

shall be pledged; or is it for the interest of the United States to maintain amid the swamps, the malaria, and tropic heats, and tropic damps of that territory, more than a thousand miles from our southern border, an army, a fortress, and a naval force sufficient to cope with the entire navy of Great Britain? The reasons which operated then seem to me to be in force now; and it is one of the great and principal advantages of the present scheme that it entirely relieves us from the difficulties which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, considered as in force, would impose upon us on one side, or which if the Clayton-Bulwer treaty be treated as abrogated would press upon us on the other.

Mr. EDMUNDS. With the consent of my friend from Massachusetts, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. VEST. I hope not, Mr. President.

Mr. CULLOM. It is a little early.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, it is not early. It is half after 4.

Mr. VEST. I want to finish the bill, if possible, to-night.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We can not finish it to-night.

Mr. VEST. We will see whether we can.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We shall see.

Mr. VEST. I hope it will be finished to-night. There will be an appropriation bill to-morrow. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Pending the motion, the Chair will announce the appointment of a committee of conference on the part of the Senate.

Mr. VEST. Very well.

#### PUBLIC LAND LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. DOLPH, Mr. TELLER, and Mr. COCKRELL the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7887) to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber culture, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 542) for the relief of William Ervin.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1162) for the erection of a post-office building at Lynn, Mass; and

A bill (S. 2533) for the relief of E. Remington & Sons.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 531) to provide for the erection of a public building at Lafayette, Ind., with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5959) granting a right of way through certain public lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE PRICE.

The message further announced that the House had passed resolutions commemorative of the life and services of Hon. William T. Price, late a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5959) granting a right of way through certain public lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] moves that the Senate adjourn, on which motion the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to ask too much for myself, but it is half past four, and my honorable friend, I have no doubt, can have some arrangement made by which we can go on with the bill to-morrow.

Mr. VEST. Has not the Senator from Massachusetts concluded?

Mr. HOAR. No, I have not concluded.

Mr. VEST. I beg the Senator's pardon; I thought he had concluded his speech. If the Senator desires, the bill may go over until to-morrow.

Mr. CULLOM. Then ask that the call for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

Mr. VEST. I withdraw the call for the yeas and nays, with that understanding.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the call for the yeas and nays will be withdrawn. The Senator from Vermont moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 11, at 12 o'clock m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 10, 1887.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. WILLIAM H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

*Resolved by the Senate*, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of John A. Logan, long a Senator from the State of Illinois, and a distinguished member of this body, business be now suspended, that the friends and associates of the deceased may pay fitting tribute to his public and private virtues.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to furnish an engrossed copy of the same to the family of the deceased Senator.

#### COURT-HOUSE, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect, recommending that the limit of cost of the court-house at Jacksonville, Fla., be increased; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

#### STATISTICS OF VESSEL FISHERIES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2287) for securing statistics of the extent and value of the vessel fisheries of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on American Ship-building and Ship-owning Interests.

#### THE LATE SENATOR LOGAN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the resolutions of the Senate in relation to the late Senator Logan, as above set forth in the above message from the Senate; which were ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, at 2 o'clock p. m., I shall call up the resolutions in relation to the death of the late Senator Logan, and I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of that day after 2 o'clock be devoted to their consideration.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TUCKER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence indefinitely.

#### MICAH FRENCH.

Mr. ZACH. TAYLOR asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Pensions have leave to withdraw the report made at the last session on the bill (H. R. 7928) granting a pension to Micah French.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

#### SECTION 5352, REVISED STATUTES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as one of the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 10) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 5352 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes," approved March 22, 1882, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND], in place of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER].

#### PUBLIC BUILDING, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. SYMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1592) to change the limit of appropriation for the public building at Denver, Colo., and that the same be put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Denver, Colo.," approved May 8, 1882, be amended by making the limit for said building \$575,000, and that sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost thereof.

Sec. 2. That the Supervising Architect and the officers of the United States Government having charge of the erection of public buildings are authorized and required to be governed by the limitation hereby prescribed in making plans and contracts for the erection of said building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I think we ought to have some decent and good reason assigned for changing the limit fixed in the original bill. I would like to know what the original limit was, and what the reason is for changing it.

Mr. SYMES. I shall be glad to state the reason, Mr. Speaker. The original limit was \$300,000. The ground cost \$60,000—that is, the Government paid \$60,000 toward its purchase, and the citizens of Denver made up \$30,000, so that it actually cost \$90,000. That ground if sold at auction in Denver to-day would bring from \$150,000 to \$175,000. Denver has more than doubled in population since the ground was purchased. The public business of Denver has doubled since that time. The foundation of this building is constructed of brick, against the protest of many of the citizens of Denver. They insisted it ought to be of stone.

The first story of the superstructure, a non-fire-proof building, is brick wall with cheap sandstone facing from the mountains. Many of

the people there protested that it should be granite. This building is surrounded by other buildings, some of them since erected, costing over half a million dollars, and five stories high or more. The Supervising Architect and the Secretary of the Treasury state, as their reason for suspending the work on this building under the \$300,000 limit, that the increase will give 24,000 square feet of room, whereas under the present limit there will be but 10,000 square feet; and there will be needed more room than they will now obtain by the increase for the public business. Last year there was paid into the revenue of the United States in the city of Denver nearly \$600,000 net. Under the present limit the building would be completed with the brick wall, the brick foundation, and basement wall, and the sandstone facing, and changed to fire-proof; and the principal reason for the change, as the architect says, is that if you do not make this a fire-proof building it is liable to be burned down by the destruction of the adjoining building, an opera-house, which cost \$750,000; and by extending the two wings in accordance with the plans now perfected there will be an increase of over 13,000 square feet. The reports of the Senate and House committees show all these facts in detail.

Mr. Speaker, is this a sufficient explanation?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Oh, I see; they do things in a large way out there in Denver. I did not propose to object; but I would like to have the reasons which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SYMES] has so eloquently given spread on the record as a justification of the change of limit. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill by the House? The Chair hears none.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SYMES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT LA FAYETTE, IND.

Mr. WARD, of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 531) to provide for the erection of a public building at La Fayette, Ind.; and that the bill be now put on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase a site and cause to be erected at the city of La Fayette, county of Tippecanoe, in the State of Indiana, a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices in said city, with fire-proof vaults extending to each story, the site, and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the cost of \$100,000; and the sum of \$75,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purchase of said site and completion of said building: *Provided*, That there shall be an open space of not less than 40 feet upon every side of said building, including streets and alleys; and that no part of said sum shall be expended until a valid title to said site shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Indiana shall cede to the United States jurisdiction over the same for all purposes excepting the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of any civil process therein, and relinquish and release its right to tax said site and the property thereon belonging to the United States.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were read, as follows:

In lines 11 and 12 strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty," so as to make the limit of cost \$50,000.

In line 12 strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty," so as to make the amount of appropriation \$50,000.

At the end of the bill add the following:

"Nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site nor plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$50,000 for site and building."

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

Mr. STORM. I ask for the reading of the report, the right to object being reserved.

The report (by Mr. OWEN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 531) providing for the erection of a public building at La Fayette, Ind., report as follows:

Strike out the words "one hundred," in line 11, and insert "fifty."

Strike out the words "seventy-five," in line 12, and insert "fifty."

At the end of the bill, after the words "United States," add the following:

"Nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site nor plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$50,000 for site and building."

And, thus amended, we recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, let us have some statement showing the necessity for this bill, as the report fails to state the facts of the case.

Mr. WARD, of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as amended, provides for an appropriation of only \$50,000. La Fayette is a city with

a population of 25,000. It is the chief city between Indianapolis and Chicago. It is prosperous in every way. The gross annual receipts of the post-office at that place amount to nearly \$25,000. In short, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, La Fayette is the best city in Indiana. It is better than any in Illinois or in the entire Northwest. It has the best Representative, and withal the most modest, in the Forty-ninth Congress, and this is the first time I have ever asked any personal favor of this House. Now, gentlemen, let this bill go through. [Laughter.] You will all feel better and sleep better if you do. You probably know that my constituents are, and have been for the last four years, grieving on account of my absence from home, in-so-much, indeed, that they have concluded to send another fellow here in my place after the 4th of next March. Then the mourning will be here instead of there, and it will be a great consolation for you to reflect that you granted this my first and last request of a personal nature. [Laughter and applause.]

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was discharged from the further consideration of the bill; and the House proceeded to consider the same.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds were agreed to.

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

Mr. WARD, of Indiana, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. Now let us have the regular order.

#### INDEX OF CLAIMS.

Mr. IKE H. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted the following privileged report; which was read:

The Committee on Accounts, to whom was referred the letter from the Clerk of the House providing for continuing the index of claims referred to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act, to the end of the Forty-ninth Congress, together with the consolidated index of Southern Claims Commission reports, report the same back to the House with the accompanying resolution instructing the Committee on Appropriations to provide in the deficiency bill for the employment of a clerk at the same compensation paid per diem committee clerks, until the first regular meeting of the Fiftieth Congress, to continue the index of claims referred under the Bowman act; to re-examine and compare the manuscript copy of Southern Claims Commission cases with the lists furnished the House of Representatives by the Southern Claims Commission at intervals during the period from 1870 to 1880, and if the printing of the said document is ordered, to insure accuracy, the committee recommend that the said clerk shall carefully compare the proof-sheets with the manuscript copy.

An investigation by the committee develops the fact that the Southern Claims Commission, during its official existence from 1870 to 1880, had before it 22,298 claims, amounting in money value to the very large sum of \$60,258,150.44, of which sum \$4,636,929.69 was paid by the Government, leaving claims to the amount of \$55,621,220.75, now in the files of the House, subject to reference to the Committee on War Claims and the transfer under the so-called Bowman act to the Court of Claims by the said committee.

Such a mass of claims demands a concise and thorough index. The present condition of the Claims Commission's records make necessary an investigation of each of ten reports in order to ascertain the condition of any particular claim. The purpose of the index proposed is to consolidate these ten reports so as to make only one such examination necessary and to complete the history of the work of the Southern Claims Commission.

The committee are of opinion that this work is of great importance, and therefore report the following resolution, and recommend its adoption, namely:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations be instructed to insert in the deficiency bill for the present fiscal year the following paragraph, namely: "To enable the Clerk of the House to continue and complete the index of claims reported to Congress by the Commissioners of Claims under the act of March 3, 1871, and by the Court of Claims under the so-called 'Bowman act' of March 3, 1883, such sum as may be necessary to pay a clerk from and after March 4, 1887, the same compensation paid per diem committee clerks, such employment to extend beyond December 5, 1887."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution reported by the committee.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. IKE H. TAYLOR moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH PUBLIC LANDS, UTAH.

Mr. PAYSON rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] demanded the regular order of business.

Mr. PAYSON. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] withdraws his demand for the regular order of business, and desired me to say so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON].

Mr. PAYSON. I move to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5959) granting a right of way through certain public lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, &c., and that the same be passed with the amendments reported from the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. The bill and amendments will be reported.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That a right of way is hereby granted to the Salt Lake and Fort Douglas Railway, a corporation duly organized under the laws of the Territory of Utah, across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, by a route surveyed



and laid down on a properly certified map, a copy of which is now on file with the Secretary of War, which location has been submitted to and approved by the post commander and the commander of the department. Said right of way hereby granted shall not exceed 100 feet in width through said reservation, except where side-tracks, spurs, turn-tables, or stations are located or to be located; and at such points the right of way shall not exceed 200 feet on each side of the main track, and not exceeding 2,000 feet in length: *Provided*, That an additional right of way is hereby granted for such spurs, sidings, turn-tables, and stations as are deemed necessary from time to time in order to transport the freights and materials to and from and across said reservation; such further locations not now laid down on said map to be made under the direction of the post commander, and to be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That the regulations for operating said railroad within the limits of said reservation shall be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided also*, That the said railway company will do nothing or cause anything to be done that will in any way lessen the quantity of water or render the water impure that flows from Red Butte cañon, upon which the supply of Fort Douglas depends.

The amendments of the committee were read, as follows:

In line 27, after the word "water," insert "except to such extent as may necessarily result from the use for engine purposes;" also by adding the following to the bill:

SEC. 2. That the grant contained in the first section of this act is made upon the express condition that the Salt Lake Rock Company, its successors and assigns, shall first convey to the United States a title in fee-simple, free and clear of all incumbrance, to the approval of the Attorney-General of the United States, of the following lands, water, and water-rights in Salt Lake County, Territory of Utah, to wit: Sections numbered 25 and 35, township numbered 1, range numbered 1 east, and section numbered 19, township numbered 1, range numbered 2 east, with all the water and water rights thereon, excepting and reserving to the said company, its successors and assigns, all stone, brick-clay, and other building materials, and all minerals in and upon said lands, and the right to enter thereon and prospect for, develop, quarry, and remove such stone, brick-clay, and other building materials, and all such minerals, with the right to locate and construct all necessary railroads, wagon-roads, and trails to give the said company the benefit and enjoyment of the rights reserved to it, and its successors and assigns, by this act, and also, in addition thereto, the right of use of so much water as may be necessary for engine purposes; and the said reservations are hereby confirmed as against the United States: *Provided, however*, That the rights reserved shall not be construed in any way whatever to impair, either in quality or purity or in quantity, the water or water-supply in and upon or flowing through and from Red Butte Cañon, except to the extent of the use for engine purposes as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed, upon the perfection of the title to the lands in the second section described in the United States, as therein specified, to pay to the said Salt Lake Rock Company, its successors or assigns, in consideration therefor, the sum of \$20,000; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum of money for the payment of the same.

SEC. 4. That the Salt Lake and Fort Douglas Railway, specified in the first section of this act, its successors and assigns, in accepting the grant to them in such first section made, binds itself, its successors and assigns, to make no higher rate or charge for transportation for the Government than it makes for like service to individuals, and to furnish cars for the transportation of Government supplies and stores required at Fort Douglas, when required so to do, upon reasonable notice from the officer or officers desiring such transportation.

SEC. 5. That the following-described lands in said Salt Lake County, in the Territory of Utah, to wit: Section numbered 24 and the east half of section numbered 26, township numbered 1, range numbered 1 east, and the south half of section numbered 18, the west half of section numbered 20, and the north half of section numbered 30, in township numbered 1, range numbered 2 east, are hereby reserved from sale or other disposition, for the use of the United States, to protect and preserve the water-supply of Fort Douglas, in said county; but there is hereby granted to the Salt Lake Rock Company, its successors and assigns, the same rights and privileges, with the same limitations, in and upon the lands so reserved, as are reserved to such company in the lands specified in the second section of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting a right of way through certain public lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes."

Mr. McADOO. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to call for the regular order of business against the gentleman from Illinois, but we do not have a copy of this bill upon our desks, and I should like to have some explanation of it.

Mr. PAYSON. I can explain, Mr. Speaker, in one moment what is intended to be accomplished by the provisions of this bill, and I think I can do it to the satisfaction of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The military post of Fort Douglas, situated in Utah Territory, about 4 miles distant from Salt Lake City, comprises an area of 4 square miles. Its entire water supply comes from a creek known as Red Butte Creek, which is situated on the lands secured by this bill.

Mr. McADOO. I know all about Fort Douglas. I have been there.

Mr. PAYSON. The War Department has been endeavoring for years to secure that water supply for the benefit of the post; indeed, it is an imperative necessity. In the present Congress application came from the railway company for permission to locate the line of their road across the military reservation, subject to the approval of the War Department, in order to reach certain quarries of stone situated in Red Butte Cañon, from which the supply of building stone for use in Salt Lake City has been obtained for many years, and from which the supply demanded by the future growth of the city must be obtained. The same may be said of deposits of brick clay in the same locality.

As I have said, the War Department desired to secure this water supply. The military reservation is between the city of Salt Lake and this cañon, and the character of the country is such that it is absolutely impracticable to build a railroad to reach these quarries without crossing the reservation. The gentlemen interested in the Salt Lake Rock Company above Fort Douglas and the company interested in the railway line have come to an agreement, and the Committee on the Public Lands have reported that the right of way asked for may be properly granted to the railroad company under the bill with the proposed amendments.

The War Department and General Sheridan, as well as the post com-

mander, approve the proposition contained in this bill, namely: That the Salt Lake Rock Company owning the land shall deed to the Government 3,000 acres for the sum of \$20,000; and the Government shall grant the right of way across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation to enable the railroad company to reach these stone quarries, provided in carrying out this grant of the right of way it shall not be allowed to interfere with the water supply for Fort Douglas. The Committee on the Public Lands have recommended the passage of this bill, and the Committee on Military Affairs have also recommended its passage. At the last session of Congress leading members of the Committee on Appropriations also recommended its passage. And not only these committees have recommended it, but I understand the Secretary of War and the entire *personnel* of the War Department also approve of the pending measure as it is proposed to be amended.

There was no objection, and the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union was discharged from the further consideration of the bill and amendments.

The amendments were concurred in, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PAYSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The title of the bill was amended to read as follows:

A bill granting a right of way through certain public lands of the United States in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING, LYNN, MASS.

On motion of Mr. LOVERING, by unanimous consent, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1162) for the erection of a post-office building at Lynn, Mass.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the United States post-office at the city of Lynn, Mass. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of \$100,000: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys, and no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Massachusetts shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LOVERING moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STORM. I demand the regular order.

Mr. HISCOCK. I wish the gentleman would let me move the consideration of this bill. I ask unanimous consent to put it upon its passage.

Mr. STORM. Is it a public building bill?

Mr. HISCOCK. No, sir.

Mr. STORM. I withdraw the demand.

Mr. SWOPE. I renew it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill called up by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2533) for the relief of E. Remington & Sons.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist upon the demand for the regular order?

Mr. HISCOCK. I hope the gentleman will let me have the consideration of this bill. It will take but a few moments.

Mr. SWOPE. I insist upon the demand.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

WILLIAM ERVIN.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I submit a privileged report from a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 542) for the relief of William Ervin, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House of Representatives recede from its amendment to the Senate bill.

JAMES D. RICHARDSON,  
JAMES T. JOHNSTON,  
JOHN J. KLEINER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*  
JOHN C. SPOONER,  
J. N. DOLPH,  
J. K. JONES,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The statement accompanying the report is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House have agreed to the foregoing conference report for the reason that not to do so amounts to a denial of justice to the claimant. The bill of the Senate makes an appropriation direct to pay the claim in this case, while the bill as amended by the House refers the claim to the Court of Claims for investigation. The three main witnesses relied upon by claimant to establish his demand are now dead, and their proof can not be had in the Court of Claims. The proof is clear and irrefragable that the cattle were taken by Colonel Jennison's regiment and used for food for the United States Army; that they were worth the sum allowed in the bill of the Senate; that claimant was a loyal man residing in the State of Kansas, and that claimant has not been paid. The chief objection made to the passage of the bill of the Senate when same was under consideration in the House was that the claim was an old one, and its payment had not been pressed. The proof clearly shows that claimant began the prosecution of his claim very early after the close of the war, placing it in the hands of his attorneys in the city of Washington. The letter of these attorneys, dated April 30, on file in the case, shows this fact. The delay should not be considered fatal to the claim, as the claimant resided after the war in the State of Texas, was quite poor, and could not come to Washington to prosecute his claim. The managers, therefore, on the part of the House, recommend concurrence in the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to state one fact in connection with this case before action is taken upon it. When it was reported from the Committee of the Whole House, about a week or ten days ago, I had moved in committee to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, and to insert a provision referring it to the Court of Claims under the Bowman act to ascertain the facts. That amendment was agreed to, and the bill reported to the House, which adopted the amendment. It went to the Senate in that shape; but the Senate disagreed to the House amendment, and a committee of conference was ordered, which, after considering the matter, now recommend that the House recede from its amendment, the effect of which will pass the bill as it originally came from the Senate, appropriating the full amount to this party without going to the Court of Claims either under the Bowman act or otherwise. The claim is for about \$7,000, and originated before the war.

Mr. PERKINS. What has satisfied the conference committee that the claim is right?

Mr. SPRINGER. I was not a member of the conference committee, and cannot answer the question. The gentleman from Tennessee can. It is a claim that originated before the war.

Mr. SAYERS. Originated during the war.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated substantially what appears in the statement accompanying the conference report. The fact is the Senate passed the bill during the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress. A similar bill was pending in the House, and was favorably reported by the Committee on War Claims—unanimously reported. After that report was made the Senate passed this bill, which came before the House for consideration, and, as stated in the report, upon motion of the gentleman from Illinois, all after the enacting clause was stricken out, and there was inserted a provision sending the claim to the Court of Claims. The Committee on War Claims was satisfied with the justice of the claim. The citizen whose property was taken lived in Kansas and lost the cattle for which the claim was made; which were used to feed Colonel Jennison's regiment. He commenced the prosecution of the claim in 1867, and has been endeavoring to secure the settlement of it ever since.

Now, the committee of conference concluded it was wiser and better to take the Senate bill making the appropriation than to have a failure of legislation upon the subject, because they believed that to send the case to the Court of Claims would amount to a failure of legislation and a denial of justice. The three leading witnesses, Colonel Jennison, the captain, and the lieutenant or quartermaster, who testified in the case, are all dead, as I am informed, and hence there are no witnesses to substantiate the claim in the Court of Claims. The committee thought, therefore, as the claim had been fully proven by the testimony of these witnesses, as the man was loyal and lived in a loyal State—Kansas—as he furnished this beef to the army for the use of the soldiers who needed it, that he ought to have compensation. The committee find that a reasonable price is charged for the beef, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill. I know nothing more of it than that.

Mr. MORRILL. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. Did not Colonel Jennison, while living, certify to the fact that this beef was taken by his order and used by the troops?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRILL. And certified under oath?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir; his deposition is on file before the Committee on War Claims to that effect.

Mr. RANNEY. Let me ask why was it not allowed?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will yield to the gentleman for a question in a moment. The cause of the delay in the payment of this claim, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, was because Colonel Jennison—and I did not know the man at all—

Mr. MORRILL. I knew him very well.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Was absent from Kansas for a number of years after the war, in a distant State, possibly California. The gentleman from Kansas will know whether this is true or not.

Mr. MORRILL. I know the facts.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And this claimant, who was very poor, after

the war emigrated to Texas, and was unable to procure Colonel Jennison's testimony or the testimony of the other officers, which accounts for the delay.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. RANNEY. You have already answered the question I desired to ask.

Mr. PERKINS. I have no disposition to oppose the claim, but I will suggest that for years Colonel Jennison was one of the most conspicuous characters in the State of Kansas. He was a member of the Legislature of the State; his whereabouts was known to all Kansas people, and I think to the claim agents here in Washington who were engaged in prosecuting claims against the Government; and the fact that for years the claim was pending, and no effort made by these people to obtain his testimony is a suspicious circumstance to me. I know nothing of the claim itself, not having been on the committee that investigated it; but I call attention to these facts, which I do know, and then if the House is satisfied with the bill, I am content.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to say in answer to my colleague [Mr. PERKINS] that I was intimately acquainted with Colonel Jennison and also with Lieutenant Tanner, who took this beef; I served in the regiment. The colonel swears that he ordered Lieutenant Tanner to take the beef, and Lieutenant Tanner swears that he took it under the order of Colonel Jennison, not in the field of active operations, but a hundred miles off, near Emporia, in the State of Kansas, and he also swears that the beef was used for the command. Colonel Jennison's affidavit is on file. He was absent from the State of Kansas a number of years afterward, but at the time this claim was first presented, in 1867, they secured his affidavit and filed it. Lieutenant Tanner made a like affidavit, stating that his men took the beef and that it was used for the troops.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. Having been a member of that regiment, can you testify that you ate any of this particular beef? [Laughter.]

Mr. MORRILL. I can not say as to the particular beef.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But you know that the boys got the beef.

Mr. MORRILL. Yes; I know that they got the beef, and Lieutenant Tanner and Colonel Jennison swear to that fact.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then let us pay for it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was then agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1336) to authorize the construction of a bridge over Bayou Bernard, in the State of Mississippi;

A bill (H. R. 3110) directing the Secretary of War to amend the record of Harrison Dewey;

A bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of James M. McKamey;

A bill (H. R. 6046) for the relief of H. C. Wilkey; and

A bill (H. R. 4839) for the relief of the personal representatives of E. P. McNeal, deceased.

#### E. REMINGTON & SONS.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWOPE] has withdrawn his demand for the regular order, and I now ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2533) for the relief of E. Remington & Sons, and that it be put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to adjust the claims of E. Remington & Sons for drawback on arms exported by them in the years 1879 and 1880 without the filing of drawback entries thereof at the time of shipment; and that there shall be allowed and paid to said E. Remington & Sons, out of the appropriation to pay drawbacks made by the act of June 16, 1880, the sum of \$5,672.15, or so much thereof as shall be found due, in settlement of such claims, less 10 per cent. thereof, as provided by section 3019 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman please explain why this legislation is necessary?

Mr. HISCOCK. I will ask to have read a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which explains the matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 4, 1882.

SIR: I have received the letter of Messrs. E. Remington & Sons, which you referred to this Department, under the date of the 31st ultimo, in regard to their claim for drawback on certain arms exported by them.

The reasons why the claim was not paid in the regular manner were, first, that at the time of the exportation it was the rule of this Department that no drawback could be allowed under section 3019 of the Revised Statutes unless the materials entering into the manufacture of the merchandise were imported within three years from the date of exportation of the manufactured article; and, second, that no drawback entries were filed in these particular cases, the



parties alleging, and it is undoubtedly true, that the reason the drawback entries were not filed was that it seemed useless to file such entries in view of the rule, the materials having been imported more than three years. The rule was, however, subsequently revoked by an opinion of the Attorney-General; still, in the absence of the drawback entries, the Department did not feel authorized to waive its general regulations limiting drawback to cases where proper entries had been made.

I am informed that since the passage of the drawback law of 1861 it has been the unvarying rule of this Department to refuse allowance of drawback where entries for exportation were not filed, regardless of the reasons which led to the failure to file such entries. In the case of the Stone and Fleming Manufacturing Company, of the city of New York, a claim for drawback was rejected for the reason that drawback entries were not filed, the clerk of the company who was intrusted with the fees and the duty of making entries having stolen the fees and failed to perform his duty. A bill, H. R. 1982, was introduced in the third session of the Forty-sixth Congress for their relief, and it is understood is now before the Committee on Claims in the United States Senate.

It is suggested that the claim of Messrs. E. Remington & Sons, which is an equitable one, be incorporated in the bill for the relief of the Stone and Fleming Manufacturing Company. Messrs. Remington & Sons have been requested to furnish full details of the claims either to you or to this Department.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. J. FOLGER, *Secretary.*

Hon. WARNER MILLER, *United States Senate.*

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HISCOCK moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I now renew the demand for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

#### SECTION 1858 REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back adversely a bill (H. R. 10217) to amend section 1858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### LAKE FRONT, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported, as a substitute for joint resolution H. Res. 232, a joint resolution (H. Res. 256) relating to the title of the United States in the Lake front at Chicago, Ill.; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original joint resolution, H. Res. 232, was laid on the table.

Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back adversely a bill (H. R. 4154) for the erection of a United States prison, and for the imprisonment of United States prisoners, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. CASWELL submitted the views of the minority; which were ordered to be printed with the report of the committee.

#### RIGHT OF WAY, CROW RESERVATION, MONTANA.

Mr. PEEL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 10657) granting to the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Relief Company the right of way through a part of the Crow Indian reservation, in Montana Territory; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING, HASTINGS, NEBR.

Mr. WORTHINGTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 1974) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hastings, in Nebraska, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### ISLAND NEAR AURORA, ILL.

Mr. PAYSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 10233) to convey to and confirm in the city of Aurora, in the county of Kane, State of Illinois, a small island in Fox River, located within the limits of said city; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

#### WAGES OF EMPLOYÉS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS.

Mr. BUCHANAN, from the Committee on Labor, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 10508) providing for the payment of weekly wages by Government contractors to their employés; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGES OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. NEECE, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of bills

of the following titles; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions:

- A bill (H. R. 5137) granting a pension to Mrs. H. S. Gardiner; and
- A bill (H. R. 5138) granting a pension to Mrs. W. H. Cross.

#### ALONZO B. CHATFIELD.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported as a substitute for H. R. 10235, a bill (H. R. 11115) to increase the pension of Alonzo B. Chatfield; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

By unanimous consent, House bill 10235 was laid on the table.

#### ELLEN SHEA.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, also reported back favorably the bill (S. 924) granting a pension to Ellen Shea; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. ELDRIDGE, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of bills of the following titles; which were referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

- A bill (H. R. 11104) granting a pension to William E. Parker; and
- A bill (S. 3135) granting a pension to Catherine E. Babcock.

#### LIQUOR TRAFFIC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with amendments the bill (S. 1380) regulating the sale of distilled and fermented liquors in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### POLICE FORCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BARBOUR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, also reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10562) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1883; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### QUIETING TITLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10991) to quiet title to certain land in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### MORALS OF MINORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, also reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 10759) for the protection of the morals of minors in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the House Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The call of committees is now completed, but if there be no objection the Chair will recognize for the presentation of reports gentlemen who were not in their seats when their committees were called.

There was no objection.

#### ROBERT BAXTER.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2935) granting a pension to Robert Baxter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees begins at eighteen minutes after 1 o'clock. The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department was passed over on a previous day with the understanding that it should not lose its place. If that committee is now ready to proceed it is entitled to do so.

#### EFFICIENCY OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. On behalf of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department I call up for present consideration the bill (S. 2877) to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office. I ask that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of this bill, and that it be now considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SINGLETON. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The regular order is proceeding.

Mr. ROGERS. Let us know what the bill is before the question is put upon discharging the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The bill will be read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. STORM. As this bill involves an increase of salaries it ought to receive its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering this bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. McMILLIN in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill (S. 2877) to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there shall be in the General Land Office ten principal clerks, chiefs of divisions, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall receive a salary of \$2,000 each per annum.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it ought not to take more than a few minutes to dispose of this bill. I will explain its nature. At the first session of this Congress in the bill providing for the expenses of the General Land Office these clerks were provided for at a salary of \$2,000 each. The bill passed the House, went over to the Senate, and there it was non-concurred in and amended so as to have three principal clerks chiefs of division at a salary of \$1,800, and the other seven as fourth-class clerks.

Now, this bill has come from the Senate to the House, passed there unanimously. It is recommended by the present Secretary of the Interior and by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and has been recommended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior from General Williamson's time down to the present.

Mr. DUNHAM. Are these clerks in addition to the present force?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. They are not additional clerks. They are the present clerks allowed by law. But the bill simply fixes their salary at something near that which is allowed to the chiefs of divisions in other Departments of the Government and in the other bureaus of the Interior Department.

I have a statement before me which will give the exact status of this case. I can repeat the substance of it, perhaps, more quickly than I can read it. In all the other Executive Departments of the Government and the other bureaus corresponding to this the chiefs of these divisions receive from \$2,250 per annum to \$3,500 per annum. This is the only instance in the Departments where an unjust discrimination is made against the chiefs of divisions. And inasmuch as the bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and has been recommended also by their predecessors, I think we may concede they understand their business fully as well as anybody. I shall now ask for a vote unless some gentleman desires to offer an amendment or desires to be heard.

Mr. STORM. Is there a report?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. STORM. I should like to have the report read.

The report (by Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa) was read, as follows:

They adopt the Senate report and make it their own, which is as follows:

The attention of Congress has been frequently called to the fact that a number of persons employed in the General Land Office, and who act as chiefs of divisions, receive an inadequate salary considering the character and amount of work required of them. It appears from the following statement that the matter has been heretofore presented in the several reports of the Commissioners of the General Land Office. Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill, and append the following statement as a part of this report:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,  
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1886.

Statement showing recommendations made as to compensation of chiefs of divisions in the General Land Office for the fiscal years 1880 to 1885, inclusive, with remarks of the Commissioners of the General Land Office relative thereto.

1880.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. J. A. Williamson, Commissioner: Three chiefs of division, at \$3,000; five chiefs, at \$2,400; and eight assistant chiefs, at \$2,000.

Remarks.—The magnitude, the difficulty, and the national importance of the work can hardly be overstated; and it would seem self-evident that it can not be done, and well done, except by able men, and so far no provision at all commensurate with the magnitude of the interests involved has been made.

1881.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. N. C. McFarland, Commissioner: Three principal clerks and six chiefs of division, at \$2,600 per annum.

Remarks.—"I have sought to name the very lowest figures which, in my judgment, would possibly justify a reasonable expectation of retaining what good and competent men are now employed and thoroughly skilled in the business, and of obtaining from the outside a class of ability which the public have a right to expect will be employed to adjust the vast interests committed to this office."

1882.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. N. C. McFarland, Commissioner: Three principal clerks and seven chiefs of division, at \$2,400.

Remarks.—"The three principal clerks and seven chiefs of division have immediate charge and direction of the varied and important work assigned to their respective divisions. The long service of the gentlemen occupying these posts of trust, the magnitude of the labor performed by them, the importance of the duty, and the ability demanded for its discharge, merit the increased compensation asked for. At present they are paid as ordinary clerks of the fourth class, a rate disproportionate to the class of services absolutely required in these positions."

"The attention of Congress has frequently been called to the inadequate remuneration of the important officers of this bureau, and the amount of compensation now estimated for is believed to be within the most moderate limit and no greater than that allowed in corresponding positions in other Departments of the Government."

1883.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. N. C. McFarland, Commissioner: Three principal clerks and seven chiefs of division, at \$2,000 per annum.

Remarks.—"The compensation provided for clerks and employes of the lower grades is reasonable; but the duties which clerks of higher grades are required to perform call for a degree of intelligence and ability that can not be retained in the service, when secured, at the inadequate compensation provided for. The Government needs the best service it can obtain and is able to pay for it, but the Land Office is often unable to retain valuable clerks. The salaries paid in the Land Office are less than in other bureaus and Departments not requiring as great capacity or ability. A transfer has recently been made from an eighteen-hundred-dollar position in this office, requiring professional skill of a high order, to a similar but not more onerous position in another Department where the pay allowed is \$2,500. A skilled assistant, whose services were needed, but who could here be paid but \$1,600, received \$2,000 by a similar transfer."

1884.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. N. C. McFarland, Commissioner: Eleven chiefs of division, at \$2,500 per annum.

Remarks.—The chiefs of division have, respectively, charge of a particular class of work, and of the clerical force employed upon it. They must know generally the rules of the office and the laws governing the land system, the relations of the classes being so intermixed as frequently to involve nearly the whole of them in the consideration of a single case. No higher service is performed by the subordinate officers of any Department, not excepting the Treasury, where the salaries range from \$2,250 to \$2,750.

1885.—Recommendations and remarks of Hon. William A. J. Sparks, Commissioner: Two chiefs of division at \$2,250, and nine chiefs of division at \$2,000 per year.

Remarks.—He reiterates the remarks of his predecessor relative to the increased compensation recommended.

In connection with the above, attention is called to the following statement showing compensation paid to chiefs of divisions in State, Treasury, War, and Post-Office Departments, and in other Bureaus of the Interior Department:

STATE DEPARTMENT.

Six chiefs of division, at \$2,100 per annum.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's office.

Three chiefs of division, at \$2,750 per annum.  
Seven chiefs of division, at \$2,500 per annum.  
One chief of division, at \$2,000 per annum.  
Chief Secret Service Division, at \$3,500 per annum.  
Chief Internal Revenue Agents, at \$12 per day.  
Chief Special Agents' Division, at \$8 per day.

OTHER BUREAUS.

Six chiefs of division, at \$2,500 per annum.  
Five chiefs of division, at \$2,250 per annum.  
Four chiefs of division, at \$2,200 per annum.  
Eleven chiefs of division, at \$2,100 per annum.  
Thirty-seven chiefs of division, at \$2,000 per annum.

WAR DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's Office.

Three chiefs of division, at \$2,000 per annum.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Two chiefs of division, at \$2,250 per annum.  
Five chiefs of division, at \$2,000 per annum.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's office.

Eight chiefs of division, at \$2,000 per annum.

Other bureaus.

Twenty-one chiefs of divisions, at \$2,000 per annum.  
Twenty-six principal examiners (chiefs of division), at \$2,400 per annum.

It will be seen from the above that the chiefs of division in the other Executive Departments, and in the other bureaus of the Interior Department, range from \$2,000 to \$3,500 per annum and the General Land Office is the only Bureau in any Government Department in this city where the chiefs of division are not paid in excess of \$1,800 per annum. This is a discrimination without a justification.

In December, 1881, and January, 1882, the United States Senate Committee on Public Lands made an exhaustive examination into the condition of the General Land Office and the work performed therein, and submitted a report thereon (Senate Report No. 362, Forty-seventh Congress, first session). As a result thereof, in the first session Forty-eighth Congress a bill (S. 554) "to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office" was introduced and passed by the Senate; it was submitted to the House of Representatives, read twice therein, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, but no action was taken on the same by said committee, and the bill failed to become a law.

Among other provisions in said bill was one for ten "chiefs of division" in the General Land Office, to "receive a salary of \$2,250 a year each." During the debate in the Senate relative thereto a communication was read from Hon. H. M. TELLER, then Secretary of the Interior (now United States Senator), transmitting copy of a letter dated January 21, 1884, from Hon. N. C. McFarland, Commissioner of the General Land Office, relative to which he states, "with whom I fully concur." In said letter the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office refers to the fact that "in all other bureaus of the Executive Departments chiefs of division are paid from \$2,000 to \$2,500 a year," and after specifying some of the bureaus he states, "In no other office or Department are chiefs of divisions required to perform more important duties than in the General Land Office, but in this office the organization established at an early period still remains. Chiefs of division (except of public lands, private land claims, and surveys) are detailed from clerks of the fourth class, and none receive more pay than any other fourth-class clerks, while in other offices chiefs of division are appointed as such and receive a higher rate of compensation than the classified clerks. I inclose herewith a partial list of officers provided for in several bureaus and Departments, showing the discrimination against this office, which appear to me unreasonable and unjust." (See pages 2501 and 2502, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-eighth Congress, first session.)

In the bill making appropriations for the expenses of the General Land Office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887 (H. R. 8974, Forty-ninth Congress, first session), provision was made for ten principal clerks at \$2,000 each, which is the same number provided for in Senate bill 554, first session Forty-eighth Congress, but at a reduced compensation of \$250 per year each, yet, notwithstanding the United States Senate in 1884 were willing to provide (and actually did provide, so far as the Senate was concerned) for ten principal clerks in the General Land Office at a salary of \$2,250 per year each, they now, in 1886, are not willing to approve of the House bill providing for ten principal clerks at \$1,800 per year, and provide for the remainder as clerks of the fourth class.

Precisely the same class of work devolves upon the chiefs of division in the General Land Office now as devolved upon them in 1885; if they were entitled to \$2,250 per year, or even \$2,000 per year, in 1884, they are unquestionably entitled to an equal compensation now.



Mr. STORM. The gentleman from Iowa says this bill does not increase the number of clerks and officers in the Interior Department?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. It does not.

Mr. STORM. As I understand there is now the same number of clerks. Are those clerks now discharging the duties of chiefs of divisions?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. There are now paid \$1,800 per annum as chiefs of divisions, and the others who discharge those duties are detailed from the fourth-class clerks.

Mr. STORM. Then the bill simply increases the salaries of ten officers from \$1,800 to \$2,000?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEELE. I ask the gentleman from Iowa if one of the purposes of this bill is not to take these men out of the civil-service class?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. It is not.

Mr. MORRISON. They are out already. These are all Democrats. Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. The bill fixes the salary at the amount fixed by the House in the bill passed at the first session of this Congress.

Mr. STEELE. But does not the bill have the effect I have stated?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. As a matter of course it has that effect.

Mr. STEELE. I am sure that the gentlemen on the other side do not wish to evade the civil-service law. They all voted for it.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I believe I have the floor, and I do not yield for a speech. If any gentleman desires to offer an amendment I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to offer an amendment which I think will greatly promote the efficiency of the General Land Office if accepted. The Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

Add to the bill these words:  
"Provided, That the chief of division longest in the public service shall be the Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office, and while so acting shall receive a salary of \$3,500 per annum for his services."

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I make the point of order that that is not germane to the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. If I understand the purport of the bill it is to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office; and the object of this amendment is that the work of the Land Department may become efficient in fact. I think the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. The amendment enlarges the scope of the bill and is not germane to its purpose.

Mr. BURROWS. I would ask my friend from Iowa if this bill in any way affects the status of clerks under the civil-service law?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. It makes the salaries of these clerks \$2,000.

Mr. BURROWS. Does it subject them to removal?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. No, sir; it makes no change except as to their salaries.

Mr. REED. How are they selected?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. As they have always been.

Mr. BURROWS. Under the operation of this bill can these clerks not be removed and anybody appointed without examination?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. That is the case with every other chief of division in every Department. Of course that would be the effect.

Mr. MORRISON. I wish to suggest that this violation of the civil-service law comes from the Senate.

Mr. BURROWS. It makes no difference where it comes from.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. CUTCHEON. Would not this put out the Commissioner?

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. Yes; I think it would.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. Yes; it would put out the sparks. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. The amendment changes the law. It would lead to confusion. I therefore insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The title of the bill is to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office. It changes the position of a few officers there. While the Chair is not absolutely certain on the question, he is inclined to the opinion it is for the committee to determine what will increase the efficiency of the office, and he therefore rules the amendment to be in order.

The question recurred on the amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 66, noes 82.

Mr. THOMPSON. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. WEAVER of Iowa.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 63, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House.

Mr. STEELE. I move the committee rise for the purpose of striking out the enacting clause, and on that motion I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 61, noes 80.

Mr. STEELE. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa, and Mr. STEELE.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 5, noes 76.

Mr. STEELE. No quorum.

Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa. There is but one course to pursue under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee finding itself without a quorum, the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called; and the following members failed to answer to their names:

|                 |                 |                |                  |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Adams, J. J.    | Dockery,        | Le Fevre,      | Reese,           |
| Aiken,          | Dougherty,      | Lore,          | Smalls,          |
| Atkinson,       | Dunn,           | Louttit,       | Spriggs,         |
| Ballentine,     | Ellsberry,      | Lowry,         | Stahnecker,      |
| Barnes,         | Fleeger,        | Markham,       | Stewart, Charles |
| Bland,          | Foran,          | Matson,        | Stewart, J. W.   |
| Browne, T. M.   | Gibson, Eustace | Merriman,      | St. Martin,      |
| Campbell, T. J. | Glover,         | Morrill,       | Stone, E. F.     |
| Candler,        | Hanback,        | Neece,         | Struble,         |
| Collins,        | Hayden,         | Negley,        | Taulbee,         |
| Compton,        | Haynes,         | O'Neill, J. J. | Townshend,       |
| Cox, S. S.      | Henley,         | Perkins,       | Tucker,          |
| Crisp,          | Hepburn,        | Perry,         | Ward, T. B.      |
| Curtin,         | Hutton,         | Peters,        | White, Milo      |
| Davis,          | Iron,           | Pidcock,       | Woodburn.        |
| Dawson,         | Laird,          | Plumb,         |                  |

The committee rose; and Mr. SPRINGER having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. McMILLIN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (S. 2877) to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office, and finding itself without a quorum, had, under the rule, caused the roll to be called, and he now reported the names of the absentees to the House.

The SPEAKER. On the roll-call 254 members answered to their names, and, under the rule, a quorum appearing, the committee will resume its session.

The Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumed its session, Mr. McMILLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee resumes the consideration of the bill (S. 2877) to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office. The committee was dividing by tellers on the motion to strike out the enacting clause, and the tellers will resume their places.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the count begin *de novo*?

The CHAIRMAN. It is customary to begin the count anew. The hour for the consideration of bills has expired, and the committee will rise.

The committee rose; and Mr. SPRINGER having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. McMILLIN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had, according to order, had under consideration the bill (S. 2877) to promote the efficiency of the General Land Office, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR BILLS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour for the consideration of bills has expired.

Mr. BELMONT. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider general appropriation bills.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest to the gentleman from New York to indicate some time when general debate on the pending appropriation bill will be closed. I would suggest two hours as the time.

Mr. BELMONT. So far as I am concerned, I considered at the outset of the debate we might easily have got through the bill in one legislative day. Now, however, gentlemen who have spoken on the bill have so misunderstood its provisions, I think it absolutely necessary the House should give some attention to it. I demand the previous question on my motion.

Mr. DUNHAM. I ask a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DUNHAM. How much time have gentlemen taken up on this question.

Mr. BELMONT. There has been time enough to give the House false impressions. The increase over last year's appropriation is but a little over \$40,000.

Mr. DUNHAM. As I understand, they have already occupied a good part of two days. Now at this stage of the session I do not think the House ought to give any more time to a discussion of this kind.

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman from New York submit a proposition to limit debate? Fix some time at which the debate shall close.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust the gentleman will consent to some limitation. Other bills are pressing.

Mr. HATCH. And if the gentleman does not desire to fix a time, I hope he will permit the House to come to some conclusion as to the proper time to close this debate.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that the debate be closed in two hours and a half.

A MEMBER. To be equally divided?

Mr. DUNHAM. I move to amend by making it fifteen minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state in answer to the gentleman from Illinois that two hours and thirty minutes have already been consumed in general debate upon the bill.

The gentleman from New York now proposes that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the appropriation bill, and, pending that, that all general debate be closed in two hours and thirty minutes.

Mr. DUNHAM. I move to strike out "two hours and thirty minutes" and insert "thirty minutes."

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 42, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BELMONT. I now call the previous question upon my motion.

The previous question was ordered, under the operation of which the motion to limit debate to two hours and thirty minutes was agreed to.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives on bills of the following titles, namely:

A bill (S. 2225) to indemnify certain subjects of the Chinese Empire for losses sustained by the violence of a mob at Rock Springs, in the Territory of Wyoming, in September, 1885;

A bill (S. 712) for the erection of a public building at Augusta, Ga.;

A bill (S. 305) for the erection of a public building at Huntsville, Ala.; and

A bill (S. 93) authorizing the construction of a public building for the post-office in the city of Houston, Tex.

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1131) to amend an act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Detroit, Mich., asked a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. MAHONEY, Mr. VEST, and Mr. PALMER managers on the part of the Senate.

Also, that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 7508) granting the right of way to the Annapolis and Baltimore Short-Line Railroad Company across the Government farm connected with the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 3186) to declare a forfeiture of lands granted to the New Orleans, Baton Rouge and Vicksburg Railroad Company, to confirm title to certain lands, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 10051) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, S. C.;

An act (H. R. 8923) to amend an act in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes, approved June 10, 1880;

An act (H. R. 9644) for the erection of a public building at Jefferson, Tex.;

An act (H. R. 10242) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; and

An act (H. R. 9371) for the completion of a public building at Santa Fé, N. Mex.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. BLOUNT in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, upon which the House has limited all general debate to two hours and thirty minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is entitled to twenty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I will yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN], with the request that he yield one minute at the close of his remarks to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi, withholds his remarks for revision. [See Appendix.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] has gone to the cloak-room to receive the congratulations of those in this Hall who are pleased with what he has said; but if he went to the place where he would receive the most intelligent and thorough approbation of the practical results of his views, he would seek a gathering of rich men—millionaires of elegant leisure—who would gladly take, unpaid, these offices in the diplomatic service which are now underpaid, and make the whole foreign service of this country simply a corps of rich men, to the exclusion of the great body of your constituents and mine. Every word that the gentleman said was, in its tendency, in favor of the reduction of even that meager payment now allowed to the slender organization which constitutes our foreign service. The duties and surroundings to which you send these officers compel them to expenditure or expose them to contempt. Do you wish them to be objects of derision? If you do not pay them suf-

ficiently to live at least well enough to escape a sneer they will draw on their own means or quit. A man without ample means will not be appointed. That will be the result.

There is not another nation in the world of one-half the weight or importance of ours that has not a foreign service larger than ours, and far better paid in every grade, and—I do not know that I can feel any national pride in saying it—their consular service is proportionally more efficient, far-reaching, and successful.

Now this bill, which has been here denounced as full of extravagances and of multiplication of officers, framed expressly for men seeking gilded rank in the diplomatic service, does what? Increases the pay of two of our ministers—only two, the minister to China and the minister to the Argentine Republic; and the increase amounts to \$8,000—not \$50,500 of increased diplomatic salaries, as has been said on this floor. There is an increase, as has been said with great emphasis, of more than \$50,000 in the diplomatic section of the bill, but that is for other expenditures, and much the largest item is required to build a house in which our minister to Japan shall reside, to cost \$25,000. I think that even the constituents of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] would deem it economy to build a house for our representative to live in at a cost of \$25,000, rather than go on paying rent, as we have paid \$34,000 in rent during the last ten years.

Mr. Chairman, it is ordinarily a thankless task to defend the foreign service. The members of that service are not like the postmasters, the collectors of internal revenue, and the other office-holders close at home, who are always at hand, always active among the people, and who can be so useful to the politicians that take care of them and make up in severe virtue and economy of public money by attacking the far-away consuls and ministers.

The longer they are at their posts, the more attentive they are to their duties, the less hold they have upon political support at home. It is a service the functions of which, when properly exercised, are of the highest character. Our ministers abroad are not daily workers, like clerks, employed for so many hours; but their duties of watchfulness, of intelligent vigilance, are of transcendent importance.

I will say but one word more of them. Their highest function, their greatest ambition, their glory and success are always to maintain peace among men. It is a matter of most serious discredit to a minister to have allowed irritation to grow up unnecessarily between peoples where national interests are committed to his charge; and the greatest zeal of every minister we have abroad is directed to promptly smoothing away each difficulty, achieving what are really great and substantial triumphs unheard of by the world. All the peace societies on earth are but second in influence and action weighed beside these active ministers of peace, who constantly penetrate to the heart of every cabinet and clique, and keep silent all the guns of the numberless armies of Europe. We can drop them if we choose; and I believe it would be better to abolish the service than to degrade it.

The consular service is changed much more in this bill, though less comment has been made on that. The largest apparent increase of expenditure in the bill is for consuls; but this does not arise from the creation of new functionaries. You, gentlemen [addressing the Democratic side of the House], came here pledged to reduce extravagance, to cut off useless offices. Here is an opportunity to reduce extravagance, by stopping the payment of over \$150,000 in fees to seventy consuls, and fixing their salaries at fair rates, amounting in all to \$125,000. This is no favoritism to pets. It is not the consuls who ask to have their pay changed from fees to fixed salaries; it is proposed by the President and Secretary of State, by the men who organize and watch them—the men in the Department, just as the high executive officers of every other great government have long since effected that change from uncertainly-known fees to salaries fixed and known to all the world. The consul prefers the indeterminate fees, the amount of which you can not well find out, which may make his pay three times as great as you would suspect.

I know from experience years ago in the Department of State, and I know from the statement just sent us by Secretary Bayard, that there is not to-day in that Department, as there was not in the days when it was administered by Republican energy and purity, any way to certainly find out all that takes place in a feed consulate. The temptation to irregularity is continual, and irregularities are continually discovered. The people who pay the taxes are entitled to know exactly what a public servant receives; and if the Democratic party has the courage to write down opposite to each officer's name in the public records just how much expense the people must bear to keep that man in office, they do well; even if it does apparently, though not really, increase expenditure, and I for one will support them in that course. The people ought to be able to know exactly what burden the public treasury bears. At present, gentlemen, it is not only impossible for your constituents to know this, but you can not find it out yourselves with all the powers and privileges of members of Congress.

The fee system came with the beginning of our whole consular system, a hundred years ago, when we were very poor and glad to get some merchant at a port where our people traded to perform the duties of consul in return for the fees collected. Gradually the more important posts have been salaried, and the fees required to be turned into the



Treasury. But most of them remain paid in fees—some largely, but most of them very moderately. A great part of our consular force is now paid little more than \$50 to each man in fees. But of those who have the fat places the Department has selected seventy and proposed to put them on a salary, with the requirement that the fees be turned into the Treasury. Those fees for these places amount to over \$150,000 annually, while the aggregate of the salaries proposed is \$125,000. It is a movement in the right direction. It diminishes the vicious fee system of compensation. It will purify the service, improve the revenues of the Government, and promote every national interest.

There is no danger, as my friend from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] feared, that there will be loss to the Government in fees. Not at all. No merchant ever made a shipment or refrained from making a shipment on account of the invoice fee. But the loss now to the Government, which ought to have been evident to the gentleman and which experience in the Department would quickly show to any one, is in the revenue collected at the custom-houses. Suppose a feed consul has an office in a city near one where there is a salaried consul. A merchant wants to invoice his goods falsely—to undervalue them when shipped for the United States so that they may be entered at New York at a low rate and a low tariff duty be paid to the Government on them. I know a case where a merchant with \$50,000 worth of goods went to a consul who was salaried, who had no motive to accept a false invoice, and who refused to certify it unless the merchant put up his figures to the true values.

Then the merchant went on to a feed consul, who was very anxious to have that merchant's custom, eager to have him bring all his invoices there to have them certified that he might get the certifying fee, and who at once placed the certificate upon the invoice and signed it, putting an undervaluation on that whole body of goods, so that when they came to the custom-house and the duty was assessed upon them the Government was cheated to the extent of over \$15,000. There was the economy of not paying one officer a salary but letting him have fees, and paying the other a salary, which still left him with his manhood. We had a communication not long ago from the Secretary of the Treasury saying that in a country where we have feed consulates with a special kind of fee enormously remunerative, invoices are practically almost worthless to the custom-house officers in determining the real value of imported goods. Put your consuls on salaries and they will be, as they ought to be, watchful experts, sentinels of the Treasury.

This increase of expenditure in the bill which seems so large is apparent, not real. The officers are receiving, many of them, more than the salaries specified in the bill. These increases, too, all along the line, are a complete vindication of the recommendations of the Secretaries of State in the last eight years. They are an answer that is complete to the bitter speeches, the partisan appeals, and the complaints of extravagance with which we were met on this floor for so many years. The increases now proposed are larger than were ever presented under Republican administration.

I speak, not as a partisan, but in the interests of my country and the public service when I say that the recommendations made then stand as wise and just to-day as they were then, whether they come from Republican or Democratic hands.

The cardinal duties of a consul are to defend the rights of American citizens, to promote commerce, and to protect the revenue. Here is a long list of consuls who are now paid \$1,000 a year and permitted to trade—that is, the consuls are merchants.

What system is that? The man who is to watch over the revenue is himself the man to be watched—the merchant most interested to cheat the Government. And how is he interested to enlarge and promote commerce? There are abundant instances where consuls in foreign ports, who were themselves the merchants, so used and abused their position and privileges as consuls that the firm to which the consul belonged as a partner succeeded in monopolizing the whole of the trade with this country. Is that promoting commerce—to establish by law an official machinery that will beget such a pernicious and stifling monopoly of trade? That is what we have to-day in all this \$1,000 consulates, for our law permits all of that salary to enter into trade. They are to protect the rights of American citizens, yet we make a man consul who is an active merchant, and does the work of consul with his left hand, while with his right he is straining every nerve to make a fortune. Is that the man who will give his time and care to protect an American citizen? Why, the unfortunate American imprisoned or wronged will often have to use management and influence to get an interview with the busy merchant.

Protect the revenue, he himself the maker of the invoices! Promote commerce, he the spy on every other merchant's business, who must show him all his invoices to get them certified! Upon recommendation of the Secretary of State this bill raises the pay of these \$1,000 consuls to \$1,500 and prohibits their entering into business. It does increase their pay in consideration of this restriction, but I hope respectable and intelligent American citizens can be sent out to these posts who will be altogether consuls and altogether Americans. It enlarges expense, but is it not in fact economy? And all of us Republicans and Democrats ought to wish to take every efficient step to promote the commerce of our country, to protect the revenue of the na-

tion, and to guard inviolate the rights of American citizens everywhere by faithful agents of our Government who give their whole time to their public duty.

Here is also a list of inspectors provided in this bill. As to these officers, and all officers of this kind, I think they are utterly worthless if they are appointed to provide hospitals for political lame ducks. But if they are wisely selected, and they should be chosen with great care, and if they devote themselves zealously and impartially to their public duties, there can be no better addition to the service.

The popular vote has intrusted the executive power to the Democratic party, and they have chosen their men to exercise it. Now, when they ask for the instruments and ask for the amount which I am convinced is no more than is necessary for the full efficiency of a great public service, I think it right to vote them what they ask, and then hold them responsible for the consequences. They will not conduct the public business in the way we would like, nor appoint the men who I think are most worthy, but I honor the courage that proposes to put down in plain figures, which all the country can read, the true amount every office-holder shall receive; to write on the wall, even though it increases an appropriation bill, the salary of every public servant, that every taxpayer may know just where every cent of the public money goes.

I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt in the short time I have in the general discussion to confine myself to the questions involved in this bill. I hope not to be drawn aside from those questions by some of the speeches which have preceded upon matters not in the bill further than to allude to their irrelevancy. I can only discuss in the time I have the principal changes and reforms proposed in the bill, which are the transfer of consuls from one class to another, and placing some who now receive fees alone in the classes receiving salaries, and turning fees now retained by them into the public Treasury. The other miscellaneous changes proposed in the bill I have not time to discuss and will not allude to, except the provision as to consular inspectors.

The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LORE] yesterday, whom I do not see in his seat to-day, discussed the bill under consideration as though it were a question of civil service, or of the distribution of offices in the State Department. He based his complaint against the Secretary of State on the ground that that official, in compliance with law, in a letter to the Speaker of the House, giving his opinion as to whether or not any employes in that Department could be dispensed with and the work of the Department be kept up, advised against the removal of or the diminution of the number of employes. From this the gentleman from Delaware would infer that the Secretary, because he said there were no employes in that Department he could dispense with and carry on the public business, therefore was opposed to any change there, and he was surprised that being opposed to change there he would now be in favor of a change in the diplomatic and consular service. It seems to me the consideration of this bill was simply made an opportunity to criticize the Secretary of State, who merely stated, in accordance with the law, that there were no employes in the State Department which could be dispensed with.

The law did not contemplate that he should constitute himself a partisan in this official communication relating to the force in his Department, to say that the employes should be turned out because they did not belong to the same political party to which he belongs. When the gentleman from Delaware can properly discuss the civil-service law he and I may not be very far apart, for I am not its advocate; but it has nothing to do with the pending measure, and its discussion has no place here upon this bill. Now let us consider some of the objections raised to this measure.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] a few days ago read a list of consulates, with the small fees collected at each. By this he sought to impress the House with the idea that they were unimportant points on account of the small fees collected, although this bill proposes that a fixed salary be provided for each of them larger than the present compensation. I wish to refer to a few of those mentioned by the gentleman on that occasion, and to show that the amount of fees is not a test of the importance of the consulate. For instance, he referred to the post of Odessa, where the fees were about \$180 last year. He put that among the unimportant consulates because the fees were so small, and called attention to the fact that this bill proposed to fix an increased salary. Now, what are the facts as to the importance of this post? The figures in the State Department show that for one quarter in 1885, the quarter ending June 30, the amount of shipments from that point to the United States reached \$137,000.

The most of that was wool. The tariff on wool of a certain grade is 10 per cent., and on a certain other grade 20 per cent.; so that it is fair to assume that the duty paid to the Government of the United States on the amount of wool shipped from Odessa in that one quarter was not less than \$20,000. This Government therefore was interested to the extent of \$20,000 at least in one quarter's shipment from that port; and yet the consular fees amounted last year to but about \$180. The gentleman from Kentucky, no doubt honest in this matter, but failing to thoroughly investigate the facts bearing upon the question of importance of this and many other ports, and superficially looking only to the amount of fees collected, has placed it before the House as an



unimportant consulate, and asks you to deal with questions vitally affecting the interests of the people in that manner.

What more vitally affects the interests of the people than an honest collection of the revenues due to the Government than to prevent swindling and smuggling and fraud?

The gentleman also referred to Buenos Ayres, which he put in the list as an unimportant post. There it is also proposed to increase the salary. There were exported from this point to the United States for the three months ending June 30, 1885, goods amounting to \$1,430,000, or nearly one and a half millions of dollars. And yet the fees were quite small. So I might go through with the seventeen classed by the gentleman as unimportant simply because the fees are small, and with a few exceptions show that the amount of the shipments from those points to this country are quite large, and that the question of fees is no criterion whatever by which to judge of the extent of the business.

Take for instance the shipment of fine wool from Odessa, the quality of which is high and expensive. A cargo of \$100,000, upon which the tax due this Government might be \$20,000, may be covered by a single invoice, but the consular fees would only amount to \$2.50. It is not, then, the amount of the invoice that measures the fees, but the number of invoices. It may be that there are many small shipments and a small cargo, and the aggregate of the fees collected would be quite large, whereas, as in the case I have mentioned, there may be but a single shipment covering an immense value and yet the fee would be only \$2.50.

Mr. McCREARY. Let me interrupt the gentleman for a moment. I did not hear his remarks a moment ago with reference to these consulates. I would like him to tell me what the fees are at Gaboon, Africa. It appears to me that last year they were \$7.50 and I would like to know the business done there.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the gentleman had heard my remarks he would have heard me say with reference to these seventeen consulates enumerated by him as unimportant that from nearly all of them, with a few exceptions, there was quite an extensive amount of shipments to this country, and I cited one or two instances in support of my statement. I did not say that there were extensive shipments from all of them. You may take Cape Town and Gaboon, Africa, and Levuka, which places will show very small shipments and of course very small fees.

But there are special reasons why if we have consuls at these places they should be better paid, and not be put in the one-thousand-dollar class. It costs to go from this country to Levuka, in the Fiji Islands, a man and his wife alone, \$750. So that to go and return would take \$1,500, while the salary is but \$1,000. If the office is not a necessary one, if it is not desirable to have a consul there, it should be abolished altogether. But if we do send one we should at least pay his necessary expenses. So also there are a few other places mentioned where the shipments are inconsiderable; but these are places where the country is hoping to build up a large trade, and are exceptional. The gentleman from Delaware, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky, seem to argue that where we have but little trade we ought to have no consul at all, and ought not to try to enlarge the trade.

Among the other places mentioned by the gentleman from Kentucky in his list of seventeen is Cardiff. The consul there collected last year only the very small amount of \$288 fees, and therefore it is classed by the gentleman as an unimportant place. The direct trade of that point with the United States in the last year was \$3,785,000. The number of American seamen discharged and shipped from that point was more than six hundred last year. It is second only to Liverpool as regards the discharge and shipment of American seamen back to this country. The consul has all this work to deal with without fees. He must hear and settle all disputes and differences between them and the masters of vessels.

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to ask the gentleman a question about Cardiff.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Very well.

Mr. McCREARY. Does he not know that for many years the salary of the consul at Cardiff in Great Britain has been but \$2,000? Now, in what respect has there been a change of business so as to make it necessary and proper for us to increase the salary?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have but little time to discuss these details. It is wholly immaterial whether there has been a change of business there recently or not. Certainly business and commerce and their conducts have undergone many great changes since the present classifications were fixed, and readjustment is necessary. I want to consider the matter as we find it. It matters not what was recommended by the Democratic committee in 1877, which has been adverted to in the debate. That may have been enough or it may not. There may have been some political considerations in fixing it. I have nothing to do with these questions; but whether the salary has been \$2,000 heretofore or \$3,000, and I am informed it is \$3,000—

Mr. BELMONT. The salary is \$2,000, and the whole compensation brings it up to \$3,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I see the salary proposed in the bill is \$2,500, and the fees to be turned into the Treasury, so that in this case as in many others, if the gentleman from New York is correct as to the fees

here, while there is an increase of \$500 in salary, there is really a decrease of compensation by putting the fees in the Treasury. In many cases the bill reduces the compensation of the consuls, and in others increases them. Altogether I believe this bill to be as economical as the present law, and will work important reforms if passed.

I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] if their constituents desire that the American seamen who may be thrown out in ports in foreign countries shall be turned loose and not cared for by this Government, or shall fall into the hands of irresponsible and incompetent consuls?

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to answer that question now.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The gentleman from Kentucky has had twice as much time as I will have.

Mr. McCREARY. If the gentleman refuses to let me answer his question, all right.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I repeat, that the gentleman from Kentucky has had twice as much time as I will have. I have heard his questions, but can not yield for a speech from him in my limited time.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Has a gentleman a right to ask a question and then refuse to yield for an answer?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I did not ask the gentlemen to stop in their arguments that I might answer their questions and inject a speech in the midst of theirs, and they have both spoken.

Mr. McCREARY. You should not have asked the question if you did not desire an answer.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I merely asked the question in argument, for you to think of, and to answer if you so desire in your own time.

Tangier and Algiers are places where there are sanitariums where people of foreign countries are taken care of. Afflicted people go there to build up their health. The consuls representing this Government there are the only people to whom our citizens in those places can look for protection. Without them they would often be greatly harassed and dealt with harshly in many ways. Especially would such be the case in the places I have spoken of in Africa. Among the people of the class I have referred to are American citizens who go there for health, and are engaged in business there. Under treaty arrangements with other governments at some of these places we have an arrangement by which when an American citizen dies the consul of the United States acts as administrator and takes charge of his estate; and the legatees or the heirs must depend on this Government to give an honest, efficient administrator. At this time at Levuka, in the Fiji Islands, there are three important estates in the hands of the consul for administration and distribution. At many other places the consuls are judicial officers to decide civil questions, rights of property, of liberty, and even of life. And yet we are asked to judge of the importance of these places only by the small fees that may be received there.

Right here let me read the reasons given by the Secretary of State for the changes asked, with reference to a few of the places designated as unimportant in this debate. He gives reasons in each case. I have not the time to repeat here many, but give a few, as follows. They are given by an honest official under whose charge this whole system is, and who knows best its needs to make it a pure and efficient service:

*Cape Town*—Consulate: This is the great seaport of South Africa, and is of much importance, in a commercial way, to the United States. The trade with this country is mostly direct, and is rapidly increasing. The port is visited by all United States naval vessels on that station for the purpose of obtaining supplies and refitting. It is also visited by more of our merchant marine than are to be found in all of the other ports of that part of the world combined. The cost of going to and returning from Cape Town is excessive, and the discomforts of life are great in that locality.

*Buenos Ayres*—Consul: This is one of the most important trade centers in all of South America. Its trade with the United States is large and shows a steady and rapid increase. The present salary does not support the consul, owing to the very large demands made upon him by American traders and visitors.

*Apia*—Consulate: Apia is the principal island of the Samoan or Friendly and Navigators' Islands. It has a large and profitable trade with San Francisco, which is increasing. The consul is vested with judicial functions. The place is of much political importance to the United States, and should be filled with a man of marked ability, to obtain which the present salary is entirely inadequate.

*Cardiff*—Consulate: The direct trade between this port and the United States is not very great, but it is very important to United States shipping. The usual number of seamen shipped and discharged there is at least 600 per annum. The raising of the agency at Swansea to a consulate, under the act of July 1, 1886, has the same effect as in the case of Leeds. (See Item 28.)

*Odessa*—Consul: This is the principal port of Russia on the Black Sea, and has an extensive trade, exporting large quantities of wool to the United States. The cost of living in Odessa, as in all cities of Russia, is exceptionally great, while the discomforts of life there are very considerable indeed.

Tamatave is paraded as unimportant simply because the fees are small, yet for the first quarter in 1885 the exports to this country from that point amounted to \$117,681.

Talcahuano (a town in Chilli) is a great center for whaling vessels, where relief is dispensed to American seamen, and is also an expensive place to dwell in. From Bombay, for the quarter above named, the exports were \$237,000; from Sierra Leone, \$75,000; from Venice, a great art center, \$74,000. At Nantes and Santiago are sanitariums, where many Americans go; yet all these have been enumerated as unimportant. But I can not go further with details as to particular places.

If a post is not important enough to give an honest, efficient consul



a sufficient salary, it should be abolished, because it is a discredit to the Government to have any other sort. It should not be kept up at all. It is often the case that one who receives now only \$1,000, and is permitted to trade, engages in direct trade with this country. He makes his shipments and certifies to his own invoices. Then he sees every other merchant's invoice; he knows who are his competitors, whom they are trading with, and to whom they ship, and he can write to the parties here with whom they do business saying, "These gentlemen ship at such a price; I can ship on better terms." It enables a man holding office under the Government of the United States to use a public office as a prop to support his own monopoly in private business against honorable competition which should be fostered. On this point I wish to have read by the Clerk a letter of the Assistant Secretary of State. I want to show distinctly what this bill proposes to do and some of the reasons assigned by the State Department for what it asks.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, February 5, 1887.

SIR: In connection with the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, now pending before the House, I have the honor to communicate to you the following statements, based upon said bill, namely:

First. The total increase in salaries at places already provided for by law amounts to \$34,000. This includes the raising of twenty-five consulates now receiving salaries of \$1,000 and having the right to trade to classes in which the trading privilege is not allowed.

Second. Sixty-eight offices now compensated by fees are provided with salaries, the total thereof being \$121,000.

Third. The fees collected at the sixty-eight places above named amount to \$144,484 per annum, or an excess of \$23,484 over the amount to be appropriated for salaries.

If the pending bill becomes a law we shall have: First, twenty-five officers who now receive \$1,000 each per annum, but who can give as much or as little of their time as they please to the Government, placed in a position where they will be required to give all of their attention to the public service, and will not, as at present, be permitted to make the consular service of the United States a simple prop to their private undertakings.

Next we have the long list of officers at present compensated entirely by fees collected and retained by themselves and their principals under existing law. The fees so collected and retained amount to the large sum of more than \$125,000 per annum, and yet not one of these officers is restricted as to trade; and as a matter of fact they are generally engaged in some commercial pursuit, often in the only direct trade between their respective ports and the United States. They are generally not citizens of the United States and, owing to the trade advantages flowing from the consular position, may be said to enjoy a sort of monopoly very hurtful to free commercial intercourse and enterprise. Adoption of the present bill will cure all of this, will furnish many offices which can, under existing law, only be filled by citizens of the United States, and will relieve all such of the difficult task of serving two masters, as they now do, namely: First, self-interest, as merchants; and second, the United States, as consuls; which is an end most desirable to attain.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

JAS. D. PORTER, Assistant Secretary.

HON. JUDSON C. CLEMENTS,  
House of Representatives.

I will read also a few lines from the President's message upon this subject. In his annual message, in relation to the estimates submitted by the Secretary of State and in pursuance of that clause in the appropriation bill of last year (placed there by the House), requiring him to submit these estimates with a view to readjusting this system of service, the President says:

Pursuant to a provision of the diplomatic and consular appropriation act approved July 1, 1886, the estimates submitted by the Secretary of State for the maintenance of the consular service have been recast, on the basis of salaries for all officers to whom such allowance is deemed advisable. Advantage has been taken of this to redistribute the salaries of the offices now appropriated for in accordance with the work performed, the importance of the representative duties of the incumbent, and the cost of living at each post. The last consideration has been too often lost sight of in the allowances heretofore made.

The compensation which may suffice for the decent maintenance of a worthy and capable officer in a position of onerous and representative trust at a post readily accessible, and where the necessities of life are abundant and cheap, may prove an inadequate pittance in distant lands, where the better part of a year's pay is consumed in reaching the post of duty, and where the comforts of ordinary civilized existence can only be obtained with difficulty and at exorbitant cost. I trust that, in considering the submitted schedules, no mistaken theory of economy will perpetuate a system which in the past has virtually closed to deserving talent many offices where capacity and attainments of a high order are indispensable, and in not a few instances has brought discredit on our national character and entailed embarrassment and even suffering on those deputed to uphold our dignity and interests abroad.

In connection with this subject I earnestly reiterate the practical necessity of supplying some mode of trustworthy inspection and report of the manner in which the consulates are conducted. In the absence of such reliable information efficiency can scarcely be rewarded or its opposite corrected.

I can show this committee instances of consulates, unimportant according to the standard of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] where the fees are very small, yet where the consuls are authorized to administer estates of American citizens, and where, as a consequence, orphans have been defrauded and wronged. The President says, in effect, that this unwise policy has led to discredit to our national honor and to the injury of individuals as well as of the public service of the United States. I do not believe that the people of Mississippi, or the people of any other State, are unjust in regard to this matter. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] is doubtless right when he says that the people of his State are in favor of economy; but I say to him that the people of Mississippi, as well as the people of every other State in this Union, are in favor of honesty and justice, as well as of economy. They are in favor of protecting the lives, liberty, and rights of American citizens abroad as well as at home.

They are in favor of efficient government. They do not demand of

us to uphold a system which is discreditable to them and to our national character. There is no constituency that will demand that at the hands of its representative here. The trouble, I fear, with the gentlemen who present this superficial view of the question is that, in looking solely to what the people of a particular district may say, they have not read the estimates of the Secretary of State or the reasons assigned for them. I am afraid they have not gone to the bottom of this question to ascertain whether these consulates, of which they speak, are really important or unimportant. Whenever an increased appropriation is recommended for any purpose it is fashionable on the part of some to cry out, "Economy," and talk about what "the people" said last fall, and what "the people" will do with us. Tell the people the truth about this question of the foreign service of the United States and they will demand at your hands an honest and efficient corps of American, and not foreign, citizens in the service. Many of our consuls are paid only \$1,000 a year and are allowed to trade. Suppose you deny them the right to trade, how many of them can afford to go to their points of service and live there on \$1,000 a year? You must, then, have inefficient or dishonest men who must violate the law to live, or put rich men only in these offices and exclude the poor.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] said there was no trouble about finding people to fill these offices. We have one or two consulates now that can not be given away. One of them is at Asuncion, the capital city of Paraguay. Two or three men have been commissioned to go there, but when they found out what it would cost to go, and how small the salary was, they declined. Are we going to adopt the policy of selling out the offices of the United States to the lowest bidder? Is that wise economy? Will that help the poor people of whom the gentleman from Mississippi speaks? Shall we appoint men to these places and require them to pay their necessary expenses of travel and living, which are more than their salaries, and have them resort to that which is contrary to the honor of the country in order to live?

Do you want us to perpetuate these consulates at a thousand dollars a year, and give the consuls permission to trade, and allow them to certify to their own invoices as they do now? That is the present system. That is the system which drives out honest competition by giving the consuls of the United States at such points an insight into the business of rival traders. The consul, of course, sees whom they ship to, and by reason of his position is master of the situation, because he is propped up and sustained by the Government of the United States, and is thus enabled to maintain a monopoly which is against fair competition, against public policy, against common honesty, and detrimental to commerce.

The Secretary of State has given in the Book of Estimates (briefly, as he was compelled to do) the reasons for his recommendations, and the President of the United States has called special attention to the matter and recommended that no idea of mistaken or false economy shall guide the House in dealing with it. That is demanded by a due regard for our national honor. According to the idea of the gentleman from Kentucky, we can find plenty of men to fill all these offices at the present salaries. There is no doubt about that. I have no doubt that there are many in the gentleman's district who would be willing to take his seat, perhaps without any salary at all; but is such an idea in accordance with the spirit of this Government or of our institutions—to confine office-holding to the rich only, or to perpetuate a corrupting fee system antagonistic to fair dealing among business men and an honest public service?

Certainly you can find men all over the country who are willing to take the consulships if they are allowed the privilege of trading with the advantage which their position will give them in building up their own private fortunes at the expense of the Government and its honor, and of the business of other people. Upon that condition you can find plenty of men who will take them and pay their own expenses. But the question is, do you want to perpetuate that policy? Do the people of Mississippi want to fill the offices of this Government by selling them to the lowest bidder? I submit that it is impossible to secure the services of honest, reputable, and efficient men at remote points, when the cost of traveling is greater than the salary unless they have private fortunes, and the only way you can get men to take these appointments will be by giving them the right to trade, to the injury of others and to the inducement of fraud.

Take the case at Odessa, which has been already alluded to, in connection with the shipment of wool. In the shipment of cargoes of fine wool, if the appraisement goes up to a certain point, the duty is 10 per cent., but if it goes a hair's breadth above that, the duty is 20 per cent. How easy it is for the consul in such a case, if he is in concert with a dishonest shipper, or if he is not faithful to the interests of the Government he represents, to vary the appraisement just enough to let the cargo in at 10 per cent. instead of 20 per cent.

On a shipment of \$100,000 the difference to this Government in duties would be \$10,000. We have already had an illustration of what has occurred in this regard. At Three Rivers, in Canada, where the consul is allowed to retain fees up to the amount of \$2,500, those engaged in shipping produce to this country—hay and other products—made an arrangement with him by which, instead of charging \$2.50 on the invoice, the amount fixed by law, he would charge himself with



this amount, but in fact would receive only \$1.75. He would accept \$1.75, while giving a certificate showing that \$2.50 had been paid. He did this because he was allowed to retain the fees up to \$2,500. If he had been upon a fixed salary there would have been no inducement to do this. Many instances can be shown where shippers pass by salaried consuls, and put themselves to cost and inconvenience to reach a feed consul, where they get more favorable certificates as to their invoices, which practice results in defrauding the Government of its just revenues.

The case is similar to what it was in regard to fourth-class postmasters a few years ago, when those officers were compensated according to the number of stamps they sold. Many of them became peddlers of stamps. The Government did not sell any more in consequence of the fact that they became interested in selling a great many. Their commissions were estimated upon the number of they sold, not the number canceled; and they became competitors, to the injury of one another and not to the benefit of the Government, because it did not sell one more stamp on that account. Those officers were stimulated—to do what? Not to serve the Government, but to use a public office so as to make private gain. Such practices ought not to be encouraged or permitted by law in any branch of the public service.

Now a word in relation to consular inspectors who are specially recommended by the President in the paragraph which I have read from his message. You have inspectors in the internal-revenue service; and in the customs service you have post-office inspectors. Yet when we talk about having inspectors for consulates, the gentleman from Kentucky and others say "appoint honest men; that is the remedy for all these evils." If that is a sufficient remedy, why do you not abolish post-office inspectors, custom-house inspectors, and internal-revenue inspectors, and rely simply upon the appointment of honest men to these different branches of the service? Of course any upright administration will appoint honest men so far as it can, but all men are not honest; all men can not withstand the constant temptations held out by the present law to use their positions for private gain. They do not all withstand these temptations; therefore, whether or not you call it dishonesty on their part, people doing business with the Government are wronged and the Government is discredited. We ought not to uphold this system any longer.

What does it take to change it? The amount of increase of this bill is not large. I do not believe it is one cent above the corresponding benefits in the way of fees and correct appraisements, and consequently increased collections. We propose to put the fees into the Treasury instead of the pockets of the officials. We propose that they shall cease to engage in private business, which is contrary to the efficiency and purity of the service, and repugnant to the interests of the Government which they are called upon as public officers to serve.

The first sentence of the speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] is that "public office is a public trust." We have a large number of public officers holding "public trusts," who make more out of the pursuit of private business antagonistic to the nature of the service they are expected to perform for the Government than their salaries or their fees. Yet the gentleman would perpetuate these abuses and allow public trusts to be used, in the language of the Assistant Secretary of State, as simple props to their private undertakings.

Under the system now proposed, these official fees will be required to be turned into the Treasury. They amounted last year to \$125,000. This is a set-off in part against the apparent increase; a faithful collection of lawful duties would more than balance the real increase, and the proposed plan would not only be the best, but would be the least expensive, to the Government.

It is said if you put these officers on salaries alone they will lose interest in collecting fees. How do they control the amount of fees they collect? No shipments can be made to this country without invoices, and all invoices must be certified to by the consuls or commercial or consular agents. The amount of exports controls the amount of fees collected.

But the assumption that he will not collect and account for fees because of a fixed salary is a denial of the argument we have heard that we must have honest men and trust to their honor alone. It is a contradiction of that. It is saying they will not be honest when you put them on salaries. Which is the more likely to tempt a man to dishonest practices, merely to withdraw his interest in the fees or to hold before him opportunity to make large emoluments—which will tempt him the stronger? Certainly the latter.

I wish I had time to go further into details on these matters, and call attention to the amount of shipments at particular places enumerated here by the gentlemen as altogether unimportant because the fees are small, but I have not.

The people of the United States are an enterprising and progressive people, and have never confined themselves to this continent. They are to be found everywhere, and in all manner of business enterprise, almost everywhere. They are to be found traveling in every country.

Perhaps the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] would deny the American people the privilege of going abroad for pleasure. I will therefore say nothing about those who go for pleasure. But there are American citizens almost everywhere in business. Wherever they go,

whether for business, for health, or for pleasure, they are liable to need the services of a faithful consul.

In what I have said as to misconduct at particular consulates mentioned, I deem it just to say that none of it refers to the gentlemen representing the Government there at this time.

The fee system is certain to lead to abuses wherever it exists. In the execution of the internal-revenue laws it is exemplified by the multiplication of unfounded, vexatious, and oppressive prosecutions in order to make fees for the officers. If right here at home among our own people and in the face of rigid inspection abuses grow up in consequence of a desire to make fees, how much more must the abuses be at far distant points without these restraints?

It must be a matter of regret to every American that so large a proportion of those in the consular service of the United States are foreigners. It is stated in a recent report made by Consul-General Walker that of the United States consular corps of Great Britain and Ireland there are thirty-four Americans and eighty-two Englishmen. The following table taken from his report is of interest on this point:

| No. | Rank.                             | Nationality. |          |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------|
|     |                                   | American.    | British. |
| 1   | Consul-general.....               | 1            | .....    |
| 1   | Vice consul-general.....          | 1            | .....    |
| 1   | Deputy consul-general.....        | 1            | .....    |
| 20  | Consuls.....                      | 18           | 2        |
| 18  | Vice-consuls.....                 | 3            | 15       |
| 3   | Commercial agents.....            | 3            | .....    |
| 2   | Vice commercial agents.....       | .....        | 2        |
| 32  | Consular agents.....              | 1            | 31       |
| 2   | Commissioned consular clerks..... | 2            | .....    |
| 30  | Consular clerks.....              | 1            | 29       |
| 3   | Sanitary inspectors.....          | .....        | 3        |
| 3   | Rag inspectors.....               | 3            | .....    |
| 116 |                                   | 34           | 82       |

The changes proposed by this bill in this service mean better service at no greater cost than at present. It has been argued as if the changes were in the interest of the consuls, but many of them oppose the changes because they can make more out of their trading privileges and fees than the salaries proposed. The changes are in the line of a long-needed reform of abuses, and while under the rules they may be subject to points of order it is of the utmost importance that they should be effected.

We should for many reasons have responsible American officials abroad as well as at home. Our commerce ought to be fostered, American citizens and seamen in foreign countries ought to be protected by Americans. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. How much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-eight minutes.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I ask the Chair to notify me when I have occupied twenty-eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will do so.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri, withholds his remarks for revision. [See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The twenty-eight minutes have expired.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY] the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCREARY. How much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-five minutes.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with pleasure to all that has been said on both sides. I desired to dispassionately examine this question and then to cast my vote as seemed best under all the circumstances.

Now, sir, what is involved in the question under discussion to-day? The Committee on Foreign Affairs have reported a bill appropriating money for the consular and diplomatic service. On the face of that bill there is an increase of \$325,000. Is it right to make this increase?

Mr. BELMONT. Will my colleague permit me an interruption?

Mr. McCREARY. I have but a short time, and I would rather not be interrupted.

Mr. BELMONT. Then I cannot correct the gentleman's misunderstanding of the bill.

Mr. McCREARY. The gentleman will have twenty-four minutes in which to make his speech, and I think it is best that I shall not be interrupted. As I was just saying, the apparent increase in this bill is \$325,000 over the amount appropriated last year. The experience of the past is always a good lesson to read, and I hold in my hand a statement of the appropriations that have been made for the diplomatic and consular service for the last ten years. In 1877 a Democratic House appropriated \$1,186,797.50; in 1878 a Democratic House appropriated \$1,140,747.50; in 1879 a Democratic House appropriated



\$1,087,565; and, coming down to 1887, the last year for which an appropriation was made, the amount appropriated is \$1,364,065. In the past, then, it has not seemed to be necessary, in order to do justice to our diplomatic and consular service, to appropriate, as this bill proposes, \$1,681,445. Therefore I ask this question: Why should we now double the salaries of twenty-three consuls, and increase the salaries of seven consul-generals one-fourth, and why should we increase the salaries of thirty-seven consuls from \$2,000 to \$2,500 and \$3,000?

Mr. BELMONT. We do not do anything of the kind.

Mr. MCCREARY. I say you do, and the bill shows it, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT] is mistaken.

Mr. BELMONT. I will undertake to prove the contrary.

Mr. MCCREARY. The statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT] is on a parity with his deductions in his report, where he says that the estimated gain to the Treasury from increased collections is \$150,000. He can not prove that; it can not be proved. I have already presented to this House (and the contrary can not be shown) that this bill does double the salaries of twenty-three consuls, and does increase the salaries of thirty-seven from \$2,000 to \$2,500 and \$3,000. That is what the bill does. Now, I ask the House whether good reasons have been given for this increase.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Is there any increase in the number of officers?

Mr. MCCREARY. There is no increase in the number of salaried consuls, but feed consuls have been changed to salaried consuls.

Mr. BELMONT. Does the bill—

Mr. MCCREARY. I decline to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to proceed without interruption.

Mr. MCCREARY. As the gentleman from New York has twenty-four minutes in which to present his views, it seems to be very fair that he should not interrupt me. Mr. Chairman, for many years the salaries of consuls, as provided in the statutes of the United States, have seemed to be sufficient. Why, then, shall we increase those salaries? Why shall we start an increase of salaries in any respect? I hold that if there is a branch of the public service wherein there should not be an increase of salaries, and wherein no demand is made for any such increase it is our diplomatic and consular service.

As I have before asked, do we find any trouble in getting men to occupy these places? The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], who asked me a question and would not allow me to answer it, said that the reason why the committee proposed to increase the salaries of certain consuls is that the places to which they are obliged to go are far distant. But we have always found men who were willing to go there on the present salary. During this administration we have found men who are willing to do so.

This bill shows that the first increase for our diplomatic service is \$50,500. In all the speeches which have been made I have heard no good reason for this increase of \$50,500 in our diplomatic service. No member has shown, in my judgment, a necessity for increasing the salary of the minister to China from \$12,500 to \$17,500; and I have heard no member undertake even to explain why we should add \$12,000 in this bill in order to provide secretaries of legation to the Argentine Republic, to Belgium, to Corea, the Netherlands, the Roumanian, Servian, and Grecian missions, the Swedish and Norwegian missions, Switzerland, and Venezuela. Gentlemen have been as dumb as death on this subject, so far as I could hear. And no gentleman has yet undertaken to show the necessity for appropriating \$25,000 for the erection of a legation building in Japan. Whenever we erect a legation building in Japan we commence the business of erecting legation buildings; and next session we shall be called upon to erect such buildings in England, in France, in Germany, in Italy, and in different parts of the world. I am opposed to the erection of legation buildings in Japan.

But my friend from Georgia referred to seventeen cases of consuls whose salaries it is proposed to double, and some of whom collect only \$2.50 in the way of fees. I desired that he should answer me and state what amount was collected at Gaboon, in Africa; yet no answer has been received up to this time. When he said that he wanted to pay various consuls additional sums because some of the countries in which they serve are far distant, I desired to ask him the reason for increasing the salary of the consul at Gaspé Basin, Canada. That consul has been receiving \$1,000, and this bill doubles the salary, making it \$2,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the gentleman allow me to make one statement?

Mr. MCCREARY. The gentleman would not allow me to interrupt him, but I will treat him more graciously.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman further than to say that the State Department asks that the office at Gaspé Basin, Canada, be abolished.

Mr. MCCREARY. I have great respect for the distinguished and able gentleman at the head of the State Department, and for the eminent and able Assistant Secretary of State; but this is a day of convictions. We, who are here as representatives of the people, ought to have convictions, and ought to have the manliness and courage to stand by our convictions. Although I entertain great respect for the wisdom and intelligence of these gentlemen, my convictions are against the increase of salaries. I came here pledged to restore economy and reduce expenditures; and I

can not get my own consent now to increase the salaries of the men belonging to our diplomatic and consular service.

No good reason has been given here to-day for appropriating \$18,000 for inspectors of consulates. I endeavored to show when I was last on the floor that two men had been appointed in years gone by as inspectors of consulates; that one of these, Mr. Keim, made his report, which was very severe indeed upon the consuls, and the other, Dr. Newman, made no report. I believe to-day that the best plan is to appoint honest, faithful, and capable men in the consular service. I have no desire to see a gentleman swing round the world, calling upon our consuls, making each one a visit in order to come back and write another report of the style of that of Mr. Keim. The report of the committee—and I call the attention of my friend from New York to this point—states that this bill will bring to the Treasury from increased collections an estimated gain amounting to \$150,000. I have investigated the question carefully and closely; I have here tables prepared from the Fifth Auditor's report; and I am unable to find that there is such a gain as stated by the gentleman.

Mr. BELMONT. Will the gentleman now permit an interruption?

Mr. MCCREARY. No, sir; you can make your explanation in your speech. There are fifty-one salaried consuls proposed in this bill, in lieu of officers now compensated by fees. The bill also shows that nineteen salaried consulates are proposed at places where there are now simply consular agents, making in all seventy. Adding on the one hand the proposed salaries, and on the other all the fees collected, we find that the salaries for the seventy new consulates amount to \$125,000, and the fees collected last year by the different consuls amounted to \$140,000, a difference in round numbers of \$15,000. If you take away the fees collected at St. Galle and at Annaberg, the aggregate of the fees collected is about the same as the amount of the proposed salaries. It cannot be shown, according to my examination, that this bill only increases the salaries, as the gentleman from New York said, about \$40,000. I think the bill will not bear any such interpretation; the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs admits an increase of \$50,500 under the head of diplomatic expenses, and \$56,000 increased salaries of consuls, and \$50,000 contingent expenses, and \$25,000 for the erection of a legation building in Japan, and \$18,000 to pay consular inspectors, and \$12,000 to pay secretaries. I submit what I deem the proper showing; and I think it can not be denied, for I have made it with great care.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Proposed increase of this bill:   |           |
| Diplomatic service .....  | \$50,500  |
| Consular service.....   | 275,080   |
| Total increase .....  | 325,580   |
| Reductions:   |           |
| Legation building in Corea .....  | \$5,000   |
| Consul at Mahe.....   | 1,500     |
| Salary of one consular clerk (\$1,200 to \$1,000) .....   | 200       |
| Revising consular regulations .....   | 3,000     |
| Total reductions.....   | 9,700     |
| Net increase .....  | 315,880   |
| Amount in last law.....   | 1,364,065 |
| Total amount of pending bill.....   | 1,679,945 |
| Deduct amount of fees collected at consulates and consular agencies in 1886 where specific salaries are provided by the bill..... | 140,841   |
|   | 1,539,104 |
| Deduct amount of law last year.....   | 1,364,065 |
| Net increase of this bill over law of last year.....  | 175,039   |

In comparison with the salaries from 1877 down to 1881 you have an increase of nearly \$400,000.

I said before there is no demand for this increase. There is no demand comes up from those in office.

It has been alleged here to-day we ought to dignify the consular service; we ought to increase the salaries of consuls to a certain compensation because they are not getting enough to live in the style they ought to live in. If you adopt that as the idea to control us, that because an officer can not live in the style he ought to live in, you shall increase his salary, then, sir, ought not many other salaries to be increased? One of the great beauties of this great Republic is its simplicity. We have no desire to copy after the manners and customs of the aristocracy of Europe. If our people live in simplicity and plainness in this Republic why should those we send abroad as consuls live in more grandeur and style because they are foreign ministers and consuls?

I say men we send abroad should be required to live in the same style we live in over here. There is no demand at present for increase of salaries at any point in my judgment. And when I remember the party to which I belong has pledged itself to restore economy and reduce expenses I am opposed to the increase as presented in this bill.

I now yield for three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO].

Mr. MCADOO. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was up last year for discussion I made some criticism of the manner and style of the con-

sular reports. I wish to say now on examining the reports for last year I find a great improvement in them. They have evidently been carefully edited, and I think the improvement is due not so much to the taste of the consular agents as to the superior editing to which they have been subjected at the Department.

I know of my personal knowledge one consul not far removed from this continent very lately devoted the whole of a state paper to the discussion of his wife's dress and the tremendous success she achieved at a local entertainment in the representation of Columbia. I find, notwithstanding the care taken by the State Department, there are yet a few things in these consular reports which, in my judgment, should be omitted. I find, for instance, our estimable and no doubt our valuable consul at Bordeaux, George Washington Roosevelt, spreads himself in his report on the subject of chestnuts. [Laughter.] Not the chestnuts in Congressional debate beginning: "Mr. Speaker, I am for the people and in favor of the laboring man," or, "I am in favor of the agriculturist," or, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggests "the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia," or, "the annihilation of oleomargarine." [Laughter.] But Mr. Roosevelt discusses the chestnut of commerce. He is performing an estimable service to the good housewives of our country, and it will no doubt be taken advantage of by the chincapin gatherers of the district of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] in order to preserve the chestnuts. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.  
Mr. BELMONT. I do not understand my friend from New Jersey is opposed to this bill.

Mr. McADOO. No; not generally.  
Mr. BELMONT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to my colleague on the committee from Kentucky [Mr. McCREARY], who has furnished a tabulated statement of his views to the House which has remained unanswered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for several days for the consideration of members, that while I appreciate the industry and sincerity with which he has approached this question, I can not but believe he has been greatly misled. He has referred to the report of the Fifth Auditor of the Treasury for the last fiscal year as establishing the statements he has put into the RECORD with regard to the compensation paid to and the fees collected by the officers he has named. I will meet him on that ground, and I think I can show conclusively to the House that the gentleman is mistaken both as to his facts and his figures.

The Fifth Auditor's report, it is true, is a very confusing report, and it is natural that a gentleman in looking over its columns should make mistakes in his calculations, and yet it would seem—

Mr. McCREARY. I am willing to agree that I do make mistakes, but the gentleman will also admit that he makes mistakes.

Mr. BELMONT. I decline to yield. It would seem that there is no room for mistake here; and while I appreciate the trouble of my colleague in the preparation of these tables, still I do think it strange that a member of this committee, a committee which has not only during this session but during the last Congress given its special attention to the diplomatic and consular service, which has reported two bills previously to the House, one for a complete reorganization of the service on a salaried basis, a bill which was certainly before that gentleman for consideration, and to which he agreed, for we made a unanimous report upon the subject—

Mr. McCREARY. When?  
Mr. BELMONT. During the last session.

Mr. McCREARY. I agreed to the report.  
Mr. BELMONT. And I think it very strange, therefore, that this gentleman, a member of the committee, should now furnish the House with a table—I only now speak of the last table published with his remarks in the RECORD of Sunday last, the 6th instant, where he mentions:

Salaried consulates proposed at places where there are now consular agents.

And gives a list of nineteen alleged consular agents (many of them not so) beginning with Reichenberg (which is a feed consulate), and under the head of "salary for 1886" proceeds to state figures, ranging from \$48.50 to \$1,000, as the "salaries" paid these officers in 1886.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and should know, after the attention we have given to this subject, that no consular agent in 1886 received any "salary." Consular agents are paid by fees, which they collect and retain.

Mr. McCREARY. I am talking of the present.  
Mr. BELMONT. But the committee will see that the table is misleading, for it gives a list of "salaries." For instance at Farnham the "salary" is put at \$48.50! Who could imagine that such should be the salary of a consul? The gentleman from Kentucky should have put in that column at its head "fees," but he puts "salaries," and the House can therefore see the value of the other tables which have been presented by him.

I have made an estimate of the overstatement in regard to increases. In the first table (and I shall ask permission to insert in the RECORD a tabulated statement covering the entire subject)—in the first table there is an overstatement of \$10,400 in the actual increase of compensation proposed by the bill to the consuls enumerated in the table of

Mr. McCREARY, as I will presently show. There is an understatement of \$2,758.50 in the amount of fees collected at the consulates enumerated in his second table. In table 3 there is an understatement of \$15,114.56 in the consular receipts at the consulates named, and table 4 is incorrect as to facts and figures in nearly every item, the figures being taken from the wrong tables, as I have already stated, and I trust—

Mr. McCREARY. Let me interrupt the gentleman a moment.  
Mr. BELMONT. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to show where the gentleman himself is mistaken.

Mr. BELMONT. I will not yield. And if gentlemen will take the trouble to carefully read these tables in the RECORD to-morrow morning, with the comments and explanations I will make in respect to them, they will only do simple justice to the committee, for the tables will explain why it is that a member of the committee should have come in here—

Mr. McCREARY. I am perfectly willing they should read them.  
Mr. BELMONT. And mislead this House of Representatives.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this—  
Mr. BELMONT. I decline to yield.

Mr. McCREARY. If the gentleman means to say that I purposely misled the House, his statement is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to be interrupted.

Mr. BELMONT. I decline to yield to the gentleman. I have no doubt that my colleague on the committee is perfectly sincere, as I stated at the outset, in his criticisms; but he is as mistaken as he may be sincere.

Mr. McCREARY. I am willing to go to the country on my figures.  
Mr. BELMONT. I ask that the tables and explanatory notes I now hand in may be incorporated in the RECORD.

TABLE I.—OVERSTATEMENT OF INCREASE.  
[Extracts from table headed "Consular service increase" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1417), presented in Mr. McCREARY'S speech.]

| Consulates.          | Present salary. | Proposed salary. | Increase. |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|
| Birmingham.....      | \$2,500         | \$3,000          | \$500     |
| Bremen.....          | 2,500           | 3,000            | 500       |
| Chemnitz.....        | 2,000           | 3,000            | 1,000     |
| Nottingham.....      | 2,500           | 3,000            | 500       |
| Aix-la-Chapelle..... | 1,500           | 2,000            | 500       |
| Nuremberg.....       | 2,000           | 2,500            | 500       |
| Cardiff.....         | 2,000           | 2,500            | 500       |
| Hamilton.....        | 2,000           | 2,500            | 500       |
| Leeds.....           | 2,000           | 2,500            | 500       |
| Quebec.....          | 1,500           | 2,000            | 500       |
| Cadiz.....           | 1,500           | 2,000            | 500       |
| Total.....           |                 |                  | 6,500     |

COMMENTS.  
This table, as printed in the RECORD, is substantially taken from the committee's report, page 5. With this difference: The explanation given in that report, at page 3, that the apparent increase at many of the consulates changed in grade was only apparent, is not given. In each of the above-mentioned consulates the increase of salaries is in compensation for fees from agencies withdrawn. The details are given in appendix to the Estimates, pages 269, 270, and 271, as follows, and are now put in tabular form for convenience of comparison:

| Consuls.             | Present compensation including fees from agents. | Proposed salaries with agencies taken away. | Decrease in actual compensation. |
|----------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Birmingham.....      | \$3,300  | \$3,000                                     | \$300                            |
| Bremen.....          | 3,300  | 3,000                                       | 300                              |
| Chemnitz.....        | 3,000  | 3,000                                       | .....                            |
| Nottingham.....      | 3,300  | 3,000                                       | 300                              |
| Aix-la-Chapelle..... | 2,500  | 2,500                                       | .....                            |
| Nuremberg.....       | 3,000  | 2,500                                       | 500                              |
| Cardiff.....         | 3,000  | 2,500                                       | 500                              |
| Hamilton.....        | 3,000  | 2,500                                       | 500                              |
| Leeds.....           | 3,000  | 2,500                                       | 500                              |
| Quebec.....          | 2,500  | 2,000                                       | 500                              |
| Cadiz.....           | 2,500  | 2,000                                       | 500                              |
| Total.....           |  |   | 3,900                            |

There is thus shown a net decrease of \$3,900 in the actual compensation of the consuls named, instead of an increase of \$6,500.

TABLE II.—UNDERSTATEMENT OF FEES COLLECTED.  
[Extracts from table in the first column of page 1419 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, presented in Mr. McCREARY'S speech.]

Fees collected in 1886, as shown by Fifth Auditor's report.

|                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Pernambuco, Brazil.....     | \$973 50 |
| Cape Town, Africa.....      | 325 00   |
| Cardiff, Great Britain..... | 288 00   |
| Total.....                  | 1,586 50 |



COMMENTS.

The annual report of the Fifth Auditor to the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, contains at pages 30 to 35, inclusive, in tabular form, a statement showing the character and amount of fees collected in each consular district during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886. From that statement it appears that the fees collected at the above-mentioned consulates were as follows:

Fees collected in 1886, as actually shown by Fifth Auditor's report.

|                             |            |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Pernambuco, Brazil.....     | \$1,604 00 |
| Cape Town, Africa.....      | 1,019 50   |
| Cardiff, Great Britain..... | 1,720 50   |
|                             | 4,344 00   |

There is thus an under-statement in these three items of \$2,757.50 in a total footing of \$6,307.00 for the whole table.

TABLE III.—UNDERSTATEMENT OF CONSULAR RECEIPTS.

[Extract from table published on first column of page 1419 of the RECORD headed "Salaried consuls proposed in lieu of certain ones now compensated by fees." Presented in Mr. McCREARY'S speech.]

| Places.                          | Proposed salary. | Fees received during fiscal year 1886. |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Baranquilla.....                 | \$2,500          | \$2,963 50                             |
| Dusseldorf.....                  | 2,500            | 1,827 50                               |
| Brunswick.....                   | 2,500            | 5,087 50                               |
| Dunfermline.....                 | 2,500            | 3,051 50                               |
| St. Galle.....                   | 2,500            | 7,710 00                               |
| Chatham.....                     | 2,000            | 2,892 50                               |
| Port Stanley and St. Thomas..... | 2,000            | 3,032 00                               |
| Curacao.....                     | 2,000            | 1,219 05                               |
| Cognac.....                      | 1,500            | 1,857 50                               |
| Rouen.....                       | 1,500            | 1,490 00                               |
| Belleville.....                  | 1,500            | 1,812 50                               |
| Coaticook.....                   | 1,500            | 661 00                                 |
| Collingwood.....                 | 1,500            | 742 50                                 |
| Morrisburgh.....                 | 1,500            | 1,066 50                               |
| Port Hope.....                   | 1,500            | 1,869 50                               |
| St. Hyacinthe.....               | 1,500            | 1,630 50                               |
| Stanbridge.....                  | 1,500            | 990 00                                 |
| Catania.....                     | 1,500            | 1,531 85                               |
| Merida.....                      | 1,500            | 1,127 50                               |
| Gothenberg.....                  | 1,500            | 1,307 00                               |
| Total.....                       |                  | 43,919 90                              |

COMMENTS.

The report of the Fifth Auditor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, at pages 30 to 35 inclusive, states that the fees collected during that year at the consulates above named were as follows:

Fees collected as per report of Fifth Auditor.

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Baranquilla.....                 | \$3,230 46 |
| Dusseldorf.....                  | 2,575 00   |
| Brunswick.....                   | 5,272 00   |
| Dunfermline.....                 | 3,929 00   |
| St. Galle.....                   | 7,725 00   |
| Chatham.....                     | 4,165 00   |
| Port Stanley and St. Thomas..... | 3,204 00   |
| Curacao.....                     | 1,254 00   |
| Cognac.....                      | 2,915 00   |
| Rouen.....                       | 4,237 00   |
| Belleville.....                  | 2,574 00   |
| Coaticook.....                   | 2,385 50   |
| Collingwood.....                 | 2,460 50   |
| Morrisburgh.....                 | 1,492 50   |
| Port Hope.....                   | 2,297 50   |
| St. Hyacinthe.....               | 2,231 25   |
| Stanbridge.....                  | 2,148 50   |
| Catania.....                     | 1,654 85   |
| Merida.....                      | 1,899 40   |
| Gothenberg.....                  | 1,384 00   |
|                                  | 59,034 46  |

Thus by the report of the Fifth Auditor this is an understatement of \$15,114.56 in the consular receipts in the table as published in the speech referred to.

TABLE IV.—CONSULS INSTEAD OF CONSULAR AGENTS.

The following table is published on page 1419 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of Mr. McCREARY'S speech:

Salaried consulates proposed at places where there are now consular agents.

| Places.              | Salary for 1886. | Proposed salary. | Fees collected in 1886. |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Reichenberg.....     | \$1,000 00       | \$2,500          | \$4,123 00              |
| Charleroi.....       | 1,000 00         | 2,500            | 2,237 50                |
| Furth.....           | 1,000 00         | 2,000            | 3,767 50                |
| Glauchau.....        | 1,000 00         | 2,000            | 3,010 00                |
| Brockville.....      | 250 00           | 2,000            | 552 50                  |
| London, Ontario..... | 102 33           | 2,000            | 1,554 50                |
| Stratford.....       | 1,000 00         | 2,000            | 3,078 50                |
| Brunn.....           | 240 00           | 1,500            | 1,240 00                |
| Gera.....            | 1,000 00         | 1,500            | 2,171 50                |
| Farnham.....         | 48 50            | 1,500            | 1,048 50                |
| Huddersfield.....    | 1,000 00         | 1,500            | 4,920 50                |
| Kidderminster.....   | 645 00           | 1,500            | 1,645 00                |

Salaried consulates proposed at places, &c.—Continued.

| Places.                   | Salary for 1886. | Proposed salary. | Fees collected in 1886. |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Leicester.....            | \$602 50         | \$1,500          | \$1,602 00              |
| Paris, Canada.....        | 308 50           | 1,500            | 1,308 50                |
| Point Levi.....           | 656 00           | 1,500            | 1,656 00                |
| St. Helen's.....          | 1,000 00         | 1,500            | 2,156 00                |
| Swansea.....              | 50 50            | 1,500            | 1,052 50                |
| Jerez de la Frontera..... | 382 50           | 1,500            | 1,382 50                |
| Chaux-de-Fonds.....       | 187 50           | 1,500            | 1,187 50                |
| Totals.....               | 11,475 33        | 32,500           | 39,693 50               |

COMMENTS.

Reichenberg.—A feed consul (Estimates, page 92), not a consular agent. His compensation from fees exceeds \$2,500 per annum (Estimates, appendix, page 272). The amount of "salary" stated in the table is \$1,000.

Brockville.—An independent commercial agent (Estimates, page 92), not a dependent consular agent. Compensation from fees, \$2,000 (Estimates, appendix, page 275). Amount of "salary" stated in table, \$250. The fees collected at this agency for seven months only of the fiscal year 1886 were \$1,688.50 (Fifth Auditor's Report, page 25). The total amount of fees stated in the table to have been collected during the whole year is \$552.50.

London, Ont.—Commercial agent (Estimates, page 92), not a subordinate consular agent. Compensation, fees, \$1,544.50 (Fifth Auditor's Report, page 32). "Salary" stated in table, \$102.33.

Farnham.—Compensation from fees, \$1,000 (Fifth Auditor's Report, page 20). The salary stated in table is \$48.50, which is the percentage of his fees paid over by the consular agent to the consul at Saint John's, Quebec, under whom he serves (Fifth Auditor's Report, page 20).

A similar comment applies to Jerez de la Frontera, Swansea, and other agencies enumerated in the table, where the "salaries" paid are stated to be under \$1,000. The figures have either been taken from the wrong tabular statement in the Fifth Auditor's report, or from the wrong column in the right tabular statement.

The tabular statements appended to the report of the Fifth Auditor are so constructed that they are difficult to understand. There is Table B, which purports to give a "statement of consular fees, salaries, and expenses" for all the consulates included in Schedule B; there is Table C, which purports to give a "statement of consular fees, salaries, and expenditures" of all consulates included in Schedule C (which is the \$1,000 trading class); and then there is Table D, which professes to give a "statement of consular fees, compensation, expenses, and loss by exchange of all consulates and commercial agencies not included in Schedules B or C." In these three tables, wherever a consulate or commercial agency has a subordinate consular agency attached, the fees of the principal office and the additional fees the principal office receives from its agencies are subdivided.

The tables published in the RECORD of the 6th instant give with regard to consulates that have agencies only the fees collected at the main consulate, whereas the percentage of fees received from the subordinate agencies should be added; and with regard to many, if not all, of the agencies, give as their total collections only the percentage of fees which those agencies have paid over to the main consulates, after withholding their own compensation.

But at page 30 to 35 of the report table "I" is published, which gives a consolidated statement in detail of all the fees collected in each district, and it is from that table that the figures contained in the last three statements published on the 6th instant should principally have been drawn, but were not.

RECAPITULATION.

Table I: An over-statement of \$10,400 in the actual increase of compensation proposed by the bill in the consulates enumerated.

Table II: An under-statement of \$2,758.50 in the amount of fees collected at the consulates enumerated.

Table III: An under-statement of \$15,114.56 in the consular receipts at the consulates indicated.

Table IV: Inaccurate as to facts or figures in nearly every item. The figures being taken from either the wrong tabular statement in the Fifth Auditor's report, or from the wrong column of the right statement.

Mr. BELMONT. As to whether or not this is the time for making the increases of salary proposed in the bill is for the House to say. In view of recent events, I think the House will appreciate the fact that in Canada, at least, there is some need of attention to our consular service, and in this bill it will be found that the Canadian service is especially held in view.

Some doubt has been cast by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LOBE] as to whether or not there was a misunderstanding between the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the State Department. I found it very difficult, as I did in the case of the gentleman from Kentucky, to interrupt him in his remarks, but I did undertake to say that the misunderstanding was confined to Delaware. Upon reading the RECORD this morning I found that this statement was omitted; and I take occasion to repeat that it does not seem strange to me that the gentleman from Delaware should have opposed the recommendations of the Department of State when he also opposed the recommendations of the Navy Department at the time the reorganization bill was before the House, though he himself is a member of the Naval Committee.

I do not care whether our friends upon the other side are interested in our differences of opinion on this side or not, because I believe there will elapse many years before they will obtain any benefit from such differences. We may differ very safely, and even widen our differences if need be; and for my part I have no objection at all to standing among those who desire some improvement in the public service, even though that improvement should involve some increase of expenditure. We do not understand that the changes we propose in the consular service will involve any drain upon the Treasury. We are satisfied from the statements of the Department itself, statements which the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at least, is entitled to repeat to the House, statements to which we can give the greatest confidence—we are satisfied from those statements, as I will show in the RECORD, if the House

permits me to establish it by presenting the figures, that this bill increases the appropriation in actual amount only \$196,000; and if we take the very lowest estimate which the Department has made of the increase of revenue that will result through increased collections to the Treasury, the whole bill will simply increase the expenditures for the foreign service of the Government over the appropriation of last year to the amount of \$40,900.

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| As shown in the report, the total increase in the diplomatic service (including the cost of legation buildings for Japan and Siam) is.....                   | \$50, 500  |
| The consular increase is (on the face of the appropriations).....  | \$274, 800 |
| Less fees of consular agencies abolished, as shown in appendix to Estimates....  | \$10, 400  |
| Less fees now retained by officers to be hereafter paid by salaries.....   | 120, 000   |
|  | 130, 400   |
|  | 144, 400   |
|  | 194, 900   |
| From which, if the increase of revenue from closer collection of duties (which at the lowest estimate is placed at \$150,000) be still further deducted..... | \$150, 000 |
|  | 40, 900    |
| Leaves the total cost to the Treasury.....   | 40, 900    |

My colleague [Mr. McCREARY] has challenged proof of the saving to the revenue. He has distinctly called my attention to this point, and has proceeded to demonstrate by tables compiled from the Fifth Auditor's report, which have no bearing on the subject, that an increase is impossible. It is not expected that the enhanced revenues will be derived from consular fees, but from the removal of the facilities which the fee system now affords for the undervaluation of invoices by importers and consequent loss of duties by the Government. One instance involving \$20,000 was mentioned in the debate on Saturday; another case involving \$15,000 has been mentioned to-day.

All consuls, commercial agents, and consular agents paid by fees have a maximum, fixed by the Secretary of State, of fees they are allowed to retain. Everything they collect over that they must return to the United States. In Canada there are a hundred or more consular officers paid by fees, who, under ordinary circumstances, would never collect up to their maximum. It makes no difference to these men what kind of returns they make to the United States, because they will never be called upon to account for any surplus collections over their maximum. Consequently to obtain business they cut down the scale of fees prescribed by the United States, in order to get the importers of Canadian produce to deal with them in preference to salaried consuls, who would be compelled to charge and return full fees, and they make false returns to the Government, representing that they have collected the legal fees when they have not.

Thus they double their own receipts, but for every extra dollar they make themselves they take a dollar and a half out of the Treasury of the United States which would otherwise get in there if the importer had to do business with a salaried consul.

The evils of this system were laid before the House to-day by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] in a letter from the consul at Fort Erie. I will ask that the portions I have marked may be printed, without taking up the time of the House by reading them:

No. 20.]

UNITED STATES CONSULATE,  
Fort Erie, Canada, March 10, 1886.

SIR: On reading your circular bearing date January 26, 1886, on the subject of careless and improper use of the consul seal, and also that of January 28, 1886, as to consular clerks acting as agents of shippers, it occurred to me that these and many other abuses may and do exist because of the great number of inland, commercial, and consular agents depending solely on fees for their compensation, many of these agents not being citizens of the United States, and taking no interest in the service or in the welfare of our Government, and in fact caring for nothing except the amount of fees which they may be able to make.

It is [a] current report here, and I have been so informed by my predecessor, that those agents appoint railroad employes and others as subagents to intercept and get business for them, allowing them a percentage of the fees for the same, and that they supply them with blanks signed and sealed, to be afterwards filled up.

I find affidavits of shippers on record in this office, proving that they obtained their certificates in this way, and showing that in some cases the station agents refused to forward the freight until the shippers consented to take their certificates from them. I think it would be safe to say that hundreds of so-called consular certificates are issued, the shipper or declarant never seeing the consular officer to whom the declaration purports to have been made and whose signature is attached.

The inland agencies are on lines of roads terminating at Fort Erie or Clifton, which are the ports of clearance to the United States of a great bulk of the products of this Province, or at other salaried consulates on the frontier; so that they simply divert business from its natural channels and absorb the revenue which would otherwise accrue to the Government.

This matter of inland agencies has heretofore been under consideration, and I find by the record that in 1868 they were discontinued on investigation by and report of the Commissioner of Customs, that in his opinion "the interior agencies were not necessary, and were an obstruction to business."

When I asked why they were again established after having been thus discontinued, I was answered that continued application was being made, and that as long as a consular agent was allowed \$1,000, and a commercial agent \$2,500

from the fees, there would be no lack of applicants with memorials numerously signed, urging the great necessity of such agencies.

This system of inland unsalaried agencies leads to continued strife and contest for fees, and tends very much to lower the standing of the officers and the dignity of the office, and to lessen the pride which any man may justly feel as the representative of the Republic in a foreign land.

If an economic view of the subject be taken, very strong reasons will appear why such agencies should be discontinued and the business done by the salaried consuls located at or near the ports of clearance.

In 1870, after the discontinuance of inland agencies, and when the commerce of this province was not near as large as now, and the consul's compensation amounted to \$2,000, this office netted to the Government an annual revenue of over \$4,000. At that time Port Stanley and St. Thomas and Port Rowan agencies were embraced within this consular district. Now the same extent of territory, including these agencies, is not self-sustaining.

The deficit made good by the Government, and the former revenue accruing to it, constitute a loss of at least \$4,500 yearly.

I inclose exhibits 1 and 2, compiled from the report of the Fifth Auditor of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885, showing salaried and unsalaried consulates and their agencies, the amount of fees collected by each, the compensation of salary, and the rent account and contingent expenses.

Exhibit 1 shows that the fees collected by salaried officers and their agents amounted to \$26,750; the salaries to \$16,000, and contingent expenses and rent to \$2,745.

Exhibit 2 shows that the fees collected by unsalaried officers and their agents amounted to \$22,931; the compensation to \$20,979, and contingent expenses to \$517.65.

Now, all the fees collected by both classes of officers amounted to \$49,681. If the business were done by the salaried consuls alone, deducting salaries, rent, and contingent expenses, which amount to the sum of \$18,745, there would be returned to the Treasury a balance of \$30,936. Allowing a margin for additional expenses because of increased business at the consulates, and for an increase of salary, as recommended by the President and as now being under consideration in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and let that margin be \$10,936, the consular service of the province of Ontario alone would yield to the Government an annual revenue of \$20,000.

The services would be performed by men having a due sense of their responsibility, feeling it to be their duty and incumbent upon them to perform their official functions in such a manner as to forward the commercial interests of their country, and command for themselves and their Government the respect of the people among whom they may be temporarily domiciled.

Upon receiving your circulars hereinbefore referred to, and upon thought that some legislation relative to the consular service is now under discussion, I deemed the time opportune to communicate to you my observation and views, and I respectfully submit these suggestions for the consideration of the Department.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES WHELAN, Consul.

HON. JAS. D. PORTER,  
Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

This matter was also discussed in a report (No. 1938) which was made to the House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs last session, to which the gentleman [Mr. McCREARY] himself assented.

I will make one extract:

There can be no question that the adoption of the plan proposed (that is, of paying all officers by salaries) would correct many abuses and indirectly benefit the Treasury in various ways. It would remove the temptation which now exists for consular officers to enter into collusion with shippers for the sake of obtaining their custom, and to the detriment of the revenue. It would put an end to a practice which it is believed largely prevails in Canada among consular agents who (knowing they will not collect more than their maximum, and therefore will never be called upon to make good the difference between the face of their returns and their actual collections) charge less than the scale of fees established by law for the certification of invoices, so as to obtain business in competition with other agents, and at the same time enter the proper charges on their returns.

The gain to the Treasury by the abrogation of this system it is believed will be very considerable. In this and in many other ways, it is therefore expected that from an economical point of view the proposed change will be beneficial, and every other consideration renders it most desirable. The system of compensation by fees is demoralizing to the service. Its abolition has been recommended by successive Secretaries of State. The Forty-seventh Congress directed the Department to prepare an estimate of the amount required to put the consular service on a salaried basis, and in accordance with those instructions a report and a proposed bill were drawn up (Executive Document No. 121, Forty-eighth Congress), but no action was had thereon. A change to a system of fixed salaries, as now proposed, was recommended by the present Secretary of State, and is among the reforms of the consular service commended to the attention of Congress by the President, and by the House referred to this committee.

But suppose the increase proposed by the bill were really \$196,000, what shall be said when a bill (which I would have voted for had I been present) appropriating \$1,500,000 for a public building in the city of Brooklyn went through this House this week with scarcely an objection? What will the country say when it finds a bill like that goes through without debate, while a bill appropriating for our whole diplomatic and consular service, for the establishment of buildings for contingent expenses, in fact for the whole foreign intercourse, scarcely any larger amount, in fact only a little over \$1,600,000, has been debated and combated at every opportunity since Saturday last? It was my appreciation of the amounts contained in this bill, and of the purposes of the committee to present only such a measure as the necessities of the service called for, that induced me to ask on Saturday last that we might go on to the reading of the bill after a brief explanation of its provisions. I now move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10396) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. BELMONT. I move that the House do now adjourn.



## PUBLIC BUILDING AT PORTSMOUTH, OHIO.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.  
Mr. BELMONT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6976) to erect a public building at Portsmouth, Ohio, and that the same be put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, &c.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase or otherwise provide a site and cause to be erected thereon a substantial and commodious building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the post-office and for other Government uses, at Portsmouth, Ohio. The site and building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed in cost the sum of \$60,000; nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site, nor plan for said building, shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of \$60,000 for site and building; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet, including streets and alleys: *Provided,* That no part of said sum shall be expended until a valid title to the said site shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Ohio shall cede to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THOMPSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BELMONT. I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent—

Several members called for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR (by request): Petition of the Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Good Templars, in behalf of Senate bill 1579—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Petition of the Legislature of the Territory of New Mexico, asking legislation for the settlement of the Mexican and Spanish land-grants in New Mexico and adjoining Territories—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial and joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada, relative to the United States Mint at Carson City, Nev.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Resolution of Wm. M. Collin Post, No. 589, Grand Army of the Republic, of Sandy Hill, N. Y., requesting the passage of the so-called Edmunds-Tucker bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Sarsfield Club of New York city, opposing the so-called extradition treaty with the British Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COMPTON: Memorial of the heirs of the late Wm. J. Hickey, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Memorial of the Farmers' Institute of Northern Michigan, praying for the passage of the Miller pleuro-pneumonia bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Post No. 246 and of Post No. 298, Grand Army of the Republic, Michigan, in favor of the Edmunds-Tucker anti-polygamy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELDREDGE: Papers relating to case of R. H. Butler—to the same committee.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of F. F. Morris, of Winfield, Putnam County, West Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HISCOCK: Petition of H. S. Beattie, surveyor of the port of New York, in relation to the payment of medical expenses, &c.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of Abel Smith Post, No. 1435, of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking for the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. F. A. JOHNSON: Petition of Witherbee, Sherman & Co., and 16 others, citizens of Port Henry, N. Y., for repeal of internal taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYMAN: Protest of the National Vinegar Makers' Association against the passage of House bill No. 9733—to the same committee.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of C. M. Jones and other citizens, for a high court of arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Joint resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, in favor of repeal of arrears-of-pension act, to give arrears to all pensioners, to grant pensions to survivors of rebel prisons, and to grant pensions to all dependent soldiers who are sixty-two years of age—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. M. Knapp, of Bellevue; of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, and resolutions of the Farmers' Institute of Crawford and Newaygo Counties, Michigan, in favor of the Miller bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Wolcott Post, of Earl Halbert Post, of Edward Dwight Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Michigan, in favor of the Edmunds-Tucker bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Thomas Rhead, and of William Allen, and of A. H. Reed, M. D., of Napoleon; of J. W. Dark and others, of Union City; of B. S. Holly and others, citizens of Woodland; of S. J. Cassady, of Coldwater; of Mrs. H. C. Carpenter, of Woodland; and of the officers of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Charlotte, of Vermontville, of Bronson, of Napoleon, of Albion, of Nashville, and of Quincy, Mich., in favor of the Blair bill—to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Knights of Labor of Coldwater and of Island City, Mich., against large pensions to widows of public officers, and against paying public money for funerals and the erection of monuments—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial and resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of New Mexico, relative to settlement of the Mexican and Spanish land grants in New Mexico and adjoining Territories—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PINDAR: Petition of Erastus C. Weaver, of New York, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED: Petition of Rev. Henry Blanchard, and other citizens of Maine, in favor of arbitration between nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENEY: Protest of the National Vinegar-Makers' Association against the passage of House bill No. 9733—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Cincinnati Musicians' Protective Union, respecting foreign musical organization importations—to the same committee.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Petition of the Owen Roe Club, of the Hamilton Rowan Club, and of the Sarsfield Club, of New York city, opposing the so-called extradition treaty with Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRAIT: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, in relation to pleuro-pneumonia—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., for improvement of certain water ways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WAKEFIELD: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Saint Paul, Minn., favoring the passage of a bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Minnesota State Horticultural Society, and of the Amber Commercial Association, favoring the Hatch agricultural experiment-station bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota, favoring pleuro-pneumonia legislation—to the same committee.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., invoking liberal appropriations for the rivers and harbors of Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILO WHITE: Paper from the State board of health of Minnesota, relating to pleuro-pneumonia—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILKINS: Petition of A. M. Nichols and 15 others, citizens of Granville, Ohio, for the passage of Senate bill 1636—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON: Petition of Robert W. Waters, for payment of amount due him by District of Columbia, and fraudulently paid to other parties—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. FISHER: Of 224 citizens of Bay City, Mich.

By Mr. FULLER: Of 46 citizens of West Union, Iowa.

By Mr. GROUT: Of 139 citizens of Warren, Vt.

By Mr. LIBBEY: Of citizens of Franklin, Va.

By Mr. PAYNE: Of 141 citizens of Palmyra, N. Y.

By Mr. RIGGS: Of 126 citizens of Beardstown, Ill.

By Mr. WAKEFIELD: Of 73 citizens of Alton, Freedom, and Clinton, Minn.

By Mr. WARD: Of 148 citizens of La Fayette, Ind.