

certificates of deposit, and all other resources, the property of the national banks, at the above date, amounted to something over five hundred and fourteen millions, which, at the low rate of 5 per cent., makes an additional interest income of twenty-five millions. The following statement will therefore correctly represent the facts:

October 1, 1877:	
National banks	2,080
Resources	\$1,741,000,000
Interest on resources paid by the people per annum	130,000,000

In return for the establishment of this stupendous money power it simply acts as an agent in transmitting the currency of the United States from the Treasury to the people. Will any one pretend that a cheaper and more equitable mode of supplying the country with a circulating medium cannot be framed by our legislative wisdom? In fact can any one for a moment defend such a system of monopoly and oppression? He who desires its permanence desires also the permanence of the national bonded debt. The two are inseparable. One rests upon the other. If the national banks are a blessing then our public debt is a blessing, for the debt supports the banks. This idea is embraced in the act of January, 1875. Provision is made in the third section of that act for an increased number of "banking associations" to be based on an increased number of interest-bearing bonds sold for that purpose. They are armed too by this section with hostile powers against the legal-tender greenback. With the aid of the Secretary of the Treasury they are authorized to exterminate this favorite money of the people. For every \$100 issued after the date of the act of January, 1875, by the national banks then in existence or organized afterward \$30 in legal-tender notes are to be withdrawn from circulation and destroyed until that currency is contracted to the limit of \$300,000,000. The purpose of this legislation is to make the banks completely master of the financial situation and to subordinate all the wants and interests of the American people to their will and pleasure. And in order to facilitate this purpose the greenback dollar has been denounced with every epithet of contempt and derision known to the English language. I will not pause now to defend this great money in its contest with those who are bent on its destruction. Its reputation in peace and in war is known to all. The soldiers and the sailors knew it in the great hour of peril; their widows, their orphans, and their maimed and crippled comrades have known it ever since. The people of every class and of every party, engaged in business and labor, know that, in spite of all assaults, in spite of the fact that the Government dishonors it by refusing to take it for Government dues, and in spite of the fact that there is not gold enough in the Treasury to redeem it at ten cents on the dollar, yet to-day it ranks but 3 per cent. below gold in the money markets that are most hostile to its existence. All these things are known and treasured up, and I do not dwell upon them now.

Sir, thus far I have spoken in pointing out what I conceive to be the vicious legislation of this country on the great and paramount question of its finances. There are two opposing ideas on this subject now thoroughly aroused into vigilance and activity. On the one hand is the vast money-power in all its various developments of bonds, banks, and loaning associations, and on the other are the great industries, the active business, and the laboring people. The issue has been years in making up, but it is now joined. Nobody need be deceived. All the wide-spread influences of capital are organized and combined. The holders of public securities in America and in Europe work together. They think and act in concert.

The national banks of the United States have a solid organization to protect what they have and to get as much more as possible. They are asking now to be relieved from paying taxes on their circulation and deposits, in order that they may enjoy their enormous profits free from all burdens for the support of the Government. Associations of capitalists, engaged in obtaining mortgages at 12 per cent. interest on western farms, on account of the scarcity of money in that section, are not only striving to make all such mortgages payable in gold a year hence, but they are threatening those in pecuniary distress that they shall have no further favors at the same rates unless they agree in advance to pay gold in return for greenback loans. The power of money in the midst of times like these is very great, but I am much deceived in the people if they have not turned at last in defiance and bold warning upon their oppressors. They are not in favor of repudiating a single dollar of their public or private debts. They intend to pay everything they owe, but they intend to submit to no more changes of contracts, violations of obligations, and breaches of public faith, in order to increase their indebtedness or to take away their means to pay it. They demand, too, that certain specific wrongs shall be redressed.

First, those for whom I speak demand the restoration of the silver dollar exactly as it stood before it was touched by the act of February, 1873. They desire that it shall have unlimited coinage, not fearing that it will become too plenty for their wants; and that it be made a full legal tender, believing that it is as good now with which to pay all debts, public and private, as it was during eighty-one years of American history.

Second, they demand the repeal, unconditionally, of the act of January 14, 1875, compelling a resumption of specie payments in January, 1879, holding that the question of a return to a specie basis for our currency should be controlled entirely by the business interests of the country. They do not believe that the country should be dragged

through the depths of ruin, wretchedness, and degradation in order to reach a gold standard for the benefit alone of the income classes.

Third, they demand that the national-banking system be removed and a circulating medium provided by the Government for the people, without taxing them for the privilege of obtaining it. And they ask that the amount thus placed in circulation shall bear a reasonable and judicious proportion to the business transactions and the population of the United States.

Fourth, they demand that the currency circulated on the authority of the Government shall be made a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, including all dues to the Government, well knowing that it will then be at par with gold, or more likely at a premium over it.

And fifth, they demand that hereafter the financial policy of the country be framed permanently in their interest; that they shall not be discriminated against in future legislation as in the past, and that their prosperity, and not the mere growth of incomes to retired capitalists, shall be the primary duty of the Government.

In my judgment, these demands are just and moderate. I implore Senators not to suppose that they can be disregarded with safety. If they are rejected now they will be renewed hereafter with still greater determination and perhaps with others added. I plead for the financial credit of the Government. It rests on the popular will alone, and that will can no longer be defied or menaced with impunity. The people are sovereign, and they can bind and they can loosen. If the money power is advised with wisdom it will stop and retrace its steps. It confronts a power now mightier than itself: a free people at the ballot-box, inflamed by a sense of injustice and oppression. If, however, it is joined to its golden idol; if its heart is hardened and its neck stiffened by its vast possessions; if the burning lust of avarice has made it deaf to the voice of reason and blind to all human experience, it will push on in its career, until it works its own destruction; for, sooner or later, the people, irrespective of party names, will unite in their own defense and establish justice. They have been slow to believe that there was a deliberate purpose to degrade and impoverish the great producing classes, but they are being rapidly educated now. The condition of the country is a teacher whose awful lesson is engraven on all their hearts. They have also recently read the proclamations of the great organs of the money power, removing all disguise as to the meaning of our financial legislation and the misery it has created. In the columns of one they have read that—

The American laborer must make up his mind henceforth not to be so much better off than the European laborer. Men must be content to work for low wages. * * * In this way the workingman will be nearer to that station in life to which it has pleased God to call him.

In the columns of another organ of consolidated capital they have read the following revolting sentiments:

There seems to be but one remedy. It is a change of the ownership of the soil, and the creation of a class of land owners on the one hand and of tenant-farmers on the other; something similar in both cases to what has long existed and now exists in the older countries of Europe.

And in every form in which the English language can be used the American people, and especially the people of the West, have been notified, not that their consent will be asked, but that they will be compelled to submit to the legislation which results in this British system of baronial landed estates, a dependent tenantry and pauper wages for the workingman. Sir, I have no word of menace to utter on this floor, but, in behalf of every laborer and every owner of the soil whom I represent, I warn all such as value their investments that when these doctrines of despotism are sought to be enforced this fair land will again be convulsed in agony and the fires of liberty will blaze forth again, as they did a hundred years ago, in defense of the natural rights of man. May the wisdom of our fathers and the benignity of our God avert such an issue; but if it shall come, if infatuation has seized our councils, the result will only add one more instance to the long catalogue of human crime and folly, where avarice, like ambition, overleaps itself and in its unholy attempt to rob others of their possessions loses its own.

Mr. HAMLIN. I move that the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at three o'clock and ten minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 15, 1878.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. P. HARRISON.

The Journal of yesterday was read in part, when Mr. DUNNELL asked unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting his annual report of the contingent expenses of the House for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1877; which was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY IN POSSESSION OF CLERK.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of property belonging to the United States, in his possession December 3, 1877; which was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

OFFICERS OF QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the petition of certain officers of the Quartermaster's Department praying restoration to their former places upon the Army list; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTINGENT FUND OF NAVY DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a statement of the contingent fund of the Navy Department; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

ASSISTANT LAW PROFESSOR AT WEST POINT.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the professor of law of the Military Academy at West Point in reference to an appropriation for the payment of an assistant professor of law of that institution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESUMPTION OF SPECIE PAYMENTS.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House resolutions of the Union League Club of New York, opposing legislation tending to defeat the resumption of payments on a gold basis as now provided by law; which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CLAIMS ALLOWED IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The SPEAKER also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with the second section of the act of June 16, 1874, a list of three hundred and forty-five claims, with the papers in each case, arising under the act of July 4, 1864, which have been examined and allowed; which was referred to the Committee of Claims.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. BANKS. A number of gentlemen have petitions with reference to woman suffrage which they were not able to present yesterday. I ask consent of the House that these petitions may be received at the Clerk's desk at any time during this day, and printed in the Journal and the RECORD with their indorsements, in the same manner as was done with similar petitions yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Would it not be just as well to place those petitions in the petition-box in the ordinary way?

The SPEAKER. That is substantially what is proposed to be done.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I understood the request was that the petitions should be read at the desk to-day.

The SPEAKER. That is not the request. The only request made which is not provided for by the rules is that the superscription of the petitions shall be printed in full in the RECORD.

Mr. LUTTRELL. I wish to say that I have received two petitions from my district, in which I believe there are two hundred and fifty thousand residents; and I find on those petitions about fifteen or twenty names only. I do not desire the people of my district to be held responsible for the action of those few persons.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter for the gentleman from California, [Mr. LUTTRELL.] The Chair hears no objection to the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BANKS,] and it is agreed to.

FIRE AT PATENT OFFICE.

Mr. BANNING, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. R. No. 81) to print 5,000 copies of the Official Gazette of October 9, 1877, containing an account of the fire of September 4, 1877; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

MARITIME JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DUNNELL, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2464) to declare and define the jurisdiction of the United States over the harbors and navigable waters of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SAINT GEORGE'S CHURCH, ACCOMAC COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

Mr. DOUGLAS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2465) to indemnify Saint George's church, Accomac County, Virginia, for damage done by the United States troops under Brigadier-General H. H. Lockwood during the late civil war; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

OPEN CORRESPONDENCE THROUGH THE MAILS.

Mr. BLAIR, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2466) to facilitate open correspondence through the mails and reduce postage thereon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN L. BRITTON.

Mr. BLAIR also, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2467) for the relief of John L. Britton, late drum-major of the Second New Hampshire Volunteers; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ABSENTEES.

Mr. ROBBINS. I ask unanimous consent to submit the following resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to inquire into the propriety of a rule, and if they deem it expedient to report a rule, requiring the RECORD to print the vote on each question taken by yeas and nays under four heads, namely: "yeas," "nays," "paired," and "absent unpaired."

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to inquire into the expediency of a rule to prohibit pairing by members and to require all non-voters to be reported simply as absentees and to forbid any notice of pairs by members being given in the House.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I object.

Mr. ROBBINS. Let it go to the committee. It only instructs the committee to inquire.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I do not object to the reference.

Mr. ROBBINS. It is simply a resolution instructing the committee to inquire into the subject.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I think gentlemen of this House should have sense of duty sufficient to discharge their public obligations without being whipped into so doing by being heralded for default all over the country in the press and otherwise.

Mr. ROBBINS. I wish to have the Committee on Rules inquire into the subject, and that is all I ask.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I insist on my objection to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ROBBINS. Let it be referred.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Very well, I do not object to its reference to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Rules.

RESTORED ARMY AND NAVY OFFICERS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2468) to amend section 1228 of the Revised Statutes relating to the pay and allowance of officers of the Army and Navy who have been dismissed and afterward restored to the service; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

IMMIGRATION REPORT.

Mr. STONE, of Michigan, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which under the rules was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed from the stereotyped plates 2,000 copies of the special report on immigration, with information for immigrants, compiled by Edward Young, chief of the Bureau of Statistics, 1,000 copies for the House and 1,000 copies for distribution by the Treasury Department.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAX.

Mr. DAVIS, of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to present the following preamble and resolution, and, as it is a subject in which a great many people take a deep interest, I ask they be read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears from the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1876 that the whole amount of tax collected from internal revenues for that year was \$115,417,747.33, of which sum the State of Illinois, with a property valuation, according to the census of 1870, of \$2,121,630,579, paid \$25,582,960.71, while the State of New York, with a property valuation of \$6,500,841,264, paid only \$14,655,081.89; the State of Ohio, with \$2,235,430,300, paid \$16,610,446.09, while Pennsylvania, with \$3,808,340,112, paid only \$5,981,273.46; the State of Kentucky, with \$604,318,552, paid \$7,648,612.13, while the State of Massachusetts, with \$2,132,148,741, paid only \$2,759,653.61, thus showing that Kentucky, with less than one-third the wealth of Massachusetts, paid nearly three times as much of said tax; the State of Virginia, with \$409,588,133, paid \$7,313,021.13, while the States of Maine and Rhode Island, combined, with \$645,121,317, paid only \$314,826.48, or less than one-thirtieth, in the proportion, paid by Virginia; the State of North Carolina, with \$260,757,245, paid \$1,679,345.69, while Vermont, with \$235,349,553, paid only \$48,097.15, thus making it manifest that the burdens of this tax are unequally and unjustly distributed and made to bear most heavily upon States least able to pay; and

Whereas it appears from said report that the whole amount assessed was \$136,756,374.40, while the amount collected was only \$115,417,747.33, showing a loss of \$21,338,627.07, while the cost of collection was \$4,239,282.22; and

Whereas the temptations to frauds, evasions, and violations of said law, by reason of its unequal impositions and the modes of its collection, have tended to demoralize the country and diminish that respect and reverence for law which have characterized the American people; and

Whereas an equal apportionment of the burdens of taxation among the different States and sections of the Union is the dictate of sound policy as well as of justice: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee of Ways and Means, in providing the means for defraying the expenses of the Government, be instructed to provide for the total abolition of the internal-revenue system, or, if this shall be found impracticable, then to so modify and change the same as to impose its burdens equally upon all sections, and, by reducing the taxes now imposed and providing a less obnoxious

mode of collecting the same, remove the just ground for complaint which now exists, and remove also the temptations to fraud, evasions, and violations which have brought reproach upon the whole system.

Mr. COVERT. I object.

The SPEAKER. The preamble and resolution therefore are not before the House.

BURIAL OF LIEUTENANT W. L. ENGLISH.

Mr. KNAPP, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2409) relative to the burial of Lieutenant W. L. English; which was read a first and second time by its title.

Mr. KNAPP. I ask that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill, which was read, authorizes the Secretary of War, at such time as in his discretion may be proper, to have removed to the cemetery at Jacksonville, in the State of Illinois, and have buried there, the remains of Lieutenant W. L. English, who was killed at the Big Hole battle, in Montana Territory, in August, 1877, and whose remains are at present buried at Deer Lodge, and appropriates \$600 for that purpose.

Mr. CLYMER. Let it be referred.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

INVENTOR OF THE SOLAR COMPASS.

Mr. HUBBELL, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2470) for the relief of the heirs of the late W. C. Burt, inventor of the solar compass, adopted and used in the public surveys of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' HOMESTEAD.

Mr. CALKINS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2471) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act relating to the soldiers and sailors' homestead;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

ELIAS B. BELL.

Mr. CALKINS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2472) for the relief of Elias B. Bell, late private of Company E, Third Regiment West Virginia Cavalry; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. SHELLEY, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service:

Resolved, That a committee of three members of this House be appointed to inquire and ascertain whether the Treasury Department of the United States has complied with the act of Congress of March 3, 1875, entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1876, and for other purposes," touching the appointments of the Treasury Department, and requiring such appointments to be so arranged as to be equally distributed between the several States of the United States, Territories, and the District of Columbia according to population, (pages 398 and 399, volume 18, part 3, United States Statutes at Large,) with power to send for persons and papers, and to report at any time.

ORDER TO PRINT.

Mr. RICE, of Ohio. I ask that by unanimous consent the memorial accompanying the bill (H. R. No. 2283) to enable the Secretary of the Interior to make final settlement with the Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan and Indiana, under treaty stipulations existing with them, be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ESTATE OF SOPHIA A. FOX.

Mr. CHALMERS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2473) for the relief of the estate of Sophia A. Fox, deceased, of Warren County, Mississippi; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FORT HALL INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. FENN, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2474) to provide for a reduction of the area of the Fort Hall Indian reservation, in Idaho Territory; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ISSUE OF ARMS, ETC., TO IDAHO.

Mr. FENN also, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. R. No. 82) providing for issuing arms and ammunition to the Territory of Idaho under the act approved July 3, 1876; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSENGER IN FOLDING-ROOM.

Mr. CRITTENDEN, by unanimous consent, introduced the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee of Accounts:

Resolved, That a messenger be employed by the Doorkeeper to serve in the folding-room.

DANIEL LEWIS.

Mr. VANCE, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee of Accounts:

Resolved, That the sum of \$250 be paid Daniel Lewis out of the contingent fund

of the House for services rendered in the Doorkeeper's department from the 1st day of March to the 1st of July, 1877.

JAMES F. EDWARDS.

Mr. BUCKNER, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee of Accounts:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to James F. Edwards out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of \$111.11, for his services as messenger in the Doorkeeper's department from December 1, 1877, to January 10, 1878.

LEGAL TENDER.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I ask unanimous consent to offer for present consideration the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this House that United States notes should be made a legal tender in payment of duties on imports, and the Committee on Banking and Currency are instructed, at as early a period as may be practicable, to report a bill to this House for that purpose.

Mr. FRYE. I object.

MAIL SUBCONTRACTORS.

Mr. WADDELL, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2475) for the protection of subcontractors in carrying the mails; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

LIFE-BOAT SERVICE.

Mr. VEEDER, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved, That in consequence of the many disasters at sea, and the great loss of life occasioned thereby, the board of supervising inspectors of steamboats be, and is hereby, instructed to immediately examine into and report to the House of Representatives on the merits of the various life-boats, life-rafts, or other means of saving life at sea, to the end that suitable laws shall be enacted for protection of all those navigating and traveling the seas and inland waters.

WILLIAM C. WHITTLE AND OTHERS.

Mr. GOODE. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill and put it upon its passage to remove the political disabilities of William C. Whittle and others, of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read for information, after which objections, if any, will be in order.

The bill was read. It proposes to relieve (two-thirds of each House concurring therein) William C. Whittle, Thomas Jefferson Page, William Sharp, John D. Simms, C. H. Kennedy, Virginius Freeman, of Virginia, and C. H. Williamson, of New York, of all political disabilities imposed upon them by the third section of the fourteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. FRYE. Is there a request in each case?

Mr. GOODE. Yes, sir; there is a request in each case and a bill for the relief of each of these persons was passed by the House last session.

Mr. FRYE. Then I have no objection.

Mr. BREWER. I object.

There being objection, the bill was not received.

J. J. SINTS.

On motion of Mr. SOUTHARD, by unanimous consent, leave was given to withdraw from the files of the House the petition and accompanying papers in the case of J. J. Sints for compensation as custodian of public property at Erie, Pennsylvania, and to refer the same to the Committee of Claims.

REMISSION OF DUTIES.

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 2476) to remit the duties upon certain goods destroyed by fire at the late conflagration at the city of Boston; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

BALTIMORE DRY-DOCK.

Mr. SWANN, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to communicate to the House of Representatives any information he may have in regard to an application of certain citizens of Baltimore for the grant of a portion of property at Fort McHenry, in the city of Baltimore, for the construction of a dry-dock upon terms and conditions beneficial to the Government, as set forth in a communication to the Secretary of War on the 26th of May, 1877.

CLERK TO A COMMITTEE.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Alabama, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee of Accounts:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department be allowed a clerk.

CONTRACTION OF THE CURRENCY.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent to offer for consideration at this time a bill to prevent the further contraction of the currency.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the volume of the legal-tender notes of the United States shall not be contracted or reduced below the amount of \$350,000,000;

and any surplus of such notes, received or redeemed by the Government, that may be in the Treasury at any time in excess of the sums required to meet the appropriations made by Congress, shall be reissued by the Secretary of the Treasury in the purchase of coin for the payment of the coin obligations of the United States, or for the purchase of the outstanding bonds thereof under such regulations as to notice of such purchases as will best protect the interests of the Government.

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. GARFIELD. I object to the consideration of that bill at this time, but not to its reference.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will not the gentleman from Ohio consent to its being made the special order for some day during the present week?

Mr. BURCHARD. Let the bill be referred to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object to that reference.

Mr. BURCHARD. It relates to the payment of the debt.

Mr. SPRINGER. I must insist on my objection to that reference. The object of the bill is to prevent the contraction of the currency below \$350,000,000.

Mr. GARFIELD. And it should certainly go to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SPRINGER. The contraction of the currency now nearly reaches that point.

The SPEAKER. One part of the bill relates to the currency and another part relates to the indebtedness of the United States. It is a question for the House to determine to which committee it shall be referred.

Mr. WOOD. Let it be reported again.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BURCHARD] to refer the bill to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BURCHARD. The bill was objected to and it is not before the House.

Mr. GARFIELD. I objected to allowing the committee to report at any time.

Mr. BURCHARD. The reception of the bill was objected to and it is not before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] to object to the present consideration of the bill; but not to its reception for reference.

Mr. GARFIELD. That was all.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman himself suggested a reference.

Mr. GARFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. BURCHARD. Then it was only admitted for reference.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SAMPSON. To report at any time?

The SPEAKER. That has been objected to, and it requires unanimous consent.

The question was taken on Mr. SPRINGER'S motion, and it was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. No. 2477) to prevent the further contraction of the currency was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

Mr. PEDDIE, by unanimous consent, presented resolutions of the New York Board of Trade, requesting that raw materials used in our manufactures may be admitted free of duty; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FINLEY. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order being demanded, the morning hour commences at two minutes after one o'clock. During the last morning hour there remained as unfinished business the bill (H. R. No. 1918) entitled "A bill for the relief of Milton B. Cushing, paymaster United States Navy."

Mr. GARFIELD. Is not that a private bill?

The SPEAKER. The bill was reported upon a day when reports of public bills were in order. The gentleman from Ohio is aware that on public-bill days private bills may be introduced although public bills may not be introduced upon private-bill days.

Mr. GARFIELD. It was reported, then, as a private bill on a day when reports of a public nature were in order?

The SPEAKER. It is a private bill reported on a public-bill day and it comes up now as unfinished business, and the question is upon ordering the bill to be engrossed and read a third time. The Chair will direct the bill to be read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the accounting officers in the Treasury Department of the United States are hereby authorized and directed to cancel a charge of \$10,000 now upon the books of said Department against Milton B. Cushing, a paymaster in the United States Navy, which is based upon a certain requisition and receipt purporting to be made by him on and to Paymaster Henry H. Pangborn, and bearing date May 2, 1866, said requisition being a fraud and forgery against the said Cushing.

The SPEAKER. The pending question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Ohio from the Sandusky district, [Mr. FOSTER,] that this bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to withdraw my motion to refer. Upon examination I find that the committee are unanimous in their report in favor of this bill, and that the case is really a meritorious one. I made the motion to refer because I felt that all such bills as this should go to the Committee of the Whole for discussion and investigation. I believe this House has been too lax in this matter of granting relief in such cases as this. But after examination I believe the committee were right in recommending the passage of this bill, and therefore I withdraw the motion to refer.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. I originally made the objection to the passage of this bill. I concur in the remarks just made by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. FOSTER.] Before this bill passes, however, I would like to be informed, and I would like that this House be informed, why proceedings were not commenced against Paymaster Pangborn for this \$10,000. Certainly the responsibility rests somewhere, and the Government should not be deprived of any opportunity to reclaim this money. I think it would be wise and just to introduce a bill authorizing the suing of the sureties of Paymaster Pangborn for this amount.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Although I was not the author of the report in this case, I have investigated it for the purpose of presenting the leading facts to the attention of the House. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WHITE,] I will say that the papers in this case disclose the fact that when Paymaster Pangborn died his accounts were square, and that from the funds left in his possession at the time of his death the sum of \$10,000 was taken, probably by one of his old clerks. Therefore I think that any suit brought against Mr. Pangborn's sureties would fail upon the ground that he was never a defaulter.

This case is a very simple one. When Frank Moore was an assistant paymaster of the Navy at New Orleans he made a requisition upon Paymaster Pangborn at Pensacola for the sum of \$20,000, to be applied in the payment of the officers of the Navy at the New Orleans station. After having made the requisition upon Mr. Pangborn, Mr. Moore was ordered to another place, and Mr. Cushing was ordered to take his place at New Orleans.

Mr. Cushing repaired to New Orleans, and on arriving there found that Mr. Frank K. Moore was just about leaving, and that a vessel had arrived from Pensacola with \$20,000 on board to answer the requisition of Mr. Moore. The question was immediately raised between them whether Mr. Moore, who had already closed his accounts, should reopen them, or whether Mr. Cushing should give a receipt for \$20,000. It was determined that Mr. Cushing should give a receipt for the \$20,000, and he accordingly signed a receipt upon the back of the duplicate requisition drawn by Moore, and received the \$20,000 and disbursed it.

The papers in the case, and the evidence is very clear and exact, show that soon after, as soon as the receipt reached Paymaster Pangborn, he objected to it upon the ground that it was informal. And gentlemen can readily see that a requisition drawn by a particular officer ought to have been receipted by the same officer. Mr. Cushing receipted upon a duplicate of the requisition of Mr. Moore, and Mr. Pangborn probably objected to it upon that ground, and asked for a new receipt. Mr. Cushing accordingly, on the 2d day of May, 1866, made this requisition upon Mr. Pangborn:

There is required for disbursement on board this vessel and the ironclads in ordinary, and for other necessary expenditures on this station, the sum of \$20,000, under the following appropriation, viz: Pay of the Navy, \$20,000.

That was signed by Mr. Cushing, and approved by the lieutenant-commander commanding. At the bottom of that requisition he also wrote the following words:

NAVY-YARD, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

Received [date left blank] of Paymaster H. H. Pangborn, United States Navy, the sum of \$—, for which I am accountable to the Navy and to the Treasury Department.

That was signed by Mr. Cushing. Mr. Brown, an assistant paymaster, was on his way to Pensacola, and in order that the papers might be promptly exchanged, Mr. Cushing gave them to Mr. Brown and asked him to go to Paymaster Pangborn's office and take up his old requisition and receipt and give the new one. Upon arriving at Pensacola, Mr. Brown was taken sick with the small-pox. Deeming it important that the papers should go into the possession of Mr. Pangborn at once, he sent it by a messenger to his office. As soon as Mr. Brown was able to get about, he himself called at Mr. Pangborn's office. In the mean time Mr. Pangborn himself had died of the small-pox. Mr. Brown found a clerk who assured him that the matter was all right, and that the original paper had been sent by mail to Mr. Cushing at New Orleans.

Soon after that time, Mr. Cushing, not having received the paper, and being at Pensacola, called at the office and was allowed to examine the books of Mr. Pangborn. The clerk assured Mr. Cushing that the original paper had been forwarded to him. Mr. Cushing, upon examining the books of Mr. Pangborn, found the account stated right, and that he was charged with only \$10,000.

Long afterward, when the accounts of Mr. Pangborn were settled at the Treasury, it turned out that the receipt which Mr. Cushing had signed in blank had been filled up, the words "May 21, 1866," having been inserted in the blank for the date and the sum "10,000" having been inserted in the blank for the amount.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no requisition of Paymaster Cushing

for \$10,000. He never called for that amount of money and never received it at any time. The receipt discloses that the filling up to which I have just referred is in the handwriting of Mr. Pangborn's clerk. Now Mr. Pangborn is dead; Mr. Brown, the messenger, is dead; and Paymaster Cushing is obliged of course to rely on the testimony of his wife as to conversations of Brown and one or two other witnesses who knew the fact that Pangborn required a duplicate receipt.

This matter, when it came before the Department, was referred to the Second Comptroller with the expectation that the error or wrong would be corrected under the third section of the act of July 28, 1876, which provided—

That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized, in the settlement of accounts of the disbursing officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, to allow, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, such credits for losses of property and funds as have occurred during the late rebellion and shall occur hereafter, and which shall appear to them, by such vouchers and testimony as they shall require, to have been occasioned by accidental circumstances or a condition of things over which such officers had no control and for which they are not justly responsible.

This matter went before Mr. J. M. Brodhead, the Second Comptroller of the Treasury, who, on December 24, 1875, reported as follows:

Respectfully returned with the statement of facts to the Secretary of the Navy. In my opinion it is not competent for any authority short of Congress to allow the credit asked for by Paymaster Cushing. On a consideration of all the papers in the case, however, it is my belief that he did not receive the \$10,000 debited to him on his last receipt in Pangborn's account.

Thus the matter rested until February 8, 1876, when the Second Comptroller, Mr. C. C. Carpenter, reported upon the matter in the following words:

In reply I have to say that, after careful consideration of this case, I am of the opinion that it does not come within the provisions of the act referred to.

The act I have just read.

Congress evidently intended by this act to relieve any officer who had or who might hereafter sustain a loss of funds actually in possession by casualty or act of Providence over which he could not have any control; and it was not intended, in my judgment, to authorize a credit for errors or losses which might have been prevented. This construction of the law is concurred in by the Assistant Solicitor of the Treasury, who has been consulted.

I might, however, in this connection add that, from the evidence in your case, I am fully satisfied that you did not receive the \$10,000 which is charged against you in Pangborn's account; and did the law warrant it I should have no hesitation in affording you the relief asked. But in the absence of a general law giving the accounting officers this power, your only remedy is to apply to Congress for relief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said all that I think is necessary in this matter.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me a question or two?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has given a very satisfactory history of this proceeding. Did I understand him to say that Mr. Pangborn received credit in his accounts for the \$10,000 inserted in the first requisition which was signed in blank by Paymaster Cushing?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. The gentleman is referring to the second receipt.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. Very well; and that is a forgery?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I believe it is.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. Now, the gentleman, in answer to a former remark, stated that he did not think the securities of Mr. Pangborn were responsible to the Government for this amount of money. Why does he make that assertion? I agree with him that Paymaster Cushing should not be charged with it; but why are not the securities of Pangborn responsible?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. My ground for making the statement was that I did not suppose the bondsmen of Mr. Pangborn could be held responsible for a larceny committed by a third person after the death of Pangborn.

Mr. WHITE, of Pennsylvania. But he gets credit for the amount in his accounts.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is true that Mr. Pangborn, in the settlement of his accounts, received a credit which did not belong to him; but when I am asked, "Can Mr. Pangborn's bondsmen be made answerable?" I say no, because Pangborn himself was not a defaulter at the time he ceased to act as an officer of the Government. Now, if you think you can sue the bondsmen of Mr. Pangborn for a larceny committed by a third person after Pangborn himself was dead, I do not object to its being tried; but it seems to me that in dealing with this question we ought to try to do justice to an honest officer of the Government, who is now liable to suit by the Government for \$10,000 which never came into his possession in any way.

I do not desire to discuss this question any longer. I know nothing of the parties in this case, except as the facts are disclosed upon the files of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

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. HARRIS, of Massachusetts, 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.

GUANO ISLANDS.

Mr. COX, of New York, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported back, with a recommendation that it pass, the bill (H. R. No. 1474) further to suspend the operation of section 5574 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, title 72, in relation to guano islands.

The bill was read. It provides that section 5574, title 72, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, be further suspended, as therein set forth, for the period of ten years next from and after the passage of this act.

Mr. COX, of New York. If there is no objection to the bill, I will ask that it be put on its passage without discussion.

Mr. DUNNELL. I would like to hear read the section of the statute to which the bill refers.

Mr. COX, of New York. I will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that in the law of August, 1856, in section 5570 of the Revised Statutes, in reference to guano islands, there is a provision that whenever any citizen of the United States discovers a deposit of guano on any island, rock, or key, not within the lawful jurisdiction of any other government, and not occupied by the citizens of any other government, and takes peaceable possession thereof, and occupies the same, such island, rock, or key may, at the discretion of the President, be considered as appertaining to the United States, and in the second section of that same act there is a proviso that no guano shall be taken from any such island, rock, or key, except for the use of the citizens of the United States or of persons resident therein. That was the limitation on the right or power to sell guano. Afterward that proviso was suspended for five years, and again suspended so that persons interested in the guano trade might sell to all the world and not merely be limited to citizens of the United States. The committee could see no reason why that suspension should not still continue.

Since these islands were discovered, or since possession was taken of them by our citizens, phosphates, guano, &c., have been discovered more or less at home, and have been utilized at home for agriculture. The object of the committee is to give those interested a larger market; that is all, and if any gentleman has any objection to that and will give me a valid reason why this bill should not pass, I will move to recommit it to the committee.

Mr. GARFIELD. Is this merely a suspension of that last clause?

Mr. COX, of New York. That is all; a continuation of that suspension.

Mr. GARFIELD. Is it a suspension for a limited time?

Mr. COX, of New York. Ten years. I do not see why it should not be suspended altogether, but that is all the parties in interest ask for.

Mr. GARFIELD. Is this a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. COX, of New York. It is a unanimous report. Such extension has passed two or three times before for a period of five years. This provides for a further extension for ten years.

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. COX, of New York, 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.

LAW LIBRARY FOR DAKOTA.

Mr. BAGLEY, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 789) to appropriate money for the purchase of a law library for the Territory of Dakota, and moved that it be put upon its passage.

The bill was read.

Mr. CLYMER. I make the point of order that the bill, as it contains an appropriation of money out of the Treasury, must, under the rules, have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. BAGLEY also, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 1201) making an appropriation for the purchase of a law library for the use of the courts and the United States officers in the Territory of Wyoming, and asked that it be put upon its passage.

The bill was read.

Mr. CLYMER. I make the same point of order, that the bill, containing an appropriation, must, under the rules, have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

CUTTING OF TIMBER, WYOMING TERRITORY.

Mr. FRANKLIN, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 802) regulating the cutting of timber on public lands in Wyoming Territory, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. It is referred with the understanding that it is not to be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

TIMBER LANDS IN WYOMING TERRITORY.

Mr. FRANKLIN also, from the same committee, reported back a joint resolution and memorial of Wyoming Territory, praying for such legislation by Congress as will enable the people of said Territory to acquire and utilize the timber resources of the Territory to such an extent as their wants and the demands of internal improvements may require, and moved its reference to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. It is referred with the understanding that it is not to be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

HENRY BECKMAN.

Mr. RICE, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 1929) for the relief of Henry Beckman, and moved its reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. It is so referred, with the understanding that it is not to be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

ELECTRICAL ANNUNCIATORS.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to submit the following report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, having had under consideration the following resolution of the House of date November 1, 1877, to wit:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be instructed to ascertain whether it is practicable to provide suitable electrical annunciators for this Hall to enable members at their desks to call pages, and to report as early as practicable by bill or otherwise"—

beg leave to present the following report:

First. It is practicable to provide such annunciators. There is a hollow space under the floor of the House, so that there would be no difficulty in arranging electrical wires to communicate the electrical current between the desks and the index box or boxes placed at any point in the Hall.

Second. It will cost between \$1,500 and \$2,000.

Your committee think it simply a question whether the convenience of having such annunciators over the present method of calling pages will justify the expense of putting them in, and present this their report with the accompanying propositions of Henry Lyon, of Peekskill, New York; of the Western Electric Company; Saint Louis Electric Manufacturing Company, and of J. H. Rogers, electrician of the House, without recommendation, and leave it to the House to decide whether the superior convenience of the method proposed will justify the expense of the change, and ask to be discharged from further consideration of the subject.

Respectfully submitted.

By order of the committee.

J. S. JONES,
B. J. FRANKLIN,
J. C. STONE,
Subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. What disposition does the gentleman propose to make of the subject?

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, and that the report be laid upon the table and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXAMINATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to report back, with an amendment, a resolution in regard to ascertaining the wants and requirements of the public service in respect to public buildings in certain cities.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is hereby authorized and directed to send a subcommittee of its members to the cities of Chicago, in the State of Illinois; Providence, in the State of Rhode Island; Pittsburgh, in the State of Pennsylvania; Saint Louis, in the State of Missouri, and Louisville, in the State of Kentucky, for the purpose of ascertaining the wants and requirements of the public service in respect to public buildings in those cities, and report the same for the information and further action of the House: *Provided, however, That said subcommittee shall not consist of more than five members, and that they shall receive no pay or allowance for such service except mileage, as now allowed by law to Senators and Representatives in Congress in going to and returning from said cities*"—

report the same back to the House and suggest the same be amended by inserting after the word "Kentucky," in the original resolution, the following: "Detroit, Michigan, and Cleveland, Ohio," and as thus amended they unanimously recommend its adoption.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I move the adoption of the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee. I am instructed by the committee to make that motion.

Mr. GARFIELD. I desire to ask the gentleman who reports this resolution whether any particular facts are known to the committee respecting the condition of the public buildings in those cities and their wants which call for the expenditure of this sum in order to send out subcommittees, or is the object merely that they may make a roving excursion to see if something may not be needed?

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. I am happy to say in answer to the inquiry addressed to me that there has been a question before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds as to whether they should act upon the report of the architect or whether through a subcommittee they should make an examination for themselves prior to recommending the extension, for instance, of public buildings. It is the unanimous judgment of our committee that before we report a bill to this House for the extension of a building we should have a subcommittee of our committee to make the examination. It is not the intention of the committee to visit any city except where there is a

proposition of this kind, where a bill has been introduced into the House for the extension of a public building; where that has been done the committee desire not to act on the mere report of the architect, but they desire that some members of the committee should make an examination; and for this reason: architects, by reason of their professional education and cultivation, always lean to large expenditures in the way of ornamentation and in the way of magnificent buildings. The committee therefore prefer to make the examination themselves rather than to rely on the report of an architect as to the matter. I am unable to speak from personal experience, but it has been represented to the committee, and such is the judgment of the old members, that it is not always safe to rely simply on the report of the architect. The committee therefore desire, before they make a recommendation, to have some members of the committee make a personal inspection; and they have no intention whatever of sending a subcommittee to any place where a bill has not been introduced for the purpose of adding to a public building. It is not their intention to send a subcommittee to examine where there is a proposition to erect a new building. They only desire to do so where it is proposed to have an extension of old buildings.

Mr. POTTER. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. STENGER. If I understand the resolution correctly, it makes an appropriation, and is subject to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will reserve the point of order.

Mr. POTTER. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Ohio, in what respect the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are to make an examination. As to what?

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. They desire to send a subcommittee to make an inspection of the accommodations already enjoyed by the locality, in order to see whether any such extension as is proposed is really needed. That is the object of it.

Mr. POTTER. I understand from the remarks of the gentleman that what was proposed was to make an examination in respect of the nature of the building to be erected.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. No, sir; the object is to inspect the old building and to see if any additions are necessary.

Mr. POTTER. And to see if we cannot get along with the accommodations which already exist.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. Yes, sir.

Mr. POTTER. I think it might be well that something should be done in that direction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STENGER] makes the point of order that this resolution, as it makes an appropriation, should have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES, of Ohio. The committee are unanimously of opinion that if we are to have this authority we ought to have it soon, and they introduce the resolution at this time for that purpose.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Do I understand the Chair correctly that he rules that this resolution must go to the Committee of the Whole on the ground that it contemplates an expenditure of money?

The SPEAKER. It directly states that mileage shall be paid to those who go on the investigation, so that the resolution comes under the operation of Rule 112; which the Clerk will read.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Then whenever committees are appointed by the House to go on investigations or to visit different parts of the country they have first to be recommended from the Committee of the Whole? I wish to ask if that has ever been a rule of the House.

The SPEAKER. Any report, or any bill, or any resolution which involves the expenditure of a dollar, is subject to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STENGER], under Rule 112, which will be read.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Has that been the practice of the House heretofore?

The SPEAKER. It has been the practice of the House ever since the adoption of Rule 112, or at least it ought to have been.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I think that there were investigating committees appointed at the last session of Congress, and in not one solitary instance were they recommended by a Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Missouri refers to committees that were sent to Louisiana, to South Carolina, and to Florida, the recollection of the Chair is that those committees were appointed under a suspension of the rules upon the first day of the last session.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I did not understand it in that way.

The SPEAKER. Oh, the RECORD shows that it was done in that way, and the Chair remembers distinctly stating that it required a two-thirds vote.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Hardly any bill comes before the House that does not involve an expenditure of public money.

The SPEAKER. The rule will be read, and when the gentleman from Missouri sees how far-reaching it is, he will concur in the decision of the Chair.

The Clerk read Rule 112, as follows:

All proceedings touching appropriations of money and all bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, shall be first discussed in a Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER. All proceedings touching the expenditure of public money must have their first consideration in a Committee of the Whole.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. No. 2142) to authorize and direct the Secretary of State to affix the great seal of the United States to a certain document therein stated.

J. D. BOND.

Mr. DAVIS, of North Carolina, from the Committee of Claims, reported a bill, (H. R. No. 383,) with a favorable recommendation, for the relief of J. D. Bond and Brother, of Wilson County, Tennessee; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

BIDOW AND WILSON.

Mr. DAVIS, of North Carolina, also, from the same committee, reported back the bill (H. R. No. 343) for the relief of Bidow and Wilson, of Danville, Kentucky; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM M'INDOE.

Mr. HENRY, from the same committee, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 150) for the relief of William McIndoe, postmaster at Lonaconing, in Alleghany County, Maryland; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

C. H. WALKER.

Mr. HENRY, also, from the same committee, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 1315) for the relief of C. H. Walker, postmaster at Frostburgh, in Alleghany County, Maryland; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

ANSON CALL.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the same committee, reported back, with an adverse report, the bill (H. R. No. 781) for the relief of Anson Call; which was laid upon the table, and the report ordered to be printed.

EDWIN A. CLIFFORD.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the same committee, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (S. No. 145) for the relief of Edwin A. Clifford; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

DANIEL W. PERKINS.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, from the same committee, reported back, with a favorable recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 850) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins, of East Saginaw, Michigan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the report ordered to be printed.

JAMES BRICE.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, from the same committee, reported adversely the bill (H. R. No. 562) for the relief of James Brice, of Jackson County, Missouri, for depredations committed by the Arapahoe Indians; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

REGULATION OF STEAM-VESSELS.

Mr. REAGAN. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce to report back, with a substitute, the bill (H. R. No. 673) to amend certain sections of titles 48 and 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States concerning commerce and navigation and the regulation of steam-vessels, and to move that the substitute and accompanying report be printed and be made a special order for Tuesday next after the morning hour, and from day to day until disposed of; not to interfere with the appropriation bills.

Mr. GARFIELD. How much time will the bill take? If I were a member of some committee in charge of some of the larger matters of legislation, I should not want the time of the House given away in this manner without some limit.

The SPEAKER. Whenever the House desires, it can close debate on any bill.

Mr. REAGAN. I will state to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARFIELD] that a bill on this subject passed at the last session of Congress with very little debate, and I do not think there will be much discussion upon this bill.

Mr. BANNING. I must object to its being made a special order, unless there is some limit of time fixed for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman say?

Mr. BANNING. Whatever time may be necessary, but I desire some limit.

Mr. REAGAN. I will say three days, although I do not think it will take so long a time.

There being no objection, the bill in the nature of a substitute (H. R. No. 2478) was read a first and second time, with the accompanying report ordered to be printed, and made a special order for Tuesday next, not to interfere with the appropriation bills, and from day to day until disposed of, not to exceed three days.

Mr. REAGAN moved to reconsider the order just made; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS FROM THE MISSISSIPPI AND OTHER RIVERS.

Mr. REAGAN, from the Committee on Commerce, also reported, as a substitute for House bill No. 2048, for the removal of snags and other obstructions from the Mississippi, Missouri, and Arkansas Rivers, and House bill No. 1904, appropriating money to open and keep unobstructed the navigation of Red River, and take care of property of the United States, a bill (H. R. No. 2479) for the removal of obstructions from the Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, and Red Rivers, and for the preservation of the public property; which was read a first and second time.

The first section of the bill appropriates the sum of \$40,000, to be expended under the direction of the War Department, for the removal of snags and other obstructions from the Mississippi, Missouri, and Arkansas Rivers, and for the preservation of the Government vessels in that service.

The second section appropriates \$6,000, to be expended under the direction of the War Department, for the purpose of opening the navigation of Red River above Shreveport, in the State of Louisiana, and keeping said navigation open and free from rafts, and for the purpose of preserving the vessels and boats of the United States employed in that work.

Mr. REAGAN. I am directed by the committee to ask that this bill be considered at the present time.

Mr. CUTLER. I raise the point that the bill contains an appropriation and under the rule should receive its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CUTLER] listen to me for a moment?

Mr. CUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. It is true that this bill makes an appropriation, but it is made upon the report of the engineers of these works and the recommendation of the Secretary of War, and is necessary for the preservation of public property. There was an appropriation of \$50,000 made in 1876 for the removal of obstructions from the Mississippi River, which appropriation has been exhausted. We have had before us testimony that the commerce of the country is suffering very seriously because of the failure to clear the river of snags and other obstructions to navigation, and also that the vessels of the United States engaged in the work, five in number, and costing half a million of dollars, will suffer a greater injury than the amount of this appropriation by not being properly cared for. There are five of them now, and only one man on each to watch them.

In regard to the Red River I will say that the work of removing the raft has been a continuing work and has long received appropriations from the Government. But, as is shown by the evidence of the report of the engineers and others, the raft has been blocked up in several places by logs, and there is now no money provided to take care of the boats in that service or to remove the obstructions in the raft and let out the commerce of northwestern Louisiana, southwestern Arkansas, northeastern Texas, and the Indian nation. The amount proposed by this bill is \$6,000, and we believe from the evidence that the appropriation should be made in order to facilitate the commerce of that portion of the country.

It was only because of the present necessity that the committee consented to make this report. If this bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole no one can tell when it will be reported from that committee. Our object is to secure prompt action, because if action is delayed there will be material injury done to the property of the Government and the commerce of the country.

The SPEAKER. The point of order having been made and sustained by the Chair, the bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PRICE. Has the morning hour expired?

The SPEAKER. It has.

Mr. PRICE. Then I move that the rules be suspended and the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

WILLIAM H. H. CLARK.

Mr. GARFIELD. Before the vote is taken upon that motion I ask leave to introduce for reference a bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to place the name of William H. H. Clark, late a private of Company G, Eleventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, on the pension-rolls.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. No. 2480) was received, read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The question was then taken upon the motion of Mr. PRICE, and it was agreed to.

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

REMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, before I commence the remarks which I propose to make, I want to say, for fear I shall be charged with discourtesy, that I do not wish to be interrupted during the course of

my remarks; but after closing them I shall be willing to hear, and to try to answer, any questions that may be asked me.

If there ever was a time when the financial prosperity of this nation depended upon wise legislation this is certainly the time. In the war of words and conflict of opinion now attracting the attention of the American people two questions present themselves which loom up above all others.

I need not say that these questions are the resumption of specie payments and the remonetization of silver, and if I am not much mistaken the former depends largely upon the latter for success. One good feature connected with the discussion and determination of these questions, and from which we may hope for the best results, is that no political party lines can by possibility influence the opinions or bias the judgment of the men who must make the final decision.

The silver dollar seems to be the subject of more diversity of opinion than might at first have been expected. It seems, however, to be pretty generally admitted that if a silver dollar can be made that will be equal in value to a gold dollar then there will be little or no objection to having silver dollars and making them a legal tender. To this feature of the subject, then, I propose to address some remarks. And just here I wish to say that unless we can have a silver dollar at least equal in value to a gold dollar, I do not want any law creating silver dollars and making them legal tenders. Men equally honest and equally intelligent differ in opinion as wide as the poles about the quantity and quality of the material out of which to manufacture an honest dollar, and in the enforcement of arguments to sustain opinions on either side it is not uncommon to hear the terms *Shylock*, *plutocrat*, *repudiator*, &c., freely used. The use of these pet names furnishes no convincing argument on either side, but they do show that the parties using them are fearfully in earnest as to the correctness of their several positions.

It has seemed to me that the better way to reach a just conclusion would be to examine the history of the past in reference to the silver dollar (for that is the dollar that all this controversy is about) and determine from that what would be its status in the future. For if it be true that like causes produce like effects, then it is most certainly true that whatever position this dollar occupied in the past it will occupy in the future, if the conditions are the same. Now, I state no new thing when I say that for nearly the entire life-time of this nation the silver dollar of 412½ grains of standard silver was worth more than a gold dollar, and at no time, not even for one day, was it worth less than the gold dollar. As long, then, as it had the same sanction of the Government that the gold dollar had, it was not only the equal but the superior of the gold dollar. But, Mr. Chairman, while this much-abused silver dollar was thus more than holding its own in the race with the gold dollar, the law stepped in and said it should no longer be coined, should no longer be considered as the money of account, should no longer be a legal tender. Of course thus shorn of its strength, with the foot of the nation upon its neck, it became a commodity. Its great function as money, recognized as such by the Constitution of our country and by the usages of nine hundred millions of the inhabitants of the earth in all the generations of the past and the present, was destroyed; and thus shorn of its strength and degraded from its high and legitimate position it had to take its place among the other metals for mechanical and ornamental purposes.

But, sir, even with this immense disadvantage against it its bullion value as a commodity has kept for most of the time above 90. Will any one pretend to say that if the position of the two metals was reversed and gold demonetized, and silver the only metal used for money and a legal tender, as gold is now, that the amount of gold (25.8 grains) now in a gold dollar would be worth one dollar in silver? Certainly not. The difference between 25.8 grains of gold bullion and a silver dollar under these circumstances would be very much greater than the difference now existing between 412½ grains of silver bullion and a gold dollar. In order to put gold above silver as it is now it was necessary for the law to discriminate in favor of gold, and against silver, for without this discrimination silver as a coin was always above gold as a coin in this country. One of the most singular features of this controversy is that when the friends of the silver dollar insist on having it placed where it was prior to the act of 1873, demonetizing silver, some of the opposition raise the cry that this will make it so valuable that it will not circulate as a currency and the money of account, and that as a consequence we will lose all our silver, and it is asserted in support of this argument that such was the case prior to 1873, and that that was one of the chief reasons for dropping it out of the coinage.

Now, if this be so, we cannot suffer, because we will have given to the silver additional value by coining it and making it a legal tender, and if other nations are determined to carry it away they must give us value for it, and therefore it is certainly the part of wisdom for us by additional labor and legal enactments to give our own people the benefit of its increased value, for it must not be forgotten that we are the silver-producing country of the world, and that the production of silver in mining, smelting, and transporting the raw material, fuel, and supplies furnishes employment to thousands of our people, and that the food and clothing necessary for those thus employed gives employment to additional thousands. So that the more labor we can put upon one hundred pounds of raw material dug from our own mines the better it will be for our own people. Labor,

Mr. Chairman, is to a great extent the standard of value, and when we have the raw material and the labor necessary to develop it, our Government would, in my judgment, be inexcusable if it failed to utilize them so as to add to the happiness and prosperity of the nation.

But on the other hand it is claimed that if we make a silver dollar of 412½ grains a legal tender we will be cheating somebody, by compelling them to take a money of less value than they had a right to expect. We must remember, in this connection, that the law required payment of our indebtedness in either gold or silver, at the option of the debtor, and inasmuch as either the gold dollar or the silver dollar was larger than the paper dollar, which measured what we received for many of our bonds, either of them was certainly large enough to satisfy every equitable as well as every legal claim of the creditor, and most certainly the debtor should be allowed to retain the option which under the then existing laws his contract gave him. Had not this option been taken away from him by stopping the coinage of legal-tender silver by the law of 1873, specie-par would have been so much lower than it now is that before this time paper would have reached it. The process of contraction would thus have been brought to a stop, for the moment paper attained the level of either gold or silver, specie would have begun to enter into circulation, which would have relieved the stringency of the money market. And this would have happened whether specie payments had been formally resumed or not, just as it has happened in France under similar circumstances.

But, sir, this objection of cheating comes mostly from the crooked narrow streets in New York and similar places, where men most do congregate who produce nothing and consume much but by some means to the uninitiated unknown get money. These arguments against the silver dollar, so diametrically opposed to each other, I suppose might be classed with those vessels called double-enders, which sail one way just as well as another. This silver dollar, if we are to believe all we hear about it, is a curious joker. One day it is so good that everybody wants it and nobody can get it, and the next day the same dollar is so bad that it would be cruel injustice to make anybody take it. When the goldites wanted it out of the coinage it was too good to stay in, and now when it is proposed to restore it, the objection is raised that it is too bad to go in. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this cross-eop-logic doctrine must have originated where men make money by their wits, by puts, and calls, and straddles. I am not prepared to say positively that either *puts* or *calls* are applicable to it, for I confess I know next to nothing about that way of doing things, but it seems to me that this double-ender argument must belong to the straddle family, where it is possible to be on either side, or no side, as the occasion may require. That the silver dollar was dropped out of the coinage because it was too valuable does not admit of a doubt, for it is specifically so stated by Mr. Hooper who had the bill in charge and who explained its provisions to the House. His language on that occasion was:

Being worth intrinsically one dollar and three cents in gold it cannot circulate concurrently with gold coins.

Now I wish it to be distinctly remembered that this language of Mr. Hooper was used in reference to this identical silver dollar about which we are now talking, and which was the unit of value and the dollar of account, and that at the very hour when it was being murdered in what should have been the house of its friends, it was admitted by its murderers to be a better dollar than the gold dollar. Section 16 of the law of 1873 degraded the good old silver dollar of 412½ grains to 384 grains so as to make the gold dollar the unit of value. Mr. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, in the discussion on this bill said that it was necessary to make the change from 412½ to 384 grains because unless this was done we "could not keep silver coin in the country." If time allowed I might continue the proofs of this character to show that the coinage of the silver dollar of 412½ grains was discontinued because it was too good a dollar; so valuable, sir, that it would be sought after by other people to such an extent that we could not keep it in the country.

But now, sir, how is it? What kind of arguments are we who favor the restoration of the old and time-honored silver dollar met with? Why, sir, we are charged with being demagogues, repudiators, seeking to defraud our creditors by paying them with a silver dollar that is not worth a dollar. And yet these bad, these dishonest dollars are the identical dollars that some of these same men said only a little while ago were worth more than a gold dollar; in short, too good for ordinary mortals to have. Am I not justified, then, in calling this kind of logic a double-ender argument. It reminds me of the lines applied to another party on another occasion, of whom it was said—

Twixt worming in and worming out,
He leaves the beholder still in doubt,
Whether the snake that made the track
Was going south or coming back.

I have already intimated that a restoration of the silver dollar to its old legal standing would place it in value just where it was before there was any discrimination against it. As a proof of this I now put upon the witness-stand David A. Wells, one of the men who is opposed to the position I take and opposed to the remonetization of silver and the restoration of the silver dollar, and who has written labored articles to sustain his position. He is therefore a witness for

the opposition and not for our side of the case, and yet he testifies that remonetization "will probably bring silver in proximity to par with gold." This much, sir, the stubborn facts of history encountered by the enemies of the silver dollar compel them to admit. I may say in this connection that coined money has for generations, and among all peoples, been worth more than bullion or metal, out of which it was coined. The gold dollar, that has so many worshippers to-day, is worth more than the metal out of which it was manufactured, and no one can doubt that the same law would apply with the same results to silver as a metal and silver coined.

The strongest proof of this is found in our nickel coins, about \$5,000,000 of which are to-day in circulation among our people, and yet the metal in one dollar of nickels costs only fourteen and one-third cents, and yet because it is coined and has stamped on its face the words "United States of America, five cents," one dollar of it will purchase as much food and clothing as ninety-seven cents in gold coin. I might ask the enemies of the silver dollar if it is not reasonable to suppose that ninety-two cents' worth of silver bullion would be worth one hundred cents when coined, when fourteen and one-third cents of nickel and copper are worth ninety-seven cents when coined, particularly if silver is a legal tender, which the nickel is not and never was, taking gold as the standard by which to measure both, and I think it would be difficult for them to answer.

But we are told that other nations are adopting the gold standard, and, therefore, we must do so too. I, sir, for one, fail to see any force in this argument. To apply any rule for the observance of two or more parties the circumstances and surroundings must be the same. Now, sir, is it necessary for me to repeat what I referred to on this floor some weeks since as to the difference between our country and any other on the globe? We have, sir, a diversity of soil, climate, and productions, with facilities for producing, transporting, and manufacturing possessed by no other country or government in the world. And in addition to all these we are every day becoming richer by the increased development of our agricultural and mineral resources. We are fast becoming the bread and meat producers to feed the world. It is estimated that we have more acres susceptible of cultivation than the balance of the world combined. The pathways opened up by the *Pinta* and the *Mayflower* are now being traversed by ships of thousands of tons burden, carrying from the fertile plains of this fruitful land not only the products of our bountiful grain-fields, but also the sheep and the oxen from more than a thousand hills, and landing them on the wharves of the old world, bringing us back in return that which adds to our wealth and power as a nation. Nor is this all. The peoples from all parts of the Old World are deserting the homes of their fathers and taking up their abode with us. We are not going to them; they are coming to us and bringing with them their money and their days' works, by all of which means we are, as a nation, increasing in wealth more rapidly than any other nation on earth, and there is no nation that can live within itself so well as we can. These are some and only a part of the reasons why a rule that may be a good one for other nations may not be applicable to us.

Again, sir, I insist we must decide these questions for ourselves, because, in addition to what I have already said, there is this other reason, that they have in the past acknowledged themselves to be mistaken.

For instance, Germany is now held up as a pattern for us to follow, and a reason why we should repudiate the silver dollar and adhere to the single gold standard; yet Germany demonetized gold in 1857 and adopted silver as her standard of value and money of account, and did not change her policy in that respect until the heavy payments to her by France in gold made it her interest to demonetize silver and adopt the gold standard. Some turn in the affairs of the world may cause her to change back again. No one can tell. Her history and the history of other nations justify me in saying that no nation attempts this while she is a debtor nation. But when a nation becomes a creditor nation, her interest may be to have gold alone as the standard, and the dearer they can make the gold the better for them.

If, then, we are to learn anything from Germany on this question, it is that as long as we are a debtor nation our interest is to make both gold and silver our legal-tender money for all debts, and particularly is this so while we are such large producers of silver.

It is a noticeable fact that since the demonetization of silver in Germany real estate has fallen in price to an alarming extent. A property that was bought five years ago near Berlin for 2,550,000 marks, was sold a few weeks since for 258,770, or about one-tenth of its former value. A little reflection will satisfy any one that this is a necessary result of confining our money to one item or metal. Money is admitted to be the measure of value of the property of the world.

Then, as a consequence, as you reduce the measure of value you reduce the value itself. For instance, suppose the money of the United States was \$600,000,000 in gold and \$300,000,000 in silver and we strike from the list all the silver, the measure of value would be reduced one-third, and of necessity the property would be reduced in value in the same proportion; so that what had been worth \$3 would be worth but \$2.

This is the law that has produced these results in Germany, to which I have referred, and the same results have always followed a

like course in every country in the world. This of necessity is a benefit to the man who has his means in money, but operates to the injury of every man who depends upon the sale of his property or his labor for a living. The effect is to make money dear and labor cheap, and no amount of special pleading or sophistry can avoid this stubborn fact.

Let me remind gentlemen who take the opposite side of this question that the language of our Constitution in reference to our money is gold and silver not gold or silver, and I very much doubt (and am sustained in this by some good constitutional lawyers) whether the framers of our Constitution contemplated anything by the terms gold and silver, as used by them in that instrument, except an honest coinage of both these metals which should be a legal tender, fair to both debtor and creditor, and among all classes of our people whether rich or poor.

I am aware, sir, that both England and Germany, that are paraded before us as sources from which we are expected to draw wisdom, have a debased coin for use principally among the laboring and producing classes. England has about \$93,000,000 of debased silver, and Germany when she demonetized silver in 1873 authorized the issuance of nearly \$100,000,000 of debased silver to be used for a similar purpose.

If that be honest statesmanship, I for one want none of it. I put myself on record here and now as opposed to a silver dollar of 384 grains for one class of our people and a larger dollar for another class. The man who has one dollar due him for his labor or the product of his labor is entitled to just as good a dollar as the man who has much or little due him for the product of his capital. I would, if I had the power, make the dollars honest ones as developed by the light of history and experience, and I would make them all alike so that all men should be on an equality in that respect. If we want to stop this cry of capital oppressing labor (a cry frequently used for bad purposes) we had better let the laboring classes see by our works that we propose to give them as good a dollar when they earn it by their labor as we give the man who earns it by his capital. If England and Germany wish to pursue a different policy let them do so; this Government, I hope, sir, will never follow their example upon the labor question.

One word, sir, in answer to the assertion so often made, that the vast increase in the quantity of silver produced in this country is the cause of its depreciation. In answer to this I may say that it is stated upon good authority that during the year 1877, India, Japan, and China took in the course of trade \$105,000,000 in silver, which is about twenty-five millions more than the entire production of the world for the same time. The eastern world has always been called the grave of silver. It is the money of that country, and will continue to absorb any surplus of silver we may have.

But I must remind gentlemen that Germany, with all the flourish of trumpets with which our ears are greeted about her gold standard, has not been able to get along without some silver as a legal tender. Germany has to-day several hundred millions of francs in silver as a legal tender on a basis of 15½ to 1, which is less silver to equal a gold dollar than we propose, and this gold and silver of Germany are exchangeable at par. Now, how does it come that in Germany, the boasted land of the so-called gold standard, they have silver as a legal tender and at par with gold at 15½ for 1, while if we propose to make silver a legal tender and at par with gold at 16 for 1 the howl is raised that we are repudiators and are about to ruin the country? Is it because we give more silver for a dollar than they do in Germany? If not this, what is it? (Letter of E. B. Washburne to Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State, March, 1876, page 177.)

The Director of the Mint, in his report for 1876, gives the gold coin in the United States at \$151,565,000 and silver coin at only \$30,113,000, (page 8,) and in his report for 1877 he gives the coinage from June 30, 1850, to June 30, 1877, as follows: gold, \$861,965,700.50; silver, \$113,181,141.50, (page 11,) proving very clearly that all the silver we have cannot materially affect the money market. The Director of the Mint admits, (page 8,) first, that from 1792 to 1870 the relative value of gold and silver was about 1 to 15½, and that silver appreciated so that in 1859 a silver dollar of 412½ grains was worth 105½ in gold, (page 47;) and, second, that the great depreciation in silver was after it was demonetized, and that as soon as it was commenced to be coined, even for subsidiary coin, it appreciated. This, I think, demonstrates very clearly two things: first, that the amount of silver production has not been, and is not likely to be, so great as to make it dangerous to use it as a legal-tender coin, and, second, that the moment we commence to coin it, even though not a legal tender, it begins to reassert its capacity for equality with gold.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is a noticeable fact that within the last few weeks every conceivable mode of warfare is being resorted to for the purpose of defeating the remonetization of silver and influencing legislation here upon that question. We are told that silver dollars of full weight are being sent from California and New York and other gold centers into the western States for sale at ninety-seven cents in legal-tender notes. Of course, sir, if this is being done it is for the purpose of creating the impression that silver is so plenty as to be a burden. The hypocrisy and dishonesty of this are manifest when we consider that the banks and the merchants have bought and are now buying subsidiary silver coin, that every one knows is a debased coin, and paying par for it, which they certainly would not do if they

could buy dollars of 412½ grains for ninety-seven in the same kind of pay, for it would be base flattery to call a man a fool who would pay one hundred cents for 384 grains of silver when he could buy 412½ grains of the same kind of silver for ninety-seven cents. The fact is the trick is too shallow to deceive any one, and in my judgment this kind of unscrupulous sharp practice will only serve to give the people a chance to see these tricksters in their true light.

The question naturally arises why did not these overburdened silver men offer these silver dollars at these prices before this time? Why did they wait until the question of the remonetization of silver arose? The whole thing, sir, is a fraud, a delusion, and a snare.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another mode of warfare which these gold men have resorted to that I am sorry to be compelled to notice. Not satisfied with controlling the press in these money centers, they have by some means been able to enlist the services of certain gentlemen of the sacred calling. This I think they will find has been unfortunate for their cause, for these gentlemen of the cloth have exhibited so much bad temper and such utter ignorance of the question that in place of assisting they have injured their cause. A gentleman in Brooklyn, by the name of Beecher, with the prefix of reverend to his name, has taken up the cudgels for the dwellers in Wall street, and has exhibited about as much ignorance upon this question as can well be crowded into one sermon, for it must be remembered that he is a preacher. He talks finance from the pulpit, and publishes it in a book, (this book, sir, which I now hold in my hand,) and sends it to us benighted heathens to admonish and warn us, so that we go not astray. But, sir, from the reckless character of his talk we are led to conclude that he is just the kind of man that Burns had in his mind when he said:

Some books are lies frae end to end,
And some great lies were never pened;
E'en ministers they have been kened
In holy rapture
A rousing whid at times to bend,
And nail't wi' Scripture.

The reverend gentleman has certainly succeeded in all except the nailing, although he took for his text the sixth and seventh verses of the twelfth chapter of I Samuel, which, if any one will look at, I think he will conclude a different sermon might be preached from. Mr. Beecher informs us that "gold is the standard in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, north, south, east and west;" and that "it is a universal, unchanging standard," thus including the whole known world, when the facts are that 768,944,456 of the population of the world use exclusively and entirely silver as their standard, and 137,300,000 use both gold and silver, and only about 100,000,000 use a single gold standard. In this statement I have not included the United States.

Now, am I not justified in saying that this reverend gentleman, in making the sweeping statement above referred to, either wickedly stated what he knew to be false or else advertised himself to the world as a consummate ignoramus upon this question that entitles him to the contempt of every man who has ever given the subject any thought? Then, having settled that question I suppose to his entire satisfaction, he proceeds to tell us what kind of men these are who wish to remonetize silver. He describes them, in his own chaste and classic language, as "bull-headed, without eyes, endeavoring to undermine the integrity of the nation;" and says "they deserve an infamy as deep as the lowest depths of hell." He further says that we are "miscreants," and that this attempt to remonetize silver "is a high crime and misdemeanor, and if men in Congress do not know it, what are they there for?" Yes, sir; what are we here for? Why not vacate our seats, and give place to such men as this reverend gentleman, whose record is so clean, whose reputation so unblemished, who has never been before the church and the world in any equivocal positions. He would be the man to fix all this, for he certainly has an experience in a certain direction that I presume no man who supports this silver bill can boast of. But it is a little surprising, I think, that his reverence should consign us to hell, for, if the papers report him correctly, he has abolished or at least desulphurized that institution. It is possible, however, that upon this subject the wish is father to the thought, produced by personal considerations.

Another reverend gentleman, by the name of Frothingham, took occasion on Sunday, the 16th of last month, to pay the advocates of the silver dollar some left-handed compliments. He compares us to those people spoken of in the Scriptures and of whom it is said, "Ye are of your father the devil, for he is a liar and the father of lies." Again, he says: "One thing is sure; the passage of this bill will shake the foundations of the Republic. A deeper danger is in it than in the first shot fired against Fort Sumter." These words, sir, are samples of Mr. Frothingham's sermon, preached in the city of Buffalo on Sunday, the 16th of December, 1877, and the text of Scripture upon which he tried to hang this sermon was composed of the words "pictures of silver," found in the eleventh verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Proverbs. The whole verse reads thus, "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver." I think it would not be very difficult to preach a different and much better sermon from that verse. For instance, we might say that it is proposed to give the people the value of a dollar in gold in a picture of silver, and proceed from that to elaborate and amplify.

This Mr. Frothingham, whatever else he may lack, certainly does

not lack froth, and I presume will never be at a loss for a text from which to preach on any subject. I have heard of one such case before, and but one. A certain preacher was dissatisfied with the manner in which the ladies of his congregation wore their hair, which, according to the fashion of the times, was done up in a bunch or knot upon the top of the head, and he determined to preach a sermon against that style of wearing the hair, and of course he must have a text upon which to hang his sermon. In looking for an appropriate passage of Scripture for this purpose he came across this one, found in the thirty-first verse of the seventeenth chapter of Luke:

In that day, he which shall be upon the house-top, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away.

A man of less ingenuity than he would have found it difficult to get a text out of that verse for the purpose intended, but this man was equal to the occasion; so, taking the last syllable of the word "house-top" and prefixing it to the words "not come down," found in another part of the verse, his text would read "top not come down."

Mr. Chairman, another argument or rather plan to get votes against the silver dollar is that capitalists will not any longer lend money to the West or South unless an obligation is given them to pay principal and interest in gold. This may be justly styled the thumb-screw argument. They propose to lend paper worth ninety-seven cents in gold or subsidiary silver coin, which according to their own testimony is only worth eighty-eight cents—for it must not be forgotten that these men say that 412½ grains of silver is only worth ninety-two cents, consequently 384 grains are only worth eighty-eight cents—so that the proposition of these money-lenders is to lend us ninety-seven or eighty-eight cents and compel the borrower to pay them back one hundred cents in gold. I am reminded of something about three thousand ducats and a pound of flesh. But I will not blacken the name of shylock by a comparison with these men. In the next breath after this exhibition of remorseless greed and avaricious tyranny, they shed a few crocodile tears over the poor man who, they say, will be so much injured by this silver dollar. But while so anxious that the poor man shall not be cheated by being paid for his labor or his produce in a silver dollar of 412½ grains, they continue to pay him with 384 grains of the same metal and call it a dollar. This is probably the first instance in the history of this country when 384 was found to be more than 412½. But these gold men are wonderful logicians as well as arithmeticians. If you will only have unlimited faith in them they can prove that "black is not black, nor yet is white so very white."

Not long since the Legislature of the State of New York, influenced by the same interest that is now seeking to shape legislation here on the money question, passed a law requiring the State taxes to be paid in gold. That was all very well for Wall street, but the farmers do not seem to like it so well and are now clamoring for the repeal of that law. Strange that, when these Wall-street philanthropists, who deal in gold and play bull and bear, devise such splendid plans for the benefit of the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, by allowing them to take their pay in paper or light silver and then pay what they owe in gold, they should not be thankful to the men who deal in gold!

I have already referred to the objection to silver: that its abundance would make it comparatively worthless. Let me add that prior to 1848 the percentage of silver produced was about 72 per cent. and gold 28 per cent.; and since that time the relative percentage has been, of silver, about 32 per cent., and, of gold, 68 per cent.

I said a little while ago that Asia was the grave of silver. I find that the Director of the Mint, in his report for 1877, page 16, says that "in the last twenty-two months the export of silver to eastern nations amounted to \$143,500,000." No danger, therefore, need be apprehended from too much silver in this country. The Secretary of the Treasury, although opposed to some of the views I here present, advocates the issuance of the silver dollar in exchange for legal-tender notes when demanded by the holder of said notes. But it is urged that the remonetization of silver will stop the refunding of the national debt into 4 per cent. bonds. I do not believe this objection is well taken, for I have full confidence that if the bill now before the Committee of Ways and Means, providing for the issuance of 3.65 certificates, which certificates may be exchanged for 4 per cent. bonds, becomes a law, our own people will take up these bonds and hold them at home in place of sending them abroad, which will be a great improvement on the plans heretofore adopted for disposing of our bonds.

But suppose we do not remonetize silver and do attempt resumption in gold alone, and continue to sell 4 per cent. bonds and apply the proceeds to the redemption of the three hundred and fifty millions of outstanding legal-tenders, we will then have exchanged 4 per cent. bonds for an indebtedness bearing no interest at a cost to the country of \$14,000,000 per annum, when by using the silver which our own mines produce resumption would be made easy with no shock to the business of the country and no expense in the shape of additional interest. In short, sir, the redemption of our outstanding legal-tenders is to me a very plain one so far as duty is concerned, but by no means a plain one so far as ability is concerned, and in my judgment it would be the extreme of folly to reject the assistance of so powerful an agent as the silver which we own. Without silver we cannot hope to succeed without selling bonds for gold, and that lays an additional burden upon our people by exchanging a non-interest for an

interest-bearing debt. With silver we may resume without any additional burden of this kind. Allow me to add here, what I should have said before, that in place of having too much silver, even now when it is not a legal tender, we have too little, for the Director of the Mint says in his report for 1877 (page 9) that sometimes the demand for silver for China is so great that he has been compelled to buy silver in the London market. "But," say the objectors, "we must keep faith with the men who purchased our bonds;" to all of which I say amen. Let that be done to the last word and letter of the contract.

But, Mr. Chairman, before examining the history of the sale of our bonds and the contracts and agreements under which the sales and purchases were made, allow me to refer for a moment to the history of our coins, so that we may have a more correct idea of what kind of money we obligated ourselves to pay in; and for this purpose I use the following summary of the laws of the United States:

In 1785 the Congress of the United States, under the Articles of Confederation, adopted the silver dollar as the unit of money. On the 2d of April, 1792, Congress, in the law establishing a mint, enacted that "the money of the United States shall be expressed in dollars or units," the dollar "to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar, as the same is now current," and contain 371½ grains of pure silver. The same act fixed the weight of pure gold in the eagle at 247.5 grains, or 24.75 grains of gold to the dollar, which made fifteen pounds of coined silver the equivalent in all payments of one pound of coined gold. In 1834 the weight of pure gold in the eagle was reduced to 232 grains, and, as no change was made in the silver dollar, the equivalency between gold and silver became 16.045 of silver to 1 of gold. In 1837 the quantity of alloy in both the gold and silver coinage was changed so as to make the coins of both metals nine-tenths fine. The quantity of pure silver in the dollar was not changed, but the quantity of pure gold in the eagle was increased to 232.2 grains, so that the equivalency between gold and silver became 15.986 of silver to 1 of gold. Since 1837 no change has been authorized in the weight or purity of metal in either the gold or silver dollar. It will thus be seen that in the whole history of the United States the weight of pure silver in the silver dollar has never been changed, while the weight of pure gold in the gold dollar has been changed twice.

Gold and silver have been money in this country since its first settlement, by force of the English common law, and the Constitution of the United States recognizes and fixes them as money by the provision that the States shall not make anything but "gold and silver coin a tender in the payment of debts." Congress cannot demonetize either gold or silver, except under a claim to a general authority over the subject of currency, upon which, if it exists at all, there are no limitations, and which may extend to monetizing any form of paper. If Congress can establish a legal tender, it is not prohibited, as the States are, from making anything "but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Between 1821 and 1834, when the legal equivalency between the metals was 15 to 1, gold was at a premium in silver of from 5 to 7 per cent., and disappeared from the circulation, and but little was brought to the mint for coinage. The legal relation of value between the metals of about 16 of silver to 1 of gold, established in 1834, was an undervaluation of silver. From that date on and until 1874 the silver dollar bore a premium in the London market over the gold dollar of from 1 to 3 per cent. Notwithstanding this premium, silver did not wholly disappear, as gold did between 1821 and 1834, but the quantity in circulation continually grew smaller down to 1862, when both the metals were expelled from the circulation by legal-tender paper. Between 1850 and 1873, whenever payments were made in coin, gold was used because it was the cheaper of the two metals, just as silver was used for a similar reason between 1821 and 1834; but during each of these periods both gold and silver possessed equally the potentiality of money, the metal out of actual use being certain to come again into actual use when the conditions changed.

After 1834, on account of the undervaluation of silver by the coinage law of that year, there was a tendency to export silver rather than gold in the settlement of adverse balances of foreign trade. In 1852 a scarcity of the small coins required in minor transactions began to be seriously felt. To meet this difficulty the act of February 21, 1853, was passed. It provided that the silver coins under the denomination of \$1 should be struck slightly below standard weight, and that the legal-tender function of such coins should be limited to \$5 in any one payment. This expedient, or the equivalent one of slightly debasing such coins, is familiar in the practice of European countries. Previous to the act of 1853 the owners of silver bullion had the right (act of January 18, 1837, section 30) to demand its coinage into any of the denominations of silver coin authorized by law. Before that act the law did not authorize any silver coins except the three-cent piece, which were not of standard weight and fineness, and which were not a legal tender for all sums. Under the provisions of that act, the subsidiary or fractional coins, being underweighted, possessed a mint value above their bullion value, and were permitted to be coined only on Government account. By this regulation the Government made a profit or seigniorage on the subsidiary coinage equal to the difference between its mint and bullion value. But after the passage of this law, as fully as before its passage, the owners of silver bullion had the right to demand its coinage into dollars, whose weight remained unchanged, and which, when coined, were equally with gold a full legal tender. This right was never denied to silver bullion until the passage of the law of February 12, 1873, nor was the legal-tender quality of the full-weighted silver dollar taken away or limited until the adoption of the Revised Statutes in June, 1874.

The act of February 12, 1873, above referred to, is a long act of sixty-seven sections, regulating all the details of the Mint. It does not demonetize the old silver dollar or any of the silver coins of standard weight issued prior to 1853. The silver dollar is not named in it, and it would escape casual observation that that dollar was in any way affected by it. Precisely what the act did was to authorize the coinage of silver half dollars, quarter dollars, and dimes below standard weight, and of a new silver coin for Asiatic commerce above standard weight, to be called "the trade-dollar," and to prohibit these particular coins, described as "said coins," from being a legal tender for more than \$5 in any one payment.

The law of 1873 did not attempt to interfere with the legal-tender quality or power of the silver dollar, but it did prevent its coinage in the future. So that whatever of silver coins there was in the country possessing the legal-tender quality still retained that quality or power. (Page 89.)

Now, sir, with these facts before us, how do we stand as to the bondholders?

Prior to 1870 many of our bonds were sold for paper, and many persons, and among them some of the best lawyers in the country, insisted that we had the right to pay in paper, but to settle this question Congress passed a law requiring payment in coin. Then in July, 1870, Congress passed what is known as the funding act, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certain bonds, which bonds should be redeemable in coin of the present standard value

and bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and every bond of any and every kind and denomination issued since the 14th of July, 1870, has been issued in compliance with that law and bears upon its face these words:

This bond is issued in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, amended by an act approved January 20, 1871, and is redeemable at the pleasure of the United States after the 1st day of September, 1891, in coin of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870.

Now, sir, on the 14th of July, 1870, the silver dollar of 412½ grains standard silver (which is equal to 371½ of pure silver) was one of the coins of the United States and a legal tender, and the gold dollar of 25.8 grains of standard gold was also one of the coins of the United States and a legal tender, and when the purchaser took the bond he took it with this condition fully and plainly expressed, and that specified condition is so binding upon both seller and buyer that no difference what changes are made in our coinage laws, no difference how large or how small we may make the gold dollar or the silver dollar, when we come to pay our debt, both principal and interest, for the same condition is expressed on the face of the bond in reference to the interest, we must pay for every dollar we owe 25.8 grains of standard gold or 412½ grains of standard silver. We can pay no less, and our creditor can demand no more.

The controversy upon this question has about narrowed down to this, to wit, whether the silver dollar of 412½ grains will be equal to the gold dollar. The proof that it will, is found in the fact that it always was equal or superior to the gold dollar while it had an equal chance under the law, and in the further fact that to-day 400 grains of silver in France is the equal of the gold dollar. And the question, Why will not 412½ grains of silver be as valuable as a gold dollar in this country, when 400 grains of the same kind of silver is the equal of a gold dollar in France? has not and cannot be answered.

When we ask these opposers of the dollar proposed in the bill to say how much silver shall compose the silver dollar they cannot answer. They do not attempt to. They are as silent as a charnel-house. They are powerful as objectors, but helpless as advisers. They are good to pull down, but useless to build up. The arguments in favor of the remonetization of silver and making it a legal tender are found in the facts of history and the experience of nations. The arguments against it consist of theories, of surmises, and of conjecture, all born of fear or cupidity.

Mr. Chairman, when the advocates of a single gold standard can point me to one single fact, lasting for one hour in our country's history, when (all the circumstances and surroundings being equal) the silver dollar of 412½ grains was not as valuable as a gold dollar, I may have some doubts of the correctness of my position; but until then never. We who advocate the restoration of silver as it was prior to 1873, are not repudiators. We seek to avoid no contracts or obligations; we want no silver dollar that is not as good as any gold dollar. The acts of 1873-74 took from our people what for long years and under all circumstances had been a sound, reliable and current coin of the nation, and now, sir, in the name of the oppressed and suffering industries of the country, we demand the restoration of what was wrongfully taken from us. We demand that the dollar of the capitalist shall be the dollar of the farmer, mechanic, and day-laborer. We demand that the dollar earned by labor, however humble, shall be as good as the dollar earned by capital however powerful. No worse and no better. This doctrine, is so eminently just and proper that it must find a hearty response in every man's heart.

We are not speaking or legislating for bullion, either gold or silver. We are legislating for gold and silver, coined and made the legal-tender money of the nation, as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States. We are laboring to get back the dollar that has been tried in every condition and under every variety of circumstance in this country and never found wanting. We are directing our footsteps in the pathway lighted by the lamp of experience. We are not pioneers. We are only seeking for the old paths made luminous by the footprints of the fathers of the Republic. They beckon us onward; they say to us: "This is the way, walk ye in it." And he who has been a watchful student of history cannot mistake his way; and if we be attentive listeners, we may hear from every passing breeze that is wafted to us from the marts of commerce or from the field of the husbandman, and from the hum of the loom and the ring of the anvil, words of encouragement to pursue steadily the silvery pathway that shall conduct our nation to the goal of financial prosperity.

Mr. CLYMER. I move that the committee rise.
The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOKER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union having had under consideration the Union generally, and particularly the annual message of the President of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The following additional petitions were presented under the order of yesterday, and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:
By Mr. ALDRICH: The petition of Jane Graham Jones, a citizen of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois, praying for the removal of her political disabilities or to be relieved from taxation.

By Mr. BANKS: The petition of Abby A. Bennett, Hannah Buffum, John Bailey, John L. Robinson, and others, citizens of Lynn, Essex County, Massachusetts, asking for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the several States from disfranchising United States citizens on account of sex.

Also, the petition of Elizabeth Bancroft, Jane T. Osgood, Caroline E. Field, Samuel S. Osgood, William A. Eaton, Mary A. Howe, A. M. O. Daniels, S. A. Bemis, Emily Sibley, E. T. Doane, and others, citizens of Athol, Worcester County, Massachusetts, of similar import.

Also, the petition of J. B. Dean, Louisa Northup, Nelson Brown, F. G. Phillips, and others, citizens of Cheshire, Berkshire County, Massachusetts, of similar import.

Also, the petition of E. B. Sargent, Mrs. Phineas Haynes, Sarah A. Bean, Charles F. Smith, and others, citizens of West Haverhill, Essex County, Massachusetts, of similar import.

By Mr. BLAIR: The petition of Mary A. Powers, Filley Ruth, W. Smith, Joseph Powers, George W. Chapman, and others, citizens of North Haverhill, Grafton County, New Hampshire, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Caroline F. Barr, of New Ipswich, of similar import.

By Mr. BOYD: The petition of Helen A. Sutherland, Mrs. M. C. Smith, J. A. Sutherland, John Northcarrow, and others, citizens of Elmwood, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. BRIGGS: The petition of Caroline F. Barr, Louisa L. Barr, E. A. Barrett, E. S. Preston, and others, citizens of New Ipswich, New Hampshire, of similar import.

By Mr. BURCHARD: The petition of Mary L. Davis, Flora L. Stigner, A. Inman, G. W. Becker, and others, citizens of Davis, Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Alma Upchurch, Elizabeth M. Fitch, E. H. Maberly, Mary Stedman, and others, citizens of Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Mary L. Davis, a citizen of Davis, Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Sarah A. Dupuis, Abby Gray, M. Dupuis, T. B. Hardin, and others, citizens of Savanna, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. BURDICK: The petition of Ann Satterthwait, Tennice W. Chambers, Nathan Satterthwait, Sallie Heald, Lydia P. Cowgill, Sarah V. Barnes, N. W. Macy, Jennie K. Barnes, and others, citizens of West Branch, Iowa, of similar import.

By Mr. COVERT: The petition of Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., a citizen of New York City, of the same import.

By Mr. CUTLER: The petition of Madelina Budd, a citizen of Chatham, New Jersey, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Cornelia C. Hussey, a citizen of East Orange, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Catherine Browning, a citizen of Orange, New Jersey, of similar import.

By Mr. DENISON: The petition of Lydia Putnam, Mrs. Parley Starr, John Eames, E. W. Harlow, and others, citizens of Brattleborough, Vermont, of the same import.

Also, the petition of Mrs. Sarah M. Lynde, Mrs. C. A. King, Alvah Smith, S. H. Edwards, and others, citizens of Guilford Centre, Vermont, of similar import.

By Mr. DUNNELL: The petition of Sarah W. Clark, Nelly C. Jargo, J. C. Jenkins, W. Raley, and others, citizens of Rochester, Minnesota, of similar import.

By Mr. FORNEY: The petition of P. Holmes Drake, Frankie B. McCarty, and Buell L. McClung, citizens of Huntsville, Alabama, of similar import.

By Mr. FORT: The petition of Viola E. Hawks Archibald, Cornelia Steeley, S. R. Hawks, F. M. Streat, and others, citizens of Watseka, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. HARRIS: The petition of Abbie May Alcott, Louisa M. Alcott, James A. Cookins, F. B. Sanborn, and others, citizens of Concord, Massachusetts, of similar import.

By Mr. HENDERSON: The petition of Eliza Knowles, Mary A. Rishel, Thomas E. Knowles, J. P. Gordon, and others, citizens of Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Nannie H. Trego, Mary T. French, Arther Trego, David W. Camblin, and others, citizens of Richland Grove, Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of S. Y. Keaton, S. F. Wheelock, S. W. Wheelock, Ada E. Schoolmaker, D. Young, Mrs. W. B. G. Lester, Mrs. Sarah F. Nourse, and others, citizens of Moline, Illinois, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Hannah J. Coffee, M. Jennie Wright, Hays Wright, George M. Candler, and others, citizens of Rural, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. HENRY: The petition of Rachel A. Hicks, Caroline Elbert, and others, of Still Pond, Maryland, of similar import.

By Mr. HUNGERFORD: The petition of Mary E. Hughes, a citizen of Sarona, New York, of similar import.

By Mr. KELLEY: The petition of Rebecca Simpson, a citizen of New Hope, Pennsylvania, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Sylvia Jane Odell, a citizen of Rome, Pennsylvania, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Emma J. McCullis, a citizen of Steuben, Pennsylvania, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Nancy C. Sanders, a citizen of Athens, Pennsylvania, of similar import.

By Mr. KIDDER: The petition of Sarah J. Barnes, Ann M. White, W. A. Roberts, E. S. Tyler, and others, citizens of Fargo, Dakota, of similar import.

By Mr. LYNDE: The petition of Mathilde Francizke Anneke, Lizzie Black, Fannie E. Strickland, J. Black, Percy S. Anneke, Edward F. Strickland, and others, citizens of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Henrietta J. Partridge, Mrs. George Esberty, W. M. Branch, F. Winchester, and others, citizens of Whitewater, Wisconsin, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Ida E. Delane, Mrs. J. H. Comstock, J. H. Comstock, Albert Cowland, and others, citizens of Pensaukee, Wisconsin, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Laura Goodell, Mrs. L. G. Burrington, William Goodell, S. A. Hurdson, and others, citizens of Janesville, Wisconsin, of similar import.

By Mr. MONROE: The petition of Mary V. Griffith and Emiline G. Fawcett, citizens of Salem, Ohio, praying for the removal of their political disabilities.

Also, the petition of Henrietta L. Monroe, a citizen of Xenia, Ohio, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Elizabeth G. Bridge, a citizen of Yellow Springs, Ohio, of similar import.

By Mr. MORRISON: The petition of Pamela Lacy, a citizen of Ashley, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. MORSE: The petition of Harriet H. Robertson, G. F. Small, R. C. Sargent, Sidney D. Shattuck, and others, citizens of Malden, Massachusetts, for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the several States from disfranchising citizens of the United States on account of sex.

By Mr. PATTERSON: The petition of Margaret P. Evans, Mrs. P. M. Kelsey, Content P. Crocker, John Evans, G. W. Miller, and others, citizens of Denver, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of M. S. Crary, E. M. Bacon, M. M. Boyd, W. L. Slutz, and others, citizens of Golden, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Mrs. Giles Harrington, Mrs. J. O. Stewart, L. E. Leren, A. R. Forbes, and others, of Georgetown, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Edward Remdell, Mrs. M. M. Hawkey, George Aux, Mrs. L. L. Rice, and others, citizens of Kiowa, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Jennie Prescott, Mrs. T. R. Wright, C. H. Jerome, W. K. Eggleston, and others, citizens of Texas Creek, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Lucy Freeman, Mary King, James M. Marshall, H. A. Campbell, and others, citizens of Central City, Colorado, of similar import.

Also, the petition of George P. Matthews, Mrs. Julia Martin, M. E. Lashey, Mrs. Mary A. Spensor, and others, citizens of Mainton, Colorado, of similar import.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: The petition of Mrs. R. A. Eaton, Kate Hanson, and 26 others, citizens of Leavenworth, Kansas, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Mrs. Emma Faris, Mrs. Libbie Beecher, H. P. Spurgeon, H. V. Faris, and others, citizens of Farisville, Kansas, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Mrs. Emma Ingersoll, Lizzie Murray, William B. Livingston, Joseph W. Ingersoll, and others, citizens of Empire, Kansas, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Lenora Bigelow Van Brunt, Mrs. M. Chow, M. P. Tenney, John R. Hill, and others, citizens of Westmoreland, Kansas, of similar import.

Also, the petition of C. E. Gray, Mrs. C. E. Gray, George E. Smith, E. S. Barr, and others, citizens of Holyoke, Kansas, of similar import.

Also, the petition of Lucy A. Christian, Josephine McChesney, Wirt Kempton, Selvin McBride, and others, citizens of Belleville, Kansas, of similar import.

By Mr. PRICE: The petition of Mary A. Mills, of Des Moines, Iowa, of similar import.

Also, the petitions of Amelia A. Bloomer, of Council Bluffs; of Nancy R. Allen, of Maquoketa; of Clarissa and Sarah Coffin Seymour, of Ottumwa, Iowa, of similar import.

By Mr. REAGAN: The petition of Rhoda A. Cooper, C. A. Hall, Maggie Hall McLemore, and Martha Goodwin Tunstall, of Crockett, Texas, of similar import.

By Mr. SAMPSON: The petitions of Ellen Armstrong, L. B. Tobias, N. W. Dennison, Edward Everett, and others, citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa; and of C. S. Nelson and 116 others, of Monroe County, Iowa, of similar import.

By Mr. SINICKSON: The petitions of Lucinda B. Chandler, S. H. Cornell, J. M. Chandler, George Pearson, of Vineland; of Cornelia C. Henssey, Susan M. Carson, J. M. Long, Nelson Lindsay, and others, citizens of Orange, Chatham, Essex and Morris; of Elizabeth Ely, Carrie Price, Joseph Smith, and others, of Lambertville; of Eliza Post, Ellen Mann, James Schomaker, and others, citizens of Passaic; of Mary Hopkins, Caroline B. Graham, Robert Hopkins, and others, citizens of West Orange, New Jersey, of similar import.

By Mr. STEWART: The petitions of Cornelia E. Alwater, Mary N. Klinefelter, and others, citizens of Saint Paul; of Dora Sanquist, Lizzie Wright, and others, citizens of North Branch Station; of Almira D. Williams, Flora D. Conger, and others, citizens of Rush City; of

J. Runnyon, E. D. Wilson, and others, citizens of Sunrise City; of Mrs. George H. Johnson, Mrs. M. S. Peaslee, and others, citizens of Detroit City; and of William O'Bryan, Mrs. E. U. O'Brien, and others, citizens of Reynold, Minnesota, of similar import.

By Mr. STONE, of Michigan: The petition of Mrs. S. Carpenter and Annie Weir, citizens of Lapeer County, Michigan, of similar import.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois: The petition of Rebecca H. Orange, Catharine Harris, and others, citizens of Albion, Illinois, of similar import.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Michigan: The petition of Louisa L. Weightman, Amelia Jackson, and Mary S. Cary, of Washington, District of Columbia, of similar import.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Wisconsin: The petitions of Lucena C. DeWolf and Henrietta J. Partridge, of Whitewater, and of Lavinia Goodall, of Jonesville, Wisconsin, of similar import.

Mr. CLYMER. I move that the House now adjourn.

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

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions, &c., were presented at the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as stated:

By the SPEAKER: The petition of Carter & Coates, Sherman & Co., and other publishers, booksellers, and importers of Philadelphia, that tariff duties remain unchanged until thoroughly investigated—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALDRICH: The petition of the Journeymen Silk-hatters' Association, of Chicago, for a reduction of the duty on silk plush—to the same committee.

By Mr. BLAIR: The petitions of Thomas H. Powers, William B. Davis, and 48 others; of Alexander Scott and 272 others; of L. B. Cox and 143 others; of Samuel F. Platt and 78 others; of A. McElroy Wylie and 106 others; of Josiah Roberts and 177 others; of Theodore Justice and 43 others; of R. J. Hough and 146 others; of Mrs. Henry W. Gwinner and 80 others, embracing many clergymen, judges of courts, professional men, merchants, and others, of Philadelphia and vicinity, for a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the same committee.

By Mr. BRAGG: The petition of citizens of Wisconsin, for the repeal of the bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKNER: The petition of 54 citizens of Warren County, Missouri, for a reduction of the tax on tobacco—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL: The petition of the Tobacco Association of Danville, Virginia, for a reduction of the tax on manufactured tobacco—to the same committee.

By Mr. CASWELL: The petitions of E. Fred Russell and 38 others, of Payette; of J. Bowman and 26 others, of Kilbourn City; of Bassett & Davies and 40 others, of Columbus; and of Alexander McCracken and 24 others, of Waterloo, Wisconsin, for the repeal of the bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHALMERS: Papers relating to the bill providing for the purchase of the land upon which the Grant-Pemberton monument at Vicksburg, Mississippi, is erected—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK, of New Jersey: A paper relating to the establishment of a post-route between Montana and Broadway Station, New Jersey—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COLE: Resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange of Saint Louis, relative to the default of the Pacific Railroad—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

By Mr. COX, of New York: The petition of Patrick Horrigan, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, the petition of Casper Karz and 25 others, citizens of New York, for the repeal of the tax on matches—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIBRELL: The petition of William T. Cate, late postmaster at Chattanooga, Tennessee, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A paper relating to the claim of E. K. Snead—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. DURHAM: The petition of Mary Caldwell and Alfred Williams, of Madison County, Kentucky, for a change of the internal-revenue laws—to the same committee.

By Mr. FREEMAN: The petition of American Carpet-Lining Company, at Philadelphia, that tariff duties remain unchanged until thoroughly investigated—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLOVER: The petition of John B. Wolfe, for the correction of certain abuses by military officers and the War Department—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, the protest of the eastern band of Cherokees, of North Carolina, against the passage of House bill No. 228—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts: The petition of William F. Pratt and others, of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, for the repeal of the charter of the National Capital Insurance Company, of Washington, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, the petition of C. D. Hunt, agent, manufacturer of tacks at

Fairhaven, Massachusetts, that tariff duties remain unchanged until thoroughly investigated—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOOKER: The petition of Harriet J. Carey, for compensation for property taken by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIDDER: Papers relating to the establishment of post-routes between Crook City and Spearfish, and between Crook City and Galena, Dakota Territory—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LIGON: A paper relating to the establishment of a post-route between Dick's Creek and Union Springs, Alabama—to the same committee.

By Mr. LUTTRELL: Papers relating to the claims of A. P. Jackson and others, of Nicholas Marquez, and of James E. Barnes and 11 others, citizens of California—to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: The petition of manufacturers of stone china and earthenware at East Liverpool, Ohio, that no change be made in existing tariff laws—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULLER: Papers relating to the claim of P. F. Reuss for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEILL: Remonstrance of the employes of Porter & Coates, of Philadelphia, book publishers, against the reduction of the duty on books and against the reimposition of the war tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIDDLE: The petition of citizens of New Rochelle, New York, for the remonetization of silver and the repeal of the resumption act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS: The petition of 1,100 citizens of Maryland, for Government aid in removing to and settling upon the public domain—to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STARIN: The petition of Wood, Smith & Co., manufacturers of carriage-axles, &c., at Fort Plain, New York, and of Mohawk and Hudson Manufacturing Company, at Waterford, New York, that tariff duties remain unchanged until thoroughly investigated—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART: The petition of the officers and citizens of Morrison County, Minnesota, for relief for settlers on railroad lands—to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMPSON: The petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, for the equalization of bounty to soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THORNBURGH: The petition of W. O. White, for a pension—to the same committee.

By Mr. THROCKMORTON: The memorial of M. Castro, G. W. Boutell, and others, residing in San Benito and Monterey Counties, California, protesting a change in the line of the Southern Pacific Railroad so as to allow the same to be constructed on what is known as the Salinas route—to the Committee on the Pacific Railroad.

By Mr. TIPTON: The petition of the Harvard Temple of Honor of Harvard, Illinois, for a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio: The petition of Marsh & Harwood, and other manufacturers of chemicals, at Cleveland, Ohio, that tariff duties remain unchanged—to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARNER: The petition of Frederick Sherwood and others, of Westport, Connecticut, for an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor of Westport, Connecticut—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Delaware: The petition of 83 citizens of Milton, Delaware, for an appropriation for the improvement of the Broadkilm River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Michigan: The petitions of Margaret McCrickett and Frederick R. Bruner, for pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Oregon: The petition of Louisa Boddy, for relief—to the Committee of Claims.

Also, the petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oregon, for the construction of certain river and harbor improvements—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Wisconsin: The petition of John Holroyd, for compensation for the use of certain inventions of his at the United States navy-yard, Washington, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: The memorial of the faculty of Adrian College, Michigan, for further encouragement of education by the General Government—to the Committee on Education and Labor.

IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 16, 1878.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WITHERS presented joint resolutions of the senate and house of delegates of Virginia, in favor of a reduction of the tax on manufactured tobacco; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.