

Woods, praying that his claim for property taken by the Army during the late war be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William Boling, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to prevent change of jurisdiction in United States court in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Francis M. Monks, Company E, First Regiment Arkansas Infantry, for muster and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John A. Brown, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in the case of J. S. Herrison for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, three petitions to suppress dealing in futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers in claim of Samuel P. Woods, of Benton County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PICKLER: Petition of 80 citizens of Brown County, S. Dak., asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Marshall County, S. Dak., asking that no intoxicating liquor be sold at the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 20 citizens, by individual letter, of South Dakota, asking to have the World's Fair closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of Dr. C. F. Crane and 468 others of Fenisburg, Vt., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on the Sabbath—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Jericho, Vt., praying that the Columbian Exposition be closed on Sundays and that no intoxicants be sold on the grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of the following granges of New York, North Colesville, No. 518, and De Ruyter, No. 651, in favor of a law to prevent contracts discrediting legal-tender currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petitions by the same bodies, in favor of a law to prevent gambling in farm products; and by De Ruyter Grange to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of De Ruyter Grange, for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolution of the Industrial Council of Orwigsburg, Pa., in favor of a law amending the naturalization laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Malvern, Pa., in regard to a sixteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: Petition of citizens of Pointe Coupee, La., asking for the passage of the antioption bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of 127 citizens of San Antonio, Tex., asking for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any State passing any law granting any aid to any church, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULL: Petition of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., in favor of House bill 401 in relation to immigration of aliens, etc.—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of Post No. 677, Grand Army of the Republic, of Creal Springs, Ill., requesting action by Congress to preserve and mark lines of battle at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, No. 7, and citizens of Jackson County, Ill., against the Brosius lard bill (H. R. 395) and for general food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Petition of residents of Peekskill, N. Y., in favor of the proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution providing that no State shall pass laws restricting the establishment or free exercise of religion, nor establish any form, nor make any appropriation for any church, society, or institution wholly or in part under sectarian control—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: Petition of Jane R. Stanton, administratrix of Robert Stanton, deceased, asking reference of her claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Petition of National Grand Lodge of the United States, Loyal Knights of America, in favor of amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 27 citizens of Venango County, Pa., in favor of the passage of the Paddock pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of the same county, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Petition of the United Presbyterian Congregation of Oakdale Station, Pa., asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday, etc.—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of citizens of Allegheny County, for passage of House bill 401, restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Allegheny, asking for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting passage of any law establishing religion, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Allegheny County, for passage of House bill 401, restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STUMP: Petition of citizens of Halls Cross Roads, Md., praying for passage of a law regulating speculations in fictitious farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR: Resolution of Grand Army of the Republic Post of Columbus, Ohio, against passage of the free-silver bill—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, three petitions of 131 citizens of Columbia County, Ohio, for passage of House bill 401, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE, of Pennsylvania—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Affidavit of Joseph N. Nash, late corporal Company A, Thirty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, to accompany bill for his relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: Petition of Melvill Dewey, favoring the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Lee Alliance, of Georgia, asking passage of subtreasury bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEADOCK: Petition of Earnest Schutz and others, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 685—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 8, 1892.

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

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

REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 28th ultimo, a list of the vessels of the Revenue Marine, their tonnage, stations, distance cruised for the protection of the customs revenue and other purposes, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1891, the number of guns, small arms, officers, and crews of each, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, was, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR MONDAY.

Mr. CAMERON. I gave notice yesterday that I intended to ask the Senate to-day for an executive session, but I am informed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he will not probably get through with the District appropriation bill until late in the afternoon. As we shall adjourn over until Monday, I will postpone my request for an executive session until Monday morning, after the routine morning business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COLQUITT presented a petition of the faculty and students of Gammon Theological Seminary, of Atlanta, Ga., praying that appropriations for the World's Columbian Exposition be made only on condition that it be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. HAWLEY presented the petition of Mrs. F. Scott and 150 other residents of Watertown, Conn., praying for the enactment of a national Sunday law and for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petition of C. H. Gilber, Mrs. H. E. Bates, and 300 other citizens of Thomaston, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation prohibiting unnecessary work in the mail, military, and interstate-commerce services on Sunday, and also for the closing of any exposition or exhibition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petition of E. F. Burr and other citizens of Lyme, Conn., praying that no exposition or exhibition for which appropriations are made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the following petitions of Newington, Colebrook, East Hampton, Farmington, Quinattisset, Manchester, Woodbridge, Somers, East Windsor, Watertown, and Suffield Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Connecticut:

Petitions praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of citizens of Douglas County, and a petition of citizens of Logan County, in the State of Colorado, praying for the passage of legislation regulating speculation in fictitious farm products; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches of Fort Collins, Colo., remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of the Salida (Colo.) Free Coinage Club, praying for the free coinage of silver; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the following petitions of Dry Creek Valley Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Colorado:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Springfield, Mo., praying for the passage of House bill 257, making eight hours a day's work; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ohio, containing 265 individual signatures; a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Ripley, Ohio; a petition of the Congregational Church of Ruggles, Ohio; a petition of the Christian Church of Enon, Ohio; a petition of 72 citizens of Ohio, and a petition of the Hugh Avenue Congregational Church of Cleveland, Ohio, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petition of L. B. Ritter and 27 other citizens of South Bethlehem, Pa., the petition of C. B. Maxwell and 38 other citizens of Hartzdale, Pa., a petition of 13 citizens of Leipsic, Ohio, and a petition of 48 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the adoption of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the States from passing laws respecting the establishment of religion, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Howard Lake, Minn., praying for the passage of what is known as the Dolph Alaska liquor license bill; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition numerous signed by citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of certain amendments to the naturalization and immigration laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of 32 citizens of Manville, Wyo., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, and that no intoxicating liquors be sold thereat; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PASCO presented the memorial of L. M. Merritt, vice-president of the American Shipping League, and 25 other busi-

ness men of Pensacola, Fla., representing the shipping interests of that port, remonstrating against the passage of the bill abolishing compulsory pilotage; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a memorial of citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Charity Grange, No. 103, of Harrisburg, Oregon, praying for the passage of legislation placing binding-twine on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Republican county convention of Wasco County, Oregon, held March 26, 1892, praying the extension of time to two years for payment for forfeited railroad lands; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented the following petitions of Hillsboro, Charity, Mayville, Salt Creek, Mount Hood, Highland, and Multnomah Granges, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oregon:

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of a mass meeting of churches of Cannonsburg, Pa., and a petition collected by the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pennsylvania, praying that the sale of intoxicating liquor be prohibited at the World's Columbian Exposition and that the Exposition be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petition of C. B. Maxwell and 38 other citizens of Houtzdale, Pa., and the petition of L. D. Ritter and 27 other citizens of South Bethlehem, Pa., praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of Farmers' Institute held at Mooresburg, Pa., praying for the free delivery of mails in rural districts; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Pittsburg (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, praying for the passage of legislation to establish a public telegraph system in the post-offices of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the First Lutheran Church of Chicora, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Manor Station, Pa.; a petition of the Union United Presbyterian Church of Butler County, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Bruin, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Petrolia, Pa.; and a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Summit, Pa.; a petition of the Pigeon Creek Presbyterian Church, of Pigeon Creek, Pa.; a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Claysville, Pa.; and a petition of the Presbyterian Church of Oakdale, Pa., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday, that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat, and that the art department be managed according to the American standard of purity in art; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the petitions of Security Council, Mahanoy City Council, Central Council, No. 61; Gen. Taylor Council, No. 398; Pennfield Council, Hemmings Mill Council, Shanksville Council, No. 729; Hunter Council, No. 596; Lescallette Council, No. 442; Bessie Council, No. 302; Springfield Council, No. 657; Jenkintown Council, North Star Council, No. 67; Dawson Council, Iron Council, Kensington Council, Integrity Council, High Spire Council, No. 155; Washington Camp, No. 102; Washington Camp, No. 106; Washington Camp, No. 517; Littlestown Council, No. 386; United Council, No. 482; Washington Camp, No. 450; Washington Camp, No. 478; Coaltown Council, No. 438, and Industrial Council, No. 437; Patriotic Order United American Mechanics of the American Defense Association, of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the bill to amend the naturalization laws as agreed upon and reported by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERRY presented the petition of J. T. Hannaford and 65 other citizens of Morrilton, Ark., and a petition of citizens of Arkansas, praying for the passage of what is known as the Butterworth option bill; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HISCOCK presented the petition of Irving Schmitz and 6 other citizens of New York City, the petition of Walter Gillis and 4 other citizens of New York City, praying for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or appropriating any money for sectarian purposes; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Sinclairville Grange, No. 401, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, praying for the passage of the bill to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, and the bill (H. R. 395) defining lard and imposing a tax thereon; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Miles N. Smith and 18 other citizens of Chautauqua County, N. Y., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch antioption bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SAWYER presented a petition of members of Sawyer Post, No. 7, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of Senate bill 897, providing for the preservation and to properly mark the battle lines at Gettysburg; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the Democratic Club of Pocatello, Idaho, praying for the passage of legislation providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GORMAN presented the petition of William Anthony and other citizens of Solomons, Md., praying for the passage of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that no State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof or making an appropriation of money for sectarian purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of William A. Cowen, late of Company D, Fifth Maryland Infantry Volunteers, praying for the removal of the charge of desertion now standing against him; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the following petitions of Glencoe Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maryland:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation for the encouragement of silk culture—referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

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

Mr. MCPHERSON presented a petition of the faculty and students of the Chicago Theological Seminary, of Chicago, Ill.; a petition of students of the Drew Theological Seminary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Madison, N. J.; a petition of the faculty and students of the Gammon Theological Seminary, of Atlanta, Ga.; a petition of the faculty and students of the Allegheny United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, of Allegheny, Pa.; and a petition of the students of the Newton Theological Institution, of Newton Center, Mass., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition may be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select.)

He also presented the petition of Margaret Solly, of Camden, N. J., formerly the widow of John Barr, who was a member of Company C, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, during the Mexican war, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PEPPER presented a petition of the Wage-workers' Political Alliance of the District of Columbia, praying that an appropriation of \$75,000 be made for supplying the children in the District of Columbia with free schoolbooks; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PALMER presented the following petitions of Rutland Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Illinois:

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

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

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

Mr. TURPIE presented the following petitions of Owen Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Indiana:

Petition praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent

gambling in farm products—referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

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

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

Mr. MILLS presented a petition of 23 citizens of Goliad County, Tex., praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch antioption bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. Res. 47) authorizing the resubdivision of square 673 in the city of Washington, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1077) relieving the personal representatives of John Sherman, jr., late United States Marshal for the Territory of New Mexico, from the requirements of section 833 of the Revised Statutes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MCMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4845) to amend an act entitled, "An act relating to tax sales and taxes in the District of Columbia," reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1885) to amend an act entitled, "An act relating to tax sales and taxes in the District of Columbia," reported adversely thereon, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1308) to prevent the building of houses along certain alleys in the city of Washington, and for other purposes, to report it adversely and move its indefinite postponement, a similar bill from the other House being on the Calendar.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 2868) to regulate the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1236) to regulate the practice of medicine in the District of Columbia, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1962) granting an honorable discharge to William Pierce, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VOORHEES, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2150) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating \$30,000, reported it without amendment.

MARTELLO TOWER, ON TYBEE ISLAND.

Mr. HAWLEY. I report back favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Military Affairs, the joint resolution (H. Res. 69) authorizing the use of the martello tower, on Tybee Island, Georgia, for a signal station. It is a simple matter of consent to a disposition of that property which will be valuable to the commercial interests of Savannah, and I hope the Senate will immediately concur with the other House in the passage of the joint resolution. I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It proposes to permit the use of the martello tower, on Tybee Island, Georgia, by telegraph or telephone companies for a signal station, to report passing vessels, under such conditions as the Secretary of War may deem proper to protect the interest of the United States.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I introduce a bill to provide for the reservation of certain timber lands upon the Siletz Indian Reservation for the benefit of the Indians. I wish to say that this is a bill attempting to put into practical operation upon the Siletz Indian Reservation in Oregon the suggestion made by me in discussing the Indian appropriation bill, to have the Government provide upon the reservations employment

for the Indians by which they can be made to work and earn what is necessary to support them, rather than to be supported by the Treasury. The proposition is to withdraw from sale out of the lands not needed for allotment among the Indians five sections of timber land near the saw-mill, and to allow the Indians to cut the timber for their own use and to market it under regulations to be provided by the Secretary of the Interior. I ask the present and earnest attention of the committee to the proposition, and if it appears to be a practical and a good one, I suggest whether some similar measure should not be adopted for other reservations.

The bill (S. 2869) to provide for the reservation of certain timber lands upon the Siletz Indian Reservation for the benefit of the Indians was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 2870) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Cherokee Nation of Indians of the Indian Territory, to make appropriation for carrying out the same, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2871) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mason, widow of late Julius W. Mason, major Third Regiment, United States Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2872) for the relief of James Wilcox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VILAS introduced a bill (S. 2873) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CAREY introduced a bill (S. 2874) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make leases in the Yellowstone National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2875) for the relief of George B. Stimpson, late postmaster at South Pueblo, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 2876) granting a pension to James H. Mandeville; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2877) granting an increase of pension to James T. Hood, late of Company I, Forty-third Indiana Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2878) to enable the Ottawa Indians, the Indiana Miami Indians, and Western Miami Indians to bring suit in the Court of Claims for settlement of claims against the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 2879) for the relief of Margaret Solly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2880) to provide for a medal in commemoration of the services of Haym Salomon during the war of the Revolution, and to express recognition of the same; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BLACKBURN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2881) to further amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2882) for the relief of John M. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Ordered, That John Cowdon have leave to withdraw from the files of the Senate a memorial relating to the improvement of the Mississippi River signed by him.

TARIFF COMPILATION OF 1891.

Mr. COCKRELL. I offer a concurrent resolution for printing the Tariff Compilation of 1891, and I hope that very early action may be had upon it. It will be remembered that the Finance Committee made a report to the Senate giving a history of tariff legislation, a tariff compilation, up to 1891; but the document has never been printed for distribution. A resolution was passed I think by the Senate ordering it to be printed, and it went to

the other House and there failed of action in the last Congress; It is a document that is often called for.

The concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 copies of Senate Report No. 2130, Fifty-first Congress, second session, being Tariff Compilation of 1891, prepared by the Senate Committee on Finance under authority of the act of Congress of August 30, 1890, of which number 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and 10,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT STREET RAILWAYS.

Mr. VEST. I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners for the District of Columbia be directed to inform the Senate what railroad companies operating their roads in said District have failed for the period of two years from March 2, 1889, to exercise the powers and privileges given them in regard to changing the motive power of their roads, by the provisions of the District appropriation act approved on the date aforesaid. And if the companies so failing have complied with the requirements of said act as to causing the rails and roadbeds used by them to be level with the surface of the streets upon each side of said track or roadbeds. And if the said companies have not complied with the law, whether the Commissioners have taken the steps required by them by the act aforesaid to compel the observance of the provisions hereinbefore set forth.

And if no steps have been taken by them to enforce the law, as they were directed to do, what is the cause of such failure—

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I had occasion yesterday to make the statement that an act of Congress had been disregarded entirely by certain railroad companies in the District of Columbia. I was under the impression at the time, because I had made no examination outside of what was necessitated by the line of travel that I pursue myself in coming to the Capitol and returning to my residence, that the Belt Line was the only company in the District that had failed to comply with the law. But I am informed, in fact I may say I know, that other companies on their branch lines have utterly disregarded the statute, and in order that it may be seen that I make no willful attack upon these companies (and I have no disposition to oppress them in any way) I ask the Secretary to read the law, which seems to have passed out of the memory of the public generally and especially of these corporations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The law sent up by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That any company authorized by law to run cars propelled by horses within the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to substitute for horses electric power by storage or independent electrical batteries or underground wire, or underground cables moved by steam power, on the whole or any portion of its roadway, with authority to purchase and use any terminal grounds and facilities necessary for the purpose; and any such street railway company electing to substitute such power on any part of its tracks or roadbeds on the streets of the District of Columbia shall, before doing so, cause such part of its roadbeds to be laid with a flat grooved rail and made level with the surface of the streets upon each side of said tracks or roadbeds, so that no obstruction shall be presented to vehicles passing over said tracks: *Provided*, That in the event said companies or either of them shall fail for the period of two years from the passage of this act to exercise the powers and privileges hereinbefore given, such companies are hereby required to cause said rails and roadbeds to be relaid with the flat-grooved rail hereinbefore mentioned, so as to be level with the surface of the streets upon each side of said tracks or roadbeds and the cost of making the changes hereinbefore required shall be paid by the corporations or persons owning or operating said street railroads, and if, after being notified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in writing to comply with the terms of this act, the said corporations or either of them shall not within ninety days thereafter begin the work required and complete the same within a reasonable time, not more than twelve months from the expiration of said period of ninety days, it shall be the duty of the Commissioners to cause the necessary changes in said rails and roadbeds to be made as soon as practicable; and shall issue certificates of indebtedness against the property, real or personal, of said railway company, which certificates shall bear interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum until paid, and which, until they are paid, shall remain and be a lien upon the property on or against which they are issued, together with the franchise of said company; and if the said certificates are not paid within one year the said Commissioners of this District of Columbia may proceed to sell the property against which they are issued, or so much thereof as may be necessary to pay the amount due, such sale to be first duly advertised daily for one week in some newspaper published in the city of Washington, and to be sold at public auction to the highest bidder: *Provided further*, That after the passage of this act no other rail than herein mentioned shall be laid by any street railway company in the streets of Washington and Georgetown, and all companies granted franchises or extensions by the Fiftieth Congress shall have extension of one year's time within which to lay their tracks. So much of the charters of the street railway companies of the District of Columbia as is inconsistent with this section is hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That the foregoing requirements as to motive power, rails, and roadbed shall not apply to street railroads outside the city of Georgetown and the boundary limits of the city of Washington: *And provided*, That the authority hereinbefore granted in each and every particular shall be exercised only with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, expressed by resolution of said board.

Mr. VEST. That is a part of the District appropriation act of March 2, 1889, and although certain railroad companies in the District failed to avail themselves of the provisions of the preceding part of what has been read from the desk and have not changed their motive power, and the limitation of two years expired on March 2, 1891, no steps have been taken to enforce the

law whatever. That is all I desire to say about it. I ask for the passage of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

TREASURY ACCOUNTS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Iowa to allow a resolution of inquiry to pass that comes over from yesterday. It is a part of the morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Iowa will withhold his motion for a moment, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. CHANDLER on the 6th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate what applications have been or may be presented to the accounting officers of the Treasury to reopen accounts or claims settled by said officers or paid by disbursing officers under a construction of law subsequently declared erroneous by the Supreme Court, stating briefly the grounds of any such decisions of the court, the circumstances and amount involved in each case decided, the number of all similar cases, and the amounts covered thereby, and the full history of each class of such accounts or claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOHN B. MEIGS.

Mr. ALLISON. I now renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will allow the appropriation bill to be suspended for a moment, until I can have a pension bill passed for a very aged man in very destitute circumstances, who will probably live but a short time?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Florida appealed to me yesterday for this aged man, and I will yield now if it takes no time.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a bill (S. 2351) granting a pension to John B. Meigs.

Mr. ALLISON. I reserve the right to object if it takes time. There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place the name of John B. Meigs, a soldier of the United States volunteer forces in the Seminole Indian war in Florida in 1835, on the pension roll, at the rate of \$20 per month.

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

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6746) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. PADDOCK. I was not in the Senate yesterday evening when this matter was under consideration, and I should like to have the amendment read. I do not know what the proposition is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the amendment: And the whole of said amount shall be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KYLE. Do I understand that the amendment before the Senate is the one offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment now pending is the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, which has just been read, to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KYLE. I will wait until that is passed on.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] was pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was simply read as an amendment intended to be offered by him, but not yet offered and not in order at the time.

Mr. CULLOM. I think it would not be in order until the pending amendment to the amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator from Missouri offered his amendment before that, being an amendment to an amendment, and there being no door open to me I gave notice that I would offer mine as soon as there was an opportunity.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to have the provision stated as it will be with this amendment. I did not hear the original proposition. I was not here when it was under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan as a substitute for the amendment reported by that Senator from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

National encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic: To pay the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment of such honorably discharged Union soldiers, sailors, and marines, who served in the war of the rebellion, as may attend as delegates or otherwise the Twenty-sixth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, D. C., and attending the preparation for such reception and entertainment, \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will now read the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add to the amendment:

And the whole of said amount shall be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I am myself heartily in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment; but, in the first place, I am inclined to be opposed to the whole thing. I do not believe this proposition ought to be here. The city of Lincoln, the capital of my State, was a competitor with Washington to secure the location of the encampment for this year. A fund by individual contribution was guaranteed, as I remember, of \$50,000 by that young city of 60,000 people, where one dollar in the legitimate enterprises is worth two dollars in such uses here, where the people, although prosperous and the city which they have built up by their pluck and enterprise, one of the best and strongest and most rapidly improving and developing, are not in a condition to contribute in any such degree as the citizens of Washington are. Yet they offered to make up whatever sum should be required by their own individual contributions there and in that section to defray the expenses of the encampment if it should be located there. Because of the superior financial ability of the citizens of Washington and because of the superior facilities for entertaining these ex-soldiers here their competitor—Lincoln—was beaten by a few votes.

Now, I think it is presumptuous in the highest degree for the citizens of this wealthy town, where the people are able to contribute a million dollars if necessary to entertain the ex-soldiers, to come to the Congress of the United States and ask the people of Lincoln and all the other people of the United States to contribute in order that they may make a good demonstration and provide good facilities for the entertainment of the ex-soldiers whom they ought to and can easily entertain strongly, liberally, and most hospitably by their own individual contributions, according to their agreement.

This encampment will be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars in the matter of business to the city of Washington. The hotel and boarding house people of this town, considering the enormous business that will come to them alone on account of the encampment, could well afford to pay every dollar that it will cost to provide the proper means for the entertainment of our ex-soldiers.

So far as I am concerned I am strongly inclined to vote against this proposition unamended. I want to see the people here do what they understood and admitted would be their requirement to do and the expectation to do if they secured the encampment. Here are men of great wealth interested in valuable and rapidly appreciating real estate who are in a situation where they can afford and ought to contribute; who are abundantly able to and should contribute in order to entertain these old soldiers as they should be entertained, and as they deserve on all such occasions. I am for the best entertainment that can be commanded for them; but I want the citizens of Washington to go into their pockets and take their own money out and pay these expenses.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I can understand a strict constructionist of the Constitution like the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] finding difficulty about an appropriation of this kind, but I must confess I am amazed at the line of argument of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK]. The only objection which seems to be entertained by him is that a town in his State called Lincoln

failed to obtain the necessary votes as the location of this encampment, and therefore he proposes to vote against any proposition allowing the city of Washington even—for that is all there is in it if the amendment is adopted—

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FRYE. The Senator will pardon me; in a moment, not at present.

If the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is adopted, it is simply authorizing the city of Washington to appropriate a certain amount of money to entertain the old soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic, and the Senator interposes the objection that Lincoln did not get it.

Mr. PADDOCK. No, sir, I simply interpose this objection, that the citizens of Washington, who were there represented, proposed and agreed that they themselves would raise or had raised or were ready to raise whatever money might be required to entertain these ex-soldiers. Therefore I do not believe that they ought to come here for any appropriation. They put themselves on that plane and secured the location of the encampment, and after making such a proposition as they did, they ought to adhere to it without any demand whatever on Congress.

Mr. FRYE. There has never been an encampment of the Grand Army that was sustained and taken care of by voluntary contributions, and there never will be one. There would not have been one in Lincoln. The city council of Lincoln would have been compelled to have made an appropriation. Even in the city of Boston, where there is one hundred times more wealth than there is in the city of Washington, the city was compelled to make an appropriation, and the State—both the State and the city were compelled to make appropriations. No city will be found, in my judgment, on the face of the earth that will entertain the Grand Army of the Republic simply on voluntary contributions.

Then, there is no great private wealth in the city of Washington. They have obtained contributions now to the extent perhaps of thirty or forty thousand dollars. It may be that \$50,000 has been subscribed, but, Mr. President, the city of Washington, the capital city of the country, presents an entirely different plane from any other city in the United States. This capital next September is to be the Mecca of the Grand Army of the Republic. Every surviving soldier who took part in the parade at the close of the war through the streets of this capital city of Washington expects to be here once more, and this is his time. There is not the slightest question but that at least 100,000 old soldiers will be in Washington to engage in this great encampment. Now, what will it cost? It will cost at least \$1.25 for quarters for soldiers who come here. There is \$125,000. The other expenses will be at least \$50,000 more, making \$175,000; and yet the Senator from Nebraska insists that the people of Washington shall subscribe the entire amount, and that even the city shall not be permitted to make an appropriation.

Why, Mr. President, I am surprised. I did not suppose that it would come from this side of the house. I admit I can understand objections that come elsewhere, but I can not understand such an objection as that.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the United States appropriating out of the Treasury \$100,000, without charging it to the city of Washington or the District of Columbia, or \$125,000 or \$150,000 if in the judgment of the Senate it will take that amount to entertain the soldiers when they come here to the capital of the country, and I hope that no amendment will be made cutting down this amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] for \$100,000. Not a dollar less would I consent to take, for, in my judgment, it is not enough to serve the purpose which it is intended to serve. As to whether the District of Columbia shall pay it or not it is entirely immaterial to me, and it is equally immaterial to my constituents.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine does not state my position correctly at all. I started with the declaration that I was for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], and that I should vote for it. I am perfectly willing that that amendment shall be adopted, and I desire, if any legislation is to be had, that that shall be the legislation.

I spoke of the matter of individual contributions. I do not think the citizens here, who would be benefited enormously by this encampment, ought to come to Congress at all. I do not think this question ought to have been obtruded here considering what was understood and what is a matter of record in the newspapers as to their ability and their determination to make provision themselves as citizens of Washington.

Of course, if the city government, through such methods as it may adopt, may make this appropriation, that is all right, and I shall vote for it. That is what I want to do; but what I said, in

addition to that proposition, was simply that I did not think, as a matter of taste, it was a proper thing for the citizens of Washington to come here at all about.

As to the city of Lincoln, the Senator says that if the encampment had been held there its common council would have had to appropriate; but there probably would not have been power to do this. It probably would not have been competent for the common council of the city of Lincoln under its charter to make any such appropriation. It would have been necessary to obtain individual contributions from the loyal people there, and every Democrat as well as every Republican is a loyal man when it comes to entertaining the ex-soldiers under such circumstances and at such times, in the West—and that vigorous, plucky town would have found the money.

I can not consent to be placed in the position in which the Senator from Maine undertakes to place me in respect to this thing.

Mr. FRYE. I did not wish to place the Senator in any position he did not occupy. I understood him that he would have voted against any appropriation.

Mr. PADDOCK. I did not say that I would vote against the proposition of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. FRYE. Did not the Senator say he would vote against any appropriation?

Mr. PADDOCK. No, sir.

Mr. FRYE. Then I misunderstood him; and if he is going to vote for it I will take back every word I said.

Mr. PADDOCK. I said I was not in favor of any appropriation out of the Federal Treasury chargeable to the Government of the United States as such for the payment of the expenses of this encampment.

Mr. FRYE. I am glad the Senator is going to vote for it. I thought he would.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am not willing to vote for any appropriation to be charged to the Government of the United States. I am willing to vote for an appropriation to be paid by the people of the District of Columbia, as provided by this amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, when in the Grand Army encampments the question is discussed "Where shall we meet next," of course there are always competing cities. Those who go there to represent those cities and urge the encampment to adopt this or that place as the next place of meeting, have as a rule previously talked with some of their leading citizens, ascertained the temper of the city, and whether it will be generally acceptable to the railroads, hotels, and public-spirited people of all descriptions, and they make an estimate of what they can possibly raise for the entertainment of the soldiers, and the Grand Army chooses then, not only according to the pecuniary estimate, but upon their fancy in general as to where they would like to go.

I am very glad they chose this place. There are a great many of them at every encampment who will never attend another. The great majority of them are getting so far along in years now that they certainly will never come to Washington again. A great majority of those who will be here next September have never been here since they passed through this city during the stormy times of war, and there will be a majority of them, probably, soldiers who have been through Washington in one way or another, ten or twenty thousand of those who went through here in Sherman's great final review.

Now, Washington as a city must not be behind Detroit or Boston or any other public-spirited or patriotic city. It must even do better, for it is not only an American city, but is the American capital city, and it must not deal with this thing in any narrow spirit.

We ought not to saddle this whole expense upon the citizens of this town. It is ungenerous; it is not a broad and manly and generous treatment of the question at all. We have made mistakes enough in that direction. We have imposed upon the people here the cost of a zoölogical garden upon a scale that a city of 250,000 inhabitants elsewhere would never have thought of undertaking. We have ordained the park in the gratification of national pride and for national cultivation. We had no right, I say, to impose the expense on this community. I regard that action of Congress as a very great mistake and an ungenerous imposition. Now, do not let us follow it up in a case so peculiar as this with another attempt to tell them how much these people shall spend upon patriotic and hospitable intent.

It is quite wrong, in my judgment. I would rather that whatever we gave should be given out and out entirely by the United States as its share of the contribution. We are carrying on here a large number of charitable institutions, and in accordance with that understood rule of partnership between the Government and the city, we pay half the expenses of those charitable institutions. The constitutional argument against that sort of expenditure is just as strong precisely as the constitutional argument against this appropriation for this coming entertainment,

and yet nobody has been troubled about what we give towards these charities.

Mr. President, this is not a wealthy city in the true sense, if you carefully think of it. There is a colored population, I do not know how large, but probably from sixty to eighty thousand here. We know that is not a wealthy population. Then, there is the great population that is dependent, directly or indirectly, upon Government employment, and the pay given Government employés. Most of them are not wealthy people. Many of them are saving some money to support families elsewhere, and to buy themselves little homes about here. The wealthy population referred to is largely a population that comes here as it goes to Saratoga and Long Branch. They are temporary residents, and many of them have homes elsewhere, where they have calls for public purposes and charitable purposes. This is not a wealthy city. I should be glad if this appropriation could be a generous sum directly from the Treasury of the United States, without asking anybody else to assist, and without imposing any share of it upon the District of Columbia.

I wish to say a word more, which I came very near omitting. For this District the Congress of the United States is the municipal government, the State government, the National Government, all in one. The people of the District have no representation here. We are absolute masters of the situation. We have put the government of this town in the hands of three receivers, being dissatisfied with the democratic experiment here. We have assumed all the duty, I say, of the city, the state, and the national relation toward these people; and where we are supreme in this way, we have the perfect power to do anything that any municipality can do, for we can create and we can destroy municipal government here. We have all these powers reposed in us; we have all the national powers reposed in us; and we can do what becomes a gentleman among gentlemen in a matter of this sort.

Now, take the city of Detroit. The citizens there raised \$50,000 and the city gave \$20,000. In Boston it was similar, except that the State of Massachusetts gave something, the city of Boston gave something, and the citizens gave something. We must do as well by this matter certainly as anybody else did, and we ought to do just a little better.

This is not wasted money, gentlemen. You will have here 100,000 men whom you asked to go out and save the nation in a time of trouble. You are giving a great object lesson in patriotism, and the whole country will look at this extraordinary march of the men who left here long, long, years ago, and are now near the end of their term of life.

Mr. McPHERSON. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with this appropriation and the objects it has in view. What so becoming in a great Government as to enable the soldiers who fought in her defense to meet in the shadow of this Capitol, which, owing to their courage and sacrifices, still remains the capital of a reunited, prosperous, and happy country? I am sure the people of this city, which bears the name of our first patriot, will gladly welcome the Grand Army to this city, and will be more than willing to make the necessary expenditure to receive them in the spirit and after the manner of other great cities heretofore honored by their presence. The attempt to shift the expense from the national Treasury to the city of Washington for a great national tribute to the nation's defenders is too niggardly to satisfy the people of this great country, whatever we may say of the representatives of the people.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, I shall not vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], to charge this whole appropriation upon the District of Columbia. I should much rather vote for the proposition of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], that the National Government itself should do whatever is done in the way of providing for this encampment here.

The true significance of the encampment is its national character; the purpose of it is national; the origin of it is national; the benefit, if any shall arise out of it, is national in all its phases and in all its results. The fact that there is to be one is a great national fact. There is no side of it, there is no inspiration in it, there is nothing that stimulates the old soldier to come here which is not national in all its phases and all its colors and all its emotions.

It would not be fair for us, having the power here, to turn around and say we will saddle the expense upon the city of Washington. Washington has no more interest in this than the nation has, nor as much. All that there is in Washington peculiar in this matter is national itself, and it does not become us here, it seems to me, to undertake to compel the city of Washington to do that which the whole nation ought to do.

If there is anything sad about it, it is because every part of the nation and every individual in the nation can not participate in it with the same feeling. I wish all might. If anything will contribute to a unity of feeling in this respect it will be a great and generous and noble provision on the part of the United

States as united States for this one celebration of the great incidents connected with the war.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me to ask him who invited this encampment to this city? Was it the Government, or was it the people of Washington City?

Mr. DAWES. Why, Mr. President, the Senator threw that out yesterday as a reason why we should shirk this whole thing. It seems a very small reason why we should. It was not the city of Washington in its corporate capacity that did this thing; it was citizens of Washington, who are citizens of the United States and not having any voice at all in the administration of public affairs here. It ill becomes us to take advantage of that fact and saddle upon them the whole expense. It was not the city of Washington that extended the invitation to the Grand Army. The city of Washington in that respect has no corporate existence, no method of speaking as a city, and can not speak except through the Congress of the United States. The Constitution has devolved upon the United States all the functions that pertain to the city of Washington, and the Congress of the United States are to-day debating the question whether it is not best for them, availing themselves of this constitutional power, to shirk participation in this one great and grand occasion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was quite aware of the fact that the city of Washington as a corporation had not extended any invitation, nor can it extend any except through Congress; but my question looked to the answer that the Senator has given. The invitation was extended by the people of Washington, and if the encampment is here, they are the guests of the people of Washington, and not the guests of the Government.

Mr. DAWES. Does the Senator suppose that the amount of money made out of this grand encampment is the object or purpose of it; that there is nothing beyond the amount of money to be put into the pockets of the population around here, hack-drivers and hotel-keepers and saloon-keepers? Is that the object of this great encampment here? If it is, we had better not have anything to do with it, and all others had better keep clear of it. If there is not something better, higher, and nobler coming out of this encampment by which all the people of the United States are to be benefited, then we had better not have anything to do with it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President, as a question of power, an appropriation from the national Treasury can as easily be justified as can be the vote of the Senate imposing the expense contemplated by this amendment upon the city of Washington. That is to say, I can as easily, with my views of the powers of Congress under the Constitution, vote to assume the whole burden that this appropriation would impose, or a part of it, as I could impose it upon the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, if this appropriation is intended merely for the benefit, or if its results are to be limited to such benefits as may be derived from the presence of a large number of persons who will spend a great deal of money in Washington, if the people here are to be alone benefited, then they ought to pay this expense; and if I believed that, I would agree with those who say that Congress ought not to interfere at all. That is to say, if I believed it was purely a grand gathering from which Washington would derive all that is beneficial, I should say make no appropriation, but let the people of Washington—if there are any people in Washington, for I confess, although there are a great many citizens here, it has not been my good fortune to meet many of them; it seems to be the habitation of strangers—but if that were so I would say to them "arrange your own matters in your own way."

But, sir, that is not the view I take of this matter. I realize what in my own person I observe in the persons of many thousands of the Union soldiers in the North and in the South, that the number is becoming less and less; time is doing its work upon these men. That they deserve well of the country is admitted. They do not possess all the spirit of patriotism that is in the country, but they have evinced their patriotism under exceedingly trying circumstances. This gathering will be a gathering of peace; it will be promotive of important national results, for I incline to believe that this grand gathering of soldiers will not be confined alone to the men who wore the blue. I have no doubt when the grand encampment takes place during the next fall that thousands of men who live across the river will be present and they will be taken by the hands as brave men shake the hands of each other.

It will be a grand assemblage of men who were soldiers in war, but who are now citizens in peace. It will be a meeting of the men who have done more to promote the peace of this country after the civil war than any others, because it is a fact that if, at the close of the war, the settlement of the terms of peace had been confided to the soldiers of the two armies there would have been very little controversy in the country after actual hostilities ceased.

It is in that view that I favor this appropriation, and I confess

I do not want the people of Washington to regard it as their occasion at all. I do not want them to understand that they are expected to pay this expense. There is a sort of partnership between the District and the Federal Government, so that appropriations for objects like this and others may be imposed upon the Federal Treasury and upon the District equally; but I desire from my standpoint that this shall be supported by an appropriation dictated by the Congress of the United States, and that it shall be controlled in the interest of the old men who will gather here at the capital of their country for the last time, who will, in passing from the West and the North and the South, see how marvellous this country has grown since the great struggle that involved the existence of the Union, men who will see what this capital has come to be, and will realize by seeing what has been accomplished that they have served the country well, and that North and South and East and West have grown and prospered as the result of the great struggle in which they were engaged.

Let them come, old men that they are; they will be here but a little time longer; time is dealing with them; their heads are gray; their limbs are palsied, and they will desire to come for the last time to visit the capital of their country, which has grown so much since the great hours of sorrow that spread over the whole land.

I will vote for charging this upon the District treasury or upon the property here, with reluctance I confess, but if it will insure the passage of the amendment I will favor it, and in one point of view it will be just, but I prefer that the appropriation shall be made from the National Treasury, and that the Congress of the United States shall say to these old tottering men, "come and share in the hospitality offered you by your country and not by this paltry city." I say "paltry," though it is a grand and beautiful city, but what is it compared with this Republic of which it is the mere capital?

I trust, therefore, that the Committee on the District of Columbia will control this appropriation. I am not disposed to enter into any terms. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] if it is necessary to insure the passage of the measure; but I would rather that it should not be adopted. I would rather it had not been proposed. I should have been glad, waiving all constitutional difficulties and waiving everything else, that this appropriation of \$100,000 had been passed without a single word of dissent or comment as the voluntary tribute of this country to this great carnival of peace, which will take place here during the coming fall.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] has relieved this side of the Chamber of all suspicions of disloyalty, I suppose that I may venture to let fall a few desultory observations further in this discussion.

I have not seen since my early experience at a Fourth of July barbecue in my own native State of Kentucky, when I could smell the barbecued meat, as much unalloyed patriotism as I heard from that Senator this morning. It reminds me somewhat of my early history, of a performance that I once witnessed in which the lines and words of the play were not particularly noticeable, but the act concluded with the principal performer wrapping himself in the American flag, rushing to the footlights, firing off a horse-pistol, and screaming like the American eagle. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that Senator thought proper to refer to those of us who had scruples about this appropriation as being ingardly. I resent that epithet, there is nothing in my public career which justifies it. I would not have thought of mentioning it, but the fact is that in looking back upon my career here as a Senator, I think I have been the author of more public-buildings bills, with the exception of those fathered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], now absent on account of sickness, than any other Senator of equal service here, and very many of these buildings have been constructed in the city of Washington, and have added to the beauty and to the growth and to the population of this capital.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] says that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and myself on this side of the Chamber oppose this appropriation on constitutional grounds. I made no such argument against this amendment. I said if the Constitution was so clear that it could be viewed at a distance and understood as having no objection to this legislation, I would not vote for this appropriation.

I understood that Senator to remark that no similar meeting of the Grand Army had ever been held in this country where there had not been other than private contributions. The Grand Army assembled in the city of St. Louis, and the expenses were defrayed by the voluntary contributions of citizens alone, and not by an appropriation on the part of the municipal assembly or by the Legislature of the State of Missouri.

The ground upon which I oppose this appropriation is simply

because it is a municipal or private affair—no, not even a municipal one. It was originated by individuals, who pledged themselves to the Grand Army when it met at Detroit that they would defray these expenses and extend to them the hospitalities of the national capital; and now it is proposed that \$80,000 shall be paid by the taxpayers of this city.

Mr. CULLOM. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. VEST. Eighty thousand dollars I understand to be the amendment—\$80,000 to be taken out of the poor people of this capital, who have nothing to do with this matter; who were not consulted in regard to it, but whose tax money is to be coerced out of them in order to make good the promises of the gentlemen who got up this thing originally. That is just as objectionable to me as the original proposition. What right had these gentlemen to put this charge upon all the people of the District of Columbia? What is the benefit to any poor man in this city, who is barely able to support his family upon his income, and whose taxes to-day, even when he pays one-half of them, are onerous—what right have they to place upon him any portion of this burden?

Mr. President, if we are to act upon enlarged and patriotic national grounds, of which we have heard so much this morning, if this is to be an occasion in which to build up patriotism and to do away with all the acrimonious feeling of the war, why not go further and let the Congress of the United States make appropriations for the next ecumenical or ecclesiastical council that is held here in the city of Washington? Why, when the Episcopalians or the Presbyterians or the Catholics see proper to call a great ecclesiastical convention, a national convention, as they have done in the past, should not Congress step in and pay the entire expense and relieve the public of their duty? If patriotic feeling is to be the basis, the salvation of souls is a much higher object. If we are to support an organization of private gentlemen who have been soldiers upon either side, why not appropriate money for the soldiers of Christ?

Mr. President, to go a little further, why should we not, as Democrats and Republicans, pay the expenses of our national conventions if they are held here? If I had the constitutional opinions of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] I should have no scruple. He believes that under the general welfare clause Congress can do anything, and I have heard him declare in this Chamber that he was in favor of imposing any amount of tariff duties even if the Government did not need a cent of revenue. I am obliged to the Senator for his criticism upon my strict-construction opinions. He ornaments me more than I deserve. If I entertained his opinions I would have no constitutional scruple about Congress doing anything. Under the blanket clause of the Constitution they can make a two-year-old mule out of a yearling or make any appropriation in the world which they see proper. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in the discussion of this question, the Senator from Nebraska, who spoke so earnestly a moment ago, should not forget that probably five times as many old soldiers will come to Washington as would have gone to any town or city in that great State, and he ought to recognize the fact that they acted wisely in making the selection they did. They will come here not only for the reason that they desire once more to see this magnificent capital, on the streets of which that grand review was had when the war ended, but they will come for the reason that many of the battlefields of the war of the rebellion, in which some of them participated, are in the vicinity of Washington, which they will wish once more to revisit.

I feel, Mr. President, that we should be generous to the surviving soldiers of the Union armies, and that whatever money is needed to make this encampment a great success should be given by Congress with an unstinted hand.

It is argued that in addition to what may be appropriated from the revenues of the District of Columbia we should not take \$50,000 out of the Treasury of the United States for this purpose. Do Senators stop to reflect that \$50,000 will be only four-fifths of 1 mill for each man, woman, and child in this great country? I do not believe that there is a citizen of the United States who measures his patriotism by that standard. Certain I am that the people whom I have the honor in part to represent do not measure their patriotism in that way.

Mr. President, the constitutional argument which has been raised on this question has no terrors for me, nor should it be allowed to influence a single vote.

I recall to mind the fact, as the patriotic people of the nation recall to mind the fact, that there was a time when the Congress of the United States would have given all the revenues of this Government if those soldiers could have promised to save the Union and to restore the nationality which was trembling to its fall. By their valor and sacrifices they did save the Union, they did restore the nationality, they did preserve the Constitution,

they did bring back that old flag without a single star erased, the flag, Mr. President, that floats over every capital of every State in this great Republic to-day.

Shall the Constitution now be invoked against them? Shall the remnants of our brave armies not be honored by a grateful people? Can the nation afford to forget or be indifferent to their claims? Surely we ought not to weigh with the apothecary's scales the appropriation that Congress may make for the encampment that is about to be held in this great city. To many of them it will be the last reunion with their comrades, and it is fitting that their eyes once more behold the flag floating over the nation's Capitol, which they helped to save in the days that tried men's souls.

Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the appropriation recommended by the District Committee as modified by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan, and I trust, in view of the past, as well as in view of the future of this great country, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri may be voted down, and that the appropriation of \$100,000 to aid in the proper observance of what will be a grand historic occasion may be made with practical unanimity. Any other result would be unjust to ourselves, ungrateful to the defenders of the Union cause, and a blot upon the fair name and fame of a patriotic and liberty-loving people.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak upon this question, though I warmly favor the largest appropriation to defray the expenses of this encampment, and the payment of the entire sum by the General Government. After a period of almost thirty years, the soldiers of the Republic have concluded to hold a reunion here in the city of Washington, and I would not have it under any circumstances characterized, as it has been when held in other places, as being put up to the highest bidder, or of its being supported and the expenses of it defrayed by private charity or by private contributions.

I suppose that I, for these views, will be understood as holding extremely liberal notions in the construction of the Constitution, but there are such ample precedents for a Government appropriation in this case that I am quite willing to add another.

Pass out, sir, in front of the Capitol and your eye meets the monument of Washington piercing the clouds. The monument was reared to Washington's memory, to perpetuate it. The appropriation of the money for that purpose must also have been an infraction of the Constitution, and strained it as severely as the appropriation proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Pass through the streets of this city, and everywhere your eye greets monuments to our gallant generals, many of them reared at the expense of the General Government, or which contributed in some way to them—infractions of the Constitution; but I cite them as precedents for this one that you again propose to furnish.

Look across the river and your eye greets Arlington, where sleep the immortal dead, interred at Government expense; and, except for that expenditure, those bones would be scattered upon the battlefields upon which the heroes fell—an unconstitutional appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury.

I say, Mr. President, appropriations like these and for these purposes are not for a moment to be illustrated away by the question "Why do you not appropriate money for a religious convention and to defray the expenses of political conventions?"

The appropriations may be unconstitutional, but I say to you they promote a great educational purpose. Patriotism is educated and developed by money expended in this manner, and I have no hesitation in saying that if the battlefields of the Revolution and of the war of 1812 and the grave of every hero of that heroic age had been immortalized through the North and South by a monument reared to mark the first as holy ground, and to the memory of the others, to perpetuate the glories of American patriotism and American soldiers, and of their heroic services for their country upon the field of battle, there never would have been a war to dissolve the Union.

I am willing that these veterans shall come here as the guests of the nation, and that in no sense shall they come here aided by private contributions because this petty trader or that hotel-keeper can make something from the money that they will spend. By the pensions that we have granted, by the decorations that we have bestowed, by the monuments that we have reared to the honor of those who served the country in its greatest need and necessity, we have demonstrated that it is not the object, or rather it is not the purpose, of this nation to impose upon the soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic, in their reunion at the national capital that they saved, the necessity of defraying their expenses by contributions solicited or paid as a matter of personal pecuniary interest or by a contribution from the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the larger appropriation that has been proposed here, and of its being paid from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] will not prevail. This subject was considered by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the question naturally suggested itself whether the District of Columbia should meet this entire expense, or whether the Government of the United States should share in this entertainment. It was the judgment of a majority of the committee that whatever was appropriated should be appropriated as other appropriations are made for the District of Columbia, and that the Government should assume its fair share of the appropriation. As has been suggested, the reason therefor was because it was looked upon as a national gathering, a national entertainment, rather than a local one.

I was at the encampment in Detroit when this invitation was extended to ex-soldiers of the Republic to meet here in this national encampment, to enjoy the hospitalities of this beautiful city and to revive again the associations which are historic, and which naturally cluster about this nation's capital, and I am very sure that no assurance was given there by the representatives of this city that no appropriation would be asked from Congress. I am very sure that no representation was made by that delegation that the entire expense would be met by the people of this city. Those who were gathered at that encampment in Detroit were assured that, if the invitation was accepted and this national encampment was held here, those who gathered here to participate in its felicities and its pleasures, would be royally entertained and hospitably received. They were assured that the doors of the city would be opened to them and that they would be received with royal hospitality; but there was no assurance given that Congress might not be called upon to contribute in some fair measure to this great national gathering.

The District of Columbia was represented at that encampment by two of the Commissioners and the city of Washington was represented by some of its most conspicuous citizens. Upon the representations made and the invitation extended, it was decided that this encampment should be held here, not only because of the associations which cluster about the city, but because of the historic fields that are so accessible to it. As has been suggested, it is the judgment of all who have had occasion to investigate it or to give it a moment's thought, that this will be the largest encampment ever held in the history of this organization. The historic fields of Virginia are so accessible, to say nothing of the points of interest in this city and the associations connected with it, that comrades will gather here in greater numbers than ever before in a national encampment.

I think with those who favor this proposition that it is too much to ask of the people of the city of Washington to bear the burden of this entire entertainment or to share its entire expense. The veterans will gather here in numbers the like of which has never been seen in other encampments. In Detroit \$50,000 was appropriated from the municipal fund and \$60,000 was raised by private contributions. They had exposition buildings there and other accommodations that could be used for the entertainment of the old soldiers without any considerable expense to the city or to the citizens. No such advantages exist here. Provision must be made for this entertainment; accommodations must be secured; lodging houses must be created or provided for, and so the entire expense of this entertainment must be met.

As has been suggested, in Boston it was found that the State of Massachusetts ought to make a contribution, and it did it liberally and patriotically. So the city of Boston made its municipal contribution in addition to the contributions made by private citizens. This is not a wealthy city, and yet it is urged here that the people of this city ought to meet this entire expense.

It has been suggested that if we make an appropriation for this purpose, we must make an appropriation for other gatherings, and perhaps it is but fair to suggest in this connection that during the last year fifty different conventions have been held in this city, and the people here have met the expenses very largely. The people have secured and provided accommodations generously; they are taxed almost weekly for this purpose, and they do not complain of it.

Mr. PADDOCK. Have the people here not received the benefit in every case?

Mr. PERKINS. There has been very little benefit accruing, except that it has given the delegates attending these conventions the advantages of seeing this city, its grandeur, and its beauty, and of sharing in its hospitality; but in a financial way I question whether it has been of any benefit to this city; but the people have been called upon from week to week to make these contributions, and they have done it cheerfully and uncomplainingly.

But in view of the thousands who are to gather here at this encampment they have thought it was but fair that Congress should, at least in part, assist in this great entertainment. We are appropriating each year for our monuments here, for the

decoration of our public buildings, and for the beautifying of the city, and in all this the Government of the United States bears its full share of the appropriation. So it was thought by a majority of the committee having jurisdiction of this subject that the Government of the United States should share with the people of this District in meeting this expense and in making the appropriation.

I hope, and I know it is the wish of the majority at least of the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will not prevail, but that Congress will in its wisdom direct that this appropriation shall be made with such conditions accompanying it that the Government of the United States will share in the obligation and in making this encampment the most hospitable and enjoyable in the history of the country. Let the defenders of our nation's unity and power be received in the nation's capital with a royal welcome that will give evidence of a nation's gratitude and of a country's appreciation of their services as soldiers and of their worth as citizens.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I had not expected to say anything upon this subject, and will say but a word.

The appropriation proposed to be made by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of the entertainment of the soldiers when they come here to attend the encampment of the Grand Army of the United States, it seems to me, should be an appropriation from the national Treasury. I believe that for the reason that, whatever may have been done elsewhere, the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic here in Washington will be regarded in some degree, at least, as a national encampment, recognized by the National Government, and the Government of the United States can not afford not to make it a national encampment in the fullest sense of the word.

Sir, the suggestion that was at first made by some of the Senators upon this floor that the Constitution was in the way, is certainly met by hundreds of appropriations made for purposes no more within the purview of the Constitution than would be the appropriation proposed now to be made. For instance, take the action of the Congress of the United States in passing the following act, which is a very brief one, and which I will read:

That the President be, and is hereby, authorized and requested to extend to the Government and people of France and the family of Gen. La Fayette a cordial invitation to unite with the Government and people of the United States, on the 19th day of October, 1881, in a fit and appropriate observance of the centennial anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown. And for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution the sum of \$20,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the same or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

That was an act passed by the Congress of the United States directing the President to invite these foreign gentlemen, and when they came here to entertain them, and an appropriation for that purpose was made. That was followed subsequently by another act making provision in an appropriation bill as is proposed to be done here:

For the additional amount required to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution of February 18, 1881, authorizing and requesting the President to extend to the Government and people of France and the family of Gen. Lafayette an invitation to join the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the centennial anniversary of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Va., including the expenses of the officer of the War Department detailed to take charge of the military ceremonies at Yorktown, and the liabilities incurred by the Yorktown Centennial Commission, \$32,323.92, including \$300 additional compensation to William S. Gilman for acting as disbursing officer of the commission, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable upon accounts specifically stated, and to be audited and paid by the Secretary of State.

So I might look through the statute books and find perhaps one hundred acts of Congress providing for appropriations on a level with the appropriation which is proposed to be made today, except that in this instance the proposition is to provide for the entertainment of the men who fought for the Union and for the flag and who saved the integrity of the nation. I say that if there was ever an appropriation proposed to the Congress of the United States upon the line of appropriations that may be said not to have been specifically named in the Constitution, the one before the Senate of the United States is above all of them in consequence and entitled to consideration.

Sir, there has been much talk about the District of Columbia. So far as I have observed, there are few people in Washington who have money; it is a city of boarding houses. Except, as my colleague suggested, there are a very vast number of strangers here within our gates. To impose upon the District of Columbia the necessity of raising, I have no doubt, \$150,000, if not more, to entertain the soldiers who may come here—I speak of them as soldiers, although they are now citizens—would almost bankrupt the people who would have to raise the money. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe that it would be fair to them; and if it were fair to them it would take away from this movement the character of nationality which it should have by the Congress of the United States making the necessary appropriations and being responsible for it?

Sir, it has been twenty-seven years, I believe, since the Army of the United States, or a great part of it, came home with their tattered flags and banners and rags, if you please, and marched through the streets of the city of Washington, and I do not know that I can contribute anything better than to read a portion of the description of that great event, in the following language:

Meanwhile the victorious armies of the Union had been congregated at Washington, where they passed in review before President Johnson and Gen. Grant, and then marched home and into history. On the 23d of May the "Army of the Potomac" and on the 24th the "Division of the Mississippi" swept through the metropolis for hours, the successive waves of humanity crested with gleaming sabers and burnished bayonets, while hundreds of bands made the air ring with patriotic music. Loyal voices cheered and loyal hands applauded as the heroic guardians of the national ark of constitutional liberty passed along. Neither did the legions of imperial Rome, returning in triumph along the Apian Way, or the conquering hosts of Napoleon the Great, when welcomed back from their Italian campaign by the Parisians, or the British guards when they returned from the Crimea, receive a more heartfelt ovation than was awarded to the laurel-crowned "boys in blue."

Great expectation concerning this review was indulged throughout the nation. The home-coming of the "boys in blue" was a matter interesting every hamlet of the North and almost every home. But more than the welcome was clustering about the scene. These grand armies and their famous leaders had become historic, and worthily so, for they had endured and achieved, and victory now was theirs. The newspapers proclaimed the grandeur of the coming event, the railroads extended their best accommodations to travelers, and the people responded in immense numbers. With the soldiery and civilians Washington was densely packed, but cheerful enthusiasm appeared on every side.

Two hundred thousand veteran troops, trained on a hundred battlefields and commanded by the leading generals of the service, were there to be reviewed by the Lieutenant-General who commanded them all, by the President of the United States, by his Cabinet, etc.

Mr. President, in my opinion the gathering together of the Grand Army of the Republic in this city this year will be a scene much like that, but instead of 100,000 there will be nearer 200,000 of those scarred veterans coming to the national capital, where many of them were mustered out, and where they then for the last time visited the capital of the United States, which they had helped to save.

I contend that this should be made, so far as Congress can do in preparing for this great event, a national affair—not for the purpose of rekindling animosities between the sections; far from it. I would not make a suggestion of that sort; but they will come here to meet their comrades, to see the capital of the nation, and to mingle again together as they do in a small way in their several localities, and if they come, as I believe they will, they will come under the old flag, singing again the Star Spangled Banner, and they will rekindle a flame of patriotism in this country which can be done in no other way as well.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], I believe, suggested that we build monuments. So we do. When the old soldiers come here they will find a monument, a very modest one it is true, to Mr. Lincoln, a statue of Gen. Scott, one to Gen. Thomas, a modest one above the remains of Gen. Sheridan, statues to McPherson, to Rawlins, to Farragut, to Dupont, to Logan, and I do not know how many more scattered over this city, making it the most interesting of any place on the American continent in which the veteran soldiers can assemble.

Therefore, without further taking the time of the Senate, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri may be voted down, if it is not withdrawn, and that Congress will vote an appropriation of \$100,000 for the veterans of the late war.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, when I offered this amendment yesterday evening, a very simple one, merely providing that "the whole of this amount shall be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," I did not anticipate such a glorious outpouring and revival of patriotism and eloquence; I did not anticipate that I was furnishing a stage scene for all the Presidential aspirants to enter upon and show themselves before the people of the United States. [Laughter.] I did not anticipate that my good friend from Illinois would be so far carried away that he would believe in his heart that the great city of St. Louis was a State of the Union and had a United States Senator upon this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know to whom the Senator alludes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] in his burning patriotism and eloquence referred to the "Senator from St. Louis."

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator will pardon me. I knew that he represented a greater area than that.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly. I do not even reside in the city of St. Louis. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, this has all passed away very pleasantly. It has given an occasion for patriotism and sentimentality and eloquence and all that; but it is a practical question whether half of the proposed appropriation shall come out of the Treasury of the United States and half out of the District of Columbia or whether it shall all come out of the treasury of the District of Columbia. That is the practical question.

Has the Congress of the United States invited the Grand Army of the Republic to hold an annual encampment here? No, sir;

not all. How did it agree to come here? How did it happen to consent to be located here? It has not been here for years. There is an annual encampment held every year, and at the last annual encampment various cities of the United States competed for the location of the coming encampment in September next. They do that every year. St. Louis competed for it and obtained it; Chicago competed for it and obtained it; San Francisco, I believe, obtained it once, and Boston obtained it, and so it has assembled in different parts of the country, in cities offering the best accommodations and advantages, all things considered.

Now, the good people of Washington wanted this encampment. There are persons in Washington besides boarding-house keepers. There are business men here; men of wealth in Washington. There are private citizens in Washington who are developing the city and making it what it is. It is not the boarding-house mistresses nor the occupants of boarding houses that make Washington City what it is. It is true that we have some 25,000 Government employes here, and a great many of them, when their terms of service expire, remain here, become citizens, and go into business. It is the citizens of the District of Columbia who sought and obtained this encampment to arrange to come here, without any kind of authority from the United States—no more authority from it than Boston had when that great city obtained the encampment; no more authority than the citizens of St. Louis had to bind the United States when that city obtained the encampment.

Mr. President, this is not the only organization in the United States whose encampments or whose annual meetings are sought for by various cities in the United States. We have various national organizations who hold their annual sessions here and there, this city and that city competing for them. It is an advantage and an advertisement to the city; it is an advantage to all kinds of business in this city. Enterprising citizens, real-estate owners, real-estate brokers, merchants, and others, all make efforts to bring people to the city, to show them its beauties, its advantages, its future, and all that. So it is with all the cities.

Mr. President, I say that if we pay the expenses of this encampment out of the Treasury of the United States and of the District of Columbia equally, as the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia proposes, then the time is coming when every association that meets in Washington will expect Congress to treat its members as the guests of the nation and their expenses to be paid by the United States as well as by the District of Columbia.

This is only an entering wedge; it is only a stepping stone; it is the foundation for all these national organizations to hold their sessions in this city upon the invitation of the citizens of this city, and then to have the expenses paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

I warn Senators of what will be the effect of this; and I warn the citizens of the District of Columbia that the time may come when forbearance will cease to be a virtue and the people of the United States in their sovereignty will say to their Senators and Representatives, "You shall no longer vote upon us one-half of the burdens of the District of Columbia." That time is rapidly coming, and we are only adding fuel to the flames that will bring it.

I am a friend of the people of the District of Columbia, and I want to see them fairly treated, but I do not want to see them do damage to themselves. There are many persons in this country who do not believe it is right that the whole people of the United States should be taxed to pay the expenses of the local government of the District of Columbia. An agitation of that question before the people of the various Congressional districts would be a popular one, and it would send many a Representative here. We are simply laying the foundation in this proceeding to make Congress acknowledge its responsibility for all invitations to national organizations which may be given by the District of Columbia to be held in this District.

It is not a question of constitutional power that is involved in this amendment; it simply proposes that the whole amount shall be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District of Columbia. It does not even affect the amount to be appropriated. It is true I offered another amendment proposing to reduce the amount to \$80,000, but that is not now pending. This is simply that the amount, whatever it is, that is appropriated shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I can vote for this amendment to the amendment. I believe it is right; I believe it is just. It is what every other city in the United States has done and will do in the future for these encampments and for the various national organizations and societies that may be held in their midst. I can not vote to tax the people of Missouri, my constituents, to pay one-half of this expense, and if Senators insist that it shall be imposed upon both the United States and the District of Columbia, I desire now

to record my vote against it and my opposition to it. It is a proper thing to be paid by the District of Columbia; it is not a proper thing to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. SANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. HIGGINS. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SANDERS. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2729) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. HIGGINS. With the consent of the Senator from Montana, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri one question, and that is whether he considers that one-half of the regular and general taxes paid out of the revenues of the United States for the uses of the District of Columbia are paid by the people of Missouri and the rest of the country or are a proper tax upon the property of the United States in this District?

Mr. COCKRELL. No, sir; I do not. I do not think that the basis of division is equal or honest or fair or just, but as it was settled before I came into the Senate, I have acquiesced in it. I am not trying to agitate it. I think it will be a dangerous question to agitate before the people of the United States—the humbuggery that the United States owns the streets of Washington.

What are the streets of Washington for? For the benefit of the people of the District of Columbia who are living here. To undertake such a pretense, such a sham, such a fraud upon the people of the United States as to hold that they own the streets of Washington and therefore must keep them in repair and pay all the expenses of this District!

It is a mockery, Mr. President, it is an insult to the intelligence of the honest taxpayers of the United States to say that they own them. They belong to the District of Columbia just as much as the streets of St. Louis belong to the city of St. Louis, or of Baltimore to the city of Baltimore.

And our public buildings, what are they? An ornament and a glory to the city of Washington. They have helped to make it what it is. They have increased the value of the real estate here, and Washington City would not part with them for all of its worth. Any city in the Union would give millions of dollars and leave the public buildings untaxed to have the public buildings erected in their midst that have been erected in the city of Washington, and would pledge themselves for all eternity, until Gabriel's trumpet should blow, that they would never tax them.

It is nonsense to talk about such things. I do not want to agitate the question. I say the amount paid by the taxpayers of the United States is out of all proportion. It should not be 50 per cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know whether it is the pleasure of the Senate that the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope it is, and to that end I ask that the regular business may be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill. If there be no objection, the same will be considered as agreed to. The Senator from Montana [Mr. SANDERS] has the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I believe in a strict construction of the Constitution; or, in other words, I believe that it means what it says, and I do not believe that plain English words, even if found in a constitution, are mere playthings. That being the case, I am brought face to face with the proposition whether this appropriation is within the constitutional authority of Congress or not. While I do not contemplate a legal argument upon that proposition, I find abundant authority in the precise words of the Constitution (abandoning that clause which authorizes us to promote the general welfare) to grant rewards to the soldiers who have fought in their country's wars without reference to the particular contract that was made when they enlisted. I find that from the beginning of this Government until now such an authority has been asserted by everybody who comprehended English speech and had occasion to deal with such an instance.

The cemeteries in which repose the hallowed dust of our soldiers do not tell of infractions of the Constitution. The bones of the 2,000 nameless soldiers that we gathered up between the Potomac and the Rappahannock after the war and deposited over here at Arlington, and over which we erected a monument that told their history, do not speak of an infraction of the Constitution. No act or event that intensifies in the public heart patriotism, that rewards those men who do the highest service which

their country calls upon her fellow-citizens to do, is beyond the purview of the Constitution. We may not only promote the general welfare, but we may provide for the common defense. I know every Senator upon this floor, as we have have passed through the vicissitudes and excitements and exigencies of the last year when we were confronted by the possibility of foreign war, felt more secure in the patriotic impulses of the people that we had discharged every duty that we owed to those who heretofore had fought in the wars of the Republic.

Now, for myself, I am like the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] in that I live in a town or represent a State that was also a candidate for this great convention of ex-soldiers of the Republic, but because my town did not finally secure the location there I am not going to imitate the ancient spinster who said that she was prejudiced against matrimony because she had been once disappointed herself. [Laughter.] I acquit the Senator from saying or from making as the basis of his argument the proposition that because the soldiers did not conclude to meet at Lincoln therefore he would oppose this appropriation.

Mr. PADDOCK. I only intended by that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SANDERS. I thought I was explaining his position with so much more perspicacity than he did, and I undertake to say with as much as he could, that I do not think he ought really to ask me to yield just now. I shall do so cheerfully in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. PADDOCK. I agree fully with the Senator as to his perspicacity. I simply used an illustration. I used Lincoln as an illustration; that was all.

Mr. SANDERS. But I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the manifest injustice of the provision which he thinks he favors. The grounds on which it stands it is not necessary at this stage of what I have to say to examine. If the United States was not the possessor and the occupant of a large portion of the property in the District of Columbia there would be something of justice in the argument which he made and the position which he undertook to maintain.

I regret exceedingly that a question of constitutional law must arise upon a contention like the one before us now, and I regret equally that the determination of a question of fact as to what is the relative value of the properties belonging to the United States and belonging to the citizens of the District of Columbia must arise in a somewhat heated discussion of this character. I had supposed from what I had seen and heard in this Hall that it had been agreed, not over the question of an appropriation to pay the expenses of the Grand Army of the Republic, but through a long period of discussion illuminated by a great many instances, that it was about fair between this District and the United States that each of the municipalities should pay one-half of such expenses as this. I am now informed by the Senator from Missouri not only that that is not so, but that he really does not want that question raised because, forsooth, it is the foundation or source of a cyclone that is going to wipe Senators off from the footstool and the District of Columbia out of existence.

When our forefathers put into the Constitution the provision that the Congress of the United States might exercise exclusive jurisdiction over such district, not exceeding 10 miles square, as might be selected for the seat of Government, and when we accepted that seat of Government here there was imposed upon the Congress of the United States a duty which they can not abdicate. I do not myself undertake to enter into a discriminating determination of what proportion of the taxes should be paid by the people resident here and what proportion should be paid by the Government of the United States that has from twenty to twenty-five thousand employes here upon a salary, whose residence is in other places, whose personal property and the taxation consequent upon it is under the authority of law rightly collectable in the States where they reside and not here.

When we contemplate the further fact that about one-third of the population of this District is of colored people who were brought here by a civil commotion and who are not themselves as a rule large property holders, I do not know what precise proportion of the property and of the funds is rightly to be attributed to one of these municipalities and what proportion to the other. I am content so far as that matter is concerned to accept the determination of gentlemen upon this floor who have made it the subject of investigation time and time again in a multitude of instances that have passed away, when their prejudices or their preconceived opinions, if you please, were not excited by a discussion of this character.

But I protest that that question simply illustrates the injustice of this amendment. It does not touch the proposition as to where this money that we here propose to appropriate should come from.

While it was true that the town of Helena, in which I happen to live, did not secure the meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic, another patriotic organization, the sons of the men who fought in that war, did select that town as an appropriate place where they might meet at their annual session this year, and that town, without question or doubt or inquiry, and its citizens and the citizens of the surrounding country are engaged in building a large auditorium and in other ways providing for the accommodation of that vast throng of young and patriotic men, the Sons of Veterans, who will assemble there in memory of the deeds that their fathers performed during our recent civil commotion.

No question arises as to the propriety of doing that. No matter what may be the political views of gentlemen there, with a unanimity that is absolute, with one heart and one mind and one effort, they intend to make that gathering a magnificent success.

I say that when we are charged with the duty of governing this District it is as lawful for us to make this appropriation as it is to care for the insane that are across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac, as it is to care for the Soldiers' Home up here, and so far as it concerns those soldiers who were discharged from the service of the United States, so far as caring for these two cemeteries that are within the sight of this Capitol.

There being no constitutional objection to this, the question arises whether anything has transpired that makes it unpatriotic, that makes it profligate that we should make an appropriation of an hundred thousand dollars.

The honorable Senator from Nebraska says that these gentlemen came down there to Detroit, where his town of Lincoln was a competitor with Washington, and promised if the Grand Army of the Republic would assemble here at Washington they would pay all the expenses consequent thereon by private contributions. I should like to inquire of him where he got that information?

Mr. PADDOCK. I got it from the statements of reliable citizens of Nebraska who were there present. There was no intimation there of any kind or nature whatever on the part of anybody who represented the city of Washington that the Congress of the United States would be called upon to make an appropriation to defray the expenses of the encampment; none whatever, as I was told.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, a philosopher who put his wisdom into forms of wit once said that it was a great deal better to know a little that was true and to know it well than to know a great deal that was not so. I am authorized to state by the gentlemen who constituted the committee who went to Detroit that they never pledged, nor promised, nor encouraged anybody to hope, first, that they would not expect the United States Congress to do that which its wisdom approved by way of an appropriation, and that they did not assume to promise in behalf of the municipality of Washington or the liberal-minded citizens of Washington that all the expenses that they would hope to expend for this meeting of the Grand Army at its twenty-sixth encampment would be paid by contributions of private citizens here.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to ask the Senator if he is able to state that there was any intimation whatever on the part of representatives of Washington at that competitive moment that the Congress might be expected to make an appropriation of any kind or nature? Did they not occupy exactly the same attitude in respect to this competitive performance that all of the representatives from other towns, including the great city of Helena, as well as that of Lincoln and others, occupied at the time?

Mr. SANDERS. I decline to go off in a quest of that kind or in search of other inquiries than those which the Senator by his statement made. It is enough for me to say that the statements that these gentlemen went down there and made the promises of which they are accused are not so.

I possibly outside of this Chamber might agree with the Senator from Nebraska that our respective towns were not fought fair; but so far as that proposition is concerned I will say, first, that these gentlemen did not promise that out of the private generosity of the citizens of Washington all these expenses should be paid; and, second, I say if they did, the Congress of the United States is not thereby estopped from doing that which it believes patriotism requires to be done with reference to these soldiers of the Republic.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I do not propose to say anything about the doctrine of estoppel in this matter, but nobody is able to state, as I believe at least, as was the understanding of the citizens of my State who were there that there was any intimation or expectation that the Congress of the United States would be called upon to appropriate; but the understanding was that the citizens of Washington who were to receive the enormous benefits that would necessarily flow in a business direction

from the location of the encampment would take care of it by making the necessary contributions for the entertainment of the encampment.

Mr. SANDERS. I have had occasion heretofore to be deeply pained at the understandings of the people of Nebraska, or their misunderstandings in recent years, and I would not undertake to maintain and prove a tangible and palpable and probative fact by saying it was the understanding of my people. If anything was to be deduced from that argument it was that the particular contract that was entered into when the twenty-fifth encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic fixed its next meeting in Washington, such things were said there by men authorized to say them, that prohibit or forbid or make it unjust or unpatriotic for the Congress of the United States to appropriate such a sum of money as it thinks the patriotism of the country dictates to make happy in this capital of their country the 100,000 men who fought our battles and won our great victories.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we had better defer the question of appropriations to soldiers who have fought in our wars for favors or for comfort or for necessities of life or for educational purposes, or for purposes of observation, to some controversy which will not divide us upon lines which unfortunately seem to some extent to have obtruded themselves here. It is a misfortune that such a controversy as this shall arise over a question like this, for men of a mean and coarse cast of mind will attribute the views of constitutional law that are here put forth to some other purpose or to some other consideration than a mere comprehension of the plain English speech in which the Constitution of the United States is framed.

For myself, believing an hundred thousand dollars cordially, unanimously, without question appropriated as a compensation for services rendered, and for perils endured, would not only have had a wholesome effect upon public opinion and thought North and South to-day, but would have been a potential influence so long as time endured in showing that those who thus discharge the highest duties that can be rendered to a country will never be forgotten, and that fighting its battles, protecting its flag, redeeming and rescuing its Constitution, and making it a power honorable among the nations of the earth, is a service that secures to every actor in it the abiding gratitude of the Republic, and that this gratitude does not continue to diminish as the years pass away, but grows brighter and brighter, and seeks new forms and methods of expression as the events themselves go into the perspectives of history, and that such heroism thus recognized becomes a part and parcel of the treasures of the Republic, unifying it, crystallizing it, and making it a power and an authority among the nations of the earth, and excites a gratitude which exists from generation to generation. I trust the appropriation will be made. It would be a wholesome spectacle, and I do hope that the amendment that is offered by the Senator from Missouri will be voted down, and that the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be unanimously passed by this body.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, I desire to say simply a word. In the first place, I want to say that so far as the city of Washington is concerned no desire nor thought of doing it an injustice was in my mind. I have never had a desire other than to do those things which are helpful in the upbuilding of this great national capital. There never has been a proposition here looking to the development, the adornment of this capital that I have not voted for. I have always voted freely and cheerfully for all propositions deemed necessary for beautifying and making Washington more attractive and prosperous.

And there is another thing. As far as the ex-soldier is concerned there is no one who has uttered a word here to-day whose record is clearer as to friendship and services for him than mine. It is true I did not share with him the fatigues and hardships of the march nor the vicissitudes and discomforts of the camp, or stand with him at the front and take the storm and stress of battle, but I have always been his friend from the beginning to the end. So far as the ex-soldiers have knowledge of my dealings towards them there is not one who will not acquit me of a desire at any time or anywhere to do anything which would operate in any possible way to their detriment or to their disparagement in any respect whatever. No patriotic expression has been uttered here to-day which has not found a ready and an earnest responsive in my heart.

But this proposition seemed to me, as it seemed to the citizens of our State, who were interested in another location, to be purely a business matter on the part of the citizens of the town who were to be benefited and improved by its location, whose business was to be helped, who were to receive vast sums of money on account of this encampment from the multitude of visitors who were sure to come, through their hotels, etc., and that it was their interest and their duty to defray whatever expense might be necessarily incurred to make the encampment a success.

It was with that view only that I have expressed the sentiments I have here, and that I have thought it my duty to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], as I have indicated, because, as I have said, I believe that it is an injustice to call upon all the people of the United States to do that which is specially and particularly for the interest and benefit of the citizens of the town where the encampment is to be located, wherever it might happen to be.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I should be glad to make some observations upon this subject, but it has been debated so fully and so thoroughly that if we can have a vote now I shall waive my opportunity. I hope we may have a vote on the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. VEST. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VOORHEES. Let the amendment to the amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment:

And the whole of said amount shall be paid exclusively out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll will be called on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALTHALL (when Mr. GEORGE'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA]. I have no idea how he would vote, and I withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN. I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON]. Were he present I should vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], and I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DOLPH. Is the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] recorded?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pair of the Senator from Oregon with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] has been announced by the latter's colleague.

Mr. DOLPH. I am paired with him, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. McMILLAN. My colleague [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE] is unavoidably detained away. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. BRICE. I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. FELTON]. I have no knowledge as to how he would vote on this question. If he were here I should vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If he were present I should vote "yea" upon this amendment to the amendment, and then vote against the amendment as amended.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. CAMERON] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. If my colleague were present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 32; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Voorhees,
Berry,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Wilson.
Cockrell,	Irby,	Peffer,	
Coke,	Kyle,	Pugh,	
Colquitt,	Mills,	Vilas,	

NAYS—32.

Allen, Allison, Blackburn, Carey, Cullom, Dawes, Dubois, Frye,	Gallinger, Gray, Hale, Hansbrough, Hawley, Higgins, Hiscock, Hoar,	Jones, Ark. McPherson, Manderson, Mitchell, Palmer, Perkins, Power, Quay,	Sanders, Sawyer, Sherman, Shoup, Stewart, Teller, Vest, Washburn.
---	---	--	--

NOT VOTING—32.

Aldrich, Barbour, Blodgett, Brice, Butler, Call, Cameron, Carlisle, Casey, Chandler,	Daniel, Davis, Dixon, Dolph, Felton, George, Gibson, La. Gibson, Md. Gordon, Harris,	Hill, Jones, Nev. Kenna, McMillan, Morrill, Pasco, Pettigrew, Platt, Proctor, Ransom,	Squire, Stanford, Stockbridge, Turpie, Vance, Walthall, Warren, White, Wolcott.
---	---	--	---

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. HAWLEY. I offer now the amendment of which I gave notice yesterday.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment:

And the sum hereby appropriated shall be paid to and disbursed by the citizens' executive committee of Washington having in charge such reception and entertainment, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to offer a further amendment to the amendment, to which I think their will be no objection. I move to strike out in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan in the third line the words, "the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment" and insert in lieu thereof "for the subsistence and quarters," in the fifth line, before the word "union," to insert the word "nonresident," and to strike out in the ninth line the words "and attending the preparation for such reception and entertainment," the effect of the amendment being to restrict the appropriation to the actual necessary expenses of board and lodging of the visiting delegation, leaving the ceremonial and social expenditures to be paid from the subscriptions of the citizens of the District.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, in line 3, after the word "pay," the words "the proper and legitimate expenses attending the reception and entertainment" and insert "for subsistence and quarters;" at the beginning of line 5, to insert the word "nonresident," and in line 9, after the word "Columbia," to strike out the words "and attending the preparation for such reception and entertainment;" so that the amendment would read:

NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

To pay for subsistence and quarters of such honorably discharged nonresident Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend, as delegates or otherwise, the Twenty-sixth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. And the sum hereby appropriated shall be paid to and disbursed by the citizens' executive committee of Washington having in charge such reception and entertainment, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. QUAY. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Several Senators having responded to their names—

Mr. MORGAN said: What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN]. As there seems to be a misunderstanding as to the pending question, the Chair suggests that it should be again stated. Is there objection? If there be no objection, the amendment as proposed to be amended will be again read.

The Secretary read the amendment as it would read if amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on adopting the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The roll call will be continued, unless there is a misunderstanding as to the question. If so, it will be begun anew.

Mr. PALMER. I should like to inquire whether the amend-

ment to the amendment affects that provision which gives to the Secretary of War the control of the fund.

Mr. FRYE. That has already been adopted as a part of the amendment.

Mr. PALMER. If it does not affect that provision, it strikes me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania is an exceedingly proper one.

Mr. PERKINS. It does not interfere with that at all.

Mr. QUAY. It does not interfere with it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll call will be continued.

The Secretary resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. DOLPH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. FAULKNER (when Mr. KENNA's name was called). My colleague [Mr. KENNA] is detained from the Senate by indisposition. He is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. McMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR].

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CALL. I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 5; as follows:

YEAS—43.

Allison, Bate, Berry, Blackburn, Brice, Carey, Chandler, Coke, Colquitt, Cullom, Davis,	Dubois, Faulkner, Frye, Gallinger, Gray, Hale, Hansbrough, Hawley, Hiscock, Irby, Jones, Ark.	Kyle, McPherson, Manderson, Mitchell, Paddock, Palmer, Peffer, Perkins, Power, Pugh, Quay,	Sawyer, Stewart, Teller, Turpie, Vest, Vilas, Voorhees, Warren, Washburn, Wilson.
---	---	--	--

NAYS—5.

Allen, Mills,	Sanders,	Sherman,	Shoup.
------------------	----------	----------	--------

NOT VOTING—40.

Aldrich, Barbour, Blodgett, Butler, Call, Cameron, Carlisle, Casey, Cockrell, Daniel,	Dawes, Dixon, Dolph, Felton, George, Gibson, La. Gibson, Md. Gordon, Gorman, Harris,	Higgins, Hill, Hoar, Jones, Nev. Kenna, McMillan, Morgan, Morrill, Pasco, Pettigrew,	Platt, Proctor, Ransom, Squire, Stanford, Stockbridge, Vance, Walthall, White, Wolcott.
--	---	---	--

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE. At the request of the Department of the Potomac of the Woman's Relief Corps of this city, I move to add at the close of the amendment as amended:

Provided, That \$5,000 of this sum shall be placed at the disposal of the Department of the Potomac of the Woman's Relief Corps.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHEES. The amendment has not been made part of the bill yet. There is another amendment, is there not?

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan was an amendment to an amendment that he reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia. So the question now is, I take it, on the amendment reported from the committee as amended.

Mr. BERRY. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] as amended to the amendment reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. Upon that question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand the situation, the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] has been inserted as a substitute for all these amendments.

Mr. CULLOM, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. HAWLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. ALLISON. Senators say "no." Let us consider for a

moment. That amendment having been adopted, the question is upon placing that amendment in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, upon agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. PERKINS. As perfected.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly, upon agreeing to the amendment as amended. So when Senators said "no" they were mistaken, I submit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan as amended.

Mr. HAWLEY. Which is an amendment to an amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. As I understand the matter, the Senator from Michigan reported an amendment from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and then himself offered an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. A substitute for it.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well, an amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute, and thereupon the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] moved to strike out all that had been inserted by way of amendment.

Mr. BERRY and Mr. FRYE. No, no.

Mr. HARRIS. Only a part of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Only a few words.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; when I am mistaken of course I yield gracefully. Now I ask that the amendment be read as it stands, and that the Chair state upon what we are to vote.

Mr. HAWLEY. If the Senator will allow me, I will try to make the history of it a little clear.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand it. I only ask to have it read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

To pay for subsistence and quarters of such honorably discharged non-resident Union soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war of the rebellion as may attend, as delegates or otherwise, the Twenty-sixth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. And the sum hereby appropriated shall be paid to and disbursed by the citizens' executive committee of Washington having in charge such reception and entertainment, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment, which has just been read, to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan, as reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, was the pending question, but the Senator, in his character of Senator, offered a substitute for it, and the Senate, by vote, has adopted the substitute. Now the question is upon the amendment as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is just the position of the question that the Chair intended to state.

Mr. ALLISON. And that was just the position I endeavored to state, but it seems when I stated it it was entirely wrong.

Mr. SANDERS. Is an amendment in order?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator is in order to offer an amendment to the original text.

Mr. SANDERS. I move to strike out the last eight words, "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. ALLISON. That is the usual phrase.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is the common phrase.

Mr. SANDERS. I propose that we shall appropriate \$100,000 and quit.

Mr. HAWLEY. But, if it is worth while to argue that question at all, that being the usual and proper phrase, I make this suggestion to the Senator, that when the Secretary of War comes to make his regulations for the disbursement of this fund he will make them in such a manner that nothing shall be wasted, and the money will be given only to those who actually come and sleep and eat here. I think there will be something saved. If there should be \$10,000 saved it will go back into the Treasury. There is nobody to give it to if it is not used for subsistence and quarters.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his suggestion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana is not in order, as the Senate has already passed upon the first amendment as amended. The roll will be called upon agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT].

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. I do not know how he would vote and I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired upon

all questions with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. MCMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. If he were here I should vote "yea."

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR]. If he were present I should vote "yea."

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

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. DIXON]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORDON] upon political questions, but by the votes on the other side I observe that this is not taken to be such, and I therefore vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MORGAN. I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES]. If he were here I should vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. I desire again to announce the pair of my colleague [Mr. CAMERON] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GEORGE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH]. My colleague would vote "nay" if present and at liberty to vote.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 10; as follows:

YEAS—41.

Allen,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Teller,
Allison,	Gray,	Palmer,	Turple,
Brice,	Hale,	Peffer,	Vilas,
Carey,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Voorhees,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Proctor,	Warren,
Davis,	Higgins,	Quay,	Washburn,
Dubois,	Hiscock,	Sanders,	Wilson,
Faulkner,	Kyle,	Sawyer,	Wilcott.
Frye,	McPherson,	Sherman,	
Gallinger,	Manderson,	Shoup,	
Gibson, Md.	Mitchell,	Stewart,	

NAYS—10.

Bate,	Coke,	Jones, Ark.	Vest,
Berry,	Colquitt,	Mills	
Blackburn,	Irby,	Pugh,	

NOT VOTING—37.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Hoar,	Ransom,
Barbour,	Dawes,	Jones, Nev.	Squire,
Blodgett,	Dixon,	Kenna,	Stanford,
Butler,	Dolph,	McMillan,	Stockbridge,
Call,	Felton,	Morgan,	Vance,
Cameron,	George,	Morrill,	Walthall,
Carlisle,	Gibson, La.	Pasco,	White,
Casey,	Gordon,	Pettigrew,	
Chandler,	Harris,	Platt,	
Cockrell,	Hill,	Power,	

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLAN. On page 22 of the bill, line 23, after the word "hour," I move to insert:

And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized, in their discretion, to provide for lighting, by means of incandescent lamps instead of gas and oil lamps, any of the streets, roadways, and avenues outside of the cities of Washington and Georgetown; *Provided*, That the said incandescent lamps shall be of at least 25-candle power; that the price paid per lamp per year shall not exceed the existing contract price for lighting the oil lamps, and that the lamps shall each be burned not less than three thousand hours per annum; and the sum of \$1,500 is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for that purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that to be a unanimous report of the Committee on the District of Columbia. If so, I do not interpose the point of order, which otherwise I think I should make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCMILLAN]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. On page 37, after line 11, I am authorized by the Committee on the District of Columbia to move the insertion of the following words:

For bathing beach: For remodeling the bathing beach in the tidal reservoir into the form of pools, also the adjacent grounds, dressing-houses, etc., in accordance with designs and specifications, to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$10,000.

The proposed amendment meets with the unanimous approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I present it as coming from the Committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VEST. On page 43, line 14, before the word "dollars," I move to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two thousand;" so as to read:

For St. Joseph's Asylum, maintenance, \$2,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on the amendment that it is not estimated for, and that it increases an appropriation in the bill without the report of any committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CALL. I move to strike out all under the head "for charities" from line 9, on page 41, to line 10, on page 45.

My purpose is to endeavor to get this question of charities into a conference with the other House. The subject of provision for the meritorious poor is one that is deserving of grave consideration; it has become a question of great importance in the industrial and social economy of the country. The most deserving of the charities in the District of Columbia are entirely left out in the appropriations contained in the bill. Under the rules of the Senate no amendment can be moved to add any of these charities to those already in the bill unless an estimate has been made or upon the recommendation of a standing committee of the Senate, and the only manner in which we can obtain any consideration of the claim of charities which have been omitted is by striking out the entire provision and leaving it to be remodeled and brought before the attention of the Senate by a conference committee. I have here a communication—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would remind the Senator from Florida that his amendment is not in order as in Committee of the Whole. It will be in order when the bill is reported to the Senate.

Mr. CALL. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I have an amendment to offer to the text of the bill. On page 21, after line 18, I move to insert:

And provided further, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to open by condemnation and extend Thirty-seventh street between Back street and Tennytown road, so called, so soon as the ground necessary therefor shall have been donated for that purpose or money to pay for such ground shall have been provided.

The object of this amendment is to have a straight, broad, elegant street on what is now termed Thirty-seventh street. It is believed that the owners of the property through which that street would run would donate the right of way, or if not that the citizens in the vicinity thereof would raise the amount of money necessary to make the improvement.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know that I have any special objection to this amendment. The Committee on Appropriations thoroughly considered the very question now proposed by the Senator from Alabama. This Thirty-seventh street extended is a diagonal street running across the lots for 600 or 700 feet, entirely destroying the plat of ground over which the street would go. It passes through valuable property, I am told, and it will not be donated, but must be condemned, and it may cost \$12,000 or \$15,000. So the committee concluded that it was wiser and better to provide for the proper widening of High street down to Thirty-fifth street.

Mr. MORGAN. Now let us have both. Do not let us make fish of one and flesh of the other.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. I do not seriously object to the amendment, but I want—

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be read.

The Chief Clerk read Mr. MORGAN'S amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. That runs right through lots some two hundred odd feet in length and practically destroys them. There are some houses there, and the amendment authorizes their condemnation.

Mr. MORGAN. So soon as—

Mr. COCKRELL. It is so guarded that there is to be no condemnation and liability on the part of the Government until the parties have paid in the money?

Mr. MORGAN. That is what it says.

Mr. COCKRELL. If so, it is all right.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, I want to know whether we are going to make fish out of one and flesh out of another. I want to know whether that lot is to be staked off out there when these people are willing to have a street go through, and others say that whatever the condemnation money is they will raise it and pay it.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all right if that is the way of it.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the way of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to hear the amendment read again to see whether that is the language. We got caught at the last session in this way to the tune of \$13,000. I want to know whether the same promise is made here, and I want the language to be plain and unmistakable.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator will excuse me, I am not trying to catch him. I am not a fowler to spread my net in the face of such a bird. I do not try to catch such old game in a trap, or anything of the kind. I present a fair, straight proposition here, that Thirty-seventh street shall be extended if the land is do-

nated or if private persons go there and pay the money to buy the right of way, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, none in the world if that is the case and nobody is deceived, as in the other case. The same kind of a promise and the same request was made before.

Mr. MORGAN. What case does the Senator refer to?

Mr. COCKRELL. I refer to the extension of Sixteenth street.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be again read. The Chief Clerk again read Mr. MORGAN'S amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all right.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know something about that street, and I am in favor of opening it; but it seems to me that the last clause of the amendment is rather indefinite. If the money must be provided it ought to be paid into the Treasury, or it ought to be placed in some bank, if the condemnation is made, as a matter of course.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know whom that lot does belong to. Somebody has got it there who has a pretty hard pull on the Senate. I should like to know who the owner is.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know who the owner is, but I know the locality.

Mr. MORGAN. Somebody does.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am in favor of the proposition, but I think the money should be paid into the Treasury or paid into some bank.

Mr. MORGAN. I suppose somebody on the floor of the Senate knows whom that property belongs to, and I wish he would rise and tell who the owner is.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suppose that no Senator on this floor knows, unless it is the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will agree to the amendment if provision is made as to where the money shall be paid.

Mr. MORGAN. There are several guardians there, *ad litem pro hac or ad hoc*, or whatever you please, who are taking care of the property. It is very nicely and closely guarded and provided for. I will add to the amendment "and paid to the District Commissioners."

Mr. ALLISON. The Treasury is the proper place to pay it. All the moneys of the District go into the Treasury.

Mr. MORGAN. Here are two members of the Committee on Appropriations differing about it—the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. I do not know which way is right.

Mr. ALLISON. In view of the situation of the Senator as respects the Appropriations Committee, I will waive any view I have on the subject and let it be paid wherever he thinks it ought to be. I think it ought to be paid into the Treasury, where everything else is paid.

Mr. MORGAN. I think so, too. I will put it that way.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The modification of the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Add to the amendment:

And paid into the Treasury of the United States.

So as to read:

So soon as the ground necessary therefor shall have been donated for that purpose or money to pay for such ground shall have been provided and paid into the Treasury of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACKBURN. On page 44, in line 22, I move to strike out before the word "dollars" the words "two thousand five hundred," and insert "five thousand." In making this motion, I beg permission to say that I have a personal knowledge of the history of this institution. I have known its work and its results for many years. In the year 1887 Congress gave it \$5,000, what I propose to make it now; again in 1888; again in 1889; again in 1890; and I appeal to the chairman of the committee and to the other members of the committee and to the Senate to concur in this amendment that I propose. For reasons which I need not state here, but which I could not control, I was called away from the city whilst this bill was being considered by our Committee on Appropriations. Otherwise I am sure that the bill would have been reported as I now propose to amend it in this item.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator's amendment has not yet been read.

Mr. BLACKBURN. My amendment is to strike out from line 22, on page 44, the words "two thousand five hundred dollars" and insert "five thousand dollars," the former old-time appropriation for the maintenance and aid of the St. Rose Industrial School, where there are now seventy-odd inmates, and this is all the assistance that has ever been given as the years have gone by. I trust that the committee will consent to the amendment,

for I feel that I am myself at fault, or if not at fault that I am responsible though without fault, having been not able to be with the committee when the bill was being prepared.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, line 22, before the word "dollars," strike out "two thousand five hundred" and insert "five thousand;" so as to read:

For the St. Rose Industrial School, maintenance, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PUGH. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. On the roll call upon the appropriation for the entertainment of the Grand Army in the District I did not observe that he was absent and had failed to vote, and I voted "nay." I make this statement to show that I ought to have announced my pair.

Mr. HOAR. I was absent from the Senate, engaged in business pertaining to the Senate on a subcommittee while the vote was taken. I should have voted for the provision for entertaining the soldiers if I had been present.

Mr. CALL. As the Senator from Kentucky has just put in an amendment, I will move, after line 22, on page 44, to insert:

For the Little Sisters of the Poor, \$5,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to listen for a moment to me before he makes any point of order.

Mr. ALLISON. I will withhold my point of order. Of course I have a right to make the point of order at any time.

Mr. CALL. I have a paper which has been sent to me from Mr. William F. Downey and Mr. S. H. Shock in behalf of this charity, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 2, 1892.

DEAR SIR: As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee will you kindly give the following your considerate attention:

To make many needed improvements at the Home for the Aged, the Little Sisters of the Poor have humbly asked for \$25,000. In support of their appeal your sub-Appropriation Committee on the District of Columbia has an itemized statement of what is necessary, the estimate for which aggregates \$36,500.

Since the establishment of the Home in 1871 private charity has given the Little Sisters more than eight times the total of your public aid. Yet every man and woman in their Home, in all these twenty years, was a public pauper, and, by reason of age and infirmity, far more justly entitled to Government care than half the inmates annually clothed and fed at the Washington Almshouse.

Strip their home and their work of all suspicion of sentiment and the indisputable fact confronts you that this very day the number of persons cared for by the Little Sisters—200 destitute, infirm whites and blacks, and every one over sixty years of age—is a greater number than the daily average of paupers of all classes fed and housed in your overcrowded Washington Almshouse, for which you annually appropriate \$20,000.

As almoners of your gifts and those of the generous people of the District they respectfully submit, in support of their present appeal, that since 1871 the national appropriation, if averaged, would annually have been \$2,750, a total of \$55,000 for construction purposes only. The Federal gift was \$42,500, and the District gift only \$12,500.

What have the people of the District done? They have given nearly a square of ground, costing \$50,000 in cash. They have added to the Home improvements, costing not less than \$70,000, and making the institution capable of housing nearly three hundred persons. The building with its furniture to-day is valued at \$125,000. They have given \$5,000 to defray the expense of Christian burial to three hundred persons, a total of \$125,000.

The annual care of the Sisters since 1871 has aggregated three thousand persons. The Almshouse reports show that to feed, clothe, and take care of the public paupers costs the Federal and District Treasury over \$100 annually for each person. This service at the Home, therefore, had a cash value of more than \$300,000 to the Government even on an Almshouse basis. A fair estimate then shows the money value of the people's gift at \$425,000 and that of Congress only \$55,000.

If two hundred persons now overcrowd the Almshouse, then to accommodate the number in the Home for the Aged, would have compelled the building of another public institution. This simply adds to the explicit showing that the people have saved the Government a sum, compared with which all that is now asked is but the merest fraction.

Perhaps these statements and arguments are unnecessary. The Little Sisters sincerely hope they are. May they not also hope that the magnitude of their humane work, and the generous cooperation of the citizens of Washington will plead with you more eloquently than even a cash value to the Treasury of such disinterested labor and charity at the nation's capital.

The exclusion of the Little Sisters from most of the public buildings has cut off fully \$3,000 in cash from their annual revenue and added to their labor in begging for necessities of life. The improvements required will be helpful to the Sisters, by enlarging their field of charity, in utilizing the labor of the inmates, and make the Home capable of caring more economically for the poor, even to the fullest capacity of the institution.

It is hardly necessary to tell your committee that the Sisters will continue to relieve the Government of an annual expense of \$20,000 for many years to come, and that not one dollar is wanted for food, clothing, or even a nominal salary for a single person.

A community that has cheerfully given the Sisters money, goods, provisions, and property, amounting to nearly half a million of dollars, will not diminish their interest if Congress, once in seven years, gives \$25,000, that being the period of time since your last gift of \$25,000.

We have had the seal of the "Home for the Aged" attached to this statement, as evidence of its approval by the incorporators who are the Little Sisters of the Poor, and in their behalf we respectfully submit it for your generous action.

[SEAL.]

WM. F. DOWNEY,
S. H. SHOCK.

Hon. WILKINSON CALL,
United States Senate.

I desire to submit to the chairman of the committee that here is an application which will save the Government a great many thousand dollars. Over two hundred persons, paupers over the

age of 60 years, destitute and infirm, are cared for by this charity, by these Little Sisters of the Poor, by daily begging alms from house to house. I submit that in all points of view, as a matter of public economy and as a matter of the encouragement of a most beautiful and beneficent charity, he ought not to object to this amendment being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the point of order is well taken, no estimate having been made for the appropriation and the item not having been reported from any standing committee. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. CALL. I ask leave to reserve all the amendments under the head of charities for a vote in the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to reserve for a separate vote the amendment I offered yesterday about High street.

Mr. HARRIS. That amendment was not agreed to. The Senator will have to renew it in the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. All right.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Florida reserves the amendments respecting charities. I understand that there are no other amendments to be reserved. Therefore, I ask that the amendments may be concurred in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole with the exception of the amendments reserved by the Senator from Florida.

The amendments were concurred in.

Mr. CALL. Now, I move to strike out all under the head "For charities," as stated before, the whole chapter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. From page 41, line 9, strike out all down to and including line 10, on page 45.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will agree to this motion for the purpose of enabling this whole subject to be brought to the Senate through the conference committee. I have read a paper here which exhibits the fact that this is a charity capable of accommodating three hundred persons, which has saved the Government \$300,000 within the last twenty years, estimated upon the basis of the present expenditure for alms and for paupers. They have collected, as I have been informed, over \$350,000 from private charity by begging daily from house to house in this city. The paupers who are there now who have been relieved (three hundred having been buried by this charity during its existence, saving all expense to the Government) are to be cared for, and they are aged people, over 60 years of age, infirm, and destitute, of all races and of both sexes. There is no more beautiful charity in the world.

There is no class of people, no order, no society that have labored more persistently than these Little Sisters of the Poor. At this day there are two hundred aged and infirm people over 60 years of age who are comfortably cared for by these people. All that they ask is a small appropriation to extend their buildings and assist them in their good work. Every one of the two hundred persons would cost the Government \$100 annually to be cared for.

As it is impossible to get this matter before the consideration of the Senate in any other way I move to strike out the whole chapter on charities in order that it may come back from the committee of conference with this provision remodeled.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to say a few words respecting this matter of charities before it passes from the consideration of the Senate.

I agree to every word that has been uttered by the Senator from Florida. It so happens that I have been familiar with this charity known as the Little Sisters of the Poor for more than twenty years. I know of their methods, and how well and how carefully they take care of the aged and infirm in the District. They have done so for many years without respect to race or color. There is no more deserving charity than the house of the Little Sisters of the Poor. They have never, however, been placed within the list of those appropriated for, except that the Government has from time to time aided them in the construction of their buildings, to the extent, I think, of over \$50,000.

Mr. CALL. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that this appropriation is asked for for that purpose only.

Mr. ALLISON. So I understand. They desire now to enlarge their buildings. So with the charity the appropriation for which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] proposed to increase a moment ago, and so with other charities in this District; there are a number of them, perhaps ten to twelve; and if we add to or

enlarge the items here we shall be obliged to place upon this bill nearly or quite \$50,000 in addition to what is already appropriated in the bill for charities. There is a larger sum in the bill now for charities in the District of Columbia than has ever been in any bill for the District of Columbia at any previous session.

These charities are being enlarged from time to time and appropriations are being increased. There are direct appropriations of \$184,000 in this bill, and if you take the amount of money that comes out of the Treasury of the United States, including one-half of the \$184,000, there is now more than \$300,000 expended by the Government of the United States from its own Treasury in the District of Columbia for charities. With all the disposition found in these bodies to gradually increase these charities, it seems to me that we ought not in this bill to propose any further appropriation than is found in it, at least as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Therefore, I trust Senators will not press these appropriations respecting charities which have hitherto never been appropriated for in the District of Columbia appropriation bill or in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has alluded to an amendment I offered here, in regard to which I suppose I am powerless, but I want to submit a remark about it.

I have never favored extravagant appropriations, but I hope the time will never come when I shall feel myself called upon to oppose an increase of appropriation of \$1,500 to a lot of foundling boys, homeless, houseless, fatherless, and motherless, whom these noble women have taken out of the streets in order that they may not be pressed into the criminal classes of the country.

Here is this St. Joseph's Asylum, the only item in the bill about which I have concerned myself at all and in which I have not the slightest interest except that of the religion of humanity. I am a Protestant by education and belief; I have no religious affinities with the Catholic Church at all; but in my visitations to the market places of the city I have noticed one of these nuns standing upon each market day with poor little boys and with her basket, literally complying with the scriptural injunction, "Give us this day our daily bread."

For thirty-six years this noble charity has been in existence in this city. It has never received one dollar from the municipal government or from the Government of the United States—never one dollar in thirty-six years. They had during the last year one hundred and thirty-one orphans. They take them out of St. Ann's Foundling Asylum and they keep them until they are 7 or 8 years old, when they put them out to learn trades. They are relieving this Government of the care of these unfortunates, who would go to the jails and penitentiaries but for their action.

Mr. President, upon a mercantile and commercial basis alone they are entitled to this appropriation. They are saving human lives and souls. Besides that, they are preventing the criminal classes of the country from being swelled by these poor creatures, who would otherwise be cast into the streets with no friends, no homes, no families.

What I object to in this bill—and I have attempted to make it as good a bill as I could—are provisions such as the one just immediately preceding the one upon which the chairman of the committee raised this point of order:

For maintenance of the National Temperance Home, \$2,000.

Now, who are the people who go to this National Temperance Home? They are grown men who have broken themselves by vicious habits, who have violated all the rules that should govern sensible and intelligent human beings.

Here is another item in the bill—I do not want anybody to suspect me of any political prejudice about it, for it is not true—here is \$3,000 to be given to "the board of management of the Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors, Grand Army of the Republic, District of Columbia." Who are these people? They are very gallant old soldiers, but they are men; they all have pensions; they are receiving the bounty of the Government; and if I had my choice between these old, broken-down drunkards and these pensioned soldiers and seamen, and these poor unfortunate foundling boys, I would give the money to the boys. I would try to save them and make good men, industrious men, and honest men out of them.

But here all these items go through unchallenged. Why? Because the Senator says they are estimated for, and the House put in \$2,500.

Mr. President, this is an era of economy. There are 65,000,000 people in the United States, two and a half million in the State of Missouri, and I do not know what infinitesimal fraction would be charged to each one of these if this increase of \$2,500 a year is given to these orphan boys. If I had a constituent that objected to my action here to-day, I would thank him never to vote for me again, and I would consider myself dishonored by the support of any such man.

Mr. CALL. I hope very much the Senate will adopt this motion and strike out these charities in order that we may have this revision. The Senator from Missouri has abundantly proved the necessity for it and these two provisions, one for the boys and the other for these old people over 60 years of age, two hundred of whom are already in this home, which has the capacity to accommodate three hundred with a little assistance from the Government, having collected \$350,000 by personal solicitations in the last twenty-five years as against \$50,000 which the Government has paid, thus having saved to the public Treasury by the estimate of the amount of \$100 now paid for each public pauper, having saved the taxpayers of this country over \$300,000, it seems to me it is in the interest of economy and of the taxpayers as well as of charity that this should be done.

I ask the Senator to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether there is any provision in the bill for the Little Sisters of the Poor?

Mr. CALL. None whatever.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that the best thing to be done is to adopt the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida. I think the appropriations for this line of charities, which must appeal to every Senator, every member of the other House, and every citizen of the District, are entirely insufficient.

There are a great multitude of charities in this city, some of which are of the very highest degree of merit, which are not provided for in this bill. Indeed, I think it has been the fashion of the Government to throw the poor, the sick, the feeble, and the diseased upon the charity of the people, rather than for the Government of the United States to do its share. I do not think the Government of the United States has ever done its share. I regard it as one of the most pleasant recollections of my life that I aided in founding the Providence Hospital, which has now grown to be a great and very valuable institution. It was founded upon an appropriation to pay for forty people without distinction of color, in the old times, when the color question was very rife. That charity was founded in that way.

If this whole clause should be stricken out, that would leave all these items open and the members of the committee of conference entirely at liberty to add others which are more meritorious. If the Senator wants to avoid the point of order, all he has to do is to move to strike out the whole paragraph, and that will leave the whole to go into the committee of conference. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CALL. That is my motion.

Mr. VEST. What paragraph does the Senator allude to?

Mr. FRYE. All the charity items.

Mr. SHERMAN. Beginning in line 9, on page 41, and going down to the appropriation for the Reform School for Girls, on page 44, line 6.

I think the committees of conference of the two Houses of Congress can probably settle the details much better than we can here, because if we should attempt to put on an amendment for any particular charity, other charities will be named which are equally meritorious, and it would be very difficult to settle the details, while if the whole is stricken out, we may be very certain that those here will be preserved and perhaps some others added afterwards.

Mr. HOAR. It strikes me that that is a pretty large discretion and authority to give to a committee of conference.

Mr. SHERMAN. There is not much danger of its being used on the side of liberality.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the proposition of the Senator from Ohio is this: There being a provision for Congressional grant to two or three designated objects of charity, designated corporations or institutions in the House bill, if the Senate strike them out, the committee of conference will have authority to add any number of such objects of public appropriations that they see fit. I desire to express my dissent from that proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I think it is rather a dangerous precedent to strike out the entire chapter relating to charities. I should be afraid that the other House might take us at our word and agree to strike out all of them, or most of them.

The truth is that a great many of these charities, some of them designated by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and others, have grown up from year to year. We have added one or two charities in nearly every District appropriation bill for the last ten years. It may be true, as the Senator from Ohio says, that we do not do our full share here as respects these charities.

The Senator alluded to one of the pleasant incidents in his Congressional career of having been instrumental in having provided for the establishment of Providence Hospital. That is certainly one of the most beneficent charities in this District. The Government has paid, and is paying, \$19,000 a year to that charity, and the government of the District of Columbia pays

nothing to it. The appropriation for it is found in the sundry civil bill, and no part of that charity is paid for by the taxpayers of this District.

There is another beneficent charity in another portion of this city where the Government pays a total of \$60,000 per annum, no portion of which is paid by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, known as the Freedman's Hospital, which is now one of the best hospitals in this city. So you may take the Garfield Hospital, so called. The Government of the United States pays from its Treasury \$15,000 per annum for that charity, and no part of it is charged to the District of Columbia. There are other charities in this District which have never received one dollar either from the government of the District of Columbia or from the Government of the United States, which are most beneficent charities. Here is the St. Joseph's Asylum, suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. There stands side by side with it St. Vincent's Asylum, which has never received a dollar, and yet it is a school for girls, and those who manage that institution insist, and I think they insist with great force, that if we provide for St. Joseph's Asylum we ought also to provide for St. Vincent's, and I can see no rule to apply to one that will not equally apply to the other.

Mr. COCKRELL. And the Washington Asylum.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] calls my attention to the Washington Asylum, an asylum in this District, which has been performing charitable work here for more than fifty years, and now has within its walls two hundred or three hundred young children, and they take all who come. They have never received from either the District of Columbia or the United States a single dollar. This institution is sustained by the beneficence of the people of this District and elsewhere.

Mr. VEST. I said nothing about the Washington Asylum.

Mr. ALLISON. So I understand. I am only speaking of the charities. If we go into enlarging in this matter we shall be obliged in equity to take care of all.

There is another charity in this District, known as the Associated Charities, which goes about these streets and picks up young girls and young boys day by day and hour by hour, and takes care of them as best they can, either in this District by assigning them to some one or the other of these charities or by providing them transportation to other portions of our country.

There is in this District a charity known as the Children's Aid Society, like the Associated Charities composed and comprised of the best people in this city, who go about from day to day picking up the waifs of this District and those who come here.

We can not put upon this bill all these charities without swelling it and enlarging it beyond what will be deemed reasonable when the bill comes to its final conclusion and solution. Therefore, it is, Mr. President, with every disposition to appropriate money for these charities—they are all useful, they are all performing a noble and splendid and beneficent work in this District—we must stop at some point. If we put on one, what answer shall we make to all those who have made the same request of us who do not find themselves provided for in this bill? It is for that reason that the Committee on Appropriations have not very much enlarged the charities in this bill; they have enlarged them somewhat, but they have placed on this bill no new charities.

We found the St. Joseph's Asylum in this bill for \$500; we found another small charity, a new one, in this bill for \$250. We did not disturb either of them, but we did not think it wise to enlarge the appropriations for them. This matter was fully and thoroughly discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, and I think this was the conclusion deliberately arrived at by the committee.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee one question, and that is, if he does not think that there might be danger of losing these charities when they go into conference if we strike them all out now?

Mr. ALLISON. So I suggested to Senators, that these charities then will come again under the supervision of the House of Representatives, if I may speak of that properly. They may be quite willing to strike out these provisions if we say we are not for charities at all, because that is what a vote striking out means. It means to say that this Senate is against all charities because it strikes out all those which have been inserted by the House, and the House may say "Very well, if the Senate is opposed to these charities we quite agree with them, and we will strike them all out."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am inclined to think if the amendment of the Senator from Florida shall be agreed to, that it will defeat the very object he has in view.

The limit of the jurisdiction of a committee of conference upon a legislative enactment is upon the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses. The House of Representatives sends to the Senate a bill containing sundry provisions for charities. The Senate has added other objects of appropriation and in some instances has increased the amount; but if the motion of the Senator from Florida should be agreed to, it strikes out all the original text as it came from the House and every amendment that the Senate has incorporated in that chapter, and the bill returns to the House simply with the original text of the House bill stricken out.

Then, the only question which it is legitimate for the committee of conference to consider is as to whether these provisions shall be reinstated as they came from the House or reinstated with diminished amounts, but as there is no disagreeing vote between the two Houses involving any larger amount of appropriation, I take it for granted the committee of conference could not exceed the amount in any instance fixed by the House, because the only disagreement would be as to whether or not that appropriation or some smaller appropriation should be made.

Mr. CULLOM. We would either get nothing or get back what we have in the bill now.

Mr. HARRIS. At least you jeopardize what you have in the bill now, and the danger is that you would get nothing but a smaller amount than the House originally appropriated.

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not know that anything I can say will be of importance to anyone except perhaps myself. I have nothing to say in regard to the parliamentary question raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] as to the effect of this motion. I have great respect for the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and I have listened with interest to his statement in regard to the charities of this District. I am impressed, however, with this idea. This District has no other legislature than Congress; there is no other legislative body to look after their wants. Were we at home in our several Commonwealths, and it was demonstrated that there was a pressing want for a small sum of money upon a very important question to care for the morals and training of the rising generation, we should not pause to consider how many charities we had already established.

When the Senator from Iowa stated that we were appropriating some \$300,000 for charities in this District, it sounded somewhat imposing; but if more is needed, then more is right. This Government can not afford to stop because it can not spare the money to do what is right for the welfare of its people, and if a line is to be drawn anywhere in regard to establishing charities in this District, let it be drawn at some other place than upon the children. After the statement made by the Senator from Missouri I should feel vastly uncomfortable unless some provision was made for these children.

I know something of the facts besides the statement of the Senator from Missouri, and I know that noble women have been giving their time, their substance, and their care on this subject to what properly belongs to bearded men, to the governing power of this country, to care for its own. I for one am not willing to shirk this question on a mere matter of \$1,500 or \$2,000, and on a question of order at that. As to the question of order, sir, it is always in order to care for the helpless and the poor; it is always in order to care for the children of the rising generation, to take them in out of the streets, to take them in out of temptation, out of the storms of vice and trouble that beset them on every hand. One hundred and thirty-one of these young souls, the Senator from Missouri has told us, are cared for now by private charity, and on a question of whether this Government shall step forward and take care of these helpless ones a question of order is interposed!

□ The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no question of order pending at the present moment.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am glad to know that. I was under the impression, Mr. President, that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]—and I certainly shall not criticize him with the slightest degree of censure—but I was under the impression that his question of order coming from the committee was still pending. I am glad to know that it is not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa raised the point of order on an amendment previously offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], but has not raised any point of order on the amendment to strike out.

Mr. VEST. If the Chair please, the Senator from Iowa raised the point of order on my amendment in regard to the St. Joseph Asylum, and it was sustained. I want to say now that I never should have offered that amendment if I had not been of the impression that the committee would not raise the point of order against it. I went to the chairman of the committee—I know it was a misconception, that I misunderstood him and he probably misunderstood me—but I told him I knew the amendment was subject to the point of order, and if the committee insisted upon it, I would have nothing to do with it, for I was bound, and he

told me he would simply state the facts and leave the question to the Senate. That is the reason I offered the amendment.

Mr. VOORHEES. I was to a certain extent, Mr. President, correct in speaking of the point of order, though it is not now pending, having been disposed of, and against the amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is entirely correct in speaking of these Little Sisters begging for the poor. They are all around us; they go from door to door soliciting charity. They are doing their duty. Sir, it is a grave question whether we are doing ours.

I repeat, if the line is to be drawn on charity, let it be drawn on some other kind of people than these. Let it be drawn upon the inebriates or those who are better able to care for themselves, or those who have had their chance in life and have thrown it away. Let it be drawn on them if somebody has to go to wreck. Let those who are rising in the world have their chance. We are responsible for them. We are not responsible for those who have passed through their career and are closing the day of their existence.

Therefore, Mr. President, I did not feel at ease until I had said this much in behalf of what I deemed to be just and right. A point of order on the part of the committee can prevail, I am aware of that, and we are talking, as it were, in vain, as long as questions of order are raised.

The Senator from Missouri offered a little amendment, I believe, of \$2,000, an increase of \$1,500, and we have been talking here \$1,500 worth since it was offered. We should have made money for the Government if we had adopted it at once and let the children have the money that we are talking and caviling about. I say the same in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Florida. There is no economy in this course of procedure, none in the immediate present, none in the long run, worse than none in the long run; for, as the Senator from Missouri has well said, charity expended as his amendment proposes to expend it is for the future welfare of society, for the safety of the home, for the suppression of vice, and the establishment of order and virtue.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations when the item in the bill was reached that was proposed to be amended by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], I felt very strongly inclined to the idea that that appropriation should be raised to \$3,000, and I still feel, knowing something more about that charity than almost any other charity in the city, that if anything is done to increase the appropriation in this bill, that is as meritorious as any one can possibly be. When the subject was under discussion in committee, however, we found that there was a vast number of these charities that were not yet proposed to be placed in any legislative bill, and that if we began on that line it would result in a very large number of other appropriations which were sought for getting into the bill, because they stood largely upon the same platform.

Mr. VEST. This is in the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. This is in the bill, put in by the House, a small sum of \$500 it is true, and which I understand those who are interested in the institution regard as a damage to the establishment rather than a benefit, because it may make the people who have been in the habit of supporting it heretofore believe that now as a little appropriation is made, it will not be necessary for them to give anything hereafter. But, I came to the conclusion, in view of the large appropriations we were making in the bill, increasing it over \$700,000 above what the House had made it, that we ought to perhaps call a halt. I therefore felt that I would give up the desire I had that the St. Joseph's Asylum should get an increased appropriation. We might as well face the question if we are going to open the subject, and make up our minds to recognize every one of these charities which has been talked about here to-day, and which has sought to secure appropriations in this bill.

My judgment is that we have got more in the bill now than we shall be able to keep there, and that we had perhaps better hesitate before opening the doors further and allowing additional appropriations to be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa, in charge of this bill, must realize that this is a very familiar subject. I doubt if any appropriation bill appropriating for the District of Columbia has been considered in the Senate but what there has been an effort on the part of members of the Senate to increase appropriations for specific charities, and I think it was this course, pursued for many years, that prompted Congress in 1890 to create a new office known as the superintendent of charities. This official, I understand, a very excellent man, qualified in every way for the performance of his functions, has been on duty since some time in the year 1890. I should like to ask whether these appropriations for charities are based upon any report as to the distribution made by him, and whether his views as expressed in a report constitute any guide to the Committee on Appropriations in dividing the sum that is to be appropriated

in gross for this purpose? I see and have heard nothing of any action based upon that report, and I should like some information from the Senator upon that subject.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations had the Commissioner of Charities before them two or three times respecting these charities. The Commissioner of Charities does not recommend any new charities to be placed on the subsidized list. He believes that these charities should have more direct Government supervision as respects admission to the list and as respects control over them. There is now pending, I understand, in the Committee on the District of Columbia, a bill looking to a more careful regulation of these charities. I understand that bill has received the approval of the Commissioners of the District.

If the Senator will allow me, while I am up I will say in respect to this officer that he made a fine impression upon those who had the pleasure of hearing him, as a painstaking, conscientious, intelligent officer, and thoroughly devoted to the work in which he is engaged.

Now, I want to say one word in response to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES]—

Mr. MANDERSON. Before the Senator departs from that subject, if he will permit me to call his attention to the peculiar wording of this law, it would seem to me on looking at it as though we had thrown upon this officer a very important and at the same time a very onerous duty.

That for the purpose of securing a more equitable and efficient expenditure of the several sums appropriated "for charities" there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as soon as may be after the passage of this act, some thoroughly experienced and otherwise suitable person, not a resident of the District of Columbia, to be designated superintendent of charities for the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be to formulate for the purposes of the expenditures for charities in said District such a system or plan of organized charities for said District as will by means of consolidation, combination, or other direction, in his judgment, best secure the objects contemplated by the several institutions and associations for which such appropriations are made.

Has there been anything in the direction of the performance of this particular duty which if properly performed would relieve Congress from very much of this detailed investigation as to the merits of particular charities?

Mr. ALLISON. The commissioner of charities, I think, took his office in April, 1891, not quite a year ago, and I have no doubt that he has faithfully devoted himself to the duties imposed upon him by the statute. He has formulated and prepared one bill, which is now, I think, before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and he has other bills in preparation in connection with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. He made a most valuable report, but that report was made of course in October of last year and before he had full time to examine into these charities. I want to say, however, that in that report the commissioner commends favorably the management and control of every charity in this city without exception; he speaks of them as all and each one of them doing a charitable and beneficent service.

The Senator from Indiana criticises me somewhat because it becomes my duty as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, having in charge this bill, to make points of order upon amendments which are offered by individual Senators, the theory of our organization being here that it is wiser and better that amendments offered should have the consideration of committees rather than that they should be adopted without much consideration on this floor.

Now, I sympathize, as the Senator sympathizes, with the waifs who are found upon these streets; but the Senator must not forget that the Government, as respects boys, has provided for all these waifs at the expense of the government of the District of Columbia. That expense is provided for in this bill. So these boys who may have been or are unfortunate are already provided for in this bill if they choose to go where this bill provides they may go, namely, to the Reform School of the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST. Oh, Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon, but he certainly does not intend to use that argument. Of the 95 boys now in the St. Joseph's Asylum 35 or 36 come from the Foundling Asylum.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not saying that the boys in St. Joseph's Asylum ought to go to the Reform School.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me, I thank him for having made the suggestion, because it enables me to say that next to allowing them to go upon the street and from there to the penitentiaries and jails, I would put them in the Reform School, where they would meet boys already lost and hardened and so thoroughly vicious that they would contaminate by association any boy who is brought in contact with them. The very object of the women who are at the head of such institutions as the St. Joseph's Asylum is to prevent that very state of the case and to furnish them with the influences of family, of religion,

and of home until they are self-sustaining and can resist temptation. If I had, and I repeat it, my choice between a jail and the Reform School, I should hesitate.

Mr. ALLISON. I might not disagree with the Senator from Missouri. He has stated the case strongly, but perhaps properly. Here are these Sisters of Charity devoting themselves to the training of such boys and such girls who are unfortunate as they can gather into their asylum, and keeping them there until they go out into the world and are prepared for its contests and its battles. They struggle there without compensation.

Mr. VOORHEES. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VOORHEES. Is it not true before one of these boys can be sent to the Reform School he has to be arrested and put in jail?

Mr. ALLISON. That is not true.

Mr. VOORHEES. And sentenced by the police court? In other words, the Reform School is a penal institution, and the boy goes there under a sentence.

Mr. ALLISON. That is not always the case. They are sent there either by the Secretary of the Interior or by a proper officer of this District.

But the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Missouri seem to think that I am hostile to what they propose. Here is this charity which the Senator from Missouri speaks of. It was organized here as a church charity thirty-six years ago, and its managers have never until this very year and month for a single moment thought of asking the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia to contribute to them.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is misinformed in regard to that entirely. These sisters have repeatedly considered the propriety of applying to Congress, and they have always been met with exactly the argument made by the chairman of the committee now, that Congress was giving \$300,000 to charities and the amount could not be increased.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not like to be making these contests with my friend from Missouri; but the very argument used to the committee by Sister Euphrasia, who presented her case, and very properly and very modestly and very truthfully, I have no doubt, stated that it was because we were giving largely to other charities that she thought, and her society thought, that they were entitled to the same consideration. I believe it, and I have no doubt that I led her to believe that I would favor her charity, because she made an impression upon me. I will say to the Senator from Missouri; but when I discovered that there were a large circle of other charities equally meritorious, not only in the church to which she belongs, but elsewhere outside of it, all claiming that they had the same right to appropriations that those charities have which are mentioned in this bill—when we found that a large addition must be made to this bill, we had some regard for the general situation respecting it, and left them all off.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If I may interrupt the Senator—

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I understood him to say that provision had been made by taxation upon the District for certain charities, which included boys, but that no provision had been made for like charities for girls. Now, is it not entirely competent for the Committee on Appropriations to require that certain sums of money shall be raised by the District to cover all these charities, and not confine them to one or to a half dozen, if more be needed, for I think I understand pretty correctly that the people of the city of Washington will be very glad to have their property taxed for all these worthy charities. Therefore it is that I see no way that a tax can be levied, except it is through some action by Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey is now stating what the Committee on Appropriations provided in a bill they reported here two years ago, namely, that there ought to be a coordination of these charities, and that there ought to be a board of charities here. The first step was the provision made for a commissioner of charities in order that he might see what they are and what they are doing.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will bear with me a single moment further, I will simply add a word more.

The Senator knows full well, as far as regards private subscription to these charities, if it can be understood by the public that they are on a firm and substantial basis and that the government of the city recognizes the importance of them, it would be a very great encouragement to private subscribers to these charities; whereas if they are going along from day to day half dead and half alive, there is nobody who feels much encouragement, because he has no confidence in the result.

Mr. ALLISON. The very reverse of what the Senator states is true. Wherever the Government of the United States has made appropriations—there are exceptions, I agree—but wher-

ever the Government of the United States has made appropriations, as a rule all private contributions cease. Last year there was expended in this District for charitable purposes by the government of the District of Columbia and by the Government of the United States more than \$300,000, and yet, so far as the private subscriptions are concerned to the subsidized charities, or the charities which receive aid from the Government, they were only a little over \$32,000.

What we want to do, and what I think we ought to do here, is to have a board of charities of the best and most responsible citizens of this city, consisting of men and women, give them the charge of these charities, let us devote a certain portion of the revenues to these charities, and let them be distributed here by a responsible charitable organization of this District. As it is now, it is a scramble, first with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, each seeking to get as much as possible, and then a scramble in this Chamber and in the other for precedence on the appropriation bills.

I must say that I regret that the Senator from Missouri, and especially the Senator from Indiana, undertook to put me in the position of being hostile to these charities or any of them in the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon. I have done nothing of the sort.

Mr. VOORHEES. And I wish to disclaim any purpose of that kind to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I accept the disclaimer.

Mr. VOORHEES. I make it with pleasure to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. VEST. I made no such intimation; but I say to the Senator from Iowa frankly that I was misled in regard to one matter. When I went to him in regard to this amendment, I received the impression that this point of order was not to be made, and I so reported to these ladies who had come to me in regard to it. It is a misconception. That is all I have said about it.

Mr. VOORHEES. A single word more. I know the Senator from Iowa is acting under the force of a rule which prevails in this body and prevails in the committee and governs him as the representative of the committee, and that he is not acting from the very good heart that is in him when he is coerced by that rule.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I want to say a word to the Senator from Missouri. I did not mean to say or to be understood by the Senator that I would not make the point of order, although I have no doubt he so understood me. Mr. President, as respects this charity and this amendment which the Senator from Missouri offers which is on this bill, so far as I am concerned I do not make the point of order on him in view of what he has said.

Mr. VEST. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. And I leave to the Senate to say whether or not, as respects to this particular charity, where the Senator from Missouri says that he was misled by observations that I made and that he misled others thereby, if he states that on this floor, I withdraw the point of order I made on the amendment.

Mr. VEST. Then I ask for a vote upon that amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. VEST. The amendment is to increase the appropriation for the St. Joseph's Asylum \$1,500, increasing it from \$500 to \$2,000.

I want to make a single remark.

The Senator from Iowa stated what is actually a potent argument for this proposed increase. He stated here that whenever the Government made an appropriation private charity generally ceased. That is so; because when application is made to an individual in such a case the reply is the Government is giving you so much money; go to the Government. To give these people \$500, when their report shows that they actually consume in provisions \$2,700, is simply to stop private charity and then give them an inadequate sum for maintenance. It would be better for them not to have anything than to give them \$500.

I ask for a vote upon the amendment.

Mr. CALL. I want to correct a statement of the Senator from Missouri. To the charity I have proposed to have inserted here, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Government has given \$42,000, and they have collected from private charity \$350,000.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, on page 43, it is proposed to strike out "five hundred" and insert "two thousand;" so as to read:

For St. Joseph's Asylum, maintenance, \$2,000.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Florida will not insist upon that amendment. I will say to him that the first paragraph, namely, that appropriating \$16,000 for the relief of the poor, has been amended so that there is an opportunity of getting what he desires in conference, and if there is any power to do that, I think that can be done.

Mr. CALL. I withdraw the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I have been requested to offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in at the end of line 8, on page 42.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 42, line 8, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That from and after the passage of this act the term of office of all of the members of the board of directors, except the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the United States Senator, and the two members of the House of Representatives, shall expire on the 1st day of January in each year, and their successors shall be chosen on the second Monday in December of each year, one-third of which number shall be nominated and appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the other two-thirds elected by a majority of the directors then in office: *Provided further*, That one-third of the number of said directors oldest in service as such directors shall not be reelected nor be appointed by the Commissioners as aforesaid, nor shall they be eligible for such reelection or appointment for the period of two years next after the expiration of their term of office: *Provided further*, That the term of office of the Senator and Representatives in said board of directors shall continue as provided in the act of Congress of June 10, 1872, and the term of office of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall continue so long as he shall remain such Commissioner.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I have no personal knowledge in regard to this matter, and I ask that the memorandum may be read which was sent to me to accompany the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Why not let it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. COCKRELL. It will only take a moment to read it.

Mr. ALLISON. I may want to make the point of order on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The memorandum presented by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Memorandum relating to the proposed amendment of the appropriation bill relating to the Columbia Hospital.

1. Under the charter and by-laws all the members of the board of directors except the Senator and two Representatives and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia hold their office for life; while the representatives of the Government, the Senator and Representatives and the Commissioner, hold only for a limited time.

2. The board of directors is not elected by the corporation. By the charter, the first twelve of the corporators were made directors, and they elect those to fill vacancies caused by death, resignation, or by the increase in the number.

3. By reason of this situation, and the fact that the Government's representatives are in a hopeless minority (4 to 14), and that these life members elect their own successors, the Government is a mere feeder, furnishing money to a strictly private corporation in the management of whose affairs and in the election of whose officers it has practically no voice.

4. During the recess of Congress the Government has no representation at all, because of absence of members of Congress, and from March 4 to December of every two years, by reason of the expiration of Congress, according to the rule adopted by the board, Congress has no membership, because its representatives are appointed only for the life of Congress, and a member, though reelected, is not regarded as a director, because the Congress from which he is appointed has expired.

5. The corporation is really a Government institution because it is supported not by contribution of these directors, but by appropriations by Congress and the profits derived from pay patients.

6. The only way to remedy this condition and give the Government a real control is by limiting the term of office of directors to one year and having a substantial number, one-third, appointed by the Government, by its representatives, the Commissioners, leaving the entire board to elect the balance of the members and thus secure a real representation by all concerned.

Mr. ALLISON. I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the point?

Mr. ALLISON. That it is legislation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I intended to offer an amendment to this bill relating to the High Street Railway, or the railway from Georgetown to Tennallytown, but after conference with several members of the committee and other Senators I have concluded that it is better to leave that matter to the conference committee, who, I think, are now prepared to consider it, and to do justice to all concerned.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. HALE it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

Several SENATORS addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order. What is the business now before the Senate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate

the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 2729) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. HOAR. Now, Mr. President, I desire to take the floor on that bill, but I yield to any Senator who wishes to make any motion.

REMOVAL OF GARBAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BLACKBURN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Whereas there was appropriated by the last Congress the sum of \$24,000 for the removal of garbage in the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1892; and

Whereas it is stated by the Commissioners for the District of Columbia in their last annual report now before Congress that said appropriation is already "practically exhausted," and an additional appropriation is asked for: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Committee of the Senate on the District of Columbia is hereby instructed to investigate the manner and methods by which said appropriation has been expended, and to report to the Senate at an early day the result of their investigations.

Also, that said committee is directed to report what changes have been made in the official management of the health department of the District of Columbia, and for what reasons; and if any unusual or unfair means have been used to accomplish such changes.

Also, if the present contractor for the transportation of garbage and the collection and transportation of dead animals in the District of Columbia is carrying out his contract according to the specifications thereof.

Also, if said contractor is an employe of the War Department, drawing a salary from the United States; and if so, why he is allowed to occupy such a double position.

Also, if said contractor has been awarded a five years' contract for the collection of garbage and dead animals in the District of Columbia; and if so, the amount of said contract; and if said contractor has been allowed to sublet said contract; and if so, to whom, and what consideration he received for the same.

BUILDING OF WAR SHIPS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution:

Whereas it is alleged that the iron and steel shipbuilding plants along the Great Lakes of the Northwest exceed in combined facilities, in magnitude, and in capital the interests of all other shipbuilding plants of the country combined; and,

Whereas it is further alleged that these great inland shipbuilding interests have been denied an opportunity to bid for the construction of torpedo boats and the smaller class of war ships which can be taken by the water route through the St. Lawrence to the sea: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether any bids for the construction of certain types of war ships have been received from any of said shipbuilding companies, and whether such bid or bids have been refused or rejected by his Department for any reason or reasons other than such as follow from the usual rule in accepting or rejecting bids for such class of work, and if so, the reasons therefor.

Mr. HALE. I do not know that there is any objection to that resolution; but I want to examine it. Let it lie over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

NAVAL FORCE ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the agreement entered into between the United States and Great Britain in the year 1817, covering the question of the naval force to be maintained by the two Governments on the great lakes of the United States is now held to be in force by the Department of State, and what, if any, action has been taken by our Government to revive or put in force the terms of said agreement, and if so, under what authority or action on the part of our Government such agreement has been held to be in force since the giving of the required formal notice by the President to Great Britain in December, 1864, of a desire on the part of the United States to annul said agreement at the expiration of the six months from the date of said formal notice, and of the ratification of said notice by the act of Congress of February 9, 1865.

Mr. HALE. Let that lie over, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over, and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 418) to change the times for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the western district of Missouri.

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. 6788) to establish subports of entry and delivery at Superior, Wis., and at Ashland, Wis., in the Superior collection district of Michigan and Wisconsin; and

A bill (H. R. 5640) to increase the pension of Cassie A. Davis.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4534) to extend to Marquette, Mich., the privilege of immediate transportation of unappraised merchandise.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CAREY. I ask to call up for present consideration Order of Business 448, being the bill (S. 577) for the relief of W. H. Ward. It is a short bill.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I want to know if the general agreement to go to the Calendar for two days after we disposed of the Indian appropriation bill is not now the order of the Senate and if the Calendar is not in order under that agreement?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that was the understanding reached some days ago.

Mr. CULLOM. I think, besides the unfinished business, there are several special orders pending.

Mr. HOAR. I was not aware that the consent was now in force. I hope the Senate will be willing to take up the bill to amend the court act, the discussion of which I think will be very short indeed.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, the agreement was that after the disposition of the Indian appropriation bill we should go to the Calendar for two days under Rule VIII, and the agreement was made subject to the understanding that if the Committee on Appropriations desired to take up the District appropriation bill that bill should take the place of the consideration of the Calendar. I suppose a fair construction of the agreement would be that we should now go to the Calendar for two days. However, that is a matter for the Senate to decide.

Mr. HOAR. I shall not interpose.

Mr. DOLPH. I think if we do that we shall reach in two days' time all these bills.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope that either now or on Monday next we shall carry out that agreement. It ought to be done.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The title of the bill called for by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 577) for the relief of William H. Ward.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think Senators should call up special bills from the Calendar at this time. If we are to proceed with business, let us go to the Calendar regularly.

Mr. CULLOM. We want two whole days for the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand we want two whole days, and this is not the time now to go to passing bills out of their order.

NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the bill (S. 455) to authorize the New York and New Jersey Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Hudson River between New York City and the State of New Jersey be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 11, 1892, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8, 1892.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. Richard T. Yeatman, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. John Little, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

Capt. Thomas E. Rose, Sixteenth Infantry, to be major.

First Lieut. William C. McFarland, Sixteenth Infantry, to be captain.

Second Lieut. George S. Cartwright, Twentieth-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry Vaupel, to be postmaster at Morganfield, in the county of Union and State of Kentucky.

James I. Weaver, to be postmaster at London, in the county of Laurel and State of Kentucky.

William F. Albright, to be postmaster at Eaton, in the county of Preble and State of Ohio.

Richard L. Templin, to be postmaster at Calla, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

James Carter, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Pittsylvania and State of Virginia.

William L. Bachelder, to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin.

Henry Schrage, to be postmaster at Whiting, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

David Vail, to be postmaster at New Sharon, in the county of Mahaska and State of Iowa.

Charles S. Doubleday, to be postmaster at Hico, in the county of Hamilton and State of Texas.

Fulgence De Bordenave, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Southampton and State of Virginia.

John B. S. Zeller, to be postmaster at Mount Joy, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

William F. Judiesch, to be postmaster at Holstein, in the county of Ida and State of Iowa.

Mary F. Trump, to be postmaster at Maquoketa, in the county of Jackson and State of Iowa.

Sylvester S. Bookhammer, to be postmaster at Lewes, in the county of Sussex and State of Delaware.

John W. Hallenbeck, to be postmaster at Auburn Park, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

George W. Stetson, to be postmaster at Cambridgeboro, in the county of Crawford and State of Pennsylvania.

George B. Tripp, to be postmaster at Mechanicsville, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York.

Charles E. Gorham, to be postmaster at Great Barrington, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

Lee McLaughlin, to be postmaster at Sanger, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

Mrs. Dora Clow, to be postmaster at Arkadelphia, in the county of Clark and State of Arkansas.

Simon J. McKenzie, to be postmaster at Adrian, in the county of Nobles and State of Minnesota.

William H. Hyler, to be postmaster at Port Chester, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 8, 1892.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D. The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INVESTIGATION OF LEASES, YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up from the Speaker's table a privileged resolution heretofore reported from the Committee on Rules, authorizing an investigation of certain leases in the Yellowstone National Park.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McRAE submitted the following, which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands be instructed and directed to examine and report, by bill or otherwise, as to the circumstances under which certain leases for parcels of grounds in the Yellowstone National Park were made on or about March 20, 1889, by the Secretary of the Interior to the Yellowstone Park Association, and also why the privilege given to said association in said leases to transport passengers into and through said park was afterwards rescinded and forfeited, and the same granted to one S. S. Huntley, together with all the facts concerning such transaction; that the committee make full inquiry into the manner of administering the affairs of said park, touching leases and privileges therein, and the management of said park generally by the Interior Department; that the committee, or any subcommittee it may designate to prosecute the inquiry and examination have power to send for persons and papers, and to employ a stenographer; and that the expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and the chairman of said committee, or of such subcommittee, if one be designated, is authorized to draw for the same on the Clerk of the House in sums not to exceed \$200 at any one time.

Mr. McMILLIN. I demand the previous question, Mr. Speaker. That will give fifteen minutes' debate on either side, if desired.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McMILLIN. There is an amendment authorized, striking out the words "and to employ a stenographer." This is in order that the official stenographers to committees of the House may be employed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection that amendment will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I have forgotten whether a special committee was ordered by the House to make this investigation.

Mr. McMILLIN. Not a special committee. It simply authorizes one of the standing committees of the House.

Mr. BURROWS. What committee?

Mr. McMILLIN. The Committee on Public Lands.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

WILLIAM M. BLACKFORD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William M. Blackford against the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ALLENTOWN, PA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 109) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Allentown, in the State of Pennsylvania; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.