		80,679,974

By this loss of \$80,679,974 to the miners of silver in the United States the United States Government has profited by purchasing silver bullion at market value \$36,152,332.

I now call attention to the tremendous loss of the wheat and cotton producers of the United States occasioned by the demonetization of silver.

*Decline in prices for wheat and cotton since the demonetization of silver in 1873.*

[Export prices from 1872 to 1879, the resumption of specie payments, reduced from currency to coin prices.]

Years.	Wheat, per bushel.	Cotton, per pound.
1872.....	\$1.47	\$0.19½
1873.....	1.31	.19
1874.....	1.42	.15½
1875.....	1.12	.15
1876.....	1.24	.13
1877.....	1.16	.12
1878.....	1.33	.11
1879.....	1.06	.10
1880.....	1.24	.11½
1881.....	1.11	.11
1882.....	1.18	.11½
1883.....	1.12	.11
1884.....	1.66	.10½
1885.....	.86	.10
1886.....	.87	.10
1887.....	.89	.09½

In 1872 we exported 1,957,314 bales of cotton, equal to 782,925,690 pounds, for which we received \$152,670,492; while in 1887 we exported 4,477,582 bales, or 2,161,435,833 pounds, for which we received \$204,423,785.

We therefore gave 1,478,510,233 pounds more cotton in 1887, yet we received only \$51,753,293 more than we did in 1872, prior to the demonetization of silver in 1873. In fact these 1,478,510,233 pounds of cotton which we have in excess exported are in reality double the quantity of the whole amount exported in 1872, and yet instead of \$278,309,495 in excess of 1872 we have received only \$51,753,293 more than in 1872, thus leaving a loss to the planter and exporter of American cotton of \$226,556,202 on one year's crop.

To understand this loss more clearly, it becomes necessary to compare the prices paid in India for cotton with those of the United States. The first authentic export prices from official returns are those of 1874.

Year.	India.	Silver.	United States.
	Rupees, per cwt.	Per ounce, par.	Per pound.
1874.....	27.2		\$0.15½
1875.....	26.5	\$1.27	.15
1876.....	25.8	1.26	.13
1877.....	26.4	1.14	.12
1878.....	26.7	1.18	.11
1879.....	28.2	1.13	.10
1880.....	29.0	1.11	.11½
1881.....	26.5	1.13	.11
1882.....	26.0	1.10	.11½
1883.....	24.1	1.10	.11
1884.....	26.2	1.09	.10½
1885.....	26.6	1.08½	.10½

From the foregoing table it will be seen that the silver rupee has not depreciated in India, but as the market value in London for silver is regulated by the price at which council bills on India are issued in London, with the decline in silver in England the price for cotton declines in the United States. As to wheat the same causes produce the same effect on our prices.

Year.	India.	Silver.	United States.
	Rupees, per cwt.	Per ounce, par.	Per bushel.
1874.....	4.2		\$1.42
1875.....	4.6	\$1.27	1.12
1876.....	3.6	1.26	1.24
1877.....	3.5	1.14	1.16
1878.....	4.5	1.18	1.33
1879.....	4.9	1.13	1.06
1880.....	5.1	1.11	1.24
1881.....	4.4	1.13	1.11
1882.....	4.3	1.10	1.18
1883.....	4.3	1.10	1.12
1884.....	4.2	1.09	1.06
1885.....	4.0	1.08½	.85

Average price for wheat in India for the twelve years equal to 4 rupees 2½ annas per hundred weight, and if silver at par is equal to \$1.76 per hundred weight of 112 pounds, or \$1.05½ per bushel of 60 pounds; but in that period council bills were issued at an average of 1s. 6d. per rupee, which reduced the price equal to \$1.33 per hundred weight of 112 pounds, or the bushel of 60 pounds equal to 79½ cents.

The exports of wheat from India since the demonetization of silver in 1873 have advanced from 735,485 bushels in that year to 41,588,235 bushels in 1887; while the United States since the enactment of the law of February 28, 1878, which provides that the purchase of silver bullion shall be at the market value of silver in London, our exports from 153,252,795 bushels in 1878-'79, have dwindled down to 57,759,209 in 1885-'86, while during the same period India has increased her exports from 4,109,495 bushels to 39,312,969 bushels—almost 900 per cent.

I have read the testimony taken before these royal commissioners, and it all tends to the same point, and every sensible man will admit that the fall in the price of wheat and cotton was produced by the demonetization of silver. Last year the cotton planters lost on their crop by this demonetization and this fall in the price of cotton \$226,556,202, as is already shown. The table also shows the decline of the wheat interest of the country year after year with the decline in the price of silver side by side, and the price of wheat and cotton have gone down with the price of silver until the exportation of wheat and cotton from the United States have dwindled down both in price and quantity, to such an extent as to prostrate those industries.

While the exports of the United States have diminished, as these tables show, the exports of wheat and cotton from India have increased, so that they command the market and fix the price of those articles in Europe, as we have seen from the testimony I have read.

We have a country with boundless resources, but no money. We have lower prices for wheat and cotton than have prevailed for one hun-

dred years. We have built up colossal fortunes by the enhancement of bonds. Our rich men are as opulent as any on earth, while our farmers, mechanics, and laborers have lost much of their thrift and independence.

If the Secretary of the Treasury had bought \$4,000,000 a month of silver since the passage of the Bland act all this would have been averted, and that is easy to demonstrate.

India imports over \$39,000,000 of silver per annum. The United States produces in round numbers about \$50,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury purchased last year \$24,000,000 worth of silver bullion at the market price. It required over \$30,000,000, nearly \$34,000,000, at the standard value of silver, to supply the amount purchased with the \$24,000,000, on account of the discount. We exported about \$20,000,000. If the Secretary of the Treasury had bought \$4,000,000 a month it would have been necessary to have imported into this country from \$8,000,000 to \$14,000,000—\$14,000,000 if the price had not been raised. What a boon that would have been, and how it would have revived the drooping industries of the country! The Secretary of the Treasury well knew, but he would not heed. Why did he not, when he saw the distress, buy more silver and put up the price? No; he did not do that. He allowed England to fix the price by her council bills.

My resolution is to call for the exact information. He allowed them to depress our wheat, and our cotton, and destroy our industries and impoverish the producing classes of this country. He allowed England to fix the price of silver without attempting to raise his hand, but bought only the minimum, accumulated the funds in the Treasury, and complained of the surplus. When the President's message came it was suggested that the power to purchase bonds being in an appropriation bill, it was desirable to have Congress express itself affirmatively on the subject. A bill for that purpose passed the House and came to the Senate. The Senate said, yes, you can buy bonds; but if you do and the national-bank currency is retired thereby, you shall buy silver, so as to prevent further contraction.

That bill was returned to the House of Representatives with a request for a conference on the amendment, but no notice has been taken of that request. We have never heard from it since; but we did see go through the other House a resolution saying that it was the opinion of the House that the President had the power to purchase bonds, and with that indorsement, without any new law, the Secretary of the Treasury is to-day purchasing bonds at from 25 to 26½ per cent. premium. He is giving to these people who bought bonds at 50 cents on the dollar and have received in interest about 130 cents on the dollar, not only the principal, but \$26 on the hundred premium, all in gold. These bonds were originally payable in lawful money, but afterwards made payable by legislation in coin, and by the demonetization of silver made payable in gold. The effect of these purchases is to contract the currency by retiring the national-bank notes, making times more and more stringent while he refuses to exercise his power to buy silver and relieve the money market. Would he do this if there was any danger that the great money trust of New York would be unable to dictate the Presidential nominee in both political parties and thereby deny to the people the right to vote upon the question of gold and silver and prosperity, or gold alone and hard times?

He has had the power all the time to relieve the money market by buying silver, but he has not exercised it. On the contrary he has exerted every power conferred on him by legislation, dictated by a great money trust, to confer enormous privileges on a favored class of money changers. No class of men on earth ever possessed such privileges before. To-day the national banks are using over \$60,000,000 of the people's money without paying a cent of interest. The Administration speculates in bonds, putting up the premium, while the farmers are crushed to the earth without money to pay their mortgages.

I want to avoid saying anything unkind of this Administration. It is following in the footsteps of Republican administrations. It has been the policy of the gold-contraction party, the bond absorption party, the grand money trust of this country, which dominates both political parties, to contract money, to enrich the bondholders and impoverish the people. It has been the policy of the Administrations, whether Republican or Democratic, from the beginning. The time will come when the voice of the people will be heard and somebody except an agent of an overgrown monopoly will be in the Treasury Department to act for the interest of the people of the United States and not to do the bidding of Great Britain to destroy our prosperity, to ruin our products, to depreciate everything produced here, to increase the wealth of bondholders in England and bondholders in the United States and to augment the wealth of England's possessions and break down our own. We will some time—when it will come I do not know, but the time will come when we shall have an American policy, when we shall have somebody at the head of affairs who will hear the voice of all the people.

Ever since the passage of the Bland act there has been a majority in both Houses of Congress in favor of the complete and absolute remonetization of silver, but it is stopped at the other end of the Avenue. Presidential vetoes and Federal patronage stifle the voice of the people's representatives in Congress. The Bland act alone triumphed over a veto, but it has been robbed of nearly all its virtue by the

refusal by the Treasury Department to execute it fairly according to the intent and meaning of Congress. We have agents sent to Europe to inquire what the bondholders there want; and who bring arguments from them for American consumption. The arguments our agents claim they make are not the same that we find in the testimony they give when testifying before their own commissions in their own country, as I have shown. They admit that their policy is destructive of us. They say that is their purpose; that they will destroy their own agriculture or protect it by tariffs for the purpose of putting down wheat and cotton they are forced to buy from us, and that they will build up India, open up trade there, and benefit their own manufacturers in that way.

It is incredible to me that any man born on American soil or naturalized under American law can be so perverse, so deaf to the voice of the people, the voice of the two Houses of Congress, the voice of common justice, as to deny to the people of the Union both silver and gold without limit and without stint. I do not wish to cast special reflection upon anybody. I am dealing with a system that was inaugurated years ago.

From beginning to end I am at war with that policy, and I want a representative in the White House with an American policy, who is in favor of American industry, of equal rights, a champion of the people and not of the bondholders or English monopolists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the resolution.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to hear the resolution read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a statement of the amount of silver bullion offered to the Government each month since the passage of the act of February 23, 1878, under the provisions of said act, and by whom, and at what prices; and also the amount of silver bullion purchased each month during such period, and from whom, and the prices paid therefor; and, further, to inform the Senate if the quotations of India Council bills in London enter into the determination to any extent of what is the market price of silver bullion in the United States.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### NEW YORK CUSTOM-HOUSE EMPLOYÉS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate another resolution, coming over from yesterday under objection, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. SPOONER April 30, 1888, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate, at as early date as is practicable, full information as to employés in the customs service at the port of New York, in the offices of the collector, the naval officer, surveyor, and appraisers at said port, all of said information, as hereinafter detailed, to cover the time between March 4, 1885, and April 30, 1888.

First. Number, names, and official designations of employés removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885.

Second. Number, names, and official designation of employés appointed since March 4, 1885.

Third. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service created since March 4, 1885.

Fourth. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service created since March 4, 1885.

Fifth. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming within the classified service abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.

Sixth. Number and designation of offices and official positions coming below or outside the classified service abolished or left vacant since March 4, 1885.

Seventh. Total number of employés, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service March 4, 1885.

Eighth. Total number of employés, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service April 30, 1888.

Ninth. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service March 4, 1885.

Tenth. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service removed or resigned upon request since March 4, 1885.

Eleventh. Number, names, and official designations of heads of divisions in the customs service appointed since March 4, 1885.

Twelfth. Number, names, and official designations of temporary employés (excepting day laborers) appointed since March 4, 1885, with the date of appointment and terms of service of each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. I see no objection to the giving by the Department of the information called for. The seventh and eighth clauses will cause an immense amount of work, and it seems to me will be entirely useless.

Seventh. Total number of employés, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service March 4, 1885.

That will include the writing out of several thousand names and will necessarily consume a great deal of time. It is also contained in the Official Register, which was published July 1, 1887. And then the eighth item is:

Eighth. Total number of employés, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service April 30, 1888.

Which will be a partial repetition. I suggest to the Senator to leave out these two clauses, and the other sections will get all the information in regard to removals and everything of that kind that may be desired.

Mr. SPOONER. I am content to have those clauses eliminated.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that those sections be stricken out.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.  
The CHIEF CLERK. It is moved to strike out the seventh and eighth subdivisions, as follows:

7. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service March 4, 1883.  
8. Total number of employes, with name and official designation of each, in the customs service April 30, 1883.

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

Mr. SPOONER. I have accepted the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accepted and the resolution is so modified.

Mr. SPOONER. There will be a change in the number of items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course that change will be made, without objection. The question is on the resolution as modified.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FORFEITURE OF UNEARNED RAILROAD LANDS.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside informally the pending business and proceed to the consideration of Calendar number 1078, House joint resolution 56.

Mr. PLUMB. Before that is done I wish to suggest that as at 2 o'clock the special order will come up, I want to ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business to-morrow the bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes, which had the right of way to-day but has been laid aside, as the Senate understands, may be taken up, and then I shall have no objection to the proposition of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I withdraw my request for unanimous consent until that is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that to-morrow after the conclusion of morning business Senate bill 1430 be taken up for consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. Is that the land-grant forfeiture bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. The Chair hears no objection and it is so ordered.

#### CASTLE ISLAND, BOSTON HARBOR.

Mr. HOAR. I now move to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1078, being the joint resolution (H. Res. 56) authorizing the use and improvement of Castle Island, in Boston Harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read for information.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That permission be, and is hereby, granted to the city of Boston, in the State of Massachusetts, through its park commissioners, to improve and beautify Castle Island, situated in said city, and belonging to the United States, in connection with a public park to be laid out on land adjoining and connecting with said island, with the right to said city of Boston to make such excavations and fillings and erect and maintain such structures as the Secretary of War may from time to time approve: *Provided*, That this resolution shall not be construed to pass any title in said island, but that the ownership and control of the said grounds shall remain entirely in the United States, and shall be subject to such changes and uses for military or other purposes as the Secretary of War may direct.

Mr. PLATT. If the resolution is being read for information, we do not get much information, because we are entirely unable to hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is entirely correct, and the Chair must insist that there must be order in the galleries.

Mr. HOAR. The city of Boston is laying out a very extensive and costly system of public parks, and immediately adjacent to the land occupied by that system of parks is Castle Island, which contains an old fort that, I understand, is of very little value to the fortification of the city of Boston in view of the modern improvements in the means of attack. This resolve simply authorizes the park commissioners to use it as part of their system of parks, subject entirely to the control of the Secretary of War, and with a provision that the city shall never get any title and that it shall always be subject to such uses as the Secretary of War shall direct hereafter. It is a mere permission for the people to extend their walks and drives on the island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

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

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT EMPORIA, KANS.

Mr. PLUMB. I move now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1175, Senate bill 1913.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1913) for the erection of a public building at Emporia, Kans.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings or other-

wise;" and in line 11, after the words "sum of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices at the city of Emporia, Kans. The plans, specifications, and full estimates of said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed, for the site and building complete, the sum of \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$75,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PALMER. That may be informally laid aside.

Mr. INGALLS. According to the notice that I gave on Thursday last, I ask that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside for the purpose of enabling me to submit some remarks upon the motion to refer the message of the President of the United States to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside for the purpose of taking for present consideration the resolution referred to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN December 19, 1887, to refer the message of the President of the United States to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, on the 11th day of January, 1888, a little less than four months ago, Maj. Gen. Fitz John Porter, now on the retired-list, wrote a letter from which I quote the following extract:

And now to you, one of the thousands of kind, generous friends, whose hearts I have felt, whose forms I have never seen nor warm hands touched, I beg to express my heartfelt appreciation of your kind acts in my behalf, and to assure you, all of you, North and South, that my heart is and always has been with you, though at one time my hand and head worked the best they knew against you and your cause, believing, as I did, it was for the best.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] in the course of his observations last Wednesday complained with some bitterness that "a determined attempt was made during the war of the rebellion," and he added:

It has been continued since, to blacken the names of the great civil as well as military leaders who remained true to the Democratic party, as at enmity with the cause of the Union and in an alliance of sentiment at least with the Confederacy.

He also admitted, what never has been conceded hitherto, so far as I am advised, by any Democratic orator, that there is such a crime as treason, and that to be an ally of the Confederacy was to be a traitor. From his complaint at the accusations which he declared had been made, the irresistible inference was, first, that the implications against the civil and military leaders of the Democratic party as sympathizers with the South were not true; and next, that if they were true, they were discreditably and dishonorably.

Fitz John Porter was a military leader in the war for the Union who remained true to the Democratic party. He was dishonorably dismissed from the Army by the sentence of a court-martial, and many years after the war ended, at the close of a fierce struggle in Congress, was placed on the retired-list by the united support of the Democratic party, including many of its members who had been soldiers in the army of the Confederacy. It was claimed by his friends that he was a gallant warrior who had been sacrificed as a political victim, but he assures the Confederates in the letter which I have read that his heart was always with the South, although at one time his head and hand were against them and their cause. That even at that fatal crisis when his head and his hand were "working their best" for that brave Commander-General John Pope, whom the Senator from Indiana describes with somewhat of redundant and elaborate affluence of diction as a vain, pretentious, specious, boasting, and vain-glorious pretender—that even then his heart was, as it had always been and has ever since been, with Jeff. Davis, Lee, and Stonewall Jackson. And Fitz John Porter, like every other general who was suspected and distrusted by Lincoln and the Northern people, is canonized as a sainted patriot and hero by the Democratic party North and South. They know their friends.

Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan was another military leader who retained his allegiance to the Democratic party. Born in Pennsylvania and educated at West Point, he went immediately to New Orleans, where he became the intimate business associate and political friend of Beauregard, and allied himself actively with the schemes for the extension and perpetuation of human slavery by the acquisition of Cuba, being concerned in that filibustering enterprise with Albert Sidney Johnston, Gustavus W. Smith, Mansfield Lovell, and J. K. Duncan. He began his military career by disobeying the orders of General Scott. He abandoned Pope to the mercy of his foes at Centerville. He failed to put the rebels to the sword at Antietam and refused to obey the orders of the President of the United States to follow them to Winchester. He fatally controlled the destiny of the Army of the Potomac until the battle of Fredericksburgh, and was the intimate friend, associate, and companion of Maj. Gen. Fitz John Porter.

In the Peninsula campaign he commanded a magnificent host, which under Napoleon would have bivouacked in every Southern capital from Richmond to New Orleans. After the victory at Malvern Hills the order to retreat was denounced by Kearny and Hooker in terms that I will not repeat here, for I am not dealing with his military but with his political career.

History has pronounced its verdict upon him as a soldier, and the Senator from Indiana will strive in vain to place him in the category with Napoleon and Hannibal and Cæsar, even though he remained true to the Democratic party.

I deal with him as a Democratic politician, and I affirm that no man can read the insubordinate and insolent letter that he wrote to President Lincoln from the gunboat in the James River, to which he fled after the loss of 70,000 men in the disastrous seven days' fight before Richmond, without being forced to the conclusion that McClellan was not fully and actively in accord with the ideas and the convictions then animating those who supported the Union cause.

Here is the letter in part:

HARRISON'S LANDING, July 7, 1862.

MR. PRESIDENT: You have been fully informed that the rebel army is in the front with the purpose of overwhelming us by attacking our positions or reducing us by blocking our river communications. I can not but regard our condition as critical, and I earnestly desire, in view of possible contingencies, to lay before your excellency, for your private consideration, my general views concerning the existing state of the rebellion, although they do not strictly relate to the situation of this army or strictly come within the scope of my official duties. \* \* \* The Union must be preserved. \* \* \* The time has come when the Government must determine upon a civil and military policy covering the whole ground of our national trouble. \* \* \* The responsibility of determining, declaring, and supporting such civil and military policy and of directing the whole course of national affairs in regard to the rebellion must now be assumed and exercised by you or our cause will be lost. The Constitution gives you power even for the present terrible exigency. \* \* \*

The war shall be conducted on the highest principles known to Christian civilization. It should not be a war looking to the subjugation of the people of any State in any event. \* \* \* Neither confiscation of property, political executions of persons, territorial organization of States, or forcible abolition of slavery should be contemplated for a moment.

Unless the principles governing the future conduct of our struggle shall be made known and approved, the effort to obtain requisite forces will be almost hopeless. A declaration of radical views, especially upon slavery, will rapidly disintegrate our present armies.

He desired to conduct the war so that the people of the South should not be subjugated, nor their property confiscated, nor treason punished, nor States conquered, nor slavery abolished, and in effect advised his army to disband if emancipation was proclaimed.

He was nominated for the Presidency in 1864 by the Democratic party upon a platform that contained the following declaration. It is ancient history, but a generation has arisen to whom it may be novel:

Resolved, That this convention does expressly declare as the sense of the American people that after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities, etc.

His nomination for the Presidency was received by the rebel armies in their intrenchments with cheers, and by the newspapers of the Confederacy with approving enthusiasm. The Richmond Enquirer of September 8, 1864, said:

Every defeat of Lincoln's forces inures to the benefit of McClellan. The influence of the South, more powerful in the shock of battle than when throwing her minority vote in an electoral college, will be cast in favor of McClellan by this indirect yet efficacious means.

Upon the day after the election in the Confederate congress Mr. Foote, of Tennessee, declared:

I say we have friends—good, true, valiant friends at the North. Every vote given for McClellan was for peace. Every vote given for McClellan was a vote against Lincoln's African policy. Every vote given for McClellan was a vote given for an armistice. If McClellan had been elected, he, Foote, was prepared to make from his seat a proposition for a convention of the sovereign States, North and South, and he believed the South would have secured from it peace and her independence.

Mr. President, the election occurred in November. McClellan received 3 votes from the State of Delaware, 11 votes from the State of Kentucky, and 7 votes from the State of New Jersey, making 21 in all; and when Mr. Lincoln was elected he resigned his commission and passed into history as a military and civil leader who had remained true to the Democratic party.

Maj. Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock was born in Pennsylvania and educated at West Point. He was another of the military leaders that was true to the Democracy. His martial career is one of the imperishable heritages of American glory. He marched and he triumphed. He filled the abyss of fame with names that will be eternally luminous—the Peninsula, Antietam, Gettysburgh, Chancellorsville, Cold Harbor, and Petersburg. Had he been a soldier under Napoleon he would have been a prince and marshal of the empire. Undaunted in battle, resolute, with an indomitable passion for glory, he was the ideal corps commander, and was well named Hancock the Superb. When the war closed he enjoyed to a degree almost unknown in our history the affectionate admiration, gratitude, respect, and honor of the American people, irrespective of party.

But he, too, became tainted with the fatal virus of an ambition for the nomination for the Presidency by the Democratic party, and they voted for him in 1880, fifteen years after the war ended, not as the man who defeated, overwhelmed, and destroyed them at Gettysburgh and in the Wilderness, but as the author of Order No. 40 and the determined opponent of reconstruction in the fifth military district, comprising Louisiana and Texas. What were his duties as defined by the act of March 2, 1867? It was entitled:

An act to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States.

I quote so much of the preamble and of section 3 as will suffice to show his powers:

Whereas no legal State governments or adequate protection for life and property now exist in the rebel States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, and Arkansas; and whereas it is necessary that peace and good order should be enforced in said States until legal and republican governments can be legally established: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That said rebel States shall be divided into military districts and made subject to the military authority of the United States, as hereinafter prescribed. \* \* \* Louisiana and Texas, the fifth district.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of each officer assigned as aforesaid to protect all persons in their rights of person and property, to suppress insurrection, disorder, and violence, and to punish or cause to be punished all disturbers of the public peace and criminals; \* \* \* and all interference under color of State authority with the exercise of military authority under this act shall be null and void.

Those who were in sympathy with President Johnson in his effort to overthrow the reconstruction policy of Congress in the rebellious States were dissatisfied with Sheridan and the other great commanders who had preceded him, and they found in General Hancock a willing coadjutor.

The condition of affairs in the rebel States at this time is well described by General George H. Thomas, who commanded an adjacent district, and who was never suspected of partisanship or injustice. He says:

In localities where the disfranchised element is strong a spirit of persecution towards those in sympathy with the authorities, those who recognize the political rights of the enfranchised negroes, and the negroes themselves, especially shows itself in utter contempt of all respect for law. Violence is openly talked of. The editorials of the public press are such as to create the most intense hatred in the breasts of ex-rebels and their sympathizers. The effect of this is to cause disturbance \* \* \* by inciting the ruffianly portion of this class of citizens to murder, rob, and maltreat white Unionists and colored people in localities where there are no United States troops stationed. The local authorities often have not the will, and more often have not the power, to suppress or prevent these outrages.

The colored people are quiet and peaceable: they have no political rights, not being enfranchised, yet ruffians are permitted to tyrannize over them, without fear of punishment. The testimony of negroes is refused in the State courts, and the United States courts are difficult of access to an ignorant people, without friends or influence. In some districts ex-Union soldiers are persecuted by their more numerous rebel neighbors, until they are forced into a resistance which sometimes ends with the loss of their lives, or they are compelled in self-defense to emigrate. An appeal to the courts affords but little hope for redress, as magistrates and juries too often decide in accordance with their prejudices, without regard to justice. The controlling cause of the unsettled condition of affairs in the department is that the greatest efforts made by the defeated insurgents since the close of the war have been to promulgate the idea that the cause of liberty, justice, humanity, equality, and all the calendar of the virtues of freedom suffered violence and wrong when the effort for Southern independence failed. This is, of course, intended as a species of political cant, whereby the crime of treason might be covered with a counterfeit varnish of patriotism, so that the precipitators of the rebellion might go down in history hand in hand with the defenders of the Government, thus wiping out with their own hands their own stains; a species of self-forgiveness amazing in its effrontery, when it is considered that life and property—justly forfeited by the laws of the country, of war, and of nations, through the magnanimity of the Government and people—was not exacted from them.

Under this inspiration the education of the great body of the people, moral, religious, and political, has been turned into channels wherein all might unite in common. The impoverishment of the South, resulting from war and its concomitants, the emancipation of slaves, and the consequent loss of substance, the ambiguity and uncertainty of political rights and financial values, as well as personal rivalries, have all combined to strengthen the efforts of pernicious teachers. The evil done has been great, and it is not discernible that an immediate improvement may be expected.

The reports of General Sheridan show that the situation in Louisiana and Texas was much worse even than that depicted by General Thomas, but General Hancock immediately upon assuming command issued his celebrated Order No. 40, prepared after consultation with the leaders of the Democratic party in Washington, written on his way down the river on a steamer, and promulgated before any opportunity to acquaint himself with the condition of affairs had occurred.

[General Orders No. 40.]

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH MILITARY DISTRICT,  
New Orleans, La., November 29, 1867.

I. In accordance with General Orders No. 81, headquarters of the Army, Adjutant-General's office, Washington, D. C., August 27, 1867, Maj. Gen. W. S. Han-

cock hereby assumes command of the fifth military district and of the department composed of the States of Louisiana and Texas.

II. The general commanding is gratified to learn that peace and quiet reign in this department. It will be his purpose to preserve this condition of things. As a means to this great end he regards the maintenance of the civil authorities in the faithful execution of the laws as the most efficient under existing circumstances.

In war it is indispensable to repel force by force and overthrow and destroy opposition to lawful authority. But when insurrectionary force has been overthrown and peace established, and the civil authorities are ready and willing to perform their duties, the military power should cease to lead and the civil administration resume its natural and rightful dominion. Solely impressed with these views, the general announces that the great principles of American liberty still are the lawful inheritance of this people, and ever should be. The right of trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the liberty of the press, the freedom of speech, and the natural rights of persons and the rights of property must be preserved.

Free institutions, while they are essential to the prosperity and happiness of the people, always furnish the strongest inducements to peace and order. Crimes and offenses committed in this district must be referred to the consideration and judgment of the regular civil tribunals, and those tribunals will be supported in their lawful jurisdiction.

Should there be violations of existing laws which are not inquired into by the civil magistrates, or should failures in the administration of justice by the courts be complained of, the cases will be reported to these headquarters, when such orders will be made as may be deemed necessary.

While the general thus indicates his purpose to respect the liberties of the people, he wishes all to understand that armed insurrections or forcible resistance to the law will be instantly suppressed by arms.

By command of Maj. Gen. W. S. Hancock.

The results of this abdication of his powers and this renunciation of his duties under the reconstruction act are disclosed in the letter of Governor Pease to General Hancock, and the reply of the latter, which I will read as a contribution to the history of a military leader who remained "true to the Democratic party."

EXECUTIVE OF TEXAS,  
Austin, Tex., January 17, 1868.

SIR: Your letter of the 28th of December, 1867, was received at this office on the 11th instant. I think it my duty to reply to some portions of it, lest my silence should be construed into an acquiescence in the opinions expressed therein in regard to the condition of Texas and the authority of the civil provisional government now existing here.

I dissent entirely from the declaration that "the State government of Texas, organized in subordination to the authority of the United States, is in full exercise of all its proper powers." The act of Congress "to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States" expressly declares in its preamble that no legal State government or adequate protection of life or property now exists in Texas, and it is necessary that peace and good order should be enforced in said State until a loyal and republican State government can be legally established. It then provides that Texas shall be subject to the military authority of the United States, and shall constitute a part of the fifth military district. It also directs the President to assign to the command of that district an officer of the Army not below the rank of brigadier-general, and to detail a sufficient military force to enable such officer to perform his duties and enforce his authority; and makes it the duty of such officer to protect all persons in their rights of person and property, to suppress insurrection, disorder, and violence, and to punish, or cause to be punished, all disturbers of the public peace and criminals; and to this end he may allow local civil tribunals to take jurisdiction of and try offenders; or when in his judgment it may be necessary for the trial of offenders, he shall have power to organize military commissions or tribunals for that purpose; and also declares that interference under color of State authority with the exercise of military authority under said act shall be null and void.

This act further provides that until the people of Texas shall be by law admitted to representation in the Congress of the United States, any government that may exist therein shall be deemed provisional only, and in all respects subject to the paramount authority of the United States at any time to abolish, modify, control, or supersede the same.

The supplementary act of July 19, 1867, declares it to have been the true intent and meaning of the original act and the supplementary act of the 23d of March, 1867, that the government then existing in Texas was not a legal State government, and that thereafter said government, if continued, was to be continued subject in all respects to the military commander of the district, and the paramount authority of Congress.

The reasonable construction of these provisions of the act of Congress referred to would seem to be that Texas is placed under a military government, of which the chief officer is the commander of the fifth military district, and that whatever civil government there is in Texas is provisional only, subject to said military commander and the paramount authority of Congress, and exists only by their sufferance as a part of the machinery through which the military authority of the United States is exercised. This construction is supported by the acts of the successive commanders of the fifth military district, and their correspondence with this office from the time they first assumed command in March, 1867, until quite recently. They have exercised the right of removing and appointing at their pleasure the officers of this civil provisional government (with the exception of the few that are appointed by the governor), and of filling by appointments all vacancies in offices heretofore filled by an election by the people of Texas. They have also at pleasure exercised the right to abolish, modify, control, and supersede the laws heretofore enacted, as well as the proceedings and judgments of the courts. They have also, at their pleasure, made arrests for violations of the criminal laws. It is true that they have permitted the officers of this civil provisional government, except the legislature, to perform their duties as prescribed by the laws of Texas, but in subordination to their orders and the laws of the United States.

I am at a loss to understand how a government, without representation in Congress and without a militia force, with such limited powers, and thus subject to be further limited and changed at pleasure by the military commander of the district, can, with any propriety, be called a State government organized in subordination to the authority of the Government of the United States, and in full exercise of all its proper powers.

I also dissent from the declaration that "at this time the country is in a state of profound peace." Texas can not properly be said to be in a state of profound peace. It is true that there no longer exists here any organized resistance to the authority of the United States; but a large majority of the white population, who participated in the late rebellion, are embittered against the Government by their defeat in arms and loss of their slaves, and yield to it an unwilling obedience, only because they feel that they have no means to resist its authority. None of this class have any affection for the Government, and very few of them have any respect for it. They regard the legislation of Congress on the subject of reconstruction as unconstitutional and hostile to their interests, and consider the Government now existing here, under the authority of the United States, as a usurpation on their rights. They look upon the enfranchisement

of their late slaves and the disfranchisement of a portion of their own class as an act of insult and oppression.

This state of feeling against the Government and its acts by a large majority of the white population, who have heretofore exercised the political power of Texas, combined with the demoralization and impatience of restraint by civil authority that always follows the close of great civil wars, renders it extremely difficult to enforce the criminal laws in those portions of the State which are most densely occupied, and often impossible to do so in those parts of the State which are sparsely settled. A knowledge of this state of affairs induces many to redress their fancied wrongs and grievances by acts of violence.

It is a lamentable fact that over one hundred cases of homicide have occurred in Texas within the last twelve months, while not one-tenth of the perpetrators have been arrested, and less than one-twentieth of them have been tried.

Within the last few months United States officers and soldiers have been killed while in the discharge of their duties, and in no case have those who committed these offenses been tried or punished. In these cases the most strenuous efforts were made by the military authorities to arrest the guilty parties, but without success, although they were well known.

It often happens that when the civil officers of a county are disposed to do their duty and endeavor to make arrests they are unable to do so because they are not properly sustained by the citizens of the county, and when arrests are made a large portion of the offenders escape from custody because there are no secure jails for their confinement, and the county authorities have not the means to pay for the proper guards. Several cases have come to my knowledge in which sheriffs failed entirely to arrest parties who had been indicted, although they remained in the county for months.

Grand juries often fail to find indictments when they ought to do so, and petit juries as often fail to convict offenders in cases where the evidence is conclusive. Hence it results that in many cases offenders escape punishment when the magistrates and sheriffs do their duty.

It is by no means charged that all who took part in the rebellion participate or approve the many outrages and acts of violence which are perpetrated in Texas without punishment. A large majority disapprove and deplore this state of affairs; few of them, however, give any active aid in the enforcement of the criminal laws.

All good citizens feel and acknowledge that there is but little security for life in Texas beyond what each man's personal character gives him. Many loyal citizens have expressed the opinion that it would have a good effect upon the community if some of the perpetrators of aggravated crimes like that in Uvalde County, where the difficulty of keeping the prisoners in confinement rendered it highly probable that they would escape and where the sparseness of population made it so difficult to procure a jury, that it was considered almost certain that the parties would never be tried by the civil courts, should be brought before a military commission. In this opinion I fully concur, and it was for this reason that I made the recommendation.

The condition of affairs here was much worse before the establishment of the present military government than it has been since. The fear of arrest by the military authorities and a trial by a military commission has had some effect in deterring lawless men from the commission of crime, but I am constrained to say that since the publication of General Order No. 40, of 29th November, 1867, from headquarters fifth military district, there has been a perceptible increase of crime and manifestations of hostile feelings toward the Government and its supporters.

It is an unpleasant duty to give such a recital of the condition of the country. But the reports and correspondence on file in the offices of the Freedmen's Bureau and of the military commanders in Texas since the close of the rebellion will prove the truth of what is stated here.

In my communications with the previous commanders of the fifth military district, orally and in writing, I have frequently given them my views in regard to the powers of the present civil provisional government of Texas, and also in regard to the condition of affairs here, and the great difficulty and sometimes impossibility of executing the laws for prevention and punishment of crime and the preservation of the public peace.

If all these matters had been known to the commanding general fifth military district, his surprise might not have been excited that a civil magistrate of Texas, who is desirous to preserve peace and good order, and to give security to person and life, should have applied to him as the chief officer to whom the government of Texas is intrusted by the laws of the United States to do by military authority what experience had proved can not be effectually done by the officers of Texas, with the limited means and authority with which they are invested by law.

I am, sir, with great respect, your obedient servant,

E. M. PEASE.

Bvt. Lieut. Col. WM. G. MITCHELL,  
Secretary of Civil Affairs.

Official:

R. CHANDLER,  
Captain Thirteenth Infantry.

To which General Hancock replied:

HEADQUARTERS FIFTH MILITARY DISTRICT,  
New Orleans, La., March 9, 1868.

SIR: Your communication of the 17th of January last was received in due course of time (the 27th of January), but not until it had been widely circulated by the newspaper press. To such a letter, written and published for manifest purposes, it has been my intention to reply as soon as leisure from more important business would permit.

Your statement that the act of Congress "to provide for the more efficient government of the rebel States" declares that whatever government existed in Texas was provisional; that peace and order should be enforced; that Texas should be part of the fifth military district and subject to military power; that the President should appoint an officer to command in said district, and detail a force to protect the rights of person and property, suppress insurrection and violence, and punish offenders, either by military commission or through the action of local civil tribunals, as in his judgment might seem best, will not be disputed. One need only read the act to perceive it contains such provisions. But how all this is supposed to have made it my duty to order the military commission requested you have entirely failed to show. The power to do a thing if shown, and the propriety of doing it, are often very different matters. You observe you are at a loss to understand how a government without a representation in Congress and a militia force and subject to military power can be said to be in the full exercise of all its proper powers. You do not reflect that this government, created or permitted by Congress, has all the powers which the act intends, and may fully exercise them accordingly. If you think it ought to have more powers, should be allowed to send members to Congress, wield a militia force, and possess yet other powers, your complaint is not to be preferred against me, but against Congress, who made it what it is.

As respects the issue between us, any question as to what Congress ought to have done has no pertinence. You admit the act of Congress authorizes me to try an offender by military commission, or allow the local civil tribunals to try, as I shall deem best; and you can not deny the act expressly recognizes such local civil tribunals as legal authorities for the purpose specified. When you contend there are no legal local tribunals for any purpose in Texas, you must

either deny the plain reading of the act of Congress or the power of Congress to pass the act.

You next remark that you dissent from my declaration "that the country (Texas) is in a state of profound peace," and proceed to state the grounds of your dissent. They appear to me not a little extraordinary. I quote your words: "It is true there no longer exists here (Texas) any organized resistance to the authority of the United States. But a large majority of the white population who participated in the late rebellion are embittered against the Government and yield it an unwilling obedience." Nevertheless, you concede they do yield it obedience. You proceed:

"None of this class have any affection for the Government, and very few any respect for it. They regard the legislation of Congress on the subject of reconstruction as unconstitutional and hostile to their interests, and consider the government now existing here under authority of the United States as an usurpation of their rights. They look on the emancipation of their late slaves and the disfranchisement of a portion of their own class as an act of insult and oppression."

And this is all you have to present for proof that war and not peace prevails in Texas; and hence it becomes my duty—so you suppose—to set aside the local civil tribunals, and enforce the penal code against citizens by means of military commissions.

My dear sir, I am not a lawyer, nor has it been my business, as it may have been yours, to study the philosophy of statecraft and politics. But I may lay claim, after an experience of more than half a lifetime, to some poor knowledge of men, and some appreciation of what is necessary to social order and happiness. And for the future of our common country, I could devoutly wish that no greater number of our people have yet fallen in with the views you appear to entertain. Woe be to us whenever it shall come to pass that the power of the magistrate—civil or military—is permitted to deal with the mere opinions and feelings of the people.

I have been accustomed to believe that sentiments of respect or disrespect, and feelings of affection, love, or hatred, so long as not developed into acts in violation of law, were matters wholly beyond the punitive power of human tribunals.

I will maintain that the entire freedom of thought and speech, however acrimoniously indulged, is consistent with the noblest aspirations of man and the happiest condition of his race.

When a boy, I remember to have read a speech of Lord Chatham, delivered in Parliament. It was during our Revolutionary war, and related to the policy of employing the savages on the side of Britain. You may be more familiar with the speech than I am. If I am not greatly mistaken, his lordship denounced the British Government—his Government—in terms of unmeasured bitterness. He characterized its policy as revolting to every sentiment of humanity and religion; proclaimed it covered with disgrace, and vented his eternal abhorrence of it and its measures. It may, I think, be safely asserted that a majority of the British nation concurred in the views of Lord Chatham. But whoever supposed that profound peace was not existing in that kingdom, or that government had any authority to question the absolute right of the opposition to express their objections to the propriety of the king's measures in any words, or to any extent they pleased? It would be difficult to show that the opponents in the days of the elder Adams, or Jefferson, or Jackson, exhibited for it either "affection" or "respect." You are conversant with the history of our past parties and the political struggles touching legislation on alienage, sedition, the embargo, national banks, our wars with England and Mexico, and can not be ignorant of the fact that for one party to assert that a law or system of legislation is unconstitutional, oppressive, and usurpatory is not a new thing in the United States. That the people of Texas consider acts of Congress unconstitutional, oppressive, or insulting to them is of no consequence to the matter in hand. The President of the United States has announced his opinion that these acts of Congress are unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, as you are aware, not long ago decided unanimously that a certain military commission was unconstitutional. Our people everywhere, in every State, without reference to the side they took during the rebellion, differ as to the constitutionality of these acts of Congress. How the matter really is, neither you nor I may dogmatically affirm.

If you deem them constitutional laws, and beneficial to the country, you not only have the right to publish your opinions, but it might be your bounden duty as a citizen to do so. Not less is it the privilege and duty of any and every citizen, wherever residing, to publish his opinion freely and fearlessly on this and every question which he thinks concerns his interest. This is merely in accordance with the principles of our free Government; and neither you nor I would wish to live under any other. It is time now, at the end of almost two years from the close of the war, we should begin to recollect what manner of people we are; to tolerate again free, popular discussion, and extend some forbearance and consideration to opposing views. The maxims that in all intellectual contests truth is mighty and must prevail, and that error is harmless when reason is left free to combat it, are not only sound, but salutary. It is a poor compliment to the merits of such a cause that its advocates would silence opposition by force; and generally those only who are in the wrong will resort to this ungenerous means. I am confident you will not commit your serious judgment to the proposition that any amount of discussion, or any sort of opinions, however unwise in your judgment; or any assertion of feeling, however resentful or bitter, not resulting in a breach of law, can furnish justification for your denial that profound peace exists in Texas. You might as well deny that profound peace exists in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, California, Ohio, and Kentucky, where a majority of the people differ with the minority on these questions; or that profound peace exists in the House of Representatives or the Senate at Washington, or in the Supreme Court, where all these questions have been repeatedly discussed and parties respectfully and patiently heard.

You next complain that in parts of the State (Texas) it is difficult to enforce the criminal laws; that sheriffs fail to arrest; that grand jurors will not always indict; that in some cases the military acting in aid of the civil authorities have not been able to execute the process of the courts; that petit jurors have acquitted persons adjudged guilty by you; and that other persons charged with offenses have broke jail and fled from prosecution. I know not how these things are; but admitting your representations literally true, if for such reasons I should set aside the local tribunals and order a military commission, there is no place in the United States where it might not be done with equal propriety. There is not a State in the Union, North or South, where the like facts are not continually happening. Perfection is not to be predicated of man or his works. No one can reasonably expect certain and absolute justice in human transactions; and if military power is to be set in motion on the principles for which you would seem to contend, I fear that a civil government, regulated by laws, could have no abiding place beneath the circuit of the sun. It is rather more than hinted in your letter that there is no local State government in Texas, and no local laws outside of the acts of Congress which I ought to respect, and that I should undertake to protect the rights of persons and property in my own way and in an arbitrary manner. If such be your meaning, I am compelled to differ with you.

After the abolition of slavery (an event, I hope, which no one now regrets), the laws of Louisiana and Texas existing prior to the rebellion, and not in conflict with the acts of Congress, comprised a vast system of jurisprudence, both civil and criminal. It required not volumes only, but libraries to contain them. They laid down principles and precedent for ascertaining the rights and adjusting the controversies of men in every conceivable case. They were the creations of great and good and learned men, who had labored, in their day, for their

kind, and gone down to the grave long before our recent troubles, leaving their works an inestimable legacy to the human race. These laws, as I am informed, connected the civilization of past and present ages, and testified of the justice, wisdom, humanity, and patriotism of more than one nation, through whose records they descended to the present people of these States. I am satisfied, from representations of persons competent to judge, they are as perfect a system of laws as may be found elsewhere, and better suited than any other to the condition of this people, for by them they have long been governed. Why should it be supposed Congress has abolished these laws? Why should any one wish to abolish them? They have committed no treason, nor are hostile to the United States, nor countenance crime, nor favor injustice. On them, as on a foundation of rock, repose almost the entire superstructure of social order in these two States. Annul this code of local laws, and there would be no longer any rights, either of person or property, here. Abolish the local civil tribunals made to execute them, and you would virtually annul the laws, except in reference to the very few cases cognizable in the Federal courts. Let us for a moment suppose the whole local civil code annulled, and that I am left, as commander of the fifth military district, the sole fountain of law and justice. This is the position in which you would place me.

I am now to protect all rights and redress all wrongs. How is it possible for me to do it? Innumerable questions arise, of which I am not only ignorant, but to the solution of which a military court is entirely unfitted. One would establish a will, another a deed; or, the question is one of succession, or partnership, or descent, or trust; a suit of ejectment or claim to chattels; or, the application may relate to robbery, theft, arson, or murder. How am I to take the first step in any such matter? If I turn to the acts of Congress I find nothing on the subject. I dare not open the authors on the local code, for it has ceased to exist.

And you tell me that in this perplexing condition I am to furnish by dint of my own hasty and crude judgment the legislation demanded by the vast and manifold interests of the people. I repeat, sir, that you, and not Congress, are responsible for the monstrous suggestion that there are no local laws or institutions here to be respected by me outside of the acts of Congress. I say, unhesitatingly, if it were possible that Congress should pass an act abolishing the local codes for Louisiana and Texas—which I do not believe—and it should fall to my lot to supply their places with something of my own, I do not see how I could do better than follow the laws in force here prior to the rebellion, excepting whatever therein shall relate to slavery. Power may destroy the forms, but not the principles, of justice; these will live in spite even of the sword. History tells us that the Roman pandects were lost for a long period among the rubbish that war and revolution had heaped upon them, but at length were dug out of the ruins, again to be regarded as a precious treasure.

You are pleased to state that "since the publication of (my) General Orders No. 40 there has been a perceptible increase of crime and manifestation of hostile feeling toward the Government and its supporters," and add that it is "an unpleasant duty to give such a recital of the condition of the country."

You will permit me to say that I deem it impossible the first of these statements can be true, and that I do very greatly doubt the correctness of the second. General Orders No. 40 was issued at New Orleans November 29, 1867, and your letter was dated January 17, 1868. Allowing time for Order No. 40 to reach Texas and become generally known, some additional time must have elapsed before its effect would be manifested, and a yet further time must transpire before you would be able to collect the evidence of what you term "the condition of the country," and yet, after all this, you would have to make the necessary investigations to ascertain if Order No. 40 or something else was the cause. The time, therefore, remaining to enable you before the 17th of January, 1868, to reach a satisfactory conclusion on so delicate and nice a question must have been very short. How you proceeded, whether you investigated yourself, or through third persons, and if so, who they were, what their competency and fairness, on what evidence you rested your conclusions, or whether you ascertained any facts at all, are points upon which your letter so discreetly omits all mention, that I may well be excused for not relying implicitly upon it; nor is my difficulty diminished by the fact that in another part of your letter you state that ever since the close of the war a very large portion of the people have had no affection for the Government, but bitterness of feeling only. Had the duty of publishing and circulating through the country long before it reached me your statement that the action of the district commander was increasing crime and hostile feeling against the Government been less painful to your sensibilities, it might possibly have occurred to you to furnish something on the subject in addition to your bare assertion.

But what was Order No. 40, and how could it have the effect you attribute to it? It sets forth "the great principles of American liberty are still the inheritance of this people, and ever should be, that the right of trial by jury, the habeas corpus, the liberty of the press, the freedom of speech, and the natural rights of person and property must be preserved." Will you question the truth of these declarations? Which one of these great principles of liberty are you ready to deny and repudiate? Whoever does so, avows himself the enemy of human liberty and the advocate of despotism. Was there any intimation in General Orders No. 40 that any crimes or breaches of law would be countenanced? You know that there was not. On the contrary, you know perfectly well that while "the consideration of crime and offenses committed in the Fifth military district was referred to the judgment of the regular civil tribunals," a pledge was given in Order No. 40 which all understood, that tribunals would be supported in their lawful jurisdiction, and that "forcible resistance to law would be instantly suppressed by arms." You will not affirm that this pledge has ever been forfeited. There has not been a moment since I have been in command of the Fifth district when the whole military force in my hands has not been ready to support the civil authorities of Texas in the execution of the laws, and I am unwilling to believe they would refuse to call for aid if they needed it.

There are some considerations which, it seems to me, should cause you to hesitate before indulging in wholesale censures against the civil authorities of Texas. You are yourself the chief of these authorities, not elected by the people, but created by the military. Not long after you had thus come into office all the judges of the supreme court of Texas, five in number, were removed from office and new appointments made; twelve of the seventeen district judges were removed, and others appointed. County officers, more or less, in seventy-five out of one hundred and twenty-eight counties were removed, and others appointed in their places. It is fair to conclude that the executive and judicial civil functionaries in Texas are the persons whom you desire to fill the offices. It is proper to mention, also, that none but registered citizens, and only those who could take the test-oath, have been allowed to serve as jurors during your administration. Now, it is against this local government, created by military power prior to my coming here, and so composed of your personal and political friends, that you have preferred the most grievous complaints. It is of them you have asserted they will not do their duty; they will not maintain justice; they will not arrest offenders; they will not punish crimes; and that out of one hundred homicides committed in the last twelve months, not over ten arrests have been made; and by means of such gross disregard of duty, you declare that neither property nor life is safe in Texas.

Certainly you could have said nothing more to the discredit of the officials now in office. If the facts be as you allege, a mystery is presented for which I can imagine no explanation. Why is it that your political friends, backed up and sustained by the whole military power in this district, should be unwilling to enforce the laws against that part of the population lately in rebellion and whom you represent as the offenders? In all the history of these troubles I

have never seen or heard before of such a fact. I repeat, if the fact be so it is a profound mystery, utterly surpassing my comprehension. I am constrained to declare that I believe you are in very great error as to facts. On careful examination at the proper source I find that at the date of your letter four cases only of homicides had been reported to these headquarters as having occurred since November 29, 1867, the date of Order 40, and these cases were ordered to be tried and investigated as soon as the reports were received. However, the fact of the one hundred homicides may still be correct. As stated by you, the Freedmen's Bureau in Texas reported one hundred and sixty. How many of these were by Indians and Mexicans and how the remainder were classified is not known, nor is it known whether these data are accurate.

The report of the commanding officer of the district of Texas shows that since I assumed command no applications have been made to him by you for the arrest of criminals in the State of Texas.

To this date eighteen cases of homicides have been reported to me as having occurred since November 29, 1867, although special instructions had been given to report such cases as they occurred. Of these five were committed by Indians, one by a Mexican, one by an insane man, three by colored men, two of women by their husbands, and of the remainder some by parties unknown—all of which could be scarcely attributed to Order No. 40. If the reports received since the issuing of Order No. 40 are correct, they exhibit no increase of homicides in my time, if you are correct that one hundred had occurred in the past twelve months. That there has been a perfect administration of justice in Texas I am not prepared to deny.

There has been no such wanton disregard of duty on the part of officials, as you allege, I am well satisfied. A very little while ago you regarded the present officials in Texas the only ones who could be safely trusted with power. Now you pronounce them worthless, and would cast them aside.

I have found little else in your letter but indications of temper, lashed into excitement by causes which I deem mostly imaginary; a great confidence in the accuracy of your own opinions, and an intolerance of the opinions of others, a desire to punish the thoughts and feelings of those who differ from you, and an impatience which magnifies the shortcomings of officials who are perhaps as earnest and conscientious in the discharge of their duties as yourself, and a most unsound conclusion that while any persons are to be found wanting in affection or respect for government, or yielding it obedience from motives which you do not approve, war, and not peace, is the status, and all such persons are the proper subjects for military penal jurisdiction.

If I have written anything to disabuse your mind of so great an error, I shall be gratified.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. S. HANCOCK,  
Major-General Commanding.

To His Excellency E. M. PEASE,  
Governor of Texas.

Mr. President, I have trespassed upon the patience of the Senate by this recital because it is claimed by the Democratic worshippers of General Hancock that his letter of the 9th of March, 1868, to Governor Pease, of Texas, was an exposition of the principles of constitutional law and of the maxims of free government which eclipses even his claims to military glory, and entitles him to stand upon the same plane with Jefferson and the other illustrious statesmen of the Revolutionary epoch. I assume, therefore, that I shall receive the thanks of the Democratic party for inviting public attention to this correspondence between General Hancock and Governor Pease, and that their gratitude will insure my pardon for affirming my opinion that General Hancock's attitude will be regarded as creditable only by those who were willing, after the battle for the Union had closed, to surrender to the enemies of the Government the legitimate fruits of victory.

This correspondence received the widest possible publicity through the Democratic press and from Democratic platforms in 1880. The world knows who one of the parties to that correspondence was; but the name of Governor Pease has not obtained as wide a renown.

Elisha Marshall Pease was a native of Connecticut, of Puritan descent, who emigrated in 1835 to Texas, while it was yet a Mexican province. He was an eminent and thoroughly disciplined lawyer. For ten years after the admission of Texas into the Union, as a member of the Legislature and governor of the State, he did at least as much as any other man in framing the laws and constitution of the new Commonwealth.

He was an original and life-long Democrat until expelled from the party for his uncompromising devotion to the Union. Before the war he was twice elected governor of the State by the Democratic voters of Texas. In all the relations of life he was without fear and without reproach. I believe that both the Senators from Texas knew him well. I am also assured that each of the eleven gentlemen who represent Texas in the other House of Congress were well acquainted with him, and I confidently rely upon the Senators from Texas and each of the Representatives in Congress to sustain me in the declaration that Governor Pease was not only an able but a thoroughly honest, upright, and conscientious man.

Apart from the merits of the questions of public interest involved in this correspondence, I feel sure that the people of the United States will agree with me in the declaration that between the two antagonists the governor of Texas bore himself with superior dignity. From some motive, which the people of the United States are as competent as I am to discern, the distinguished general, who is claimed by his adherents to be a model of knightly courtesy, permitted himself to omit the amenities which gentlemen are accustomed to observe in official intercourse. He called into question the honor and veracity of Governor Pease when the latter expressed his regret that a sense of duty compelled him to state that a degree of lawlessness prevailed in some portions of Texas which the ordinary civil tribunals of Texas were unable to repress. He allowed himself to administer an insulting reprimand to a gentleman who was honestly performing his duty, who was his equal as a man, and who, in point of experience in the civil service of his country and of acquaintance with the affairs of his State, was greatly his superior. His

orders were rescinded by General Grant, and after a few inglorious months, finding the complications insupportable, he was relieved at his own request.

Mr. President, General Hancock received his reward. The Democratic party in 1880 nominated him for the Presidency. His claims were submitted to the people, who pronounced their verdict upon his political pretensions as a military leader who had remained true to the Democratic party. Notwithstanding his magnificent and unapproachable military career, recognizing his affiliation with those who had endeavored to destroy the Government by his opposition to the reconstruction policy of Congress and the acts and statutes made thereunder, he was overwhelmingly condemned. He carried, of the Northern States, California, 5 electoral votes; Nevada, 3, and New Jersey, 9; together with the 138 votes of the "solid South," which had been promised him in his speech at Cincinnati by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON]. Of the votes of Northern States that he received, those of California and Nevada were stolen by the forgery and fraud of the Morey letter, invented by Democratic politicians upon the very eve of the election, when it was impossible that the refutation should follow before the votes were cast.

Mr. President, the affected indignation of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] and others at my alleged assault upon these Union generals is discreditably either to their intelligence or to their candor. If they did not know that in speaking of them in that debate, in which I was not an intruder, I was speaking of them not as soldiers, but as politicians and as Democratic candidates for the Presidency, they are dull, stupid, and ignorant indeed. If they do know it and persist in their misrepresentations they are disingenuous, and I suspect, if such a thing were possible, they are both. [Laughter.]

Did the Democratic party in 1880 vote for the hero of Gettysburg or for the author of Order No. 40 and the opponent of the reconstruction policy of Congress in the fifth military district?

Mr. President, from the impassioned eulogy, the rhapsody of approbation that flowed from the Senator from Indiana upon the great military achievements of McClellan and Hancock, I began to have some doubt who it was that really put down the rebellion, and was driven curiously to inquire into the attitude of the Democratic party in the North and to the Senator from Indiana as one of its acknowledged leaders in 1862, when McClellan, the idol of the Democracy, was fighting the battle of Antietam; in 1863, when Hancock was hurling back in confusion and dismay the scattered squadrons of the Confederacy at Gettysburg. I was really for the moment inclined, Mr. President, to believe that the Democratic party of the North and the Senator from Indiana and those other great patriots whom he eulogized as the immovable bulwarks of liberty, of the Constitution, and of the Union, Mr. Thomas A. Hendricks, Mr. Horatio Seymour, and Mr. William A. Richardson, were in full panoply of battle, aiding McClellan, upholding Hancock, and doing the utmost to make the success of the Union arms possible. It seems like the very climax of effrontery, the apex of audacity for these men, whose history is so well known, who were from the beginning the undisguised enemies of the cause of the Union at every step of its progress, and who, like the Senator from Indiana, were avowedly in sympathy with the South, were the advocates and apologists for slavery and secession at the outset, who gave aid and comfort to the rebellion in every possible way—the Copperheads, the Butternuts, the Knights of the Golden Circle, and all their brutal and degraded allies—to appear here as the advocates and champions of Union soldiers and of the cause of human liberty.

One would suppose from the recent enthusiasm displayed over the military achievements of McClellan and Hancock that we should upon inspection discover that the leaders of the Democracy during the war were in sympathy with the Union cause and in co-operation with the efforts to overthrow the Confederacy. Yet almost at the very hour, certainly in the very year, when McClellan was fighting on the undulating slopes of Antietam, the Senator from Indiana, without excepting even McClellan or Hancock, speaking at Sullivan, in Indiana, on the 5th of August, 1862, said in reference to the Union soldiers that they should go to the nearest blacksmith shop and have an iron collar riveted around their necks, bearing thereon the inscription, "My dog, A. Lincoln." Upon the same occasion he described Union soldiers as "Lincoln dogs and hirelings," without excepting McClellan or Hancock. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH). It is the duty of the Chair to inform the people in the galleries that under the rules of the Senate applause is not permitted, and if it occurs again it may be necessary to order the galleries to be cleared.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I speak to-day with difficulty in consequence of an infirmity of my throat, and I shall be under great obligations if there may be no interruption or disorder.

During the campaign that resulted in the election of Abraham Lincoln, the Senator from Indiana, who is now so vigorously in favor of the prosecution of the war of the rebellion, who eulogizes the efforts of the Union armies and the genius of the Union commanders, and poses as the special friend of the pensioners, and denounces and misrepresents my allusion to the political character and affiliations of McClellan and Hancock, made a speech at Greencastle, reported in the Cincinnati Com-

mercial of August 8, 1864, by Joseph B. McCullagh, now of the Globe-Democrat, St. Louis. The Senator from Indiana said:

Why, this campaign of Grant upon the Rapidan and at Petersburg—  
And Hancock was there—

this campaign of Grant upon the Rapidan and at Petersburg was of such a nature that you could hear the bones of your brave sons and brothers crash like glass clear to Washington City. The sickening details of the slaughter came up with the fumes of blood on our very breakfast plates at Washington City every morning; yet Lincoln says he will peg away for four years more. In God's name, have you not had enough of it? Let us try some other plan, this one has signally failed. Five hundred thousand more men, that's all.

Now listen to the opinion the Senator from Indiana then entertained of President Lincoln, the martyr:

Three human souls were hurried into eternity by each of Mr. Lincoln's jokes. Another section of land in view of Mr. Lincoln's room had been dug up for a graveyard, and while he jested and joked with his servile crew he could look out on this scene of dying and death. Yet you propose to me to retain that monster another term of office—that monster, that with utter disregard of human life and misery has proposed to prolong his term of office? Gentlemen, it seems to me that I can hear the spirits of the hundreds of thousands of lives that have been uselessly sacrificed in this war pleading against the re-election of this man. It seems to me the very inanimate objects and dumb brutes would cry out, enough, he has had his day—bloody, gory, reeking, let him go out into hateful obscurity, there to spend the residue of his days with the ghosts of the murdered dead, gibbering around the unhappy—felon!

In 1864, when the great struggle that resulted in the destruction and overthrow of the rebellion was going on, the Senator from Indiana put upon record the views he then entertained of Union soldiers, the President of the United States, and the efforts that were being made to re-enforce the Union Armies.

When the sun rose on the 4th of July, 1863—

Says the Senator from Indiana in his speech last Wednesday—  
and shone on Lee's army in retreat from Gettysburgh the last hope of the Southern Confederacy disappeared forever.

Yet in September, 1864, many months after the battle of Gettysburgh, that same Senator united with his party in the declaration that the war even then was a failure, that it was impossible to conduct it to a successful conclusion, and that immediate negotiations ought to be entered upon with the rebels for the purpose of procuring a dishonorable peace.

Mr. President, there appears to be some mysterious and occult fascination to the Democratic party about the "fraud of 1876." Senators within the past week have risen gravely to denounce it as one of the living issues of the day, and the Democratic party of Indiana, a few days ago, in their tenth resolution declared against it with emphasis.

I voted against the bill creating the Electoral Commission in 1876, because I believed that the power to count the votes rested with the President of the Senate. I was never specially enamored of President Hayes, but inasmuch as the question of his title is brought in controversy by the Democratic party as one of the issues of this campaign, I feel bound to say that his title is the most absolutely impregnable of any in the whole line of American Presidents, because it is the only one ever passed upon by a constitutional tribunal lawfully organized for that purpose.

The Democratic party should not forget that the Electoral Commission was one of their own devices. It was to consist, as we all remember, of fifteen members, five from a Democratic House of Representatives, five from a Republican Senate, which would leave an equal political division, and five from the Supreme Court of the United States, which as then organized would, as was discovered by the necessary investigation, complete a tribunal that would be in favor of seating Samuel J. Tilden, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency, by a majority of one.

It was not the first time, Mr. President, in the history of human affairs, that they who have digged a pit and dug it deep have fallen into the pit that they have prepared for their brother. By one of those mysterious and inscrutable dispensations of Divine Providence that sometimes appear to interfere in the affairs of man, Hon. David Davis, a member of the Supreme Court, was chosen to the Senate of the United States, in the place of Hon. John A. Logan, whose term had expired, which brought forward as the fifteenth member of the Commission on the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Bradley, and presto, instead of being 8 to 7 for Mr. Tilden it was 8 to 7 for Mr. Hayes.

The interest of the Democratic party in the Electoral Commission ceased from that instant. [Laughter.] They immediately began to denounce it as an unconstitutional and illegal body, and Hon. Henry Watterson, as you may remember, issued his celebrated proclamation calling upon 100,000 unarmed Kentuckians to visit the city of Washington upon the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans for the purpose of superintending the Electoral Commission count. [Laughter.] I happened to have a conversation with President Grant at the White House shortly after that celebrated proclamation was issued and the interest of the Democratic party in the Electoral Commission had become so languid. I asked him if he thought there was going to be any trouble. He paused a moment with that deliberate method which characterized his utterances before he replied: "No; I do not think there is going to be any trouble, but it has been one rule of my life to be always ready;" and he was ready. In obedience to some mysterious direction parks of artillery and troops and munitions of war be-

gan coming into the capital and the agitation of the Democratic party became extreme, for if there is anything that will turn the average Democrat inside out with spasmodic indignation it is the sight of a Federal soldier in a new uniform. [Laughter.] The 100,000 unarmed Kentuckians did not appear and the count proceeded, notwithstanding the negotiations at the Wormley House, and in spite of the hostility of the Democratic party to the unexpected result of their own contrivance. The reason why the Presidential count was not protracted until after the 4th of March, 1877, and the Government thrown into a revolution, so far as the Democratic party could effect this, was not because they were patriotic or because they were so sincerely devoted to the peace and welfare of the country, but it was because U. S. Grant was in the White House, who had determined that when the count was completed, on the 4th of March or any other day, the candidate who received the certificate of election should be installed as his successor, whether it was Samuel J. Tilden or Rutherford B. Hayes, if it took the whole force of the United States and its Army and Navy to put him there. The people of the United States may as well understand that all this pretense about the fraud of 1876 and 1877 is not sincere. It was a Democratic device.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the Senator say that the Democratic party was responsible for the creation of the Electoral Commission? The resolution creating the committee which reported that bill was offered in the House of Representatives by Mr. McCrary, of Iowa. No person on that joint committee had so much influence in framing that electoral bill as Mr. McCrary and the honorable member from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], a member on behalf of the Senate. They all led in the framing of the bill. That statement is due to history.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, I understand all about that. I know who devised the Electoral Commission and who supported it and how it was carried. All this talk about Hayes and fraud, and Packard and Chamberlain, which is to be apparently one of the issues of this approaching campaign as an illustration of the turpitude of the Republican party, is altogether too transparent.

I never liked the abandonment of Packard as governor of Louisiana. I never was satisfied with the abandonment of Chamberlain as governor of South Carolina. I never believed, however, that there was any truth in the Democratic allegation of a collusive agreement by which the State governments of Louisiana and South Carolina were to be turned over to the Democracy. I have heard it, but I never believed it, and the evidence is almost conclusive to the contrary, because the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives refused to make the necessary appropriations at that session of Congress for supporting the Army of the United States. Although Chamberlain in South Carolina and Packard in Louisiana got more votes for the governorship than the Hayes electors did, one obvious reason why they were not sustained was because there was no Army to send to their support. The Democratic party had refused the necessary appropriations. And yet we are perpetually reminded, in order to distract attention from the crimes of the Democratic party in the South and in our great cities, that the Republicans were guilty of an enormous and gigantic fraud in the election and in the seating of Hayes.

Why, Mr. President, Cleveland has a warranty deed apparently to the seat that he occupies, and yet compared with the title that Mr. Hayes had to his seat he is in possession of stolen goods, and the receiver is as bad as the thief. In the court of justice and fair conscience he never was elected at all, but counted into office by a partnership between Dick Turpin and Uriah Heep, foot-pads and sneak-thieves, Cartouche and Pecksniff, and it is some consolation that in this partnership the apostates and renegades have lost their share of the swag. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, we are upon the threshold of another election. We have had McClellan and Seymour, Greeley and Tilden, Hancock and Cleveland for Democratic candidates, and Cleveland is practically renominated for another term. It will be the most important contest of the century, a political battle whose result will determine the destiny of the United States for the next twenty-five years, involving the reconstruction of the Supreme Court of the United States, the control of the Senate, free trade or the protection of American labor, the currency, internal improvements, the distribution of the surplus, and all the other great political, social, and material issues that so nearly concern national greatness and individual happiness. And again we are confronted with the 153 votes of the "solid South," as we have been at every election since 1876; a "solid South" that is the essence and substance of the Southern Confederacy; and the success of the Democratic party means the triumph of the Confederacy, which is to-day as much an organized, active, aggressive force in our politics as it was in 1860 or at any previous time. Slavery is dead and secession is dead, but the ideas, the impulses, the purposes, the intentions engendered by slavery and secession remain. Ideas are immortal. They never die. Force can not annihilate them. No man was ever convinced by being conquered, and no Confederate has ever confessed that the cause for which he fought was wrong. The Senator from Virginia said the other day with spirit and courage that the Confederates felt contempt for but two classes of men, those who made apologies and those who demanded them; and so they rear monuments to their heroes, perpetuate the

memory of their victories, teach their children that the cause for which they contended was just and must ultimately triumph. They strive to regain by diplomacy their ascendancy in national affairs which they lost in the field, and eventually intend to appeal for the vindication of their cause to the judgment of posterity.

Sir, I honor and admire while I regret and deplore the constancy of the South to their ideals, their loyalty to their leaders, their fidelity to the cause for which they made such inconceivable sacrifices, and their determination to rewrite and reconstruct history so that their posterity may proudly say to the generations that are to come, "While it is true that we were vanquished by overwhelming numbers in the field, yet within twenty-five years after the war closed our leaders were restored to political power by the deliberate verdict of the American people; we were intrusted with the purse and the sword and made the custodians of the destinies of the Republic."

What other explanation will the historian be able to make of the appointment of L. Q. C. Lamar as associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States? It is the tribunal of last resort. There is no appeal from its decision except by revolution. Its influence in our political history has never been fully appreciated. All the important questions arising hereafter under the constitutional amendments, the reconstruction acts, the statutes of freedom, and the laws regulating national elections, the payment for slaves, captured property, and losses by war are to be decided by a majority of the Supreme Court. Why, then, was Mr. Lamar selected for a place upon the bench? He never was suspected of being a lawyer. [Laughter.] His bitterest enemy never accused him of that. He never had been admitted to practice at the bar of the Supreme Court; his age was against him. He had not tried a reported cause in any tribunal, State or national, for thirty years. It is an open secret that the President of the United States at one time peremptorily refused to appoint him, and said the case was closed. Why was he appointed, and how was the reluctance of the Executive overcome? There was no lack of eminent lawyers of suitable years in the South or in Mississippi. The only answer is that he had a record. On the 1st of June, 1861, upon a platform with Jefferson Davis, in the city of Richmond, Mr. Lamar used the following language:

Fellow-citizens, if this continent is to be the theater of internecine war, history will acquit these Confederate States of all responsibility for this calamity. The very first act of the Confederate government was to send commissioners to Washington to make terms of peace and to establish relations of amity between the two sections; and if the buffoon who now disgraces the seat once occupied by Washington and Madison had not been lost to the dictates of truth, justice, and humanity, it would have afforded the strongest evidence of the capacity of men for self-government ever presented to the world.

If we are to have peace, harmony, and reconciliation, why was it necessary to affront the North, the loyal sentiment of the Union, by placing in this most influential life position a man who was not a lawyer, and never had been, and who had described Abraham Lincoln as a buffoon? Why was it indispensable, of all the men in the South, to select him and force him upon a reluctant President and a protesting people? He was selected because he was the ablest and most conspicuous living representative of the Southern Confederacy, and because he was the nearest and closest adviser and representative of Jefferson Davis. That is why he was designated. There is no other explanation. If that is not true, then his nomination was a farce or a caprice, without excuse, without reason or justification.

And now already another vacancy has occurred by the lamented death of the Chief-Justice. Three associates are past the retiring age, and with another term of Democratic administration this tribunal will be reconstructed upon the basis of hostility to the amendments to the Constitution and all the legislation of Congress in the enforcement thereof.

The junior Senator from Kentucky, in a debate in the House of Representatives, of which he was then a member, in 1879, boldly declared that it was the purpose of the Democratic party to keep on until they had wiped from the statute-books the last vestige of Republican war legislation. That was a manly and honest declaration, and with a Democratic Executive, and Democratic majority in both Houses of Congress, and a Democratic Supreme Court, there is no question what the result will be. I know that the existence of such designs will be received with denials and denunciation, as an appeal to what the Senator from Indiana calls the issue of sectional hate. During the debate on the dependent pension bill I recalled the exercises at Atlanta, when the statue of Hill was unveiled, in 1886, the speech of the orator, the ovation to the venerable ex-President of the Confederacy as the "uncrowned king" of the Southern people, and the indescribable excitement and enthusiasm of the applauding myriads in attendance; my inferences were denied and my allusions resented with a freedom of criticism in the press that will not deter me from advertizing to the circumstance of a similar occasion at Macon, in October, 1887, about six months ago. A monument to the Confederate soldiers was to be dedicated, with imposing display and ceremonials. The Confederate flag decorated the city, and was borne by the veterans of the Confederate armies, who assembled in great numbers to do honor to the occasion. The venerable ex-President again appeared, and Mr. Henry W. Jackson, late minister to Mexico under this administration, was selected to deliver the address. I have received a pamphlet containing

a full report of his remarks, and, for the purpose of showing the convictions and purposes of the Democracy, I will read a few paragraphs from the address of the orator.

For to-day there stands upon the soil of Georgia the distinguished Mississippian who, within the life of the present generation, was a prisoner in irons—the so-called "traitor" leader of a so-called "lost" cause. We, Confederate veterans, relict of the army which fought for that cause, are here to meet him; to move before him, in the pride and pomp of no Roman triumph, it is true, but bending our necks to no Roman yoke of subjugation. By invitation of the State of Georgia, speaking through her duly empowered officials, all have come. Behold majestic truth revealing herself! State sovereignty is not dead! Georgia is a sovereign still!

And, after an interval, he continued:

And because, after decades of endurance as patient as it was delusive, the sovereign parties of the South declined to accept their revolutionary will in permanent place of the Constitution, the compact-breaking sovereigns of the North, with numbers overwhelming, and "material" unbounded, made aggressive war upon them to force them to accept it. Simpler record this; yet forever fixed in the firmament of truth. Falsehood abroad, reckless or malignant; dallying with the false at home, ill-judged, cowardly, or venal, can not unfix it. As well attempt, standing upon a stool, to pluck a fixed star from heaven!

The principle for which they fought—the only principle of government expansive enough to meet the requirements of advanced civilization, made of late by Gladstone's eloquence so familiar to European thought—was American-born. Sun of the modern as compared with the ancient civilization; "home rule" as contrasted with Roman centralization; it rose in the west, and now mounts the western firmament, red with the blood of Confederate heroes, moist with the tears of Confederate widows and orphans. Eastward shall it continue to roll, carrying with it the blessed light of the Christian civilization all around the globe. And, so surely as it moves, it shall bring the day of a final triumph, to be decreed by the mind and conscience of man to time-tested truth. In that triumphal procession, Abraham Lincoln shall not move as the rightful President, but Jefferson Davis, the so-called "traitor" leader of a so-called "lost" cause.

This speech is especially interesting because of the effect that it had upon the Democratic party in the State election in Ohio, which was then pending. Immediately upon its delivery at Macon to the Confederate veterans in October great fear, alarm, and agitation fell upon the Democrats at Columbus for some unknown reason. Why the assertion of this appointee of the administration of a belief in secession and of a conviction that Jeff Davis was the rightful President of the United States rather than Abraham Lincoln should be detrimental to the Democratic party rather than to the Republicans, or the Prohibitionists, or the Anti-monopolists, does not appear, but the tribulation was so great that our old associate in the Senate, Judge Thurman, in an address at the capital of Ohio, to the club bearing his name, arose in great wrath and smote him thus:

An old crank down in Georgia by the name of Jackson—God forgive him for bearing that name—a disappointed politician, a man whom Grover Cleveland recalled from his mission to Mexico, some say because he got too drunk there to be of any use; I do not know how that is, I am not accustomed to making personal charges, but what I do know is that the President recalled him, and, from the day he was recalled to this day, it is said that the President and the Democratic party have no more malignant enemy in the United States than he. [Applause.] This old fool at a meeting at Macon, a month ago, or something like that, saw fit to make a speech, and declare that the doctrine of secession was not dead.

And so on and so on. Mr. Jackson, who was an eminent citizen of Georgia, appointed on the recommendation as is understood of the two Senators from that State, naturally protested against being called a drunken old crank and fool, and filed a general denial, affirming that he was not recalled for any such reasons by Mr. Cleveland, but that he resigned and came home of his own free will and accord.

And immediately after the speech was made, Governor Gordon, of Georgia, whom we all know, our former esteemed and beloved associate in this body, desiring to counteract the injurious effects of Minister Jackson's imprudent candor upon the Democratic party in Ohio, chartered a special car and as fast as an engine could carry him went to Cincinnati to explain and qualify the indiscretion. So great was his desire to show the complete reconciliation between the North and the South, and that no hostile feeling existed between the sections, he approached General George W. Morgan and kissed him on the mouth [laughter], as was reported in the papers of that day.

After making two or three speeches which were received with tumultuous and derisive laughter from one end of the State to the other, General Gordon got onto his special car and, like the King of France, went back again. The Democratic party in Ohio suffered the worst political defeat of the generation, as Judge Thurman admitted, in consequence of this declaration of the purposes of the Southern Democracy. Thereupon Mr. Jackson wound up the controversy by declaring that the Democrats of the South do not propose to submit to Northern dictation from any quarter, but that they intend to adhere to their convictions, and to transmit them to posterity. He concludes:

Simply because of my having made a speech of such character, upon such an occasion, to an audience of veteran soldiers, called together for no political purpose whatever, you, and the swarm of insects which have been buzzing about my name, delighted, perhaps, in the thought that they were inflicting upon me the venom of their stings, have held me up to the world as the meanly vindictive enemy of the Democratic party, prepared to harm it to the full extent of my malignant power. Is it possible that we of the South are thus to be welcomed back into the Union, even by the Democratic party of the North? Are we to stand in perpetual terror of opening our mouths anywhere or upon any occasion, to say one word in commendation of our past, or in honor of our dead, or in vindication of what we know to be the truth of history, lest we may say something "to injure the Democratic party"? Is it not sufficient that we have been stripped of our property, and of many things far dearer to us than property can ever be? Must we also consent to sink our good name into the abyss of silence? Must we keep our peace, unless we be prepared to kiss the hand that smites us, and to place ourselves in the line of truckling hypocrites? Must

our children grow up around us, hearing at the home fireside the story of the past and realizing that their fathers dare not repeat it in the face of the world? Will this be the school in which to train them for the manifold discharge of the grand duties imposed by American civilization upon the American citizen? From the time they begin to perceive and to think for themselves, thus to be crushed to the dust by the cruel consciousness that, however pure and patriotic in fact their sires may have been, in the opinion of the world they were guilty of an enormous historic crime, the shadow of which must rest forever, like a black cloud of ignominy, upon the pride, the hope, and manhood of their posterity?

Mr. President, the Republican party would have no right to complain if the South was kept solid by fair means. If upon an honest, straightforward, open expression of opinion on the part of all men, black and white, in the South, there were 153 electoral votes for the Democratic party, nobody could complain. But as we have recently passed a statute forbidding all gambling and betting within the city of Washington, I may, perhaps, be pardoned for using the language of the pool-room by saying that the Democratic party is playing this political game with loaded dice. They throw sixes every time. Their cards are stocked; it is a cold deck; and they have a revolver in their boot and a bowie-knife down the back of their neck. We are compelled every day to witness, apparently without the possibility of prevention, wrongs inflicted upon thousands and hundreds of thousands of American citizens in the Southern States that, if they were inflicted by any foreign power upon "even the least of one of these my little ones," there would be a declaration of war within ninety days—even with the present Secretary of State in office. [Laughter.]

We have an illustration of what is going to happen in November next by what has just occurred in Louisiana. The Senator from Indiana after his denunciation of the Republican party, especially in its relations to the South, says:

Why gape and wonder at the result of the election a few days ago in Louisiana? There is nothing in the 75,000 Democratic majority to marvel at. It was simply the overwhelming protest of the people of that State, terrified and appalled at the prospect of ever again being governed by the leaders of the Republican party, and the only wonder is that the vote was not unanimous.

Mr. President, it was more than unanimous. The Democratic party have learned the art in the South not only of making it unanimous but of making it more than unanimous on their side. They have learned the secret of returning a larger Democratic majority than the entire registered vote in the precinct. I wonder myself at their moderation in returning only 75,000 majority. It has been going up since the Senator spoke; it is 83,000 now; and what it will amount to before dog-days nobody can tell.

I wish to refer to one other matter in connection with Louisiana. The Senator from Indiana, as a reason for this unanimity, says:

They had in former times seen their State government—

That is, the State of Louisiana—

They had in former times seen their State government pass into Republican hands with a debt of but \$1,500,000, and they had seen her in the short space of four years afterwards crushed to the very earth, financially ruined, bankrupted, and dishonored by a mountainous debt of \$50,000,000.

For the purpose of showing the accuracy and reliability of the Senator from Indiana when he makes a financial statement that is intended to be literally and exactly correct, I will read the figures of the debt of Louisiana when the State came into Republican hands and when it went out, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] being on the committee in which this report appears, the official statement having been obtained from the department of state at New Orleans.

The entire debt of Louisiana at the close of the war was \$4,352,855. The Legislature chosen in 1865 was almost unanimously Democratic, and was composed of leading members of that party, who during its two years' term increased the debt \$13,749,872; so that the entire amount of debt in Louisiana transmitted to the Republicans in 1868, instead of being \$1,500,000 was \$18,102,727. Of course the Senator from Indiana does not stand on a trifle of merely \$15,000,000 or \$16,000,000 in a statement of debt; it is nothing to him.

The bonded and floating debt of the State on January 1, 1875, was \$23,933,407. The increase in seven years of Republican administration was \$5,830,679, and in two years of Democratic administration, \$13,749,872, or nearly three times in two years the increase that the Republicans made in seven years; and instead of being \$50,000,000 that the State was in debt at the time when the Republicans finally abandoned it, the amount was \$23,933,407, or a difference of about \$26,000,000—it is a mere trifle to the Senator from Indiana—of which \$18,000,000 was contracted by Democrats and about \$5,000,000 by Republicans.

As an illustration of the temper that prevailed during the period of Democratic incumbency, there was a banquet of the Democratic members of the Legislature, and one hilarious member of that organization, in response to a toast, said:

Grant's motto is "Let us have peace." That is all very well; but we want a big piece.

And they got it. [Laughter.]

The story of the recent election in Louisiana is one of exciting interest. I do not propose to read all the tables I have here, for I have already trespassed too long upon the patience of the Senate; but it is important that the people of the United States should know precisely what the Republican party is to expect from the Democracy of the South in November next, and I shall therefore dwell somewhat at length upon the details of that election, which was held on the 17th of April.

In a speech at New Orleans in January, just before the election of delegates to the nominating convention, Governor McEnery said:

So far as my administration of the election laws is concerned, I pledge you tonight, that not only in the city of New Orleans, but throughout the State of Louisiana, I will see an honest and fair election; that every vote cast is counted as deposited, and that no substitution of ballots is practiced, but that the voice of all the voters in the State as deposited in the ballot-box shall find expression and receive recognition, and the officers elected commissioned. To that end I will remove any registrar or returning officer in the city or State that I have reason to believe will aid in the suppression or changing of the popular will.

This was a palpable admission that just ground of complaint had hitherto existed, but relying upon the public pledge of the governor, the Republicans organized and entered actively into the canvass.

The convention was held on the 10th of January, and after a bitter and protracted contest General Nicholls was nominated for governor over Governor McEnery. The Nicholls men on the committee of resolutions were asked to report a resolution indorsing Governor McEnery's administration. The question was submitted to the caucus of Nicholls men, who voted it down. J. D. Houston, a McEnery leader, informed the Nicholls caucus that unless the vote was reconsidered and Governor McEnery indorsed, he would offer a resolution in the convention declaring that the Democratic party demanded a "free vote and a fair count." Terrified by this threat, the Nicholls caucus reconsidered the vote by which they refused to indorse Governor McEnery's administration and adopted the resolution. It was reported by the committee on resolutions, adopted by the convention, and no resolution was introduced on the subject of a "free vote and a fair count."

In an interview between Governor McEnery, General McMillen, and ex-Governor Warmoth, at the St. Charles Hotel, Governor McEnery reiterated his declaration that he would see that a free, honest, and fair election should be held in April.

Governor McEnery's assurances were again and again reiterated during the campaign. As the canvass proceeded it became apparent that there was danger of Warmoth's election. The idea of a fair count and a free vote did not seem to be entirely satisfactory to the Democratic managers, and early in March, in a public speech, Governor McEnery said:

I tell you there is danger, and North Louisiana will have to save this State from disgrace. If you permit the negroes to organize, you will have to break it by power, and go right now and break it in its incipency. Before I will see such another state of affairs I will wrap the State in revolution from the Gulf to the Arkansas line. The white people under the radical régime were fast going towards the condition of Hayti, and I now ask you to establish to the world that we, the white people, intend to rule the destinies of this country. We have now a Gaul at our doors, and it is time we shall say that the law shall be silent, and uphold our liberties at all hazards.

Not satisfied with this, Governor McEnery wrote to his returning officers, whose duty it is to fix the polling places, appoint the commissioners and clerks of election, and return the votes in all of the parishes of the State, as follows:

Warmoth is developing too much strength. We must beat him. See to it that your parish returns a large Democratic majority.

The author of the above statement is Governor Warmoth, who says:

I dare Governor McEnery to deny that he has written this letter. Not to one, but to many returning officers, besides many other leading Democrats.

At the meeting in March, at which Governor McEnery declared that "the law shall be silent," etc., he was followed by Colonel Jack, of Natchitoches, who said:

You have heard the assurances of our chief executive, that come what will or may he will wrap this State in revolution, from the Arkansas line to the Gulf, rather than have radicalism come into power. And I tell you we are in danger with the astute and wily Warmoth as a leader—the wily, crafty, and insidious gentleman from New Orleans.

If this state of affairs should confront him, all Governor McEnery would have to do would be to issue his fiat or manifesto, and the people of North Louisiana would come to his rescue and redeem the State as they did before; and if what I say is treason let them make the most of it.

I quote from the returns in the New Orleans Bee of April 24, 1888, the result of the election for governor, from which it appears that instead of 75,000 majority, as the Senator from Indiana stated, the majority has already reached the number of 83,200, and returns are still coming in:

Parishes.	Nicholls.	Warmoth.
Acadia.....	1,688	149
Ascension.....	2,715	1,334
Assumption.....	1,902	2,159
Avoyelles.....	890	
Bienville.....	2,021	
Bossier.....	4,213	95
Caddo.....	4,640	339
Calcasieu.....	2,294	708
Caldwell.....	673	278
Cameron.....	400	2
Catahoula.....	112	
Clabornne.....	2,397	758
Concordia.....	4,249	145
De Soto.....	1,892	74
East Baton Rouge.....	1,994	2,576
East Carroll.....	2,680	285
East Feliciana.....	2,276	5
Franklin.....	987	4
Grant.....	582	412
Iberia.....	1,490	





they thought that they had killed everybody in the house, but Providence let it so happen that no one was killed.

I infer that the cause of the trouble was my action in the late canvass. The Republicans met in convention at Morgan City, La., and indorsed the nomination of Judge B. F. Winchester for judge of the nineteenth judicial district, comprising the parishes of St. Mary's and Terre Bonne. We made this indorsement by the request of one wing of the Democratic party of Terre Bonne. A day after the indorsement was made the Democratic executive committee of the parish of Terre Bonne also nominated Judge Winchester. They then met the following night in the Fireman's Hall, in the town of Houma, in a meeting numbering 150 or 200, all Democrats. No Republican was admitted. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Thomas L. Winder, chairman of the Democratic campaign committee, who used the following language in his speech: "For twenty-five years this parish has been held in bondage by the Republican party with a negro majority; by the eternal God we shall deliver ourselves from the bondage of the negro and the Republican party. This is a white man's government and this parish shall be placed in the column of the other Democratic parishes regardless of the cost and what may be the penalty, if it takes blood to do it." Speeches as violent were made by the other speakers.

These speeches alarmed the colored people much. Knowing that they have a majority of at least 600 votes in Terre Bonne Parish, the leaders of the Republican party made an appeal to the planters and stated that if they would give them the protection of life and safety of the ballot and a fair count they would support the candidate of their choice for judge. They pledged themselves to do that, and they did so; they asked of the Republican sheriff to appoint a planter as deputy sheriff at each poll. The sheriff did so. There was no trouble all the day of election, because of the presence of each planter (deputy sheriff) with a Winchester rifle on his shoulder. By that means we succeeded in electing the Republican State ticket and all the Republican parish officers and Judge Allen, whom the Republican leaders promised to support. Being unable to carry out their threats and plans before the election, they sought revenge after the election by calling one man from his house and putting thirty bullets through him. After killing one man they came to my house to kill me also, but I was not fool enough to go to the door and be led out by them.

This man Tobias Gibson was the captain and leader of the mob. He said he wanted to have the two Democratic members of the house of representatives elected in order to secure those two votes for his brother as United States Senator.

This man Gibson was a candidate on the Democratic ticket for district attorney.

I was compelled to leave my home in Terre Bonne Parish to save my life; also a large number of Republicans were compelled to leave, and are now refugees in your city.

Respectfully, yours, etc.,

R. B. JOHNSON.

Maj. ANDREW HERO, Jr., City.

I append also a statement showing the perils of vote-distributing for Warmoth, giving the adventures of Mr. William Adams, a resident of Ouachita Parish, who was shot to death by unknown persons at the court-house in that parish:

[From the Daily City Item, Wednesday evening, April 25.]

WAS IT ASSASSINATION?—REMARKABLE ACCUSATIONS FROM MONROE.

The Item yesterday received information from Monroe to the effect that on Sunday, April 22, William Adams, a resident of Ouachita Parish, was shot to death by unknown parties at the court-house in that town. According to this authority Adams was first shot outside of the court-house, wounded in the nose and arm, and was subsequently captured and taken into the building, where he was killed by the mob. The provocation that led to this assassination is said to be as follows:

William Adams was a Republican, and just before the election he came to this city and obtained from Governor Warmoth authority to distribute the Republican tickets in Ouachita, Franklin, and other parishes of that district, and rendered himself very obnoxious to those who dominated the politics of that district, and that this led to his assassination. The number of men engaged in the affair could not be ascertained. On inquiring why no telegrams or other intelligence had been sent to the city, the gentleman said that there was an apparent reign of terror in Monroe, and that the people did not dare send out this news for fear of being assaulted.

Still another statement is that he was first shot in the court-house yard, wounded in the nose and arm; that he then retreated to his house, from which he subsequently returned to the court-house. Upon entering the court-house a scuffling was heard, and it is supposed that he was killed with knives. Shortly after a carriage was driven away from the court-house, which is supposed to have contained his body, which has not been found.

I received this morning a private letter from New Orleans, from which I will read an extract as illustrating the condition of affairs in Louisiana:

It is said that thousands of colored men voted for Nicholls. I do not know if this is true; but I know that I was born in Louisiana, educated at the college of the Jesuit Fathers of New Orleans. I have always lived here. I know thousands of colored men, and I have never met one who was a Democrat.

I hope the North will understand the South, and will be solid in the coming campaign. For President the Republican party will not have a single electoral vote from the South.

There are many Republicans in the South, but no Republican party. With the despotism of the Democratic party of the South an organization is not possible.

And this is the "fair vote and honest count" which was promised by the governor of Louisiana!

Upon the subject of spurious and manifestly fabricated majorities, or majorities that exceed the entire registered vote, the statistics are interesting. For instance, in the parish of Bossier, giving Nicholls 4,213 votes and Warmoth 95, making a total of 4,308 cast, the registered vote of the parish is but 3,603, making a difference between the votes returned as cast and the registered vote of 705.

In East Carroll Parish the registered vote was 2,576, of which Nicholls received 2,680, or 104 in excess of the entire registration, and Warmoth the remainder of 285, being a total of 389 votes more than appeared upon the lists.

Adjoining the parish of East Carroll is Madison, where the law was entirely "suspended." The registered vote in Madison was 3,360, of which 279 were white and 3,081 colored. Nicholls's vote was 2,530, with not a single vote for Warmoth, so that Nicholls received 170

votes more than the entire number of voters, white and colored, in the parish.

The parish of Concordia had a registered vote of 4,201, of which 448 were white and 3,753 colored. Nicholls received 4,219 votes in Concordia, being 18 votes more than the entire registration, and the Democracy gratuitously gave Warmoth 145, making a total of votes cast apparently 4,364, or an excess of 163 votes above the entire registration.

In Red River Parish the result was still more "unanimous." The registered vote was 1,181, of which Nicholls received 1,679 and Warmoth 78, being a total of 1,757, an excess of 576. Subtracting the registered vote of the parish from the vote received by Nicholls, it will be perceived that the "reform" candidate was given 498 votes more than the entire parish contains. This is a free vote and an honest count.

Coming down to the parish of West Baton Rouge we find a total of 1,811, of which 504 are white and 1,307 colored. In this parish Nicholls was given 1,712 and Warmoth 454, a total of 2,166, making an excess of votes counted above votes registered of 355.

Another illustration of the fulfillment of McEnery's pledge that he would see an "honest and fair election" is found in the vote of Vermillion, in Southwestern Louisiana, a parish whose registered vote is 2,099, of which Nicholls received 1,687 and Warmoth 619, total 2,306, an excess of 211.

In Washington Parish the registered vote was 965, of which Nicholls received 763, Warmoth 271, a total of 1,034, or 69 more votes than the registration shows to have been in the parish. In these precincts and parishes to which I have referred, containing a registered vote of a little less than 20,000, the excess of votes cast above the registration is more than 2,600.

The returning officers evidently thoroughly obeyed the injunction of Governor McEnery to see to it that their parishes returned a large Democratic majority. Upon a fair and reasonable estimate of the actual poll in Louisiana on the 17th day of April there is no room for rational doubt that Warmoth carried the State by not less than 25,000 majority, which was converted by the methods heretofore described into a majority for Nicholls of more than 83,000. It is not surprising that even Democratic newspapers revolt at such an extraordinary and unprecedented result. The Madison Times, a leading Democratic newspaper in Louisiana, declares that:

The ridiculous majority of over 60,000 (or perchance 70,000) will make trouble in local and district matters; the unparalleled Democratic majority will excite derisive sneers through the North, and will go far towards electing a Republican President (though as opposed to Mr. Cleveland that would not be a terrible misfortune), and when these things come about the curses both loud and deep showered on the head of S. D. McEnery will make him quail in dismay before the storm.

Only a suspension of the law could produce such an unnecessary and exaggerated majority, and Louisiana, and the Democratic party, if it indorses such methods, will become a by-word and a reproach. A weapon has been put into Republican hands to break Democratic heads, and the heads will surely suffer. A mistake has been made, and it will not be long before everybody will know it.

Mr. Thomas Fortune, a colored Democrat of scholarship and culture, in a letter to the Brooklyn Eagle upon the results of the election, says:

You know my opinions are more Democratic than Republican, and that for years I have striven to liberalize the opinions of colored votes to the point of viewing men and parties as intelligent citizens and tax-payers rather than as narrow, ignorant, and unreasoning partisans.

The 153 electoral votes of the South predicated upon a "system of suppression and oppression," will yet become as troublesome an old man of the sea on the back of the Democratic party as they once were upon that of the Republican party—a source of weakness where they now appear a source of strength. Mark that.

I believe in the broad Democracy of Jefferson, Jackson, and Tilden. I repudiate the bastard Democracy of the South, based upon a "system of suppression and oppression."

I do not here enter into the admitted difficulties arising out of the race problem in the South. I understand them as well as any other man born and reared and educated in the South. They are systematically magnified for partisan advantage. I simply pin myself down to the scandalous outrage of constitutional guaranty and Democratic principle embodied in the system of suppression and oppression. Our Constitution recognizes neither race nor creed in its citizenship. It covers all the races of men except the Chinese. It is a question of principle, and we can not admit that it is just to outrage the principle in Louisiana without admitting that it is just to outrage it in New York.

Mr. President, it is by such performances as these in Louisiana that the South is kept solid by the Democratic party, and it is by such pretensions as those set forth by the Senator from Indiana that an attempt is to be made to divide the North at the approaching election. It is an absurd and intolerable declaration that—

but for the attitude and influence of Horatio Seymour, Thomas A. Hendricks, Allen G. Thurman, William A. Richardson, and their political associates and followers, not only would the Union never have been restored, but that the dearest and most sacred rights of American citizenship would have been swept away in the blinding storm of partisan wrath, which was most frequently mistaken for patriotic zeal.

Or that the—

Democratic party began its career and has maintained it in the broad spirit of nationality and fraternal union. No thought of a disunion of the States ever entered its councils as a party, and it filled the ranks of armies in the North and commanded them with its bravest and best.

No one has ever pretended to assert that there were no Democrats

in the Union armies, or that all Democrats were disloyal; but there were no Republicans voluntarily in the rebel armies, nor were there any Republicans who were disloyal. The great mass of the Democrats were on one side and the great mass of the Republicans on the other. There were no Republicans enrolled in the "Sons of Liberty" or as "Knights of the Golden Circle." These were Democrats. Every member of Congress who declared that he would not vote a man or a dollar or a gun to carry on the war for the Union was a Democrat. Every man who described Union soldiers as "Lincoln dogs and hirelings, who deserved to have collars welded about their necks," was a Democrat. All guerrillas and bushwhackers, the men from Union States who entered the Confederate service for plunder—in war cut-throats, in peace horse-thieves—were Democrats. All those who believed that it was honorable warfare to infect and destroy innocent men and women by the introduction of fever-infected clothing, all those were Democrats. Quantrell, Bill Anderson, Dave Livingstone, Hildebrand, and the James boys belonged then, as they would were they living now, to the Democratic organization.

Equally untenable is the claim that such a party so organized and recruited is the special champion and friend now of the pensioners, and committed to the policy of liberal relief to the surviving soldiers of the Union armies.

The Senator from Indiana enlarged upon the title of the Democracy to this confidence, and insisted that because the President had signed more bills than any other Executive the pretensions of the Democrats were fully sustained. The real question is not how many more has he signed, but how many more has he vetoed? I have examined the record with some care, and the following tabulated statement will be of some interest as exhibiting the number of private pension bills approved and the number of private pension bills vetoed in the last half century.

Name of President.	Number approved.	Number vetoed.
Jackson .....	176	.....
Polk .....	160	.....
Taylor .....	1	.....
Fillmore .....	62	.....
Pierce .....	158	.....
Buchanan .....	117	.....
Lincoln .....	48	.....
Johnson .....	431	.....
Grant .....	499	5
Hayes .....	329	.....
Arthur .....	684	.....
Cleveland .....	801	122

Two pension bills became laws without his signature, and one was passed over his veto.

The statement, however, is not entirely accurate, because in earlier Congresses it was the habit to pass pension bills embracing many persons. One bill, approved May 2, 1830, contained 130 different persons by name, who were pensioned for various reasons, but in the computation under the administration of Jackson this bill is counted only as one.

The President has been consistent in but one course apparently, and that is in his opposition to Federal soldiers and to liberal bills for their relief. He vetoed the disability bill last session, but found no difficulty in approving the service bill for the surviving soldiers of the Mexican war, under which the first pension was granted to the Confederate general John S. Williams, of Kentucky; another to the widow of the rebel general George E. Pickett, the Confederate hero of Gettysburgh, who holds certificate 1056; to the widow of the rebel general Braxton Bragg, who holds certificate No. 4040; the widow of the rebel general Gideon J. Pillow, who commanded at Fort Donelson with Floyd and Buckner and escaped during the night previous to the capitulation.

The Senator from Indiana declares that the—

Especially angry of Republican leaders is excited because the vote of the South in a national contest is solid against their party. Will some one on the other side of the Chamber, and with even the slightest knowledge of human nature, tell me how the vote of the South could be other than it is? You had political supremacy once from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. At one time and another for seven years and more after the war you had the ascendancy in every State of the entire South; you elected Republican governors, State officers, and Legislatures in them all. You had the purse with which to corrupt, the sword with which to intimidate, and a Republican Congress and President to enact and to enforce all laws necessary for the overthrow of individual and State rights and for the consolidation of your power.

You seized upon the enfranchised negro and sought to organize and hurl him against the peace and security of political and social order, and for a time and in many instances you succeeded. You and your allies, who mostly went there from the North, not "allies of the Confederacy," but allies for power and plunder, swept down upon the helpless South like Hyder-Ali upon the Carnatic, and left scarcely a vestige from which to hope and with which to rebuild, except its never-falling soil and its stanch and splendid manhood. You despoiled States of their resources, and you dismantled them of their credit. You issued their bonds and securities in the interest of fraud, and hawked them on the markets, like counterfeit paper, for anything you could get.

You ordered investigations, and sent committees and commissions, composed of your bitterest partisans, into the South, for the purpose of scraping together

and putting in permanent form the perjuries of vagabonds and scoundrels with which to defame and blacken the reputations of the Southern people. They were proclaimed in some instances as bandits, and in others as barbarians. You repeatedly annulled honest elections when their results were favorable to the stability and good order of society and against the schemes of partisan plunderers. You would have overturned the State government of South Carolina in 1876, and again sacked the substance and the credit of the State, had it not been that a giant stood in your way upheld by the public judgment of the world.

You provoked collisions between the two races in order to justify military usurpation and to inflame sectional hate at the North. Sir, the career of the Republican party during its ascendancy in the South was a career of crime, unrelieved by a single act tending to promote the education, the progress, the prosperity, the peace, or the happiness of either race, white or black. It reared and left behind it no monument of patriotism, wisdom, or benevolence to tell future ages that its presence had been a blessing and not a curse. And when the future historian comes to inquire why and how and exactly when the Republican party lost its tremendous hold on the prostrate South and slunk away to return no more forever, he will be puzzled to make answer in definite details, but he will finally write that its administration throughout all that region had become so vast and intolerable a scandal, filling the civilized world with its foul odors, that an intelligent and omnipotent public opinion here and everywhere demanded its downfall and the restoration on its ruins of home rule and decent government.

And it is this party, sir, whose leaders now fume and resolve and threaten the Southern people and their States, because they do not welcome it back again into power with all its unhallowed memories and its predaceous instincts and habits! As well might you expect a frontier settlement to welcome with joy a second invasion of tomahawks and scalping-knives.

In the controversy that is now before us the Republican party is not asking for power, but it is demanding justice. It has made incredible sacrifices in the past for justice, and it now stands, as it has done hitherto, insisting that there shall be equal rights and exact justice in every portion of the Republic.

The Republican party, with its illustrious membership and its record of imperishable glory, does not suffer from the denunciations of the Senator from Indiana, who in the same speech denounced Seward as a political charlatan; Stanton, in his grave, as an organizer of defeat; and the brave, patriotic Pope as a vain, inglorious, and incompetent military pretender.

In the supreme struggle for constitutional liberty, in the crisis of the national life, millions of patriots responded to the call of the Government for defense against the conspirators and traitors who first sought to betray and then to destroy. But for their incredible sufferings and sacrifices, their patriotic devotion, their death, we should have no country, no vast continental commonwealth shored by the oceans, comprehending all zones, all creeds, and all tongues, gratifying the highest hopes and realizing the loftiest aspirations of humanity. Instead of this majestic Union there would have been an incoherent assemblage of jealous and discordant communities, rent with internal feuds and quarrels intestine, without permanence or stability. The United States of America would have been blotted from the map; its past would have been a troubled and distempered dream; its fragments would have been a present menace to prosperity and peace. Our future would be a frustrated and broken hope, contemplated by tyrants with derision and by their victims with despair. Our history and our traditions, the teachings of our sages, the eloquence of our statesmen, the achievements of our heroes on land and sea, would have been distributed among insignificant claimants or dispersed and dissipated like the trivial assets of an insolvent partnership. The Declaration of Independence would have been an empty echo, the Constitution of the United States an antiquarian relic, and American citizenship a forgotten and abandoned attribute.

Averting our gaze from this tragic and lamentable spectacle of what might have been, we behold in the far centuries that are to come the prophetic vision of a united, prosperous, and happy America; a vast, homogeneous dominion of freemen, rulers of the continent from the polar zone to the Gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, enjoying the franchises of liberty inherited from us and perpetuating the arts of peace. And no generation will ever forget, as they assemble to recall the memories of this age, that the nation holds in its fertile and tender breast no more priceless treasure than the consecrated dust of those who died that this might be a government of laws and not of men, and that liberty and constitutional government might not forever perish from the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kansas yields the floor, hoping that he will be glad to hear the sentence a portion of which he quoted to the Senate from memory, I will call his attention to the official record of Congress on page 202, under date of April 3, 1879, three lines marked, constituting the sentence of mine a portion of which he read.

Mr. INGALLS. Give them to the Reporter.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will leave the Senator to make any correction he pleases when the Secretary shall read the words.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

We do not intend to stop until we have stricken the last vestige of your war measures from the statute-book, which, like these, were born of the passions incident to civil strife and looked to the abridgment of the liberty of the citizen.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is all.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, there is a fable with regard to a mountain in labor, a vast object struggling to express or bring forth something worthy of itself, and at last it is recorded that a poor, small mouse was seen creeping up into the distance from the labors of the mountain. The spectators had expected to see volcanic action, power

displayed, but when the end came they saw nothing of the kind, and I have never been more reminded of that fable than on this occasion.

Two hours have passed away. The blare of trumpets and notes brought here a large audience, and what have they heard, and what have they seen? Were it not for here and there a small, old, stale allusion to myself happening long years ago, and despised then as despised now, I would not rise to my feet to say a single word.

The Senator from Kansas mistakes himself. When I made my remarks last week, few and brief, but truthful, coming from my heart, my allusions to him were not because of him personally. I had no animosity towards him; I have no rivalry with him; I have no antagonism against him; but when I found the great Republican party, an organization worthy of battle anywhere, placing him in the highest position in the gift of the Government short of the Presidency of the United States, and listening to his accusation and arraignment here on this floor, I passed him by to ask the Republican party whether they expected to write the history of the war in falsehood, whether they expected to dictate a tome in history that men who were Democrats, faithful and loyal to their party, were disloyal thereby, notwithstanding the great services they had rendered their country.

That was the occasion of my allusion to the Senator from Kansas. He was more incidental to my remarks than protection is to a tariff for revenue. I alluded to him as incidental to my remarks. Why should I assail him?

Mr. President, as I have said, men mistake themselves, and the Senator from Kansas more than anybody I know. He has not been alive politically since the 6th of March last. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] disposed of him, and he has been dead politically ever since. [Applause in the galleries.] He has been walking—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. If there is a repetition of this applause in the galleries, the Chair will peremptorily order the Sergeant-at-Arms to clear the galleries.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is right. It ought to have been done some time ago, however, to make the thing fair. [Laughter.]

I repeat, Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has been walking the streets and posing before the world as a political vitality since the 6th of March. As an old friend of mine once said to me in Indianapolis, who was in failing health, "I have been dead, but I am walking around to save funeral expenses." [Laughter.] So the Senator from Kansas has been walking around to save funeral expenses in a political way. The Senator from Kentucky settled that question.

The only criticism I have seen in the press of the country in regard to my remarks of last Wednesday alluding to the Senator from Kansas has been that I galvanized the corpse. I disclaim any purpose of that kind, because I made no attack upon him, intended none, but I did intend an attack upon the Republican party. I regard the Senator from Kansas, whatever his harsh opinions may be of me, as the most brilliant and capable man on his side of the Chamber, and elevated to its highest position consequently; and when I listened to the amazing and extraordinary speech of his on the 6th of March I passed him by and I arraigned the party of which he is made the leader here because no member of that party on that side of the Chamber, either here or in the other branch of Congress, disclaimed his terrible assault upon the most brilliant names in American history.

That, Mr. President, is the reason why his name came under my review, not because of personal hostility, not because of any desire to injure him—far from it. But it seems to me the Senator is mistaken in another thing. He not only saw fit to descend from the chair to make the assault of which I am speaking, but he readily assumed the rôle of orator for the occasion, if I may so say.

Mr. President, I was raised upon a farm in the country. I have seen the splendid peacock upon a high barn-yard fence posing of a summer morning, looking at his own feathers in the glare of the sun, delighted with himself and vocalizing the whole neighborhood with his harsh, unmusical, and unmeaning cries, unmindful of the fact that there were more useful fowls in that barn-yard; and I would commend that fable, however feebly told, to the Senator from Kansas. He is not the only bird of beauty or of usefulness on the Republican side of the Senate, and if he will get anybody else to assume the responsibility which I shall speak of directly of his 6th of March speech, I will divide that responsibility with him and with them.

Sir, that Senator saw fit to-day to arraign me. How useless a task! What a waste of time! He read here the old, stale, putrid, rotten slanders of years gone by, on which I have trampled in forty campaigns. They sounded to me like the voices of old, decayed, hackneyed political campaign liars of the last twenty-five years. That I ever uttered one word derogatory to the Union soldiers, that I ever talked about their having collars around their necks, is so base a lie, so infamous a falsehood, that the black walls of perdition can not repeat them with impunity. I say so. When the war closed I ran a race for Congress in a Republican district of 1,500 majority, in 1868, with Seymour and Blair up for President and Vice-President, and they were Democrats. I carried that district in the first race I ran after the war was over and the soldiers all home, because the soldiers all believed as I now pronounce every word of that slander a calumny and falsehood. I pronounce it so here.

I do not defend myself. The people of Indiana have defended me. I do not need to stand here and respond to what the Senator from Kansas has said. I spit upon it; I spurn it; I kick it from me; I despise it; and I say to the Senator from Kansas, without meaning the full extent of what perhaps my words may convey, that it is not in his power to fish up from the sewers of infamy old campaign lies and make them respectable in the Senate of the United States; but it is possible for him in a short step to put himself on equality with them.

What have the people of Indiana answered on these questions? What have they said? I stand here, sir, with four commissions as a member of this body. I never have had an opponent in my own party; popular majorities have risen on the legislative tickets from 20,000 to 30,000 in my State. The largest majority on joint ballot ever given a man since the State was in the Union has been given for me; and let me say to the Senator from Kansas, in order to warn him against the temerity and recklessness with which he has dealt with me, that no committee ever followed me here; no suspicion ever followed me here; no affidavit charging that I bought my way ever followed me here and asperated my title. Never was I whitewashed by any report as a Senator; and it ill becomes the Senator from Kansas to arraign me, standing as I do upon the record given me by the people of Indiana. I, sir, can afford, infinitely afford to despise and condemn the reckless charges made by the Senator from Kansas.

I will do the Senator from Kansas this justice, as I look at it: I have admired his brilliancy, his scholastic habit, but he was born with inaccuracy marked upon him. If he was my long-lost brother, and I was looking for the stripling, I should look for "Inaccuracy" marked on him somewhere. He does not state things correctly and can not do so. Why, sir, a few moments ago, when reading the platform of the Democratic party in 1864, he stopped in the middle of a sentence at a comma. I have it here, and I will allude to it again. I would commend to the Senator, with his brilliant talents and his great leadership, a straight, old-fashioned adherence to the truth. Imagination he has imperial, power of language beyond almost anybody; but there is something more than that necessary to carry weight and strength, and that is to know your facts. When he assails me, as he has done here, I answer back that the people of Indiana have settled these questions and settled them as I have in many a hard-fought battle against the miserable and slanderous accusations that have been made.

Mr. President, I have observed the Senator from Kansas and what he has said in regard to his assault on McClellan and Hancock. I pray my Father in Heaven to smite me if I would do him or anybody else injustice; but he did here on this floor denounce McClellan and Hancock as false and traitorous to their country in war, not in peace, and I will show it—not in peace, after the war was over, but in war. I looked carefully over what the Senator said at a Grand Army meeting, when he spoke of the fact that his allusion was to their adherence to the Confederacy after the Confederacy fell! Nobody thought of such an explanation. He was inaccurate even then in stating that McClellan rode down the Avenue. He did not. It is so reported; I take it back, as the Senator shakes his head, and he may consider it as dropped; but that was the way he was reported.

But, Mr. President, how could George B. McClellan and General Hancock be allies of the Confederacy when it was no more? Just look at this thing broadly and squarely. The Senator from Kansas stands before the public as pretending that he alluded to those grand officers of the Union Army as allies of a vanished cause, of a broken cause; allies of the Confederacy when the president of the Confederacy was in irons in Fortress Monroe; allies of the Confederacy when every one of its armies was flying, when there was no organization of its government, when the world spoke not of it as a Confederacy.

Let me show the Senator from Kansas that he might have corrected this alleged false impression, had he seen fit to do so, very soon. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], with a superb composure equal to his superb eloquence, while on the floor said, speaking of the Senator from Kansas:

In his intemperate zeal he has not hesitated to invade graves. In his frantic efforts to stir prejudice between sections that have already been reunited he goes into the trenches of the soldiery, and not on my side but on his side, and drags up for abuse and vilification before the American Senate such men as traced with their own unblemished swords in blood the brightest pages of American history. McClellan and Hancock are to be denounced upon this floor as allies of Confederates. Might it not have been in better taste, more creditable at least to the courage and to the candor of that Senator, if he had made that charge before both of these men were dead?

"I made the charge often," interrupted the Senator from Kansas, before they were dead that they were allies of the Confederates. The Senator from Kentucky responded:

Then so much the worse for the Senator from Kansas. What warrant or ground had he for that, except that they were both different from himself, at least in political faith, if we may not hope in many other regards?

Then said the eloquent Senator from Kentucky:

Hancock an ally of the Confederates!

This was the Senator standing there and the Senator from Kansas over there.

Was he so regarded and believed when, weltering in his blood upon Cemetery Heights, he refused to be taken from the field, and yet persisted in giving orders to check the last advance of Longstreet's irresistible veterans?

These two Senators were standing and sitting near by and face to face. Here was the question hurled from the Senator from Kentucky, "Was he so regarded and believed when weltering in his blood on Cemetery Heights?" The question was then asked of the Senator from Kansas which he could have answered, was he so regarded when commanding at Gettysburgh, when leading the Union forces. Was it then, says the Senator from Kentucky, that you meant to charge that he was an ally of the Confederacy?

The Senator from Kansas says now that he meant long years afterwards. The Senator from Kentucky gave him a chance, and I use the words that he was more imposing in utterance because it gave an opportunity to the Senator from Kansas to answer. Did he answer the Senator from Kentucky, pausing himself there as we all remember, asking whether Hancock was regarded as an ally when bleeding at Cemetery Heights, commanding the Union lines, resisting Longstreet's charge? The Senator from Kansas, who is alert in debate, circumspect, and clear, sitting where he sits now, could have answered him, "I do not mean then; I mean afterwards when politics raged, when he became a candidate for the Presidency." That is what he says now.

Sir, without meaning any disrespect to the Senator from Kansas, his present position is a miserable afterthought. It is not what he impressed upon the country then. The Senator from Kentucky gave him an opportunity to disclaim all that he charges now, and he saw fit to sit in his chair and let it go by, and let the brilliant and, as he to-day declared, the superb Hancock go under the ban of an ally of the Confederacy. There is no escape from this.

I repeat, not for the purpose of tautology or iteration, but to emphasize the fact before the country, that the Senator from Kansas said he had often charged Hancock with being an ally of the Confederacy, and when the Senator from Kentucky asked him "When? Was it when he bled at Gettysburgh? Was it when he lay in those lines and refused to be carried away?" and the Senator from Kansas opened not his mouth. It is too late, sir. The verdict of history is against him and will stand against him.

But what else is there on this subject?

Mr. President, we seem to be parading in the midst of a false scene, the creation of some magician with malicious purpose, with mischief in his eye. George B. McClellan, an ally of the Confederacy! There is a passage in the speech of the Senator from Kansas which I spared him last Wednesday, which I forbore to bring forward here, which is so crushing, killing, and conclusive that I did not discuss it at that time. Said the Senator from Kansas on that occasion:

We know why Hancock was nominated. We know why that other ally of the Confederacy, George B. McClellan, was nominated, who had just declared that the war was a failure after he had been trying for two years to make it so.

The last part of that sentence is what I spared—"after he had been trying for two years to make it so." He declared the war a failure after trying two years to make it so! Sir, that covers more than the period of his entire service. He was in the service not over sixteen months. I think I said fourteen months the other day. If I did, perhaps I shortened it more than I should have done.

The Senator from Kansas says that "for two years," so as to make it sure, from the time that he was brought here from his brilliant military and successful record in West Virginia until he was deposed in November, 1862, he had tried to make the war a failure.

The Senator from Kansas is an adept in the use of language. He knows the meaning of language, and I know him too well to suppose that he will complain when I hold him to the meaning of his language.

Benedict Arnold never did more than that. He tried to make the war of the Revolution a failure. He negotiated down the banks of the Hudson in the dark. He took André across the river and called him Mr. Anderson, clothed him in disguise, and sent him back. He was to accept his \$10,000 in gold and a brigadiership in the British army, which he did, and did for what? To make the war of the Revolution a failure. No bitterer charge can be brought against Benedict Arnold than the Senator from Kansas brought against George B. McClellan, and he knows it as well as I do. He knows that his charge that McClellan was an ally of the Confederacy does not apply to the civil period subsequent to the war. He knows that his charge that McClellan was false to his country and an ally of the Confederacy is explained by that portion of the sentence which says he had tried to make the war a failure. A marshal of the army of France surrendered 180,000 men at Metz and was ordered to be shot to death. He only tried to make the war against Prussia a failure; that was all. He failed in his duty. He was forced from his command, and it is all covered by the language of the Senator from Kansas that he desired to make the war a failure.

More base, more infamous conduct can not be attributed to a man on the earth than that he wears the epaulets, takes the sword, takes the honors of the country, goes into the field with a false heart desiring to make a war a failure; and that, allow me to say to the Senator from Kansas, is what he charged upon this gentleman, this soldier, and this patriot. You can not make the country believe that of George B. McClellan. It is false from top to bottom. Before Richmond in that

dreadful, bloody contest of seven days, with one-third of his rightful army held from him—the Senators around me of the Confederate army will bear witness to what I say—McClellan was driven and beaten every day for six days, fighting stubbornly and hard against the first flower of the Confederate power before they were defeated, before their forces were stricken, before they had been decimated in battle; and yet that man, General McClellan, held the confidence of his men. On the seventh day he gathered his forces about him, every man believing in him, and at the battle of Malvern Hill, his artillery parked and his infantry steady as veterans to their holy cause, he inflicted upon the Confederate forces almost a fatal and final overthrow. That was the manner of man that is said to have planned and desired the failure of the war during all the time he was there!

Why should I not speak as I did last week? Why should I not speak for the truth of history? Why should I not say what I knew to be true? Why should I not refute as far as my humble voice could the dictates of partisan falsehood and madness on this question?

George B. McClellan was the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1864. The Senator says that he was practically an ally of the Confederacy after the war was over. I have said all I wish to say in my speech of Wednesday last about the great battle of Antietam. It is as important as any other battle-field of the world where the destinies of nations were turned. Had the result been different the history of this country would have been different; and when McClellan rode into that fight quietly but firmly in his saddle there were no such men around him as the Senator from Kansas, who would say he was trying to overthrow our country. There was nothing against him in the voice of the country then, whatever might have been suppressed in the War Department or in the hearts of rivals. There were faith and hope in his courage and in his capacity, and the result showed that the faith and hope were not misplaced.

But, sir, the Senator from Kansas sees fit to attack General McClellan as a candidate for the Presidency or in civil life as if there was something wonderful there. He read from the Chicago platform of 1864, and stopped at the words "cessation of hostilities," when the sentence continues as follows—

with a view to an ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that at the earliest practicable moment peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal union of the States.

No thought of disunion. Whether the resolution was wise or unwise, I am not discussing; I am discussing McClellan to-day, and I ask what said he on this question that justifies the Senator from Kansas in aspersing his great fame in order to call an audience together to denounce a man as faithful to duty as was ever known in human history? McClellan in his letter of acceptance of the Presidential nomination in September, 1864, said:

It is unnecessary for me to say to you that this nomination comes to me unsought. I am happy to know that when the nomination was made, the record of my public life was kept in view.

He continues:

The effect of long and varied service in the Army during war and peace, has been to strengthen and make indelible to my mind and heart the love and reverence for the Union, Constitution, laws, and flag of our country impressed upon me in early youth. These feelings have thus far guided the course of my life, and must continue to do so to its end.

The existence of more than one government over the region which once owned our flag is incompatible with the peace, the power, and the happiness of the people.

The preservation of our Union was the sole avowed object for which the war was commenced. It should have been conducted for that object only, and in accordance with those principles which I took occasion to declare when in active service.

Thus conducted, the work of reconciliation would have been easy, and we might have reaped the benefits of our many victories on land and sea.

The Union was originally formed by the exercise of a spirit of conciliation and compromise.

Is that disloyal?

To restore and preserve it the same spirit must prevail in our councils and in the hearts of the people. The re-establishment of the Union in all its integrity is and must continue to be the indispensable condition in any settlement.

And that is the expression of a man who it is said wanted the war to be a failure—"must continue to be the indispensable condition in any settlement."

So soon as it is clear, or even probable, that our present adversaries are ready for peace, upon the basis of the Union, we should exhaust all the resources of statesmanship practiced by civilized nations and taught by the traditions of the American people, consistent with the honor and interests of the country, to secure such peace, re-establish the Union, and guaranty for the future the constitutional rights of every State.

Was there ever broader statesmanship? Was there ever broader constitutional thought? Was there ever anything more worthy of commendation, however it may strike the mind of the Senator from Kansas?

General McClellan continues:

The Union is the one condition of peace—we ask no more.

Sir, there has been so much calumny, so much inconsiderate and reckless slander against George B. McClellan that while I am on my feet and hardly fit to be upon my feet, I intend to stay here until I do his great and beloved memory some justice. He continues:

Let me add, what I doubt not was, although unexpressed, the sentiment of the convention, as it is of the people they represent, that when any one State

is willing to return to the Union, it should be received at once, with a full guaranty of all its constitutional rights.

Is that what the Senator from Kansas objects to?

If a frank, earnest, and persistent effort to obtain these objects should fail, the responsibility for ulterior consequences will fall upon those who remain in arms against the Union. But the Union must be preserved at all hazards.

I could not—

Says McClellan—

I could not look in the face of my gallant comrades of the Army and Navy who have survived so many bloody battles, and tell them that their labors and the sacrifice of so many of our slain and wounded brethren had been in vain, that we had abandoned that Union for which we have so often periled our lives. A vast majority of our people, whether in the Army and Navy or at home, would, as I would, hail with unbounded joy the permanent restoration of peace, on the basis of the Union under the Constitution without the effusion of another drop of blood. But no peace can be permanent without Union.

As to other questions, he proceeds to discuss them. Sir, look back to the war; its glorious victories and even its glorious defeats under McClellan answer for his constancy and fidelity in war; that letter answers for the same in peace; and yet to-day, after time for consideration, the Senator from Kansas has no apology to make for standing here on the 6th of March, and saying that for two years George B. McClellan had endeavored to make the war for the Union a failure.

Am I, or am I not, justified before the American people in answering as I did, not in any personal hostility, malignancy, or antagonism, but in calling the attention of the country to the fact that the highest officer now in the Government by Republican suffrage dares to confront the common sense and the common decency of the nation with a charge of this kind? He had a chance to disavow as to McClellan when the Senator from Kentucky interrogated him. I can only say he had a chance not to have made this aspersion upon McClellan.

There is another matter in this regard. In speaking of the support which the Democratic party gave to McClellan and Hancock he introduced the case of our support of Horace Greeley. Sir, I was not under any circumstances for Horace Greeley. I did all I could to prevent the Democratic party from taking what I thought was a false step. But when they took that step—I am one of those men who hold that a party is wiser than an individual—I bowed my head and went to defeat with them. But I was not prepared to have the Senator from Kansas or anybody else, because we did so, and in connection with the names of McClellan and Hancock, say that there was never an occasion wherein the Democratic party did not "commit illicit intercourse with the degraded elements of the North," characterizing McClellan and Hancock and Horace Greeley as the degraded elements of the North. I see that in the pamphlet speech (and I congratulate him upon his sense of propriety to use no other word) the word "subservient" is put in the pamphlet speech instead of the word "degraded," as appears in the RECORD. It appears in the RECORD that the Democratic party in supporting McClellan and Hancock was in "illicit intercourse with the degraded elements of the North." I congratulate the Senator on striking out that word and making it "subservient elements of the North" in the pamphlet speech.

Sir, what more should I say? I do not intend on this occasion to discuss in detail the affairs of the South. I do say that my statement in regard to Louisiana, notwithstanding the denial of the Senator from Kansas, will be substantially sustained by the figures of history and by her able and accomplished representatives on this floor. I commit, with all confidence, the task to them.

Sir, the Senator from Kansas saw fit to impugn my right to speak upon military affairs. After quoting reports and assigning the authority of the Cincinnati Commercial for what I said, he arraigned me as one whom he thought most likely had fought the battles of the war. He shakes his head to me now, and it only shows that inaccuracy is indelibly written on his face—a want of memory, no more.

Why, sir, let me say to the Senator from Kansas that there is something queer in his own history. He has not faltered or shrunk from bringing up the harsh, the old, stale, exploded, and decayed slanders that have been uttered against me. I uttered nothing against his personal character when I spoke here a week ago. I did arraign him as the representative of his party, and through him I sought to arraign his party sitting around him there, and to make them stand by him or stand off.

I do not intend here this afternoon to pay compliments to the Senator from Kansas. If I did I would say he was bolder than his associates, and brighter, too; but be that as it may, how comes it that he becomes a military censor? How comes it that he becomes a military critic? It happens that I have looked through the books. The Senator from Kansas came here young, handsome, and brilliant, in 1873, and the Directories—I have them here from that day twelve years forward—contain an unbroken statement. I must say that the Senator from Kansas had a care to see to it that all he had done in life was put into that biography. There was no official position missed. He had been secretary of the Wyandotte convention, and that was put down, and everything else was put down.

We all know, Mr. President, that it is put down by ourselves, for nobody knows that much about us, and it would be of small consequence whether any one did or not. I do not blame the Senator from Kansas for having it all put in. He tells us he was born in Massachusetts in

1833. It is a good place to be born in, and a good State to emigrate from. I beg pardon of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. My allusion the Senator from Massachusetts will understand when I say that the best emigration I know of on this continent was that whose centennial he spoke so eloquently at Marietta a few weeks ago. When I say to the Senator from Kansas that Massachusetts was a good State for him to be born in and a good State for him to emigrate from, it is no aspersion on that great old classic State which the Senator from Massachusetts does so much to honor.

Mr. HOAR. I shall not undertake to pardon the Senator from Indiana, as he requests, but I recommend him to mercy.

Mr. VOORHEES. Now, don't you know that I am complimenting you? Don't bother me. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Kansas not only tells us where and when he was born, in this biography which I have here, but he tells us where he went to school. He tells us that he read law and that he was admitted to practice law. He tells us when he went to Kansas and what he did there, with a circumstantiality and minutiae that is extremely creditable to his memory. But, sir, from 1873 until December, 1885, twelve weary years, the feeble memory of that Senator did not remember that he had ever been in the military service of his country in any way, shape, or form, and for twelve years there was a statement without one reference to the great military services he had rendered his country. I have the statement here of his services. Suppose I read it. The Senator spoke two hours; I shall not speak one.

John James Ingalls, of Atchison, was born at Middleton, Mass., December 29, 1833; graduated at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., in the class of 1855; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1857, and has since been engaged in the practice of law; removed to Kansas in October, 1858; was a member of the Wyandotte constitutional convention in 1859; secretary of the Territorial council in 1860; secretary of the State senate in 1861; member of the State senate of Kansas from Atchison County in 1862; editor of the Atchison Champion in 1863, 1864, and 1865.

I am not leaving anything out.

Defeated as anti-Lane candidate for lieutenant-governor in 1862, and again in 1864.

He rather prided himself on running against Lane. I do not blame him for that much. [Laughter.]

Was elected to the United States Senate as a Republican to succeed S. C. Pomroy, Republican; took his seat March 4, 1873, and was re-elected.

Leaving out "re-elected," it answers from the beginning.

Now, Mr. President, it is a singular circumstance, not one that is discreditably at all, yet I do not know—let us see how it reads now. It reads in the same words precisely with one parenthetical invasion. I wish I could say those things like the Senator from Kansas does, so as to be startling and striking; but suppose I call it a parenthetical invasion. Here is his autobiography of twelve years' long standing, in which, after saying everything else that has been said in what I read, he then says:

Major, lieutenant-colonel, and judge-advocate Kansas volunteers, 1863-'65.

Then he goes on and finishes it. That is the parenthetical invasion in the autobiography. Two years ago last December, in December, 1885, the Senator from Kansas remembered for the first time since the war that he had been a major and a lieutenant-colonel and judge-advocate of Kansas volunteers.

Sir, I have read in regard to the fountain of honors. In monarchical countries the king and the emperor constitute the fountain of rank and of military honor. In this country, under our Constitution, the President and this body in its power to confirm, compose the fountain of splendid honor which has given to the world its mighty names. But it seems the Senator from Kansas combines all these powers within himself. In December, 1885, he appointed himself a major in the Directory, and then promoted himself to a lieutenant-colonel in the Directory, and became a judge-advocate of Kansas volunteers in the Directory. [Laughter.]

Now, if the Senator from Kansas can find in any adjutant-general's report of the State of Kansas where his name ever appeared as a warrior, even in the diluted and dilapidated form of judge-advocate [laughter], I will let up on him. I say here that the American Army has but three names of Ingalls in it. Rufus Ingalls, and I speak his name with honor, the old Quartermaster-General, the old reliable friend of Grant, was one Ingalls. There was another Ingalls, who commanded a regiment from New York, and when we go out towards Kansas there was another Ingalls, by the name of Pearl P. Ingalls, who was a chaplain of an Iowa regiment. I will ask the Senator from Iowa about him. He prayed and preached. That is the nearest that the name of Ingalls is found in the United States Army in the records of the War Department. Being pious, perhaps he was a cousin of the Senator, but I do not know how that may be. There was none other.

All this, Mr. President, is not much to the American people. The Senator from Kansas and myself know how little it counts, and all that justifies me in bringing it forward is that that Senator on such a slender foundation sees fit to appear as the censor of George B. McClellan and General Hancock.

I ask him if I am not fair in presenting the reasons why somebody else ought to discuss the military aspects of this question besides him. He may say that somebody ought besides me. I will answer, yes, but,

sir, I will say that he has no greater claims than I; and here, once for all, whatever shortcomings I may have had, I will stand with him on a popular vote before the soldiers of Indiana or the soldiers of Kansas, and leave this body if I am not approved by them over him. If that is arrogance, it is justified by the provocation.

The Senator from Kansas has alluded to General Hancock's celebrated Order No. 40, issued while he was at New Orleans, issued in the blazing spirit of civil liberty, the supremacy of civil government over the military. It spoke the voice of the fathers and rang out over the country as a bugle-call back to the foundations of the Government. The Senator saw fit to denounce it. I have simply to answer in response that the Supreme Court of the United States, composed of men of the Senator's own political persuasion, construed that order to be constitutional and founded upon the eternal principles of liberty.

Mr. President, I have occupied the floor as long as I designed to do so. I spoke, as I said, a week ago for the truth of history, and here in my heart I reassert and reaffirm what I then said. I am willing that the figures in regard to pensions may be summed up as between those stated by the Senator from Kansas and myself. I will not open that question and go into detail now. As to the history of the South and the history of reconstruction, I stated the true scenes through which I lived, through which I passed, and which I know. I know that the Republican party in its dominancy and supremacy spoliated the South of over \$200,000,000, broke in dishonor her civil governments, and but for the fact that she is composed of a people born to self-reliance, born to civilization and the higher arts and walks of life, they would have destroyed them from the earth.

In addition to what I said last week I will say here now that the annals of mankind furnish no other instance where the system of labor, social organization was torn up and turned upside down, slaves set free (which I was glad of) and put on top in political supremacy (which I was not), where society held together as it did in the South. You may attack, you may denounce, you may make war on such a people, but the end is their triumph and your defeat. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. INGALLS. It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to prolong the debate. I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Indiana has thought best to refer to personal matters in connection with my history, to which I do not propose now to advert. My military service was inconspicuous and obscure, and no one is more conscious than I am of the debt that I owe my country, and of the unpaid obligation of gratitude which I am under to those who did what I might under other circumstances have done.

But inasmuch as the Senator from Indiana has seen fit to invite comparison between his record, his history, and his relation and mine to the great questions that have for the past twenty-five years attracted the attention of the country, I feel it to be my duty, in the defense of the truth of history, to put on record the information in my possession, and I have it in a shape I think that he will not deny. I shall refer only to public matters in public records, and I shall venture the affirmation that whatever may have been my own relation to the great struggle between the North and the South, and for constitutional liberty, the Senator from Indiana was from the outset the determined, outspoken, positive, aggressive, and malignant enemy of the Union cause.

Mr. VOORHEES. I pronounce that deliberately false.

Mr. INGALLS. Well—

Mr. VOORHEES. It is absolutely false. I voted for every dollar that was paid to the soldier, for every suit of clothes he wore, and every pension that he has ever had, and for every land warrant. A proper statement—

Mr. INGALLS. I did not interrupt the Senator from Indiana. The Senator from Indiana took seven weeks to reply to my speech of March 6. He came in here with a pile of manuscript bigger than a Hebrew Talmud—sweltering venom sleeping got. I can excuse unpremeditated assaults.

There is something in chance medley and hot foot that is excusable, but the deliberate, premeditated preparation of malignant, unfounded attack is to my mind entirely incompatible with a noble nature. When the Senator from Indiana sat down in the privacy of his closet and called me a Thersites and referred to me as a "judge-advocate," a peevish and paltry politician, as one who, like Job's war-horse, had smelt the battle afar off, if he thinks that is not a personal assault, or if that is his idea of the observance of the comity that ought to prevail among gentlemen, well and good.

My relations with the Senator from Indiana for many years have been those of cordiality and friendship, and never was I more surprised than when my attention was called to the vindictive, unfounded, malevolent, and unjustifiable aspersion with which he assailed me in manuscript. I could have borne it if an enemy had done it, but it was, as the Psalmist said, "my own familiar friend." I was unconscious of ever having uttered a word in derogation of the Senator from Indiana. We have agreed on many questions, and in the supreme crisis of my fortunes to which he has referred, unjustifiably referred, referred to me as having been "white-washed," I had his avowed and expressed sympathy; and when I escaped from the conspirators who had followed me from the State capitol to the doors of this Senate Chamber the Senator

from Indiana was the very first man to write me a note of congratulation and sympathy.

Yet he comes in here to-day and says: "Thank God, he never had been followed here by a committee that questioned his right to his title to his seat," and with much diffuseness of illustration, for the purpose of casting aspersion and belittling and humiliating me in the eyes of the American people, when I had only referred to his public utterances given in debate, his speeches, which he did not deny.

Mr. VOORHEES. I did.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator from Indiana did not deny the veracity of the publication that I read.

Mr. VOORHEES. I did.

Mr. INGALLS. He could not do so. It was a *verbatim* stenographic report, and was certified to by the man who made it.

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not want to interrupt the Senator—

Mr. INGALLS. Yes; I shall be very glad to hear the Senator, because I would not do him an injustice.

Mr. VOORHEES. I say that not a word or syllable read by the Senator is true, or believed to be true in Indiana. I have met those accusations and trampled them under foot. I would say further that the Senator's insinuation that I was ever a member of the secret society of the Knights of the Golden Circle is so base and infamously false that I do not know how to choose language to denounce it. I am not so held in my own State. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the rules of the Senate be enforced in regard to applause in the galleries. We have had enough of it.

Mr. INGALLS. I am quite sure that a suggestion to the occupants of the galleries that the rules forbid disorder will be sufficient to secure a strict observance of propriety; and I trust that no violent measures of removal will be taken, and no order will be issued for that purpose. I am sure none of us here are courting applause, and none of us desire any expressions of disapprobation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the persons in the galleries that they are here by the courtesy of the Senate and its guests. They have been reminded more than once that the rules of the Senate do not allow any manifestations of satisfaction with or disagreement to what is said in the Senate; and while it would be a harsh measure, as has been suggested, and it would be much regretted, to clear the galleries, if it is necessary for the purpose of enforcing the rules of the Senate it will have to be done.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to arrest any one who makes any applause in the galleries, and to so direct the doorkeepers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant-at-Arms is so directed.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator from Indiana has just said that he was in favor of the destruction of slavery and that he was opposed to secession, and yet in the published volume of his own speeches there is a reprint of an address delivered by him in Virginia shortly before the war in which he advocates both.

Mr. VOORHEES. Now, will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. INGALLS. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHEES. I will be perfectly candid. I did not say that I was in favor of the destruction of slavery in connection with the war, but I did say that I was glad that it took place. Now, make the most of that.

Mr. INGALLS. I will say further than that, that the Senator from Indiana at the time when he delivered that speech had two editions of it prepared, one of them for circulation in the North and one in the South.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is not true.

Mr. INGALLS. Not true! Why, they are accessible to-day, just as much so—

Mr. VOORHEES. Get them and show them.

Mr. INGALLS. They are just as accessible as the Statutes of the United States.

Mr. VOORHEES. Get them and show them. I say it is not true. I have met that on the stump. I have heard campaign falsifiers before.

Mr. INGALLS. The Senator pleases to call these campaign rumors because he has heard them for the last fifteen years, and therefore they are not true.

In 1860, after the Senators from South Carolina had withdrawn from this Chamber, and when preparations for war were rife all over the South, and everybody knew that secession was to be, so far as the South could make it, an accomplished fact, the Senator from Indiana wrote a letter, which I shall read. Perhaps he will deny that. It is a letter to Mr. Francis A. Shoup, that he took South with him and filed in the Confederate war department in support of his own application for appointment as a brigadier-general in the Confederate army. The man who received it was appointed a brigadier-general in the Confederate army, and he is now an ecclesiastic in Alabama or somewhere in one of the Southern States. I will read what the Senator from Indiana wrote. Anybody can see it, and anybody who knows his handwriting can identify it. This is the letter:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 12, 1860.

My friend, Capt. Francis A. Shoup, is about visiting the South with his sister, on account of her health.

I have known Captain Shoup since our boyhood; we were schoolmates. He

is a graduate of West Point, and was in the Army as a lieutenant four years. No more honorable or upright gentleman exists. On the disturbing questions of the day his sentiments are entirely with the South, and one of his objects is a probable home in that section.

I take this occasion to say that his sentiments and my own are in close harmony.

D. W. VOORHEES.

I suppose the Senator will say that that is a campaign slander, the vile calumny of the opposition press.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, that is not a campaign slander, but it is—

Mr. INGALLS. He has trodden it under foot and spat on it.

Mr. VOORHEES. Will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. INGALLS. Certainly.

Mr. VOORHEES. I say it is not a campaign slander, but it is one of those things the people of Indiana have passed upon for now nearly thirty years.

Mr. INGALLS. The Democratic party of Indiana have passed upon it, I dare say. [Laughter.]

Mr. VOORHEES. They have passed upon it by a very large majority and no—

Mr. INGALLS. Oh, I know the Knights of the Golden Circle have passed upon it.

Mr. VOORHEES. No colporteur or missionary from Kansas can give it any more respectability than the fellows in Indiana have heretofore. I have disposed of them. There was no war when the letter was written; there was not for nearly a year afterwards.

Mr. INGALLS. Sumter fell ninety days afterwards.

Mr. VOORHEES. No, it did not.

Mr. INGALLS. Let me look at the date.

Mr. VOORHEES. In December.

Mr. INGALLS. December 12, 1860. When did Sumter fall?

Mr. VOORHEES. In April.

Mr. INGALLS. In April, 1861?

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

Mr. INGALLS. December, January, February, March—four months afterwards.

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes; inaccuracy is written on your face.

Mr. INGALLS. Within four months from the time the letter was written Sumter had fallen, and yet the Senator from Indiana says:

I take this occasion to say that his sentiments and my own are in close harmony.

That is something I suppose that the Senator regards as the vile expectation of a partisan press. He spits on it and treads it under foot and kicks it out of sight. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that that paper was very important and influential in securing Mr. Shoup the appointment of brigadier-general in the Confederate army. When the archives of that government were captured it was sent here to the War Department, and the original is on file to-day.

Jesse D. Bright, from Indiana, was expelled for as small an offense as that from this body, yet the Senator from Indiana ventures to criticize my military record and my right to speak of the relations of George B. McClellan and Hancock to the Democratic party. The Senator from Indiana says that the accusation that he called Union soldiers hirelings and Lincoln dogs, that he said they ought to go to the nearest blacksmith shop and have a collar welded around their necks on which should be inscribed, "My dog. A. Lincoln," is a campaign calumny and slander which has been spat on, and kicked out, and trodden under foot. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the averment that he made that statement can be substantiated by as credible a witness as there is in this city at this time.

Mr. VOORHEES. It is false, and even if the Senator said it it would be utterly false—just as false coming from the Senator as from the greatest liar ever in the country.

Mr. INGALLS. If this were a police court the Senator from Indiana would be sent to the rock-pile for being drunk and disorderly.

SULLIVAN, IND., September 28, 1868.

We, the undersigned citizens of Sullivan County, Indiana, were present at a public speaking held in Sullivan August 5, 1862, when Hon. D. W. VOORHEES said, speaking in reference to the Union soldiers, that they should go to the nearest blacksmith shop and have an iron collar made and placed around their necks, inscribed thereon in large letters, "My Dog. A. Lincoln," and at the same time he referred to the Union soldiers as Lincoln's dogs and hirelings.

VALENTINE HICK.  
JAMES J. LAUDERMILK.  
WARDEN WILLIAMS.  
LAFAYETTE HARTLEY.  
PHILIP W. BECK.  
JACOB B. MILLER.  
ISAAC HILDEBRAND.  
MARGARET HEREFORD.  
MARY HEREFORD.

HELEN HEREFORD.  
MRS. M. E. EARL.  
THOMAS BULTON.  
JOHN W. HAWKINS.  
RICHARD DODD.  
NELSON BURTON.  
SETH CUSHMAN.  
OWEN ADAMS.  
J. H. RIDGWAY.

I suppose those are reputable citizens of Indiana. They are not ashamed of their names or their residence. They give their home and their designation. The Senator from Indiana can settle the question of the truth or falsehood with them and not with me. And when the Senator from Indiana states that he has been indorsed by his own party, that all these accusations have been trod on and contumeliously spat upon by the people of Indiana, I say to him that has only been done by the Democratic party of Indiana and not by the people of Indiana. We all know what business the Democratic party of Indiana were en-

gaged in during the war. Seventy thousand of them were Knights of the Golden Circle, conspiring against this Union. They entered into combinations, as General Holt states in his report on that subject, for the purpose of—

1. Aiding soldiers to desert, and harboring and protecting deserters.
2. Discouraging enlistments and resisting the draft.
3. Circulation of disloyal and treasonable publications.
4. Communicating with, and giving intelligence to, the enemy.
5. Aiding the enemy by recruiting for them, or assisting them to recruit within our lines.
6. Furnishing the rebels with arms, ammunition, etc.
7. Co-operating with the enemy in raids and invasions.
8. Destruction of Government property.
9. Destruction of private property and persecution of loyal men.
10. Assassination and murder.

And it is susceptible of proof that they did conspire to murder Governor Morton, to overturn the State government and put it in the possession of the rebels; and this organization, to which the Senator from Indiana says he never belonged, had a ritual and organization of which 112 copies were found in his office—in the office of the Senator from Indiana—at the time when Hancock was at the bloody angle. In that same office was found correspondence between the Senator from Indiana and a Senator from New Jersey for the purpose of furnishing arms, 20,000 stand of them, not to the National Government, for the Senator from Indiana was not in sympathy with that at that time; not to the State government of Indiana, because that was in other and loyal hands; but for the purpose, as may be imagined, of carrying out the objects and purposes of this organization.

I am aware that the Senator from Indiana states and has stated that although these papers were found in his office, it was not then occupied by him. He is entitled to the benefit of the doubt. He states that he had abandoned the practice of law and was not intending to resume it; but I have here a list of what was found in his office at the same time when these 112 copies of the ritual and rules of organization of the Knights of the Golden Circle were found there, and he never denied it. He afterwards said that there had been an unwarrantable search of his private papers. General Carrington is a well-known man, and has stated publicly what was found in the office of the Senator from Indiana that did belong to him at the time when "these papers" were found.

The papers referred to are 112 copies of the ritual of the O. A. K., a treasonable order, aiming to overturn the Government of the United States, of whose Congress you are a member.

Your law library and office furniture were in the office where "these papers" were found.

You had declined renomination for Congress and the office as not for rent as late as April, 1864.

The ritual had been issued in the autumn of 1863. Your Congressional documents were in the office where "these papers" were found.

Your speeches, up to March, of your entire Congressional career, with the "John Brown" speech, were in the office where "these papers" were found.

The correspondence of Senator Wall, of New Jersey, under his frank, indorsing a proposition to furnish you with 20,000 stand of Garibaldi rifles, just imported, "for which he could vouch," was in the office where "these papers" were found.

The correspondence of C. L. Vallandigham, from Windsor, Canada West, assuring you "our people will fight," and that "he is ready," and fixing a point on the "Lima road" at "which to meet you," was in the office where "these papers" were found.

There is a little more historical information on that subject which I think may be valuable. In the rebel archives was found a letter from Mr. Clement C. Clay, dated Welland Hotel, St. Catherine's, July 11, 1864, addressed to Hon. Jacob Thompson, Montreal. Lest I may seem inaccurate I believe I will have the whole letter printed. I take an extract from it. It is full of confidential communications to Mr. Thompson as an agent of the rebel Confederacy, tells him what is being done by the Sons of Liberty and the Knights of the Golden Circle, advises methods for the purpose of releasing Confederate prisoners, and he says:

The only fear is, they will not be prepared for it, and will be surprised and stupefied without notice. You need not fear, as they are of the sworn brotherhood. Voorhees is to be here on Monday or Tuesday, and perhaps Ben Wood.

July 11, 1864, "Voorhees is to be here on Monday or Tuesday, and perhaps Ben Wood." What was Voorhees "to be here" for in Canada to see C. C. Clay, and why was Jacob Thompson, of the Southern Confederacy, advised of it?

The correspondence of Joseph Ristine, auditor of state, declaring that "he would like to see all Democrats unite in a bold and open resistance to all attempts to keep ours a united people by force of steel;" and that "this was a war against Democracy, and our only hope was a successful resistance of the South," was in the office "where these papers" were found.

The correspondence of E. C. Hibben, who assures you that "the Democracy are fast stiffening up when this war is to be openly declared as being waged for the purpose of freeing the negro," "which will arouse another section of the country to arms," and declaring "that Lincoln bayonets are shouldered for cold-blooded murder," was in the office "where these papers" were found.

The correspondence of J. Hardesty, who "wants you to have that one hundred thousand men ready, as we do not know how soon we may need them," was in the office where "this Ritual" was found.

And I have the letter of Hardesty here in which he calls on the Senator from Indiana to have the one hundred thousand men in readiness. There is a curious explanation about that letter, which is that when the Senator from Indiana, just previous to the breaking out of the war, was in Virginia making addresses in favor of slavery and secession, he



made a speech at a serenade or on a public occasion in which he said that if any attempt was made to coerce the South one hundred thousand Democrats in Indiana would come down to resist the effort. My informant says that they did come, but their guns were pointed the wrong way.

The correspondence of J. J. Bingham, who asks you "if you think the South has resources enough to keep the Union forces at bay," and says that "you must have sources of information which he has not" was in the office where "these papers" were found.

The correspondence of John G. Davis informing you that a certain New York journal "is wonderfully exercised about the secret anti-war movements" and "tremble in their boots in view of the terrible reaction is sure to await them" was in the office where "these papers" were found.

The correspondence of U. S. Walker, who "keeps out of the way," because they are trying to arrest him for officiating in secret societies, inclosing the oath of the K. G. C.'s prior to that of the O. A. K., was in the office where "these papers" were found.

The petition of C. L. Vallandigham, D. W. Voorhees, and Benjamin Wood in favor of two republics and a united South was in the office where "these papers" were found.

The correspondence of Campbell, E. Etheridge, George H. Pendleton, J. E. McDonald, W. B. Hanna, and others, Mr. Carrington says,

Are some of the "circumstances" that led me to believe that "these papers," the ritual of the O. A. K., were found in your office.

I looked upon these circumstances as a plain juror might be supposed to do, and not as a statesman, and innocently supposed that such papers as these, if spared from the fire, would be in possession of the owner, and that the office of the owner would be the place where "these papers" would be found.

And yet, with Colonel Thompson, I cheerfully accepted your denial, and so respond as you request "that the people may know the truth."

The Senator from Indiana in response to this wrote a letter three columns long that was published in the Democratic papers and printed in the Richmond Enquirer in Virginia, with praise of the Senator from Indiana!

A letter from J. Hardesty, of Harrisonburgh, Va., to his nephew, Daniel W. Voorhees, dated—

HARRISONBURGH, February 17, 1862.

Addressed—

MY DEAR NEPHEW: We want you to hold that 100,000 men in readiness, as we do not know how soon we may want them.

J. HARDESTY.

Addressed on envelope:

Hon. DANIEL W. VOORHEES,  
Terre Haute, Ind.

SENATOR WALL, OF NEW JERSEY, TO DAN. VOORHEES.

LONG BRANCH, August 21, 1863.

MY DEAR SIR: I inclose you two letters from a man by the name of Carr, in reference to arms. A letter directed to him simply Philadelphia will reach him. I can vouch for the excellent quality and great efficiency of the rifles.

Yours, in haste,

JAMES W. WALL.

And another from Carr to Wall, dated August 14, 1863, on the same subject, giving the price at which these arms could be purchased, which was \$14 apiece, saying there were about twenty thousand of them in all. For what purpose they were wanted is left to the imagination to disclose.

With regard to the question as to the side on which the sympathies of the Senator from Indiana were—I suppose the Senator from Indiana will deny this also and say it was mere campaign calumny cast out and trodden under the feet of men—on the 5th day of March, 1864, he spoke of Vallandigham as "that representative American patriot, who, with Hendricks and Seymour and Richardson, had done so much to uphold the hands of the American public and had preserved so far the guaranties of constitutional liberty," a man who was tried and banished from the country for being a traitor, and justly banished; and yet the Senator from Indiana said on the 5th of March, 1864:

Will some poor, crawling, despised sycophant and tool of executive despotism—

That sounds very much like the Senator from Indiana. If that is a fabrication it is a very ingenious one—

Will some poor, crawling, despised sycophant and tool of executive despotism dare to say that I shall not pronounce the name of Vallandigham? The scandal and stigma of his condemnation—

The scandal and stigma of Vallandigham's condemnation—and banishment have filled the civilized world, and the Lethian and oblivious wave of a thousand years can not wash away the shame and reproach of that miserable scene from the American name. Some members have attacked with fierce clamor the great American statesman and Christian gentleman who suffers his exile in the cause of liberty on a foreign soil. So the basest cur that ever kennelled may bay, at "the bidding of a master, the aged lion in the distance."

His opinion of Mr. Lincoln was contained in the same speech—

Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, preserved by the pen of the historian for universal execration, found no pursuit so pleasant as calling for more men for the harvest of death, and, like our present Executive, snuffing with jests and ribaldry the warm taint of blood on every gale.

Oh, bitter mockery, justice has been dethroned and the blessings of liberty annihilated.

Because four millions of slaves were set free, apparently.

There is not one square mile of free soil in the American Republic.

The Senator from Indiana was also a member of Congress in the early days of the war, and he made some speeches upon the subjects that were then agitating the country. In an address to his constituents in April, 1861—I hope I am not inaccurate about that—he declared that he would never vote a single dollar or a single man for the prosecution of the war, and he never did so long as he was in Congress.

He consistently and persistently voted against every measure for upholding the Union cause and re-enforcing its armies, voted against all the constitutional amendments, and finally declared by a nay vote that he would not hold that the amendments were constitutional or binding upon the conscience of the American people. And yet the Senator from Indiana, who I think deserves charity more than any man that I know upon this floor, and who has received it at the hands of his associates, and who can less afford than any man of my acquaintance to invite a scrutiny of his war record with anybody, with playfulness and hilarity refers to the fact that I served during the war as a judge-advocate with the rank of major and subsequently of lieutenant-colonel. I have this to say: That however obscure or inefficient my services may have been, they were always on the side of my country, and not as his has been, always against it.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas, to just take a matter of fact, will find one single vote that I have cast against the payment of soldiers for their pay, for their supplies, for their bounties, or appropriations for their pensions, I will resign my seat in the Senate. Every word that he has stated on that subject is absolutely false by the record—absolutely.

I measure my words as I stand here. If I am an object of his charity, he is an object of my contempt. He says I issued a proclamation to my constituents in April, 1861, that I would not vote for men or money. That is false. I never did anything of the kind; never in the world. I was a pretty hard fighter during the war in political campaigns. The party then in power gave it out that there should be no parties, that we should not contend as parties; but I did not accept that, and I fought my battles in my own way. I fought for free speech and a free press; but the soldiers of Indiana know, and they will measure and hear what I am now saying, that I voted for every dollar that ever fed them, that ever clothed them, and the man who says otherwise is a falsifier and a slanderer, and I brand it on him.

I can go home to my people on that statement. In 1864 I was in a bitter, hard canvass for Congress. The Senator from Kansas has announced that I had quit practicing law. That is not true. There is not a word of truth in it. I had gone from one office to another. Some papers that belonged to me were left in the office, and others put up a job on me in political campaigns, and put things there which were found and were published as found there. I denied then, as I deny now, that I was ever a member of any secret political society in my life.

Oliver P. Morton, a brave man, not, like the Senator from Kansas, small and active, but great and strong, and who believed that there was a secret organization in Indiana menacing the safety of the Republic, never pretended that I was connected with that organization. There has never been a man in public life, until the Senator from Kansas here persuades himself to do it, who ever alluded to the pretended fact that I belonged to such an organization. There was a gentleman from New Hampshire once, a member of the House, who inadvertently, in a sort of hurried way, alluded in a general manner to me as a member of a secret organization in Indiana; and the next day I took the floor for a personal explanation.

I remember the House gathered around me, and among the rest General Schenck, who was the leader of the House on the opposite side. He came close to me. I explained all these things, and that was the last of them. Now the Senator from Kansas sees fit, nosing around in a low, little way, to bring up these things which are stale, putrid, cast off, and the offal of years gone by.

When the matter that he speaks of as to my office was brought out by General Carrington I was in a hard canvass for Congress. I carried the district by nearly 800 majority. As my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], remembers they contested my seat, and they threw me out because the Republicans needed two-thirds majority to fight Andrew Johnson then, and for no other reason in the world. I went back to a changed district, where they put 1,500 majority upon me, and I beat them in that district with the soldiers all at home.

Now, if the Senator from Kansas thinks he is making respectability or honor or even courtesy by reviving these things which have been passed upon by a jury of my peers—a good deal more than his peers, but a jury of my peers in Indiana—he is mistaken. I have had several elections to Congress since all this poor old stuff was published, and then I have been four times commissioned a Senator. I have been elected three times by the Legislature, and I have carried the State twice, by from 25,000 to 30,000 majority. If the Senator from Kansas in his miserable condition attempting to extricate himself from the disgrace of assailing McClellan and Hancock, sees fit to assail me, he is welcome to do so. A man who has aspersed the fame of McClellan, and says that he had fought two years trying to make the war a failure, and that Hancock was an ally of the Confederacy, and that Hancock and McClellan and Horace Greeley all belonged to the worst elements of the North, I feel his abuse as a compliment, and I thank him for the aspersions and respond to him accordingly. [Laughter and applause.]

So far as the old stuff about my denouncing the soldiers of Indiana is concerned, the soldiers will take care of that, and there is only a miserable set of people who were never soldiers, or if they were were sutlers most likely or sutlers' clerks, ever allude to anything of that kind, and I can only say—I do not want to be offensive to the Senator

Ingers

from Kansas, and do not care much whether I am or not [laughter]—I can only say (because he has thrust these matters upon me), as I have said, that the people whose names he reads there do lie and do not tell the truth, nor does the Senator when he repeats what they say tell the truth either. I have not the slightest concern, not the slightest feeling, not the slightest irritation upon this matter. It has been passed upon time and time again.

As to the letter for Captain Shoup I wrote the letter for Frank Shoup. I knew him well. We were boys at school together. He was going down South with his sister, who was dying of consumption. It was in December, before a single State had seceded, before the war had broken out, and I did sympathize with the feelings of the South that there ought to be a compromise at that time. The Crittenden compromise was pending, and the Peace Congress was called. I had no favors to ask; and as to charity, as I said, I respond with contempt.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. INGALLS. Will the Senator from Indiana allow me to ask him whether the soldiers of Indiana did not threaten to hang him with a bell-rope on a train between New Castle and Terre Haute after he made that "Lincoln dog" speech? [Laughter.]

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. President, the Senator is a great liar when he intimates such a thing—a great liar and a dirty dog. ["Order!" "Order!"] Such a thing never occurred in the world. That is all the answer I have to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is hardly in order. Personal discussion is not proper. The Chair hopes Senators will be in order.

Mr. VOORHEES. I pass it back to the scoundrel behind him who is instigating these lies.

Mr. INGALLS. Mr. President, there is a very reputable gentleman in the Chamber, a citizen of Indiana, who informs me that the signers of the certificate about the "Lincoln dog" speech are entirely reputable inhabitants, male and female, of Sullivan County, and that he knows fifty people there who heard the speech made and can swear to it.

Mr. VOORHEES. I say he is an infamous liar and scoundrel who says I did. I say so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS] was recognized before the interruption.

Mr. BUTLER. Before that is done—

Mr. EUSTIS. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana give way to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. EUSTIS. For what purpose?

Mr. BUTLER. I was going to ask to have the resolution reported to which these speeches have been addressed.

Mr. HARRIS. I rose to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he preferred to go on now or adjourn until to-morrow.

Mr. EUSTIS. I have very few words to say and I prefer to say them now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator proceeds the Chair desires to say that a considerable portion of the debate has been out of order, and in violation of the rules of the Senate; and he hopes hereafter that Senators will observe the rules and proceed in order, and that there will be order preserved in the Senate Chamber and in the galleries.

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President, I simply rise to very briefly protest against the great freedom and license with which the Senator from Kansas has seen fit to discuss the election which has taken place in the State of Louisiana. I am aware that we must make great allowances for that Senator. The fact is that his speech reminded me of a conversation that I happened to overhear yesterday between two ladies. One of them said seriously to the other, "What a great place Washington is for amusement; just think of it; we have INGALLS and the circus and the races, all the same week." [Laughter.] I am sure that no one will complain of the very theatrical entertainment that we have had furnished us to-day by the Senator from Kansas.

I can only say that I consider it exceedingly unseemly, undignified, and unjust for a Senator of the United States, in the absence of any proof or any testimony whatsoever, to denounce as fraudulent an election which has been held in a State. I would inform the Senator from Kansas that the mode and manner in which that election has been conducted, being a State election, is none of his business whatsoever.

Mr. INGALLS. We think it is.

Mr. EUSTIS. It is only, sir, when the credentials are presented to this body of a Senator who claims to have been elected by virtue of that election, and he offers himself to have the oath of office administered, that this body has any jurisdiction or any power whatever to inquire into that election. It is only that fact and that circumstance which invests this body with any power whatsoever to pass judgment upon the legality or regularity of a mere State election; therefore I denounce as scandalous, vituperative, and unparliamentary the language which has been used by the Senator from Kansas with reference to the people of Louisiana.

Sir, there seems to be a preconcerted conspiracy among the Republican leaders to question the legality of elections in the South for no other purpose than to be able to show and convince the Northern people that a Democratic administration placed in power by the suffrages of the American people is not legally elected.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] some time ago in a speech which he made in Springfield, Ill., made the startling statement and declaration that every man, woman, and child in the United States knew that Grover Cleveland had been elected to the Presidency by fraud, intimidation, crime, and violence in the South, and that declaration has been adopted as the party cry for the coming canvass by the Republican conventions which have been held. I read the resolution adopted by the Republican convention in Vermont:

The present Democratic majority in the House of Representatives and the executive branch of the Government is a usurpation, and never before except by hostile armies has popular government been so seriously imperiled.

Then, sir, we have a like declaration made by the Republican convention in Ohio, and the Republican convention in the State of Massachusetts. The Republican party of Massachusetts, which is always true to its habit of pestiferously and mischievously interfering in the affairs of other States, made the declaration that the Louisiana election held last April was a fresh illustration of the suppression of the votes of the majority in that State.

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

Mr. EUSTIS. I have no objection if it is pertinent to what I am saying.

Mr. HOAR. I will endeavor to make it pertinent to what the Senator is saying. Does the Senator deny that the language which has been read here by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. INGALLS] and attributed to Governor McEnery, and the language which was read here the other day by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] and attributed to him, were correctly quoted?

Mr. EUSTIS. I can only answer for the quotation which was made from my speech. That was strictly accurate, and I stand by every word that I uttered on that occasion.

Mr. HOAR. Now, has the Senator no knowledge or belief in regard to that ascribed to Governor McEnery?

Mr. EUSTIS. I know nothing in regard to the speech attributed to Governor McEnery. I was taken sick soon after I went to Louisiana, and am not well to-day. What I said was this: That the Republican leaders of this country are almost preparing the American people for a *coup d'état*.

What do you mean by stating that the President of the United States is illegally and unconstitutionally in office? What do you mean by stating that the Democratic Administration is a usurpation? What does that mean except that we have a government which has been established and installed by revolutionary methods and not by constitutional and legal methods; that we are reducing ourselves to the level of Mexico and Central America, and that you are going into the canvass with the declarations which you have made by your conventions proclaiming that the President of the United States was elected, not by the free and honest suffrage of the American people, but that he holds his election by virtue of the suppression of the will of the majority and by reason of the violence and intimidation and fraud committed in the Southern States at their elections?

Mr. President, I am glad that this era has at last arrived when Republican Senators rise in this Chamber, as do the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kansas, and advocate free and honest elections in the State of Louisiana. Let them look back, and what will they find from 1868 to 1876? In 1868, in 1870, in 1872, in 1874, in 1876, the Democratic party in Louisiana carried the State by an overwhelming majority. That majority was suppressed, and by the bayonet a government was installed over the people of Louisiana, and you admitted Senators into this Chamber and members into the other House who had not the shadow of a title to the seats which were given to them by Republican votes. I was in favor of honest elections then.

As a Democrat and a Senator of the United States I could sit in silence and listen to your aspersions and your accusations, deeming them unworthy of an answer until you have cleansed yourselves of the odium and disgrace and infamy and enormity which attach to you by reason of your fraudulent elections in the State of Louisiana. I could tell you, as Peter the Great told Charles XII., if I chose—"By defeating me you have taught me the art of war." But no, sir, I take no such position as that.

I tell the Senator from Kansas that he does not know what he is talking about. I will teach him what an election in Louisiana is some day. I will tell you that there is no reason why Mr. Warmoth should have received 500 votes in the State of Louisiana instead of 20,000. There is no reason why a solitary colored man in the State of Louisiana should have cast a vote for such a governor as Warmoth. He has a record as governor in Louisiana.

Suppose we did resort to irregularities, suppose we did resort to fraud, suppose we did do what you accuse us of doing and what we know perfectly well we did not do, what did you give us by your fraudulent elections? You gave us a government which was a disgrace to civilization; you gave us a government which produced conflicts be-

tween the two races, where society was torn up by the roots. The white men of the State of Louisiana resisted this negro domination which meant desolation, disaster, destruction to every interest in our State. When you failed to perpetuate your political supremacy in that State by the infamous machinations and the diabolical machinery which you invented and which you have used, then you rise to-day and in your wrath asperse and traduce the Democratic party of the State of Louisiana.

I, as a Democrat of that State, having taken an active part in every struggle which that noble people have made, tell you that instead of being abashed by your charges and aspersions, I throw them back in your teeth and tell you that I am proud of what the people of Louisiana have done in their struggle for home government and for the redemption of the State. I applaud their efforts, and notwithstanding these harangues and speeches that are made by political leaders I believe that the conduct of the people of Louisiana will have the approval of the thoughtful and intelligent and honest people of the North, because the people of Louisiana are only doing what the people of Kansas and the people of Massachusetts would do under the same circumstances and under the same conditions unless they are deficient in manhood and patriotism, and I know they are not.

Mr. President, I have not the strength to-day to make an elaborate speech on this question, but I wish to tell the Senator from Ohio, as he has chosen to criticize a speech which I made, and by which, I repeat, I stand, that I do not consider him a fair or honest judge of an election in the State of Louisiana.

When he and I in that Chamber witnessed that dramatic political scene when the veil was drawn from the chaste body of Eliza Pinkston, and her wounds eloquently appealed to the credulous sympathies of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, from that time, with reference to elections in Louisiana, I considered his judgment most sadly perverted.

I would also tell him that if he advocates negro domination in Louisiana, as I judge that he does by his speech, or if any Republican Senator does, I would tell him that if I were in this Chamber or to go abroad among the Northern people and make a speech there, and advise them to band together to make war upon society, to hang the rich capitalists who have enslaved them for so many years, to create a reign of terror in Northern cities and in Northern communities, to strike from the face of the earth those capitalistic oppressors who have put chains on their limbs, I would tell these Senators that I would no more feel guilty of having committed a crime against my country or against society than I feel that they are guilty when they ask the negro population to become the governing race in the State of Louisiana. I am too feeble to continue. [Applause.]

Mr. GIBSON and Mr. INGALLS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. GIBSON. I give way to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. INGALLS. I thought, inasmuch as Governor Warmoth had been aspersed, or at least harshly criticised, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS], that it was no more than just to him that I should put on record the published utterance of Governor McEnery to Warmoth, his antagonist. Governor McEnery, in a speech at New Orleans, March 8, 1888, reported in the Picayune of the next day, said:

I have no accusation to make against Governor Warmoth's personal or private character. I have cited the testimony of accomplices, who were actors in the saddest drama of our history. They may not have told the truth as to him personally, but as to the acts of the party of which Governor Warmoth was the chief their evidence is trustworthy. Governor Warmoth was a product of that era and he is inseparable from it. As a private citizen his life has been exemplary, his ability universally admitted, and his energy and progressiveness recognized.

There are a few more words I should like to say, but I refrain from doing so now.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by any extended remarks in reply to the Senator from Kansas. Before commenting upon his criticisms of the recent election in Louisiana I desire to say a word in answer to his extraordinary observations upon the Southern people. He says that the Southern Confederacy still exists, that it is embodied in the Democratic party in the South, and that the Democratic party in that section is animated by all the ambitions, the purposes, and the hopes of the Southern Confederacy itself.

Now, Mr. President, this is an aspersion upon every Senator on this side of the Chamber who represents a Southern constituency. It is an aspersion upon the character, the patriotism, and the intelligence of the Southern people themselves. It is an aspersion upon the Northern statesmen who draughted and ingrafted in the Constitution of the United States those amendments that contain the fruits of the war for the Union.

What was the issue put at arms by the Southern and Northern sections? It was in the first place the institution of slavery. Every one knows that slavery was the occasion of the war, and every one understands perfectly well that the principle of secession was invoked by the Southern people as the only safeguard to protect their property and liberty, their public peace, their social and political systems from violent overthrow. Those two questions were settled and settled finally by the amendments of the Constitution which we have sworn to support, the thirteenth and fourteenth amendments.

What Southern man, what Southern State, has attempted to revive the institution of slavery? What Southern statesman has, since the arbitrament of arms, agitated the doctrine of secession? Not one. We all admit to-day that if any one were to take up arms, whether under State authority or not, against the United States, he would be guilty of treason, because the constitutional amendments declare that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States." Citizenship and allegiance are correlative.

The Southern members of the Senate have voted for years with a lavish hand nearly a thousand millions in pensions to the soldiers of the Federal Army and to their families. We have freely voted supplies to the Army and Navy of the Union, from which we ourselves are excluded.

We have done what we could to establish a sound currency for the people of the country, to diminish the public expenses, to improve the rivers and harbors, and to maintain the credit and honor of the flag in every land and on every sea under the sun.

Sir, I believe I echo the sentiment that this day is in the heart of every man in the South when I repeat the glowing language of the great Senator from Massachusetts, which I learned in my boyhood:

When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched, it may be, in fraternal blood! Let their last feeble and lingering glance rather behold the gorgeous ensign of the Republic, now known and honored throughout the earth, still full high advanced, its arms and trophies streaming in their original luster, not a stripe erased or polluted, not a single star obscured, bearing for its motto no such miserable interrogatory as "What is all this worth?" nor those other words of delusion and folly, "Liberty first and Union afterwards," but everywhere, spread all over in characters of living light, blazing in all its ample folds as they float over the sea and over the land and in every wind under the whole heavens, that other sentiment dear to every true American heart, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

These are the sentiments of the people that I represent.

Now, sir, I reply to the charges made by the Senator from Kansas against the people of Louisiana, but I shall do so briefly.

In the first place, according to the report of a joint legislative committee to examine the books and accounts and other official documents in the auditor's and treasurer's offices, dated April 19, 1875 (and which I hold in my hand), signed by E. F. Herwig, chairman, and W. W. Wharton, J. A. Masicot, and Thomas A. Cage, on the part of the senate, and by C. W. Lowell, A. B. Levisse, O. F. Huusaker, F. R. Wright, and R. F. Guichard, on the part of the house, all Republicans, a committee created by the Kellogg administration to ascertain how the finances of the State had been conducted under the Warmoth administration, the debt of the State of Louisiana amounted, on January 1, 1886, to the sum of \$1,500,000, and on January 1, 1867, after deducting available funds and credits, to \$3,595,000; and they also show that the total debt on January 1, 1873, when the Warmoth administration went out of office, as reported by the auditor, was \$29,567,849. The committee found that the funded, unfunded, and contingent liabilities of the State amounted at that time to the vast sum of \$50,597,394.95.

I will give the summary:

Floating debt.....	\$2,165,171.71
Bonds loaned property banks.....	4,830,683.33
Bonded debt proper.....	22,134,800.00
Contingent debt reported by auditor.....	10,895,000.00
Contingent debt not reported by auditor.....	9,605,500.00
	49,604,155.04
Add trust bonds and bonds missing.....	993,194.91
Total.....	50,597,394.95

The committee says:

In conclusion, the commission find that a large portion of the public debt has arisen from extravagance, profligacy, and misuse of the revenues of the State; that as to all that portion created since 1865, the State did not realize over 50 cents on the dollar, nor was the amount realized expended for the benefit of the State to the extent of more than one-half; in other words, the State has not been actually benefited in an amount exceeding one-fourth of the debt created, nor to an amount exceeding one-half of the taxes collected since 1865. The entire balance, say one-half of all the taxes and three-fourths of all the present debt, have been squandered or done worse with by the administration of the government since that date. The taxes and other revenues which have been collected and squandered are past recall, and the only possible benefit to be desired from this contemplation is the lesson which may be taught for the future administration of the revenues of the State.

This enormous debt of \$50,000,000 was contracted in four years on an assessed valuation of about \$200,000,000. While piling up this debt on the people of Louisiana they gathered in through their tax-gatherers in the city of New Orleans every year 5 per cent. of the assessed valuation of the property of that city, and 5, 6, and 7 per cent. throughout every parish in the State of Louisiana.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go further into details. This statement from Republican sources, from a committee of the Legislature of Louisiana, looking carefully into the auditor's accounts, declares in effect that Warmoth's administration had placed a mortgage upon one-quarter of the entire property, movable and immovable, of the people of Louisiana in four years, while it had consumed their annual earnings with remorseless rapacity.

With such a record as that it was natural that the property-holders

of the State, that the intelligent men of the State in the recent election should show great earnestness and firmness and devotion to their own interests, in order to prevent a return of an administration which represented a policy which had already put in peril the earnings and the property of every man in the State.

I do not accuse Governor Warmoth himself personally; I do not say that Governor Warmoth himself put his hands into the treasury; but I say that he by the irresistible logic of events found himself at the head of the negro population, who but a few years ago had been held in abject slavery. They were ignorant. They could not conduct the government of a great commonwealth like the State of Louisiana. Unscrupulous and disreputable men took possession of the negro vote of the State and of the Legislature of the State, and Governor Warmoth at that time, even if he had been disposed, would not have been able to hold in check the debased and ignorant elements of society which the Republican party then represented.

I do not defend nor condemn him. I am not speaking of individuals. I am speaking of a system of government and of the relation which the Republican party as it was originally constituted in the State of Louisiana bore to property and to intelligence. To commit their destinies again to that party would be to put in peril every interest of the people of that State, their agriculture, their manufacturing industries, their institutions of learning, and their institutions of religion.

Mr. President, I will not indulge in further remarks about the relation of this party to the finances of the State, but I desire to respond briefly and directly to the insinuations which the Senator from Kansas has thrown out against the legality and fairness of the recent election. He has said that at the election in Louisiana the number of votes cast exceeded the male population of the State, or the registered vote of the State.

Mr. INGALLS. In several precincts.

Mr. GIBSON. He mentioned amongst others some precincts of Bossier Parish, and I will meet him on those precincts. The registration was taken four years ago and it was again taken but a few days before the recent election. The registration of Bossier Parish is 4,625, as taken before the recent election, and the vote in that parish does not equal by any means the registration. So, in Tensas Parish the registration to which the Senator referred shows 5,160. These are the figures with respect to these two parishes, to which the Senator referred. I desire to call his attention to what the vote of Kansas was in 1884. The vote of Kansas was 100 per cent. of its male population over twenty-one years by the census of 1880. The total vote of Kansas was 265,843, while the males twenty-one years of age and over in 1880 were 265,714, showing that the vote of Kansas at that time actually exceeded the total number of males in that State in 1880 over twenty-one years of age.

In the recent election in Louisiana, eight years from 1880, there has been cast only 80 per cent. of the males over twenty-one years of age by the census of 1880, whereas in many States of the Union, the American Almanac, of which our Librarian, Mr. Spofford, is the author, shows that it was quite usual in the election of 1884 that 100 per cent. of the voting population by the census of 1880, as in Kansas, should be cast, 90 per cent. as in Iowa, 99 per cent. as in Indiana, 104 per cent. as in Nebraska, 94 per cent. as in Ohio, 93 per cent. as in Wisconsin. In some States the percentage was lower; as 42 in Rhode Island, 60 in Massachusetts, 40 in Nevada, 78 in Connecticut, 69 in Maine; whereas in the recent election in Louisiana the total vote is only 80 per cent. of the males over twenty-one years of age in that State by the census in 1880.

I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer. I participated in the canvass in Louisiana and addressed large audiences in different parts of the State, and I can bear testimony to the peace and harmony and good feeling that existed everywhere in the State. And I can say further that the colored people and the white people live in relations of kindness and amity so far as I know everywhere in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GIBSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I ask him the same question which I put to his colleague, whether he can tell us as to the correctness of the remarks attributed to the governor of that State.

Mr. GIBSON. I did not hear the speeches of the governor of Louisiana, except one.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator has a belief whether the governor said that.

Mr. GIBSON. My belief is that he did not say it. I heard the governor of Louisiana speak in the town of Thibodeaux, and he delivered a speech of ability and eloquence, and I never heard a man address the people with more composure and more conservatism. I heard also the speeches of Governor Nicholls, who was a candidate for the Democratic nomination against Governor McEnery, and I have the language which he employed substantially everywhere during the long six months of the canvass in the State of Louisiana, and here are his sentiments in brief:

I am thoroughly satisfied that any course of political action traced on a narrower line than the good of the whole people, regardless of color or condition, must inevitably lead to disaster and ruin.

I have earnestly sought to obliterate the color line in politics and consolidate

the people on the basis of equal rights and common interests, and it is a source of gratification to say that this great object is about to be realized.

This was the language he used when he was first inaugurated. It was the language I heard him repeat substantially in several parishes throughout the State of Louisiana. I do not know a Senator on this floor from any State in the Union who is more conservative, or who possesses the confidence of the people whom he represents in larger measure than the governor elected by the State of Louisiana. He was educated at West Point, conservative in all his instincts, devoted to the real welfare of the people of the State. I do not believe that under any circumstances there could have been a fairer canvass conducted in that State.

If every Senator here had seen fit to go to the State in behalf of Warmoth, it would not have stopped the march of the people of Louisiana in support of this gallant, heroic, and magnanimous soldier and gentleman and statesman. That is the secret, Senators, of the success of the Democratic party in Louisiana, and when that election shall be investigated through and through you will find that the colored people as well as the white people rallied around Nicholls; and I venture to declare that if that canvass had been prolonged three weeks or six weeks longer, Governor Warmoth would have retired from the race.

I have here extracts from some of the papers of Louisiana, among them extracts from papers edited and owned by colored men, in which they urge the colored voters to cast their votes for Nicholls. I will read one of these extracts to show Republican Senators particularly how these people, some of them educated, some of them acquiring property, some having pride in the name and welfare of the State, what sentiments they cherish towards Governor Nicholls. I read now from a newspaper edited by a colored man, in the city of New Orleans—the New Orleans Progress—which says:

But perhaps the most gratifying result of the election is the breaking up of the color line. Outside of New Orleans and a few of the lower parishes thousands and thousands of colored voters, remembering the just, fair, impartial, and peaceful administration of General Nicholls, rallied around his standard and joyfully cast their ballots for him. So complete is this political revolution that hereafter it will be impossible for any one to marshal the colored voters solidly under the Republican banner again.

Verily, the colored people of Louisiana have at last freed themselves from political servitude. It is for this that we have been contending for years, and whatever humble share we have had in bringing it about has made us supremely happy. Crow, our rooster, crow, and let us have the illumination.

The leading Republican organ in the city of New Orleans, edited and owned by white men and Republicans, the Item, says:

One of the results of the political canvass just closed has been a large voluntary accession of the negro vote to the Democratic party. The causes of this seeming defection are not difficult to trace. They may be found partly in the nature of the negro himself, being destitute of any great amount of sentiment such as binds white men to a principle, an idea, a nationality, or a clan.

Chiefly, however, the flexibility of the negro vote as an element in politics owes its origin to the profligate and corrupt character of those who meet in conventions to dispose of its nominal control. The recent Republican State convention which was held at Washington Artillery hall brought to the front all the old-time traders and tricksters who could squeeze themselves into a delegation under any pretext whatever; and, as their methods, objects, and aims were intuitively understood by all, even the dullest, they failed to effect an organization having any cohesive power or strength. A number of the better sort of intelligent and independent negroes, like Martinet, boldly proclaimed themselves Democrats and in favor of the election of General Nicholls from the beginning.

And now, when the Southern people, stricken by losses in battle, by poverty unprecedented in the history of the world, are rallying around the great central ideas of constitutional government, building railroads, starting furnaces, building up great institutions of learning, doubling, as in the State of Louisiana in the last five years, the number of school-houses in the State and the number of teachers in the State, reducing governmental expenses, inviting foreign immigration and immigration from our countrymen in the North—why will Senators here, merely for political purposes, endeavor to excite the animosities of our former slaves and disturb the peaceful relations that are being knit together between the white people of the South and the negro people of the South—why, for political purposes, will they put in peril these growing interests of a new civilization when they know that the white people of the South have a problem to solve which is unique in the history of civilization? Not the abolition of slavery in Rome, not the abolition of vassalage in the Middle Ages, not the emancipation of serfs in Russia, not the graduated and compensatory form of emancipation in the West India Islands, not the conquest itself of India, none of these furnish an analogue to the vast problem which in the main must be settled by the white people of the South and by the colored people of the South.

It is true, sir, that on the surface of society occasionally there is a ripple of disturbance; true, that there are individual wrongs by white men against the negroes, and by the negroes against the white men; but the great body of the population reposes solidly upon those sentiments of religion and charity, of good-will and patriotic endeavor, that constitute the basis upon which the structure of every enlightened government must rest.

The Southern people are doing their best. With benevolence, with charity, with composure, with courage, they are invoking all the resources of our civilization to settle this great question in a way that will free us from strife, from the loss of life, from the loss of property, from those unseemly agitations that possess every other people in the world

except our own. We have no orders in society, no standing armies, no traditions to which we may cling, no great vested interest, no class to lead us. There was a disruption in the South in which everything went down into a chasm and beyond recall.

By an interposition of Divine Providence a revolution was wrought at the very moment when we were put at the greatest stress of fortune; and will not the people of the North, the generous and patriotic men and women of the North, who have come to our aid with such abundant benevolence in our many trials, be persuaded that the good men and good women of the South are striving not for party conquest, not for any base and ignoble purposes, but that they are endeavoring to do all they can according to their means to solve rightly every problem which God Almighty has committed to them, to do what they can to free society from the dangers of ignorance and vice and strife?

But they will never cease as long as they cherish liberty to feel that they ought to make any sacrifices to prevent this great instrument of government from falling into the hands of a race marked as distinct from the white race, and which has not yet the capacity because perhaps it has not had the opportunity to fit itself for the responsibilities of self-government.

We united with Senators from the North to exclude the Chinese from our country because they were regarded as an element dangerous to our society, and we have read in Froude's account of the West India Islands of the deplorable and blighting results of negro supremacy.

Sir, I do not mean at this time to suggest that we should take the ballot away from the negroes. I trust the experiment of universal suffrage in the South may prove successful. But we owe it to ourselves and to them to exhaust all the resources of civilization, using a phrase of Mr. Gladstone, to dissuade them from casting their ballots in favor of men incapable of administering the government, and from banding together in secret orders, under unscrupulous and designing men, to make war upon all the institutions we have inherited from our ancestors.

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before submitting the motion, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 1, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask by unanimous consent that the reading of that portion of the Journal relating to the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions be dispensed with.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The residue of the Journal was read.

#### CORRECTION.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to correct the Journal. I introduced yesterday a bill to abolish war taxes upon American shipping. Upon examination I do not find that bill noticed in the Journal, and I would like to have the proper correction made. The mistake has arisen from confusing two bills—one introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], and the other by myself.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read that part of the Journal.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 9738) providing for the organization of the Commission on Fish and Fisheries, and defining its duties; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas. Mine was a bill to abolish war taxes on American shipping; and it does not appear in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the correction to be made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Now, I desire to have the RECORD corrected. It follows the Journal, as those bills were filed at the Clerk's desk. On page 3672 it is stated that the bill (H. R. 9738) providing for the organization of the commission on fish and fisheries and defining its duties, was introduced by myself. That is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas. My bill, which the House gave consent should be printed in the RECORD, is not noticed. I desire that the RECORD should be corrected, so that my bill may appear as introduced and may

be published in full, in accordance with the leave granted by the House.

The SPEAKER. The necessary correction will be made. The Chair will cause the Journal to be corrected according to the gentleman's statement.

The bill introduced by Mr. BUCHANAN, a bill (H. R. 9739) to abolish war taxes upon American shipping, was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, ordered to be printed, and also to be published in the RECORD. It is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act approved May 31, 1880, entitled "An act to repeal the tonnage duties upon ships and vessels of the United States and upon certain foreign vessels," which was repealed by section 15 of the act approved July 14, 1862, entitled "An act increasing temporarily the duties on imports, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, re-enacted as follows:

"That from and after the passage of this act no duties upon the tonnage of the ships and vessels of the United States, of which the officers and two-thirds of the crew shall be citizens of the United States, shall be levied or collected; and all acts or parts of acts imposing duties upon the tonnage of ships and vessels of the United States, officered and manned as aforesaid, so far as the same relate to the imposition of such duties, shall, from and after said 1st day of April next, be repealed.

"SEC. 2. That from and after the said 1st day of April next all acts and parts of acts imposing duties upon the tonnage of the ships and vessels of any foreign nation, so far as the same relate to the imposition of such duties, shall be repealed: *Provided*, That the President of the United States shall be satisfied that the discriminating or countervailing duties of such foreign vessels, so far as they operate to the disadvantage of the United States, have been abolished."

#### EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONGRESS.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of expenditures of the appropriation for entertaining and providing for expenses of the Ninth International Medical Congress, September, 1887; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPAIR OF SEA-WALL, NAVAL HOSPITAL, NORFOLK, VA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Navy of an appropriation to be immediately available for repair of the sea-wall at the naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### FIRE-ESCAPES, HOWARD UNIVERSITY BUILDING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Interior for the erection of fire-escapes upon the Howard University building; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### PENSION APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions requesting that the sum of \$3,500,000 be transferred from the appropriations for Mexican war pensions to the Army pension appropriations; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### UNION BANK OF AUSTRALIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, with accompanying papers, and a letter from the Secretary of State, relative to the relief of the Union Bank of Australia, limited, for losses sustained through payment of certain drafts drawn by the late United States commercial agent at Levuka, Fiji Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### REFERENCE OF BILLS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, under the rule, Senate bills, which were severally read a first and second time, and referred as follows, namely:

The bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building at Youngstown, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 349) for the erection of a public building at Akron, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation of Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2329) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to re-examine and readjust a claim of the State of Pennsylvania for advances made and money borrowed by said State to pay the militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 68) for the relief of James H. Smith, late postmaster at Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

#### RETURN OF BILL TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will also lay before the House a request of the Senate for the return of a bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, April 30, 1888.

*Ordered*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1161) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone.