

United States and the holder of that certificate I am willing to confirm the title. But suppose that in the mean time some person has come in and acquired a title to this same tract of land under the laws of the United States, as they are construed by the Supreme Court. I do not wish now by legislation to go back and interfere with that title, to change the law so that it will have some retrospective effect upon that title. That would not be a proper thing for Congress to do. We had better take up the certificates by refunding the money; and in fact there is a general law which authorizes and requires the refunding of money in cases of this kind where entries have been improvidently made; or if persons have gone on and made improvements on the land it is better for Congress to pay for the improvements and to do justice fully in this particular than it is to interpose its authority and the weight of its opinion in behalf of one claimant of the land against another, both claiming under the Government, one claiming under the law and the other contrary to law.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Alabama permit me?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. He will see by the phraseology of the amendment that this only applies to cases where the United States is one party and the purchaser the other party, that where there are any conflicting claims they are not included, nor is the title cured or affected in any way by this measure.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct as the bill was originally reported where there is any conflicting claim, but we have now the word "valid," or rather "any valid conflicting claims," and that requires some court to decide it; that requires some authority on the part of the Government or somebody else to decide on the validity of that conflicting claim. If the Senator should limit the question entirely between the purchaser from the Government and the Government so that the controversy that might arise in respect of it between two private citizens would not get into the case possibly, then I should be satisfied with it.

I am willing, if a man has made an entry at a dollar and a quarter an acre, and that is now the price of the land, that he should have his certificate or should have his patent, provided some person else in the mean time has not come in and acquired a right to the land; and if the amendment should be limited entirely to cases between the Government of the United States and a claimant, I am willing that this should be considered as a valid title as against the Government. But where there is any person else who is interested at all, I should object to having the matter settled in that way.

I do not wish now to legislate so as to give to a man a title that was invalid at the time he got it. I am willing to pay him for the land; I am willing to compensate him for all the damage he has sustained, but not to take the title from some person else and transfer it to him.

That is my difficulty about the amendment, and I think it will be much better for the Senator to allow this matter to be considered on a separate bill, and let us have the facts of the particular case to which the bill is to be applied. I should like to have the railroad company named, to have all the facts and circumstances of the particular case stated to Congress in order that we might know precisely what we were doing. Here is a proposition that covers the whole territory of the United States, and I think it will be found very inconvenient in respect to some of the legislation we have already enacted and some that it is proposed to enact.

Mr. VEST. I think if this matter is laid over until to-morrow I can make some valuable contributions in the way of information upon the subject. I have some papers in regard to it which I received some time ago, and I laid them away, in reference to this question coming up in the Senate; but I have them not now in the Chamber. I will move for an executive session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope before that is done—

Mr. VEST. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion until we have an order to print this bill as far as it has been agreed to, so that in some way we may know a little more as to the scope of it than we can by a hasty reading at the desk.

Mr. VEST. I think that is right.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa moves that the bill as it now stands with the amendments agreed to—

Mr. ALLISON. And proposed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. And proposed, be printed. That order will be entered if there be no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the order is made, I desire to move a substitute for section 5, so that it may be printed also.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio submits an amendment intended to be offered by him as section 5, which will be printed.

Mr. PLUMB. The old section 5 was stricken out of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know.

Mr. PLUMB. But there is another section 5.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know it.

Mr. PLUMB. I offer an additional section to the bill, which I ask may be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kansas sends an

amendment to the Chair intended to be proposed as an additional section to the bill. That also will be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 483) for the erection of a public building at Keokuk, Iowa; and

A bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Jane Veazie, deceased.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1705) to provide for the issue of duplicate checks.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That a committee of three members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the House, and two members of the Senate be appointed by that body, to wait on Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, and to notify him that he has been duly elected President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th of March, 1885; and also to notify Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, that he has been duly elected Vice-President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th day of March, 1885.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, I ask to have printed a statement to accompany the Army appropriation bill in the nature of a report from the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa, from the Committee on Appropriations, submits a statement to accompany the report of the Army appropriation bill, and asks that it be printed. That order will be entered, if there be no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 11, 1885.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. JOHN S. LINDSAY, D. D.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I rise to offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois in a moment. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POLAND] is recognized.

SUITS FOR DAMAGES IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. POLAND. I rise to present a privileged report. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 7131.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill of the House No. 7131, "to authorize suits for damages where death results from the wrongful act or neglect of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with the following amendments thereto:

In the first section of said Senate amendment, and next before the proviso to said section, insert the following words: "and such damages shall be assessed with reference to the injury resulting from such act, neglect, or default, causing such death, to the widow and next of kin of such deceased person." And also by adding to said first section, after the proviso, the following words: "And provided further, That no action shall be maintained under this act in any case where the party injured by such wrongful act, neglect, or default has recovered damages therefor during the life of such party."

And also by amending the said Senate amendment by striking out of the second section thereof the words "two years" and inserting "one year."

And the Senate agree to the said amendments to the Senate amendment to said bill.

LUKE P. POLAND,
J. R. TUCKER,
WM. DORSHEIMER,
Managers on the part of the House.
ISHAM G. HARRIS,
JOHN J. INGALLS,
H. H. RIDDLEBERGER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. POLAND. I will not take any time to make any explanation of this report unless some gentleman on the floor should desire it.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

ACTION ON BILL VACATED.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to submit a statement with reference to the action of the House on Saturday last on the bill named.

The Clerk read as follows:

The action of the House on Saturday last disagreeing to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House H. R. 5713 and asking a conference with the Senate thereon will be vacated, the said bill not having passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The action of the House was taken on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROSECRANS]. The Chair, having submitted to the House the statement of facts, asks that this may be ordered. The Chair hears no objection.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I rise to offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the House for the remainder of the present session be 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman desire to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire a vote on it.

Mr. KEIFER. I make the point that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. That is not as I understand the rule. Such a resolution has been offered every session and I have never known one to be sent to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has never known one that was not sent to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. KEIFER. I will state to the House that it will be reported back between this and Monday.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. CUTCHEON. I ask unanimous consent to change the reference of the bill (H. R. 8117) for the relief of the heirs of Charles B. Smith, deceased, from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on Military Affairs, the reference to the Committee on Claims having been erroneously made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADMISSION TO THE FLOOR.

Mr. McMILLIN. I desire to offer a privileged resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be directed to admit to the floor of the House ladies having tickets issued for the members' gallery during the joint session for the count of the electoral vote.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Is that a privileged question?

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state that this is in the exact language of the resolution offered in the Forty-sixth Congress, which was at that time held to be privileged, and which was passed. I think there can be no objection to it. The state of facts is this: About eight hundred tickets have been issued; the seating capacity of the galleries set apart is barely four hundred. Hence this is necessary in order to accommodate those holding the tickets which have been issued.

Mr. COSGROVE. I ask that the resolution be again reported.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, is that motion privileged?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. WASHBURN. Do I understand the Chair to hold that this is a privileged motion?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is a privileged motion, in the light of the rulings that have been made by the Speakers of the House.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I rise to make a point of order on this motion.

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

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the rules of the House is that under them certain persons are admitted upon this floor and all other persons are excluded. Now, the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] proposes to admit upon the floor of the House persons who, under the rules, are excluded from the floor; therefore it is a proposition to change the rules of the House, and is subject to the point of order that it must go to the Committee on Rules, and can not be considered without one day's notice.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have at hand a reference to a precedent if it is desired.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not necessary to debate the point of order further. The Chair will state (if the gentleman from Tennessee is content) that this is not the first time this point has been raised and ruled upon, and the Chair has no disposition to overrule the rulings made by its predecessors, which is that the rule to which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEWITT] has adverted does not apply to a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, but applies simply to the sessions of the House. Such has been the ruling from the Chair here-

tofore, and the present occupant feels no disposition to controvert that ruling.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is no rule excluding any one from the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Not when it is in joint session, except at the pleasure of the House. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question was taken on the adoption of the resolution offered by Mr. McMILLIN; and there were—ayes 134, nays 72.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved to lay that motion on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOLLETT. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Appropriations, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill of the House 8039, making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, together with the amendments of the Senate thereto, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows: They recommend concurrence in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 48, and 49.

They recommend non-concurrence in the amendments numbered 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, and 50.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If no separate vote is demanded upon the amendments the question will be upon concurring in the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Senate amendments be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the amendments. Before he had concluded the reading,

Mr. BENNETT rose.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from North Carolina withdraw his demand for the reading of the Senate amendments?

Mr. BENNETT. I do, sir, because I can not get any information from it. [Laughter.]

The amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 46, 48, and 49 were concurred in.

Mr. TALBOTT moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were concurred in; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. FOLLETT. I move that the House non-concur in the remainder of the Senate amendments and ask for a committee of conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FOLLETT moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FOLLETT, Mr. HUTCHINS, and Mr. CANNON.

OFFICERS OF UNITED STATES COURTS.

Mr. SPRINGER, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice the bill (H. R. 7675) relating to the compensation and duties of United States attorneys, marshals, and other court officials, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REFERENCE OF SENATE PENSION BILLS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the order of the House made yesterday various pension bills from the Senate now on the Speaker's table will be taken up and appropriately referred.

Bills of the following titles were accordingly taken from the Speaker's table, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

A bill (S. 1268) for the relief of Sydney L. Skaggs;
 A bill (S. 1365) granting an increase of pension to Eugene O'Sullivan, late a sergeant of Company K, Eighteenth Missouri Volunteer Infantry;
 A bill (S. 1416) granting a pension to Mrs. Charlotte Hackett;
 A bill (S. 1546) granting a pension to Orin R. McDaniel;
 A bill (S. 1571) granting a pension to James McCallen;
 A bill (S. 1655) granting a pension to Newton J. Burris;
 A bill (S. 1790) granting an increase of pension to Edgar L. Dutton;
 A bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to George A. Washburn;

A bill (S. 1804) granting a pension to Clarinda Hunt;
 A bill (S. 2009) granting a pension to Isabella Turner;
 A bill (S. 2158) granting an increase of pension to Jesse S. Harrold;
 A bill (S. 2160) granting a pension to Robert Walker;
 A bill (S. 2204) granting arrears of pension to Nancy B. Leach;
 A bill (S. 2231) granting a pension to Mrs. Kate A. Drummond;
 A bill (S. 2272) granting a pension to Andrew Franklin, alias Andrew McKee;

A bill (S. 2327) for the relief of James Bedell, sr.;
 A bill (S. 2398) granting a pension to Cyrus Reeser;
 A bill (S. 2514) granting a pension to David T. Hoover;

A bill (S. 2547) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Frances L. Thomas, widow of Maj. Gen. George H. Thomas;
 A bill (S. 2549) granting a pension to Isabella Higgs;
 A bill (S. 2587) granting a pension to William H. H. Gilley; and
 A bill (S. 2610) granting a pension to Patrick Furlong.
 Bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
 A bill (S. 357) granting a pension to William Lockhart;
 A bill (S. 1183) granting a pension to Hugh O'Neil; and
 A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Leonora A. Boyden.

S. W. MARSTON.

On motion of Mr. COSGROVE, by unanimous consent the bill (S. 1035) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle the claims of S. W. Marston, late United States Indian agent at Union agency, Indian Territory, for services and expenses, was taken from the Speaker's table, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

SILVER DOLLARS AND SILVER CERTIFICATES.

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that an order be made to print in the RECORD the communication which came in last evening from the Secretary of the Treasury in response to a resolution of the House asking information relative to the alleged refusal of certain banks and banking associations to receive silver dollars and silver certificates in settlement of their balances.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]? The Chair hears none, and the order is accordingly made.

The communication is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, February 10, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of resolution of the House of Representatives dated February 3, 1885, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to inform this House whether the Clearing House Association at New York, or any national bank thereof, refuses to receive silver dollars or silver certificates in the settlement of their balances, or refuses to receive silver dollars or silver certificates from the Government in payment of balances due from the Government to said association, and whether any official or officials of the Government accede to or recognize such rule or practice.

"Also, what amount of gold came into the Treasury of the United States in exchange at par for silver dollars and silver certificates during the month of January, 1885.

"Also, whether any national bank, or association of national banks, refuses to receive or pay out silver dollars or silver certificates contrary to law, or have adopted any rule or practice in that regard for the purpose of discrediting such money, or the effect of which is to depreciate the same.

"Also, what amount of silver coin was in the Treasury of the United States on the 1st day of January, 1879, and of each year thereafter, not held for the redemption of silver certificates, and what proportion the said coin bore on each of those dates to the net cash in the Treasury at those several dates.

"Also, what amount of the customs and internal revenue and other receipts of the Government, stated separately, have been received in silver coin or silver certificates, stated by months, for each year since the 1st day of January, 1879.

"Also, what other governments of the world did, during the year 1883, permit the coinage of legal-tender silver coin; also, the amount of such coinage, and what part thereof was from recoinage and what part from bullion.

"Also, the price paid per ounce by the Director of the Mint for silver bullion on the 1st days of January and July in each year from 1878 to 1885, both years inclusive."

In reply, I inclose herewith copies of reports from the Treasurer of the United States and the Director of the Mint, to whom the resolution had been referred, which contain the information desired.

Very respectfully,

H. McCULLOCH, Secretary.

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives.

TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES,
 Washington, February 10, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to submit such information as this office is able to furnish in answer to the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on the 3d instant and referred to the Treasurer of the United States for report.

1. "Whether the Clearing House Association at New York, or any national bank thereof, refuses to receive silver dollars or silver certificates in the settlement of their balances, or refuses to receive silver dollars or silver certificates from the Government in payment of balances due from the Government to said association, and whether any official or officials of the Government accede to or recognize such rule or practice."

It is not known to this office that the Clearing House Association at New York or any national bank thereof has, since the passage of the act of July 12, 1882, refused to receive silver dollars or silver certificates in the settlement of their balances, or has at any time refused to receive silver dollars or silver certificates from the Government in payment of balances due from the Government to said association.

The following resolutions, among others, were adopted by the New York Clearing House Association November 12, 1878, viz:

"Resolved, That in order to facilitate the payment of drafts and checks between the Treasurer of the United States and the associated banks, the manager of the New York Clearing House is authorized to make such an arrangement with the assistant treasurer as will accomplish that purpose through the medium of the clearing-house.

"Resolved, That the associated banks of this city, after the 1st of January, 1879, will (1) decline receiving gold coins as 'special deposits,' but accept and treat them as lawful money; (2) abolish special exchanges of gold checks at the clearing-house; (3) pay and receive balances between banks at the clearing-house either in gold or United States legal-tender notes; (4) receive silver dollars upon deposit only under special contract to withdraw the same in kind; (5) prohibit payments of balances at the clearing-house in silver certificates or in silver dollars, excepting as subsidiary coin, in small sums (say under \$10); (6) discontinue gold special accounts by notice to dealers on 1st of January next to terminate them."

In a letter to the chairman of the clearing-house committee of Boston, dated November 18, 1878, Secretary Sherman said that—

"The arrangement between this Department and the New York Clearing House Association was confined to the convenient adjustment and payment of drafts drawn upon the Treasury and the banks, respectively, and to the receipt, by the banks, of United States notes as coin, after the 1st day of January, 1879.

The several resolutions adopted by the associated banks of New York * * * were for the guidance of the banks and not in any respect a stipulation with the Government."

The Treasury, in January, 1879, became a member of the New York Clearing House to the extent and for the purposes set forth in the resolution above quoted.

A provision having been inserted in the twelfth section of the act of July 12, 1882, that "no national banking association shall be a member of any clearing-house in which such certificates (gold and silver certificates) shall not be receivable in settlement of clearing-house balances," the associated banks of New York adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the resolutions adopted by the Clearing House Association on the 12th of November, 1878, be, and are hereby, modified so far as they conflict with section 12 of the act of Congress passed July 12, 1882."

The members of the clearing-house have continued to settle their balances in gold coin or certificates, or United States notes, and as no silver dollars or silver certificates have been tendered, none have been refused. The Treasury, although not a party to any understanding that silver dollars or certificates should not be tendered, and though it has never in any way waived the right to pay demands upon it in any kind of money which may lawfully be tendered for the purpose, has conformed to the practice of the associated banks in paying the balances against it at the clearing-house. The Department has deemed it inexpedient as a matter of public policy to force the issue of silver dollars or certificates at the chief financial center of the country until compelled to that step by the condition of the Treasury. Silver certificates have recently been used in part payment of a day's balance against the Treasury, and have been accepted by the clearing-house. They will be again so used whenever the state of funds in the Treasury may require it.

2. "What amount of gold came into the Treasury of the United States in exchange at par for silver dollars and silver certificates during the month of January, 1885?"

There was deposited with the assistant treasurer at New York during the month of January, 1885, \$575,000 in gold, for which drafts payable in silver certificates by the assistant treasurer at New Orleans, La., were issued by the Treasurer.

There was also received during the same month \$42,000 in drafts on New York, which were collected through the clearing-house, in exchange for which silver dollars were forwarded by the Treasury from the mints. These drafts, while not payable in gold, became equivalent to gold receipts by reducing the balances against the Treasury at the New York Clearing-House. The exchanges were made at par.

It is not known that any other amounts of gold came into the Treasury in exchange for silver dollars or silver certificates.

3. "Whether any national bank, or association of national banks, refuses to receive or pay out silver dollars or silver certificates contrary to law, or have adopted any rule or practice in that regard for the purpose of discrediting such money, or the effect of which is to depreciate the same."

The Treasury, not being a member of any other clearing-house than that at New York, has no authentic information as to the rule or practice of other clearing-houses in the receipt or payment of silver dollars or silver certificates. It is publicly reported that silver certificates are accepted in settlement of balances at the clearing-house in Boston.

Silver certificates are used in the payments to the public creditors, including the national banks, at all of the subtreasuries, except New York.

This office has no further information as to the rule or practice of individual national banks, other than that contained in the above-quoted resolutions of the New York Clearing House Association.

4. "What amount of silver coin was in the Treasury of the United States on the 1st day of January, 1879, and of each year thereafter, not held for the redemption of silver certificates, and what proportion the said coin bore on each of those dates to the net cash in the Treasury at those several dates."

The following table shows, for the 1st of January in each year, from 1879 to 1885, the amount of the cash in the Treasury, less certificates actually outstanding, the silver dollars held and silver certificates actually outstanding, and the amount of silver dollars actually owned, with the percentage of the latter to the net cash in the Treasury.

As the Treasury also holds other silver coins and silver bullion, the table also shows, for the dates named, the amounts of such coin and bullion held, and the total silver assets, and the percentage of the same to the net cash in the Treasury:

January—	Net cash in the Treasury.	Standard silver dollars in the Treasury.	Silver certificates actually outstanding.	Standard silver dollars actually owned.	Percentage of dollars owned to net cash.
1879.....	\$202,026,723 77	\$16,704,829	\$413,360	\$16,291,469	8.06
1880.....	222,426,311 33	33,168,064	3,824,252	29,343,812	13.19
1881.....	215,040,205 57	48,190,518	36,127,711	12,062,807	5.61
1882.....	235,686,783 59	69,589,937	62,315,320	7,274,617	3.09
1883.....	223,700,425 05	94,016,842	68,443,660	25,573,182	11.43
1884.....	253,205,010 20	119,449,385	96,717,721	22,731,664	8.98
1885.....	239,423,682 25	146,502,865	114,865,911	31,636,954	13.21

January—	Standard silver dollars actually owned.	Silver bullion in the Treasury.	Fractional silver coin in the Treasury.	Total silver assets owned.	Percentage of silver assets to net cash.
1879.....	\$16,291,469	\$9,121,416 63	\$6,349,849 14	\$31,762,734 77	15.72
1880.....	29,343,812	4,402,421 19	15,881,629 15	52,717,862 34	23.70
1881.....	12,062,807	6,183,224 05	24,769,057 32	43,015,088 37	20.00
1882.....	7,274,617	3,607,829 86	25,963,641 48	36,846,088 34	15.63
1883.....	25,573,182	4,468,193 10	26,521,692 20	56,563,067 30	25.28
1884.....	22,731,664	4,534,372 93	27,224,126 33	54,490,163 24	21.52
1885.....	31,636,954	4,716,055 33	29,194,355 52	65,547,364 85	27.38

5. "What amount of the customs and internal revenues and other receipts of the Government, stated separately, have been received in silver coin or silver certificates, stated by months, for each year since the 1st day of January, 1879?"

By direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, no distinction has been made, since January 1, 1879, in the accounts of the Treasury, between coin and currency, and no record has been kept in this office of the kinds of lawful money received. The assistant treasurer at New York has, however, kept a record of the kinds of funds received at his office, from customs, since January 1, 1881; and a statement showing the amounts of internal revenue and of customs, and

the amounts of silver dollars and silver certificates from the latter source, received at his office, by months, since that date, is appended:

Months.	Internal revenue.	Customs.	Customs paid in silver dollars.	Customs paid in silver certificates.
1881.				
January.....	\$200,885 72	\$10,864,217 25	\$11,000	\$4,768,000
February.....	177,107 65	11,511,654 46	14,000	5,162,000
March.....	328,892 93	13,518,036 10	17,000	6,222,000
April.....	248,526 13	12,060,056 46	17,000	6,025,000
May.....	209,251 82	11,600,398 32	15,000	5,626,000
June.....	233,448 42	11,517,553 81	15,000	6,284,000
July.....	264,853 31	12,417,758 22	12,000	7,005,000
August.....	273,508 55	15,759,021 87	15,000	8,033,000
September.....	259,252 94	14,612,119 94	14,000	8,561,000
October.....	286,963 28	13,561,133 52	16,000	8,091,000
November.....	290,626 70	10,358,272 49	14,000	3,285,000
December.....	253,571 44	11,353,843 28	15,000	2,062,000
Total for 1881.....	3,026,888 89	149,134,065 72	175,000	71,124,000
1882.				
January.....	247,889 42	13,698,669 95	14,000	2,715,000
February.....	229,390 97	13,999,305 19	12,000	2,565,000
March.....	231,665 25	14,490,727 36	14,000	2,781,000
April.....	213,670 26	12,475,568 26	24,000	2,666,000
May.....	235,443 64	12,539,023 25	31,000	2,807,000
June.....	211,138 89	11,805,150 72	11,000	2,673,000
July.....	203,887 86	14,172,301 27	9,000	3,400,000
August.....	351,976 70	16,936,020 44	22,000	7,951,000
September.....	346,851 85	15,146,956 87	13,000	8,161,000
October.....	833,108 88	13,751,199 70	13,000	4,213,000
November.....	251,434 14	10,738,755 34	11,000	1,607,000
December.....	213,687 09	10,738,378 30	10,000	1,947,000
Total for 1882.....	3,060,604 95	160,537,056 65	184,000	43,486,000
1883.				
January.....	224,720 79	12,919,503 90	10,000	1,976,000
February.....	404,269 00	12,506,721 14	9,000	1,944,000
March.....	151,554 11	12,831,869 51	13,000	1,624,000
April.....	109,984 52	9,958,572 33	11,000	1,633,000
May.....	101,459 90	8,610,480 50	10,000	2,131,000
June.....	37,460 56	14,113,254 11	19,000	2,755,000
July.....	12,885 01	14,970,785 69	18,000	1,906,000
August.....	17,042 13	13,605,586 19	11,000	2,385,000
September.....	21,406 58	12,410,251 32	10,000	1,682,000
October.....	47,487 08	12,037,049 78	10,000	1,902,000
November.....	6,273 03	9,380,069 08	9,000	2,011,000
December.....	6,736 66	9,781,084 19	9,000	1,809,000
Total for 1883.....	1,141,259 37	143,145,218 74	139,000	23,768,000
1884.				
January.....	14,571 08	11,996,509 53	9,000	2,794,000
February.....	14,674 24	12,410,941 00	8,000	2,661,000
March.....	12,652 28	11,798,707 81	10,000	3,031,000
April.....	33,401 07	10,195,180 09	13,000	2,648,000
May.....	22,060 05	9,693,544 48	13,000	3,282,000
June.....	5,438 94	9,752,969 74	14,000	3,366,000
July.....	5,575 09	13,428,848 27	13,000	4,247,000
August.....	4,887 00	13,162,434 28	12,000	4,164,000
September.....	7,760 42	12,413,746 40	13,000	3,764,000
October.....	11,076 70	10,879,031 82	13,000	3,331,000
November.....	3,064 79	8,257,859 06	10,000	3,255,000
December.....	4,837 69	8,426,924 46	11,000	3,559,000
Total for 1884.....	144,999 35	132,416,696 94	139,000	40,097,000
1885.				
January.....	6,346 19	10,595,288 24	13,000	4,179,000
Total for forty-nine months.....	7,880,098 75	595,828,326 29	650,000	182,654,000

Silver certificates are also received at the New York office on account of transfers of funds, the 5 per cent. fund of national banks, customs receipts at other ports, &c. The following statement shows the amount of such receipts of certificates for each of the past thirteen months:

Months.	Amount.	Months.	Amount.
1884.			
January.....	\$2,430,000	October.....	\$1,971,000
February.....	2,808,000	November.....	2,372,000
March.....	2,140,000	December.....	2,264,000
April.....	2,043,000	1885.	
May.....	2,922,000	January.....	3,283,000
June.....	2,545,000	Total for thirteen months.....	
July.....	2,482,000	31,023,000	
August.....	2,014,000		
September.....	1,749,000		

The resolution of the House of Representatives is returned herewith, as requested.

Very respectfully,
 E. O. GRAVES,
Assistant Treasurer United States.
 Hon. HUGH McCULLOCH,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
 Washington, D. C., February 7, 1885.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your reference to me, for report thereon, of that portion of the resolution of the House of Representatives requesting to be informed as to "what other governments of the world did, during the year 1883, permit the coinage of legal-tender silver coin," &c., and, in reply thereto, I inclose two tabular statements giving the information as far as received at this office.

The statement in respect to the coinage gives the nominal value in United States money of the silver coinage in the year 1883 of the sixteen countries named, distinguishing, as far as possible, the amount of limited from full legal-tender coins, the amount, as far as ascertained, of silver coins withdrawn or used in coinage during the year, and whether the coinage is on Government account or for the public.

In respect to the price of silver, it is not practicable to give the price paid per ounce for silver bullion on the 1st days of January and July in each year, as the purchases are made on Thursdays of each week, and I have therefore given the average price upon the day upon which purchases were made nearest to those named in the resolution. No purchase of silver was made in January, 1878, the first purchase under the act of February 23 having been made March 5, 1878.

Very respectfully,
 HORATIO C. BURCHARD, *Director.*
 Hon. HUGH McCULLOCH,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Statement showing the average price per ounce, fine, paid for silver bullion purchased under the act of February 23, 1875, at dates named, from July 1, 1878, to January 1, 1885.

Date.	Price paid.	Date.	Price paid.
March 5, 1878.....	*\$1.2029	January 5, 1882.....	\$1.1285
July 5, 1878.....	1.1552	June 29, 1882.....	1.1440
January 3, 1879.....	1.0916	January 4, 1883.....	1.0912
July 2, 1879.....	1.1429	July 5, 1883.....	1.1117
December 31, 1879.....	1.1415	January 3, 1884.....	1.1113
July 1, 1880.....	1.1579	July 3, 1884.....	1.1098
January 6, 1881.....	1.1185	January 2, 1885.....	1.0865
July 7, 1881.....	1.1326		

*The final purchase under act February 23, 1875. No purchases were made in January, 1878.
 HORATIO C. BURCHARD,
Director of the Mint.

Statement showing the value of silver coined by foreign countries during the year 1883, and its composition.

Countries.	Silver coined.			Composition.		For whom.
	Full legal tender.	Limited legal tender.	Total.	Recoinage.	Other bullion.	
Mexico.....	\$24,083,921		\$24,083,921		\$24,083,921	Depositors.
Bolivia.....	1,600,000		1,600,000		*1,600,000	Government account.
Argentine Republic.....	1,715,445		1,715,445		1,715,445	
Great Britain.....		\$6,201,517	6,201,517	\$1,900,000	4,301,517	Government account,
India.....	24,927,400		24,927,400	750,000	24,177,400	Depositors.
Germany.....		594,464	594,464	594,464		Government account.
Austria-Hungary.....	5,552,191		5,552,191			Do.
Netherlands.....		81,095	81,095	81,095		Do.
Norway.....		37,520	37,520		37,520	Do.
Sweden.....		250,468	250,468		250,468	Do.
Spain.....	7,769,050	2,754,371	10,523,421			Do.
Japan.....	7,584,188		7,584,188	1,926	7,582,262	Depositors.
Brazil.....			23,589		23,589	
Turkey.....			44,000			Government account.
Colombia.....			699,174		699,174	
Persia.....			605,579		605,579	Government account.
Total.....	73,232,195	9,919,435	84,523,972			

*Presumed to be from domestic bullion.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Several members called for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the hour provided for by the new rule for the consideration of bills called up by members.

Mr. BUCKNER. I move that the House now take a recess until five minutes before 12 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope that will not be done. We can proceed now with business under the hour rule, and there will be that much time saved.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois is aware that this motion is not debatable.

Mr. BUCKNER. I withdraw the proposition.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that notice be sent to the Senate that the House will be ready to receive the Senate at 12 o'clock to-day, to proceed with the business of the electoral count in accordance with concurrent resolution already adopted.

The motion of Mr. KEIFER was agreed to.

JOSEPH F. WILSON.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour under the new rule now begins at fifteen minutes before 12 o'clock. The Clerk will report the bill called up in this hour yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and coming over as unfinished business.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to issue to Joseph F. Wilson, of Peoria, Ill., or his legal representatives or assigns, a number of warrants equal to eighty acres, in tracts not less than the subdivisions provided for in the United States land laws, to be located by the said Wilson, or his legal representatives or assigns, on any of the unoccupied and unappropriated public lands of the United States subject to pre-emption or homestead settlement, in lieu of the west half of the northeast quarter of section 19, in township 35 north, of range 5 west, situate in Porter County, Indiana, which said tract of land was entered by and patented to Josiah Smith, of Macon County, Missouri, under and by virtue of the provisions of the acts of Congress approved June 8, 1872, and March 3, 1873, relating to additional homesteads, and by the said Josiah Smith, after his said entry, sold and conveyed to the said Wilson, and of the title to and possession of which the said Wilson was divested and dispossessed by the judgment and decree of the circuit court of the United States for the district of Indiana, at the November term, A. D. 1880, thereof, by reason of a prior disposal of or a prior equitable title in and to said tract of land, as the said court held and decided, to or in persons other than the said Josiah Smith; and the said Wilson, or his legal representatives or assigns, after the location of the said warrants on such lands as he or they may select, shall be allowed patents for the land so located; and the lands taken, selected, and located as authorized and provided for by this act shall be in full satisfaction of any claim, right, or benefit which the said Josiah Smith, or any one claiming under him, may have, or may have had, under and by virtue of the provisions of the said acts of Congress, as well as in full satisfaction of any claim which the said Wilson, as assignee or grantee of the said Josiah Smith, may have, or may have had, against the United States touching said described tract of land.

Mr. CANNON. I think it is unnecessary to have the report in this case read or to make any statement.

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

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CANNON 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.

EIGHTH NEW YORK HEAVY ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. STEVENS. I call up for consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 92) authorizing and requiring the Secretary of War to deliver to the Eighth New York Heavy Artillery Association the regimental colors which belonged to said artillery, and which are now in the custody of the Secretary of War.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to deliver to the Eighth New York Heavy Artillery Association the regimental colors which belong to said artillery, and which were captured by the confederate forces at Beam Station, on the Weldon Railroad, August 25, 1864, and are now in the custody of the office of the Adjutant-General of the United States Army; said colors to remain the property of said association.

Mr. STEVENS. I do not care to discuss this joint resolution. I think there will be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of this joint resolution?

There being no objection, the House proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to amend the joint resolution by striking out "Beam," and inserting "Ream," which is the proper name of the station referred to in the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. STEVENS moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint res-

olution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, KEOKUK, IOWA.

Mr. MCCOID. Mr. Speaker, I move to take up for consideration House bill No. 483, for the erection of a public building at Keokuk, Iowa.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, and other Government offices, in the city of Keokuk, Iowa. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of \$150,000: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than forty feet, including streets and alleys; and no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Iowa shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of the State and the service of civil process therein.

Mr. HOLMAN. I see the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. McCoid], who represents the district in which this building is situated, is on the floor, and before objection is called to the consideration of the bill I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether he is or is not willing to reduce the amount of appropriation to \$100,000, and also to agree to an amendment to provide for the purchase of the site before the plan of the building is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MCCOID. I agree to the amendment appropriating \$100,000.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the bill will be considered as adopted.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will send up to the Clerk's desk an amendment covering the point indicated by me to the purchase of the site.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not yet before the House for consideration.

Mr. HOLMAN. It can be done by unanimous consent. It is to come in after the appropriation of \$100,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, after the site for said building shall have been purchased, to cause plan and specification of said building to be prepared, which said plan and specification shall not involve an expenditure in the erection and completion of said building or the purchase thereof exceeding the portion of \$100,000 remaining after the site of said building shall have been paid for. And no plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the sum which remains after paying for the site of said building.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand the gentleman from Iowa accepts both of my amendments.

Mr. MCCOID. I have no objection to the amendments.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Is there any report accompanying this bill?

Mr. STORM. If there is, I ask that it be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 483) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Keokuk, in the State of Iowa, respectfully report that they have had the bill under consideration, and recommend the passage of the same.

The city of Keokuk is the place fixed by law for holding the circuit court and the district court of the United States for the eastern division of the southern district of Iowa, which division embraces the oldest, wealthiest, and most populous portion of the State. Keokuk is a prosperous and growing city, of a present population of 15,000 inhabitants, and is rapidly extending and increasing its commercial and manufacturing interests. It is located at the Des Moines Rapids Canal on the Mississippi River, and is the head of deep-water navigation for the largest steamers running above Saint Louis, the average depth of the river being one foot higher from Keokuk to Saint Louis than from Keokuk to Saint Paul.

The canal is eight miles in length, and was built at a cost to the United States of about \$4,000,000.

The United States, pursuant to a recent act of the Forty-seventh Congress, are now building at the canal extension dry-docks, which will make the canal the finest harbor on the river.

The relation of this city to the Mississippi River and its vast and rapidly growing commerce make the court of admiralty here the most important north of Saint Louis.

Keokuk is equally fortunate in her railroad facilities, affording easy and ready communication with all parts of the district and State and adjoining States. The great railways of the West, the Wabash, Saint Louis and Pacific, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy meet here and compete for business; and the Saint Louis, Keokuk and Northwestern Railway Company, running from Keokuk south to Saint Louis, and north with connecting lines to Saint Paul, and southwest with connecting lines to Kansas City, have the headquarters of its operating department at Keokuk.

Thus the commerce of this city by land and by water is important and extensive. The post-office and internal-revenue receipts are very large, and the business of the courts is larger than at any other point in Iowa, unless at the capital of the State.

At present there are inadequate accommodations for the business of the Government. The courts, the post-office, the office of the deputy revenue collector and the office of the judges are in separate buildings on annual leases, and the public records and public property are exposed to hazards and dangers that should be promptly provided against by the erection of a suitable building.

All of the Federal judges for Iowa, the justice of the Supreme Court assigned to that circuit, the judge of the Circuit Court, and the district judge are united in the opinion that there is a pressing and urgent necessity for the erection of a public building at this point adequate to the accommodation of the public business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KEIFER. I ask by unanimous consent further proceeding under

the rule be discontinued, as the time has nearly arrived when the House will receive the Senate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Only five minutes remain. In obedience to the custom heretofore observed the Chair will ask that the two front or first tiers of seats in the House may be vacated for the occupancy of the Senate.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

At 12 o'clock m. the Doorkeeper announced the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall preceded by its Sergeant-at-Arms and headed by the President and the Secretary of the Senate, the members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The President of the Senate [Mr. EDMUNDS] took his seat as presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker *pro tempore* [Mr. BLACKBURN] occupying the chair on the left of the Vice-President.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The two Houses have met pursuant to the Constitution and the laws and their concurrent resolution for the purpose of executing the duty required by the Constitution and the laws in the matter of counting the electoral vote for President and Vice-President cast by the electors in the several States for the term commencing on the 4th of March, 1885. The tellers appointed by the two Houses will please take their places.

Mr. HOAR and Mr. PENDLETON, the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, and Mr. CLAY and Mr. KEIFER, the tellers appointed on the part of the House, took their seats at the Clerk's desk, at which the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House also occupied seats.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The President of the Senate will open the votes of the several States in their alphabetical order, and now opens the certificates from the State of Alabama and hands to the chairman of the tellers on the part of the Senate the certificate of Alabama received by mail, and to the chairman of the tellers on the part of the House of Representatives the certificate received by messenger. The certificate will be read.

Senator HOAR read in full the certificate of the vote of the State of Alabama, giving 10 votes for Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, for President of the United States, and 10 votes for Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, for Vice-President of the United States.

Mr. CLAY (one of the tellers) then read at length the certificate of the vote of the State of Arkansas, and announced the electoral vote of that State for President and Vice-President.

Mr. LOWRY. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LOWRY. Owing to slight confusion arising in the body of the House and throughout the galleries and from other causes we are entirely unable to hear the reading of these documents. I suppose one of the objects of having them read is that they may be heard by the members of the joint convention.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The Chair will endeavor to enforce order as far as possible. Gentlemen will please preserve silence on the floor and in the galleries in order that the certificates may be heard.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest that by unanimous consent only the operative part of the certificates be read, containing simply the result of the vote, after having been examined by the Chair and found to be regular.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. In the absence of objection the tellers will read only the substance of the certificates.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the States of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, and Indiana.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The Chair now hands to the tellers the vote of the State of Iowa received in duplicate. The Chair will state that the vote received by mail not having been received by the first Wednesday in January, the Secretary of State was officially informed thereof, who sent to the district judge for the vote deposited there as required by law, which was also returned. I open them all; two will be handed to the tellers and the third placed on file, if there be no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the States of Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, and New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. I now open and hand to the tellers the vote of the State of New York, received in duplicate, one by messenger and one by mail.

Mr. CLAY (one of the tellers). It appears by the certificate of the electors of the State of New York that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, received 36 votes for the office of President of the United States— [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. Let there be order during the proceedings.

Mr. CLAY (one of the tellers) continuing. It also appears from the certificate of the electors of the State of New York that Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, received 36 votes for the office of Vice-President of the United States. The certificate is duly attested by the great seal of the State, and is signed by the governor—Grover Cleveland. [Loud applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. The Sergeant-at-Arms will take into custody any gentleman or other person who, by applause or other manifestation, disturbs the order of these proceedings.

The tellers then proceeded to announce the electoral votes of the States of North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. I have now opened the certificates of the electors of all the States, and their votes have been reported. The tellers will now make their computations and report the state of the vote.

The following is the report read by Senator HOAR, one of the tellers;

List of votes for President and Vice-President of the United States for the constitutional term to commence on the 4th day of March, 1885.

Number of electoral votes to which each State is entitled.	States.	For President.		For Vice-President.	
		Grover Cleveland, of New York.	James G. Blaine, of Maine.	Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana.	John A. Logan, of Illinois.
10	Alabama.....	10		10	
7	Arkansas.....	7		7	
8	California.....		8		8
3	Colorado.....		3		3
6	Connecticut.....	6		6	
3	Delaware.....	3		3	
4	Florida.....	4		4	
12	Georgia.....	12		12	
22	Illinois.....		22		22
15	Indiana.....			15	
13	Iowa.....		13		13
9	Kansas.....		9		9
13	Kentucky.....	13		13	
8	Louisiana.....	8		8	
6	Maine.....		6		6
8	Maryland.....	8		8	
14	Massachusetts.....		14		14
13	Michigan.....		13		13
7	Minnesota.....		7		7
9	Mississippi.....		9		9
16	Missouri.....	16		16	
5	Nebraska.....		5		5
3	Nevada.....		3		3
4	New Hampshire.....		4		4
9	New Jersey.....		9		9
36	New York.....	36		36	
11	North Carolina.....		11		11
23	Ohio.....		23		23
3	Oregon.....		3		3
30	Pennsylvania.....		30		30
4	Rhode Island.....		4		4
9	South Carolina.....	9		9	
12	Tennessee.....	12		12	
13	Texas.....	13		13	
4	Vermont.....		4		4
12	Virginia.....	12		12	
6	West Virginia.....	6		6	
11	Wisconsin.....		11		11
401		219	182	219	182

GEO. F. HOAR,
GEO. H. PENDLETON,
Tellers on the part of the Senate.
J. WARREN KEIFER,
J. F. CLAY,
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

Senator HOAR (one of the tellers) said: Mr. President, the tellers on the part of the Senate, and on the part of the House of Representatives, have ascertained the state of the vote of the electors of the respective States for the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States; and it appears that the whole number of electors appointed to vote for President and Vice-President is 401, of which a majority is 201. The state of the vote for President of the United States is for Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, 219; for James G. Blaine, of the State of Maine, 182. For Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, for the office of Vice-President of the United States, 219; and for John A. Logan, of the State of Illinois, for the office of Vice-President, 182.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE. Senators and members of the House of Representatives:

The tellers have reported to the presiding officer the state of the vote which you have heard, from which it appears that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, has received 219 votes for the office of Presi-

dent of the United States, and that James G. Blaine, of the State of Maine, has received 182 votes for the same office; that Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, has received 219 votes for the office of Vice-President of the United States, and that John A. Logan, of the State of Illinois, has received 182 votes for the same office.

Wherefore, I do declare that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, has received a majority of the votes of the whole number of electors appointed, as they appear in the certificates read by the tellers, and so appears to have been elected President of the United States for four years, commencing on the 4th day of March, 1885; and that Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, has received a majority of the votes of the whole number of electors appointed, as they appear in the certificates read by the tellers, and so appears to have been elected Vice-President of the United States for four years, commencing on the 4th day of March, 1885. And the President of the Senate makes this declaration only as a public statement in the presence of the two Houses of Congress of the contents of the papers opened and read on this occasion, and not as possessing any authority in law to declare any legal conclusion whatever.

The business for which the joint convention assembled having been completed, the Senate will retire to its own Chamber.

[The announcement of the result of the vote was received with loud applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The Senate then retired from the Hall; and (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Speaker *pro tempore* resumed the chair, and called the House to order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. THOMPSON. I move that the House take a recess for fifteen minutes, in order that the Hall may be cleared.

The Senate then retired from the Hall; and (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess for fifteen minutes.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the bill which was under consideration during the special hour when the business of the House was suspended for the assembling of the joint convention of the two Houses.

Mr. KEIFER rose.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to know if the House did not, before suspending business for the purpose of proceeding to the electoral count, dispense with the remainder of the special hour?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I think the Journal will show that it did.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That could only have been done by unanimous consent, and no such request was submitted to the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. According to the ruling of the Chair on a former occasion the hour under the special rule consists of sixty minutes next after the beginning of the hour. The Chair made that ruling on a point of order raised by myself.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Illinois raise the point of order now?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not. I merely state that was the ruling of the Chair on a former occasion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will rule on any point of order if the gentleman desires to make it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then I make the point of order that the hour under the special rule has expired.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not think the point of order is well taken. There should not, in the judgment of the Chair, be taken into account the time occupied by the joint session of the two Houses. The Chair does not think that should be counted against the hour under the rule which the House adopted for the transaction of its business.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am very glad to hear the Chair make that ruling, because it is exactly in accordance with my previous idea.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. And the Chair would further remark that the House has not been in session, but the two Houses were in session.

COUNT OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

Mr. KEIFER. According to custom, I furnish a report of the official count of the electoral vote as declared by the President of the Senate for the purpose of having it spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], one of the tellers on the part of the House, submits the report by the tellers of the official count of the electoral vote for President and Vice-President of the United States in order that the same may be spread upon the Journal of this House.

Mr. KEIFER. And published in the RECORD.

The report was ordered to be spread upon the Journal of the House and published in the RECORD. [It appears in the proceedings of the joint convention of the two Houses.]

Mr. KEIFER. I now offer a resolution, in the usual form, declaring the sense of the House in the matter of the electoral count.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives having met the Senate in accordance with the fifth section of the act of 1st March, 1792, relative to the election of President and Vice-President of the United States, and the electoral votes having been opened by the President of the Senate *pro tempore* in the presence of the two Houses of Congress and counted by the tellers appointed on the part of the two Houses of Congress, and it appearing that the whole number of electors appointed to vote for President and Vice-President of the United States is 401, of which a majority is 201, and it further appearing that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, had received 219 votes for President of the United States, and that Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, had received 219 votes for Vice-President of the United States, which number is a majority of the votes of the whole number of electors appointed, and the same having been duly declared by the President *pro tempore* of the Senate in the presence of the two Houses: Therefore,

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That it is the sense of this House that the Constitution and laws have been duly executed and that no further declaration of these facts is necessary.

Mr. RANDALL. Is that resolution before the House for consideration?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the resolution is of such a privileged character that it is before the House for consideration now.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no objection to it. I only wish to modify it so that it shall be communicated to the Senate. It does not appear to embrace that within its provisions.

Mr. KEIFER. I supposed the resolution would be communicated to the Senate without a special provision for so doing. This is exactly the resolution offered in the House four years ago, with the exception that that resolution was in the form of a concurrent resolution, although it was not sent to the Senate. The Senate adopted a resolution exactly in this form four years ago, with the exception that it was in form of a concurrent resolution, and it was not sent to the House. So we make them separate resolutions, one of the Senate and one of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish merely to suggest that the fact of the House having adopted this resolution be communicated to the Senate.

Mr. KEIFER. I think that may be done without putting it in the resolution.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the Clerk of the House being directed to communicate the resolution to the Senate if adopted.

Mr. POLAND. It appears to me this resolution is faulty in form. It refers to the provisions of an act of 1792, which act was repealed. Its provisions are contained in chapter 1 of title 3 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. The resolution should refer to the provisions of that chapter and not to the act of 1792, which was in form repealed. I would suggest that what is said in the resolution as to the act of 1792 be stricken out, and that there be inserted a reference to the provisions of chapter 1 of title 3 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Mr. KEIFER. It is possible that the criticism upon the resolution made by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont is a fair one. I wish to say, however, that the resolution in that respect is precisely in the language of the resolution adopted four years ago and on prior occasions of like character. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I think that the fact of the repeal of this statute in the revision of the laws being well settled it might be better to modify the resolution as the gentleman from Vermont suggests, so that it shall refer to the chapter of the Revised Statutes on the subject of the electoral count.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Ohio accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. KEIFER. I do; and will modify the resolution accordingly.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the modification proposed.

Mr. HOLMAN. We did not hear what the modification was.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Vermont will communicate to the Clerk's desk the amendment he proposes to offer.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, there can be no trouble about this matter now; but, as it may become a precedent, I suggest that it had better be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEIFER. The change ought to be made now. There is no question about the fact of the repeal of the statute. The resolution can be amended, and I accept the amendment which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POLAND] has sent to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "the fifth section of the act of 1st March, 1792," and insert "chapter 1 of title 3 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

Mr. HAMMOND. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. HAMMOND. I ask it for information only. Why is it that we change the form of the resolution now from what it was four years ago, making it a separate House resolution instead of a concurrent resolution?

Mr. KEIFER. We changed the form simply because the resolution enacted four years ago in the form of a concurrent resolution was in fact only a House resolution, which was not sent to the Senate for their action. The Senate did the same thing. They adopted a resolution which was also in the form of a concurrent resolution, but was in fact

only a declaration of the sense of the Senate and did not come to the House for its action.

Mr. HAMMOND. Why?

Mr. KEIFER. Simply because each House acted separately, and while the Senate resolution was in form a concurrent resolution it was in fact a mere resolution of that body. I will state further, for the information of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND], that on yesterday, at a conference held between the tellers on the part of the Senate and the tellers on the part of the House, in the presence of the President of the Senate, this very matter was considered, and it was agreed that we should put the resolution in a form to correspond with the fact, and strike out the concurrent feature of it. That was agreed to in the conference by Senator PENDLETON and others.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether the tellers on the part of the House on our side are satisfied with the change?

Mr. CLAY. There is no objection to it at all.

Mr. HAMMOND. Then I have none.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word before this matter has been passed upon by the House. From the announcement made here by the president of the joint convention it seems that there was no declaration as to the result of the vote. On the contrary, the President of the Senate simply announced that it appeared from the count made by the tellers that Grover Cleveland had received the number of votes indicated, and that the other candidates had received the number of votes indicated as having been cast for them, and he then went on to disclaim any intention to make any official declaration as to the result of the count.

Mr. KEIFER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that at the time Mr. Lincoln was declared elected the Vice-President said:

Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, having received a majority of the whole number of electoral votes cast, is elected President of the United States for four years, commencing on the 4th day of March, 1861.

A similar announcement was made as to the election of the Vice-President. I see further, that the same form was followed when General Grant was declared elected President of the United States. At this time there has been a departure from that practice and no official declaration has been made here that anybody is elected to the office of either President or Vice-President of the United States.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Several MEMBERS. The vote was announced.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; the vote was announced. The president of the joint convention announced that one candidate had received so many votes and that the other candidate had received so many votes, but he then went on to make the disclaimer to which I have referred. Now, that is a departure from all the precedents upon this subject, and for that reason I would prefer that this whole matter should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report such additional resolution as may be necessary for the purpose of making known the official result of the election.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to say that the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, the presiding officer of the joint convention, in making the announcement of the ascertainment of the vote as had to-day, announced the result that had been found, and simply added a disclaimer of any authority on his part, as the presiding officer of the Senate or the presiding officer of the joint convention, to make any declaration at all. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] make any motion?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do. I move that this whole matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOULTON. I think the declaration is exactly right.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the judgment of the Chair the declaration of the presiding officer of the joint convention was exactly what it should have been.

Mr. KEIFER. And it has no relation at all to this resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not asked the Speaker for his opinion. I desire to state mine.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to state, as the officer representing the House in the joint convention, that there would have been a protest made if in the judgment of the Chair any improper declaration had been made on the part of the presiding officer of the joint convention.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. HAMMOND. My point is that the joint session having made its declaration, this House has now nothing to do with whether it made it correctly or incorrectly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have not made any motion in reference to that.

Several members addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman make any motion?

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to make a motion, if I can get permission to state it.

Mr. COX, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. COX, of New York. There is no motion before the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman is mistaken; there are two motions before the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX, of New York. Then I move to lay them on the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman for that purpose. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will submit his motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move to commit this whole subject to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report to the House what further declaration, if any, should be made for declaring the election of the persons who have been elected President and Vice-President of the United States.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the announced vote elects, and that any ministerial part of the proceeding is not essential to the establishment of the fact that Grover Cleveland and Thomas A. Hendricks have been elected by the electoral college President and Vice-President of the United States.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair concurs with the gentleman.

Mr. CLAY. The disclaimer to which reference has been made was only a position taken by the President of the Senate.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is discovered only at this late day that that is a proper way to make the announcement.

Mr. HAMMOND and several other members addressed the Chair at the same time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair can not listen to a dozen gentlemen at once. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] except in his order.

Mr. HAMMOND. I am in order, because I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman to make his point of order, but will try to secure order first. [After a pause.] The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] has submitted a resolution, to which an amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POLAND], which amendment has been accepted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. COX, of New York. What is it? Let it be read.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask to have that resolution reported?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will ask to be allowed to state the question that is before the House, and then, unless there be objection, the resolution will be again reported to the House by the Clerk. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] submitted a resolution, to which the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POLAND] offered an amendment, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] has indicated his willingness to accept. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has moved to refer the whole matter, the resolution and the amendment, to the Committee on the Judiciary. That motion is now pending, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND], who raises a question of order.

Mr. SPRINGER. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. HAMMOND. Then I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. KEIFER. I have no objection to having the resolution reported again, as modified, for the benefit of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection the Clerk will again report the resolution.

Mr. COX, of New York. I imagine that the Constitution settles this matter.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not yield the floor for further discussion. I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] rises to a point of order he will state it.

Mr. COX, of New York. Let the resolution first be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair had already directed the reading when interrupted by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COX, of New York. The "gentleman from New York" did not intend to interrupt the Chair for a moment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution having been again read,

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] asks that, in the event of the adoption of this resolution, it shall be made the duty of the Clerk of this House to communicate the fact of its adoption to the Senate.

Mr. KEIFER. I understood that had already been agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEIFER. I demand the previous question on the adoption of this resolution. I think it is simply a declaration of the sense of the House. It does not elect anybody, but is a proper thing to be done.

Mr. COX, of New York. I would like to have an extract from the Constitution read, so as to show that all this is irrelevant and superfluous.

Mr. KEIFER. I yield to allow the reading of the extract referred to by the gentleman, but for no other purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

The person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed.

The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed.

Mr. KEIFER. I must now insist on the previous question.

Mr. COX, of New York. I think the Constitution in this matter executes itself.

Mr. KEIFER. I agree to that; but I insist on the previous question.

Mr. COX, of New York. I move to lay the resolution on the table. I do not propose to make a precedent for the future; and I do not want my friend on the other side to elect our President.

Mr. KEIFER. The reason I have insisted on the previous question is because I hoped we would get to other business. It is not important to me whether the resolution be adopted or not; but it is in accordance with custom. It is in the same form as a resolution offered four years ago by Mr. House, then a member from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] to lay on the table the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio as amended by the motion of the gentleman from Vermont.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 78, noes 70.

Mr. KEIFER. Let us have tellers.

Mr. MOULTON. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being—ayes 34, noes 28.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will proceed to call the roll.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I hope the resolution will be read again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there be no objection the Clerk will again report the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I object.

Mr. BAYNE. I hope the resolution will be reported again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has no authority to order the resolution reported a third time, when objection has been made.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. Cox, of New York, and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 137, nays 113, not voting 73; as follows:

YEAS—137.

- Adams, J. J. Davis, L. H. Lanham, Seymour, Aiken, Dibrell, Long, Shively, Alexander, Dockery, Lore, Singleton, Bagley, Dorschner, Lovering, Spriggs, Ballentine, Dowd, Lowry, Springer, Barbour, Dunn, Lyman, Steeles, Barksdale, Eaton, McCoid, Stevens, Bayne, Eldredge, Maybury, Stewart, Charles, Beach, Elliott, Miller, J. F. Stewart, J. W. Bonnett, English, Money, Swope, Blackburn, Follett, Morgan, Talbot, Boyle, Garrison, Morse, Taylor, J. M. Brainerd, Geddes, Moulton, Thompson, Broadhead, Gibson, Muldrow, Tillman, Browne, T. M. Graves, Muller, Tucker, Buchanan, Green, Murphy, Van Alstyne, Budd, Greenleaf, Mutchler, Van Eaton, Burleigh, Hanback, Neece, Wallace, Burnes, Hardy, Oates, Warner, A. J. Cabell, Hatch, H. H. O'Ferrall, Warner, Richard, Caldwell, Hatch, W. H. O'Neill, J. J. Weaver, Campbell, Felix Henley, Payson, Wellborn, Campbell, J. E. Herbert, Pecl, Wemple, Candier, Hewitt, A. S. Pryor, Wilkins, Carleton, Hill, Pusey, Williams, Cassidy, Hopkins, Ranney, Willis, Clardy, Houseman, Reagan, Wilson, W. L. Clements, Hunt, Reese, Winans, John Converse, Hurd, Robertson, Wolford, Covington, Hutchins, Robinson, W. E. Wood, Cox, S. S. Jeffords, Rockwell, York, Cox, W. R. Johnson, Rogers, J. H. Young, Crisp, Jones, B. W. Russell, Culbertson, D. B. Jones, J. H. Ryan, Seney, Dargan, Jones, J. K.

NAYS—113.

- Adams, G. E. Findlay, McCormick, Stone, Anderson, Finerty, McMillin, Storm, Bingham, Forney, Millard, Strait, Bisbee, Fyan, Morrill, Struble, Bland, Guenther, Nicholls, Sumner, D. H. Blount, Halsell, Nutting, Taylor, E. B. Boutelle, Hammond, O'Neill, Charles Taylor, J. D. Brewer, F. B. Hancock, Paige, Thomas, Brewer, J. H. Hardeman, Parker, Townshend, Brown, W. W. Harmer, Patton, Tully, Brumm, Hart, Perkins, Turner, H. G. Campbell, J. M. Haynes, Peters, Turner, Oscar Cannon, Hemphill, Pierce, Valentine, Clay, Henderson, T. J. Poland, Vance, Connolly, Hepburn, Post, Wadsworth, Cosgrove, Hewitt, G. W. Potter, Wait, Culbertson, W. W. Hiscock, Randall, Wakefield, Cullen, Hoblitzell, Ray, Ossian Ward, Cutcheon, Holman, Reid, J. W. Washburn, Davidson, Holmes, Rice, White, Milo Davis, G. R. Horr, Rowell, Wilson, James Davis, R. T. Houk, Skinner, C. R. Winans, E. B. Dibble, Keifer, Skinner, T. G. Wise, G. D. Dingley, Ketcham, Smith, A. Herr Woodward, Ellwood, Lawrence, Smith, H. Y. Worthington, Ermentrout, Le Fevre, Snyder, Yapple, Evans, Lewis, Spooner, Everhart, Libbey, Stephenson, Fiedler, McComas, Stockslager.

NOT VOTING—73.

- Arnot, Ellis, Kleiner, Rankin, Atkinson, Ferrell, Lacey, Ray, G. W. Barr, Foran, Laird, Reed, T. B. Belford, Funston, Lamb, Riggs, Belmont, George, McAdoo, Robinson, J. S. Blanchard, Glascock, Matson, Rogers, W. F. Bowen, Goff, Miller, S. H. Rosecrans, Brattou, Henderson, D. B. Milliken, Shaw, Breckinridge, Hitt, Mills, Slocum, Breitung, Holton, Mitchell, Smalls, Buckner, Hooper, Morrison, Sumner, C. A. Chalmers, Howey, Murray, Throckmorton, Cobb, James, Nelson, Weller, Collins, Jones, J. T. Oehlert, White, J. D. Cook, Jordau, O'Hara, Whiting, Craig, Kean, Payne, Wise, J. S. Curtin, Kelley, Pettibone, Deuster, Kellogg, Phelps, Dunham, King, Price.

So the resolution as amended was laid on the table.

Mr. LORE moved to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. KEIFER objected.

The following additional pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk:

On all political questions, until further notice—

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. JOHN S. WISE.

Mr. SHAW with Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. RANKIN with Mr. KELLOGG.

Mr. COOK with Mr. LACEY, for this day.

Mr. MATSON with Mr. MILLER, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JORDAN with Mr. HOLTON.

Mr. GLASCOCK with Mr. KELLEY.

Mr. FORAN with Mr. BOWEN.

Mr. FERRELL with Mr. KEAN.

Mr. MCADOO with Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. MURRAY, with Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.

Mr. ROSECRANS with Mr. HOOPER, on this vote.

Mr. LAMB with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. KING with Mr. WHITING.

Mr. CURTIN with Mr. BARR.

Mr. ELLIS with Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. MILLS with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. SLOCUM, with Mr. RAY, of New York.

Mr. RIGGS with Mr. PAYNE.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

NOTIFICATION TO PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT ELECT.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky submits a privileged resolution, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee of two members of the House be appointed by the House, and one member of the Senate be appointed by that body, to wait on Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, and to notify him that he has been duly elected President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th day of March, 1885; and also to notify Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, that he has been duly elected Vice-President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th day of March, 1885.

Second. That the President of the Senate do make out and sign a certificate in the words following:

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

Be it known that the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, having been convened in the city of Washington, on the second Wednesday in February, in the year of our Lord 1885, the undersigned President of the Senate pro tempore did, in the presence of the said Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and count all the votes of the electors for President and Vice-President of the United States; whereupon it appeared that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, had a majority of the votes of the electors as President, and Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, had a majority of the votes of the electors as Vice-President.

By all of which it appears that Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, has been duly elected President, and Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, has been duly elected Vice-President, of the United States, agreeably to the Constitution, for the term of four years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1885.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this — day of February, 1885, and have sealed with the seal of the Senate.

And that the committee hereby appointed, when notifying the persons elected of their election to the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States, shall present to each of them a duly authenticated copy of the foregoing certificate.

Mr. CLAY. I offer that resolution, Mr. Speaker, in accordance—

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, by consent of the gentleman from Kentucky I ask him to allow me to move an amendment to that resolution, changing the resolution in the statement made that the President of the Senate opened and counted the votes, so it will read: "That he opened the certificates of the electoral votes of the several States, and they were counted in the presence of the two Houses."

Mr. CLAY. I accept that amendment as a modification of my resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As it is a matter of some importance, the Chair will ask the gentleman to reduce his amendment to writing.

Mr. CLAY. I do not think it is necessary to make any extended remarks on the resolution which I have presented. It is in accordance with all the precedents heretofore except as to the two most recent Presidential elections. I now demand the previous question on my

resolution as modified at the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. COX, of New York. With the consent of my friend from Kentucky I move to strike out "three" and insert "five" as the number constituting the committee, two on the part of the Senate and three on the part of the House.

Mr. CLAY. That is rather a large committee.

Mr. COX, of New York. It is suggested in deference to the opinion of gentlemen on both sides.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know from the Speaker what rule of the House or clause of the Constitution justifies the presentation of this resolution as a question of privilege?

Mr. CLAY. It has been so regarded from the very beginning.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. According to the custom and all the precedents such resolution on this day has uniformly been regarded as one of the highest privilege. It is not so much a question of rule as it is in accordance with the mandate of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I move to lay the resolution upon the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion will be in order when the gentleman is recognized as having the floor. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CLAY. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. KEIFER. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky to yield to me not to exceed five minutes.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I rise to another parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. When can I make the motion to lay the whole resolution upon the table?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman can submit that motion as soon as he gets the floor.

The resolution was reported as modified.

Mr. HOLMAN. Unless the precedents are uniform—

Mr. CLAY. Permit me to state, Mr. Speaker, right here that I accept the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], and will therefore modify the resolution so as to make the committee consist of five—two from the Senate and three from the House. I will now yield the floor to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, unless the precedents have been uniformly in favor of such action as is proposed by the last clause of this resolution, providing for the execution of a certificate of election of the President and Vice-President by the presiding officer of the Senate—I say unless the precedents are uniform in that direction, and I think they are not, I must, as a member of the House, object to that portion of the resolution.

The declaration of the result of the count is unquestionably proper—the counting of the votes. The appointment of a committee of the two Houses of Congress to wait upon the President and Vice-President elect and inform them of the result of the count is for manifest reasons proper. Beyond that I do not think the House should go. I think the action of the two Houses ought to terminate right there; and therefore I say again that, unless my friend from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] has found the precedents uniformly recognizing some other attestation than the simple declaration of the result of the counting of the vote, I hope he will consent that the last part of the resolution which provides for the official certificate of the President of the Senate be stricken out.

It is clearly apparent, Mr. Speaker, from what has occurred in the history of this country to what perils the Government might be exposed in the future if it was recognized that the title under which the office of President and Vice-President shall be held required some other procedure than a compliance with the simple requirements of the Constitution of the result of the count.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I can not say in response to the gentleman from Indiana that the precedents are entirely uniform, but in the election of General Washington, the first President, that form was pursued.

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, well; what was good enough for Washington ought to be good enough for us. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAY. In the election of Mr. Harrison that same form was pursued. In the election of General Grant in his second term, and Mr. Lincoln, I think, it was also pursued.

Mr. HOLMAN. But, as I understand the gentleman, it has not been the uniform practice?

Mr. CLAY. It has not been uniformly pursued, as I have stated.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is not then a uniform line of precedents—occasional instances only of such a verification as is now proposed. I think we ought not to follow and give new force to a questionable precedent, and one which experience has demonstrated might, in an unfortunate contingency not unlikely to arise in the future, greatly endanger the public safety. It is a precedent that we certainly should not now reaffirm. The counting of the vote and declaration of the result of the count, in the manner contemplated by the Constitution, and the appointment of a committee to inform the citizens chosen for President and Vice-President of their election, is as far as we can, in my judgment, go with safety. I trust my friend from Kentucky [Mr.

CLAY] will consent that all of the resolution shall be omitted except the part providing for the committee.

Mr. CLAY. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this resolution be proper at all it is very proper that the persons elected to the offices of President and Vice-President should have that information given to them and the certificates of election at the same time.

Mr. HOLMAN. But the gentleman will not hold that it is necessary or that it is required by the Constitution.

Mr. CLAY. It is not necessary, nor is it required by the Constitution.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I move to strike out all of that portion of the resolution which provides for the certificate—all after the first clause.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Kentucky is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CLAY. I have said that I did not regard it as necessary, nor is it required by the Constitution; but it is well known that the President and Vice-President elect do not know officially the fact of their election unless such action shall be taken by the Congress. This simply prescribes that an official notification shall be sent to them. At present there is nothing but the statement in the public press of the country.

I have agreed to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 235) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Augusta, Me.; and also that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested, namely:

A bill (S. 2609) to provide a permanent reservation for the Indians in Northern Montana, and for other purposes.

NOTIFICATION TO PRESIDENT-ELECT.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not perhaps occupy that much time. I rise to say, sir, simply that this resolution, in so far as it is necessary under the Constitution and the laws of the United States, in the matter of determining the election of the President and Vice-President, is wholly unnecessary. Like the resolution just laid upon the table it is not one of the essential things in the determination of the result of the count of the electoral votes. But, like that resolution, it may be a matter of courtesy on the part of the Congress of the United States, that witnessed the count of the electoral vote and the ascertainment of the result, that the officers who are elected by that count should have a proper notification. That is all.

Whether Grover Cleveland receives a notice through the newspapers of the day, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or by notification sent by the Vice-President, or through the action of a committee that may be sent by the two Houses of Congress, or not at all, it makes no difference so far as concerns the question as to who will be the President of the United States for four years from the 4th of March next.

But, sir, I maintain that there are sufficient precedents for the adoption of this resolution. They are not uniform, it is true, from the beginning of Presidential elections down to the present time, but there are precedents, and of a character that it seems to me are well worth following. In the important act of electing a Chief Magistrate of the United States, when we have done all that is essential and gone through all of the requisite forms, it is due the dignity of that high office, and to the person elected to it, that we should notify him in some form. There are many things which we do which do not belong to and can not be classified as absolutely essential, and yet they are important and in accordance with right and good policy. If the notification of the election of a person to the high office of President and another to the high office of Vice-President is only a courtesy, I would still give it.

We have had twenty-five elections for Presidential terms. In seven cases there have been re-elections of persons who were President. Washington was re-elected, Jefferson was re-elected, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Lincoln, and Grant were each re-elected to the office of President of the United States. My recollection now is, from having examined the question some time since, that in each of these cases of re-election at least there were committees sent to notify the President-elect of his election to the office of President of the United States. I do not say that this has been uniformly the case, but in some instances it has been the practice.

In other cases the policy has been to send a notification in writing over the signature of the President of the Senate to the person elected President of the United States and to the person elected Vice-President of the United States. In some instances Congress has called on the President-elect after he was notified to send notice to the Vice-President-elect of his election. But there are numerous instances that form precedents for the action proposed to be taken under the pending resolution. Therefore I shall vote for this resolution.

Mr. COSGROVE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COSGROVE. Then I will address to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COSGROVE. Is it not customary for all joint resolutions to be signed by the presiding officers of one or other or both bodies?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is. But this is not a joint resolution. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to strike out all of the resolution but the first clause?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There is a motion now pending, made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR], as the Chair understands, to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN. I thought the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] was not allowed to make that motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understood the gentleman from Ohio to make that motion, and that this discussion was going on by unanimous consent.

Mr. WASHBURN. I understood the Chair to say he would recognize the gentleman from Ohio to make that motion when it was in order to do so.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] claim he was holding the floor to the exclusion of the gentleman from Ohio to make the motion to lay on the table?

Mr. CLAY. I do. I now move the previous question on the resolution as amended, and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], which proposes to strike out that part of the resolution that relates to the certificate.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. That is to say, it proposes to strike out all after the first clause of the resolution.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Mr. COX, of New York. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is not debatable. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WARNER] rises to make a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I wish to know whether the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Kentucky has no such power. It is for the House to determine whether the amendment shall be adopted or not.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. That amendment is pending.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is pending. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Which motion has precedence?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion to lay on the table. The gentleman from Kentucky has asked the previous question on the adoption of the resolution he has submitted, subject to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana; and, pending that demand, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] moves to lay the motion on the table.

The question being taken on the motion to lay on the table, there were—ayes 38, noes 108.

So (further count not being called for) the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the demand for the previous question.

Mr. DUNN. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DUNN. Is it not necessary for a vote to be taken on the amendment which I suggested and offered?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair asked if there was objection, and the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] was accepted without objection.

Mr. DUNN. That is sufficient.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Before the vote is taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana we desire to hear how the resolution will read if amended.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman ask for the rereading of the resolution?

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I ask for the rereading of what is left, if the portion which the gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out shall be stricken out.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Unless there be objection the resolution will be read as proposed to be amended by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOBLITZELL and Mr. KEIFER objected.

Mr. KEIFER. I shall not object to the rereading after the previous question shall have been ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is upon the demand of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] for the previous question on the resolution and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CLAY moved to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. KEIFER. Now, I do not object to the resolution being read again.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. Unless there be objection the Clerk will report the resolution as it will read if amended as proposed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That a committee of three members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the House, and two members of the Senate be appointed by that body, to wait on Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, and to notify him that he has been duly elected President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th of March, 1885; and also to notify Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, that he has been duly elected Vice-President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th of March, 1885.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky, addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky. I would like to have the resolution reported again. I think it states we believe that Grover Cleveland was elected. I do not. I believe that there were forty districts in which there was no election.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the phraseology of that resolution should be changed so as to make it read: "Commencing on the 4th day of March," instead of "commencing with the 4th day of March." If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] will look at the resolution I am sure he will see the propriety of the change.

Mr. CLAY. The Constitution fixes the time.

Mr. HUNT. But the proper language should be used.

Mr. CLAY. I think that is rather a technical point.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the modification of the resolution as suggested? [Calls of "Regular order!" "Regular order!"]

PUBLIC BUILDING AT KEOKUK, IOWA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the consideration of the unfinished business under the hour provided by the special rule. The Clerk will finish the reading of the report on the pending bill (H. R. 483) to provide for the erection of a public building at Keokuk, Iowa.

The Clerk completed the reading of the report as printed earlier in this RECORD.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I wish the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MCCOY] would consent to make the amount named in that bill \$75,000 instead of \$100,000. As prices are now, \$75,000 is money enough to build a good, substantial building.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time allowed for debate in opposition to the bill has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MCCOY] has five minutes of his time left. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WARNER] desire more time?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. An amendment is not in order, because the bill is not yet before the House.

Mr. MCCOY. Mr. Speaker, I have already yielded to the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to reduce the amount from \$150,000 to \$100,000. The Secretary of the Treasury submitted an estimate stating that \$150,000 was necessary; but I have accepted the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], and I do not think it would be wise to reduce the amount below that. I only want to say further, in addition to what is stated in the report, that at Keokuk they have an iron bridge across the river which cost a million dollars, the finest bridge across the Mississippi north of Saint Louis; they have there a canal which has cost the Government \$5,000,000; they have as fine a national cemetery as there is in the country; they have there the engineers in charge of the Government works; they do a wholesale grocery business larger than is done in any other place in the State

of Iowa, and a wholesale dry-goods business larger than any other in Iowa.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thought the time for debate was exhausted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair stated that the time for debate in opposition to the bill was exhausted. The gentleman from Iowa had exhausted none of the time in favor of the bill.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. But the first five minutes was exhausted in reading the first part of the report.

Mr. MCCOID. That was not in my time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The reading of the report was called for without reference to the gentleman's time.

Mr. MCCOID. I will only add that I have been in this House a long time and have never asked a measure that was not a proper one, and I believe that those who know me know that I would not ask for the passage of a bill of which I had any doubt as to its justice, propriety, or economy. I ask the House to pass this bill, and I hope that no one will object.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I shall not object myself, but when the proper time comes I shall offer an amendment to reduce the amount to \$75,000.

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

Mr. OATES. I object.

The question was taken, and seven members objected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. But seven members have objected, not a sufficient number, and the bill is before the House for consideration.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I move to strike out the words "one hundred" before the word "thousand" and substitute the words "seventy-five," so as to make the amount \$75,000 instead of \$100,000.

The House divided; and only 18 members voted in the affirmative. So the amendment was not agreed to.

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

Mr. MCCOID moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay that motion on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

HEIRS OF MARY JANE VEAZIE.

Mr. SINGLETON. I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Jane Veazie, deceased.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$5,440 be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay the heirs of Mary Jane Veazie, deceased, late of Natchez, Miss., for property taken for the use of the United States troops stationed at Natchez, Miss.

The amendment reported by the Committee on War Claims was read, as follows:

Strike out "\$5,440" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. SINGLETON. Mr. Speaker, a bill similar to this was introduced in the Senate during the Forty-seventh Congress, was referred to the Committee on War Claims of that body, was unanimously indorsed by that committee, was passed by the Senate without opposition, came to this House, was referred to the War Claims Committee of this body, was reported favorably, and went upon the Calendar, but was never considered by the House for want of time. The present bill was introduced in this House at this session and referred to the Committee on War Claims, who have reported it with an amendment cutting down the amount allowed to \$2,500. The bill having received the favorable consideration of my friend from Ohio [Mr. GEDDES] as a subcommittee, and having been reported favorably by the Committee on War Claims, I think everybody will agree that there can be no objection to it. The loyalty of the parties, the taking of the property for the use of the Army, and the value of the property have been fully established. It seems to me there can be no objection to the bill. There is a report from the Committee on War Claims. If any gentleman so desires, it can be read.

Mr. WASHBURN. Is this a unanimous report?

Mr. SINGLETON. So I understand.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I think the report had better be read.

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

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Jane Veazie, deceased, submit the following report:

The facts out of which this claim for relief arises will be found stated in Senate report of the Committee on Claims, No. 406, first session Forty-seventh Congress, hereto appended.

Your committee adopt the said report as their own, and report back the bill with the recommendation that it do pass, with an amendment, as follows:

Insert in the third line, in place of the words "five thousand four hundred and forty," the words "two thousand five hundred."

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred a bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Jane Veazie, having examined the same, make the following report:

"It appears from the evidence and papers on file in this case that from July, 1863, to December, 1863, there was taken from the plantation and residence of Mrs. Mary Jane Veazie, near the city of Natchez, in the county of Adams, and State of Mississippi, by the military authorities of the Government, for use of the United States troops then in the permanent occupation of that district

and stationed at said post, certain property belonging to the said Mary Jane Veazie, for which the present bill proposes to make her compensation. She describes the property taken, and states her account against the Government as follows:

Two horses, at \$150 each; one carriage, \$200.....	\$500
Sixty head of hogs, at \$8.....	480
Fifty-six head of neat cattle, at \$20.....	1,120
Fencing used for fuel.....	280
Twenty-five brood mares, at \$50.....	1,250
One hundred and fifty cords of wood, at \$3.....	450
Three frame houses, at \$200, \$185, and \$135.....	520
Two bales of cotton, 420 pounds each = 840 pounds, at \$1.....	840

Total..... 5,440

"Which amount she claims under the act of Congress of July 4, 1864. She states that no receipt or voucher was given her for her property; that she had no one to attend to the matter, her husband being absent at the time, employed in the custom-house at New Orleans, La., while she was prevented from looking after the business in person by the long protracted and fatal sickness of her little child. It is clearly established by a number of credible witnesses, who were in a position to know, and who testify to the fact as of their own knowledge, that the above-described property was actually taken in 1863 from the said Mary Jane Veazie for the use of the United States Army stationed in and around the city of Natchez, and that the charges which she has made were the fair market prices therefor at the time and place the same was taken.

"It is also shown that Judge James H. Veazie, the husband of the said Mary Jane Veazie, was a loyal and consistent Union man, devoted to the Government and Union of the States; that he opposed secession, and gave no aid to the rebellion; and that in 1863, when his wife's property was taken as aforesaid, he was employed in the custom-house at New Orleans. In 1864, 1865, and 1866 he was employed as cashier of the assistant treasury in that city. Among others who testify to Judge Veazie's loyalty is General Stewart Van Vliet, assistant quartermaster United States Army, who says, 'I know that he was a loyal citizen during the war and is so now.' It is also clearly established by the affidavits of several credible parties, well acquainted with Mrs. Veazie, that she shared fully her husband's sentiments and devotion to the Union; that she and her family were loyal to the Government, and gave no aid to the rebellion. Her property having been appropriated to the use of the Government, her right to compensation, in the opinion of your committee, comes within the spirit, if not the letter, of the act of July 4, 1864. But the items of \$200 for carriage and \$840 for two bales of cotton, taken from claimant, can not be properly regarded as a necessary army supply, and should be rejected. Your committee accordingly recommend that the bill for relief of claimant be amended by striking out the words 'five thousand four hundred and forty dollars,' in the third line of the bill, and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'twenty-five hundred dollars,' and, as thus amended, the committee recommend the passage of the bill by the Senate."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (before the reading of the report was concluded). The first five minutes allowed for debate on this bill have expired.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, obtained the floor, and said: I ask that the residue of the report be read in my time.

The reading of the report was then concluded.

Mr. HERR. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill why this claim was not presented before the proper tribunal at the proper time, in the proper way, and adjusted through the regular channel?

Mr. SINGLETON. The answer to that question appears in the report. In the first place, the husband of Mrs. Veazie was absent from home, being at New Orleans, in the employment of the Federal Government. In the second place, he was in the later years of his life very much afflicted.

Mr. VAN EATON. Mr. Speaker, this claim arose in my district; and the difficulties which prevented its earlier presentation and adjustment have been correctly stated by my colleague [Mr. SINGLETON]. I happen to know—not personally, it is true, but from report about which there can be no doubt—that the husband of this lady was absent in New Orleans in Federal employ.

Mr. HERR. When?

Mr. VAN EATON. During the war, and at the time of the occurrences out of which this claim arises.

Mr. HERR. Very well; what prevented him from making the claim in the usual way and getting it allowed as other claims were?

Mr. VAN EATON. Because he was at the time exceedingly afflicted, being in impaired health both mentally and physically.

Mr. SINGLETON. So that he afterward died.

Mr. VAN EATON. Yes; and in the later years of his existence he became so poor, I understand, that his library was sold in order to furnish the means of his support.

I know further that in our section of the country this is regarded as a just claim, if any claim can be just, a just claim for the whole amount originally named in the bill. Inasmuch as the sum has been cut down by the committee to \$2,500, I believe the least this House can do is to allow this amount.

One word with regard to the loyalty of these parties. I happen to know that they were not popular at all in that portion of the country because they were loyal. While the fact that they remained loyal is no recommendation to me, it does bring the case within the usages under the law. I repeat that in my portion of the country the claim is regarded as in every sense just, if ever a claim was just; and I happen to know the feeling of that community in this matter, as the claim originated in my district, and not far from my home.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. If I understand this report, the committee find that \$4,400 is due the claimants in this case. I would like to know why the amount has been cut down to \$2,500. Is it because of the loyalty of the claimants?

Mr. SINGLETON. The claim has been cut down from \$5,440 to \$2,500.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. So I understand. The committee deduct \$840 for two bales of cotton and \$200 for a carriage. That would leave \$4,400.

Mr. SINGLETON. The committee has reduced the amount still further.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. But why? Because the claimants were loyal or because the Government of the United States has for years delayed payment?

Mr. SINGLETON. I can not say.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time allowed for debate on this bill has expired. Is there objection to its present consideration? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the House.

The amendment reported by the Committee on War Claims was agreed to.

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

Mr. SINGLETON 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.

ISSUE OF DUPLICATE CHECKS.

Mr. PETTIBONE. I move to take up for present consideration the bill (S. 1705) to provide for the issue of duplicate checks.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3446 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any original check is lost, stolen, or destroyed, disbursing officers and agents of the United States are authorized, after the expiration of six months and within three years from the date of such check, to issue a duplicate check; and the Treasurer, assistant treasurers, and designated depositaries of the United States are directed to pay such duplicate checks, upon notice and proof of the loss of the original checks, under such regulations in regard to their issue and payment, and upon the execution of such bonds, with sureties, to indemnify the United States, as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. This section shall not apply to any check exceeding in amount the sum of \$2,500."

Mr. PETTIBONE. This bill simply strikes out in section 3446 of the Revised Statutes of the United States the limitation of \$1,000 and inserts \$2,500. There are now about thirty bills pending in this House restoring lost checks, and this bill will let them all in and allow the Secretary of the Treasury and other disbursing officers of the United States, on the filing of proper refunding bonds, to issue duplicate checks in place of those which have been lost to the amount of \$2,500 instead of \$1,000. It applies to pension checks as well as to quartermaster's checks.

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

Mr. HILL. I object. I am not satisfied this important change in the statutes should be made without consideration. It seems to me it throws wide open the doors of the Treasury to all sorts of petty frauds.

Mr. VALENTINE. The bill has received the consideration of the Committee on Claims and been unanimously reported by them. It simply authorizes the very parties who issued checks to issue duplicates when it is positively proved they have been lost or destroyed, and on the filing on the part of the claimants of a sufficient refunding bond, and after a proper time has elapsed.

Mr. HILL. Is it accompanied by a report of any committee?

Mr. PETTIBONE. Yes. There are now over thirty-five cases pending in this House which this legislation will cover.

Mr. HILL. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. A word on the bill. It has always seemed to me the law is too narrow in providing for the issue of duplicate checks.

Mr. PETTIBONE. You can not get the Senate to go higher.

Mr. HOLMAN. It should embrace not simply duplicate checks, but it should also authorize the issuing of duplicate certificates of deposit in subtreasuries. There is no general law on that subject now. I had occasion a short time ago to inquire at the Treasury Department whether a duplicate certificate of money deposited in a subtreasury could be issued, and was informed it could not be done. This legislation should be broad enough to cover all these cases, checks on the one hand and certificates of deposit on the other. But I will not embarrass this measure, which, of course, is right. It changes the law only in increasing the amount.

Mr. MORRILL. The present law authorized the issue of duplicate checks to the amount of \$1,000, and this simply increases that amount to \$2,500.

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

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. MAYBURY. I call up for present consideration the bill (S. 1609) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Detroit, Mich.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase a suitable lot of land in the city of Detroit, county of Wayne, and State of Michigan, and cause to be erected on the grounds so purchased a building suitable for the accommodation of the courts of the United States, of the custom-house, post-office, pension office and other Government offices in that city. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of \$900,000: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than forty feet, including streets and alleys; and no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of Michigan shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal law of said State and the service of civil process therein: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem it advisable to use for said purpose the site now owned by the United States, upon part of which the post-office and custom-house building now stands, he may do so; and should he further deem said site insufficient, he may enlarge the same by the purchase of additional adjoining grounds.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Treasury, in the event of the selection and purchase under this act of a site other than that now owned and occupied by the United States within said city of Detroit, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell at public auction, for cash, after thirty days' advertisement of the time, place, and terms of sale, the property in the city of Detroit purchased by him for the erection of a public building under and by virtue of an act of Congress approved May 25, 1882, entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a public building at Detroit, Mich.;" and the moneys received from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the purchase and use of an entire new site, then, after the erection of the building provided for in the first section of this act, or at such a time as the exigencies and needs of the public business may render such action prudent and desirable, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to sell, at public auction, for cash, and after thirty days' advertisement of the time, place, and terms of sale, the property or site now owned and occupied by the United States as a post-office, custom-house, and for other offices of the United States; and the money received from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, delay the sale of the property referred to in the second section of this act, and offer the same for sale jointly with the property referred to in this section of this act, and in like manner and terms: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, in any and every case of an attempted sale, shall be authorized and empowered to reject any bid which in his opinion shall be less than the value of the property or part thereof offered for sale under the provisions of this act, and reoffer the same for sale in the matter above provided until the said property shall bring a fair price.

SEC. 4. That an act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a public building at Detroit, Mich.," approved May 25, 1882, being chapter 187 of volume 22 of the Statutes of the United States, is hereby repealed: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as in any manner affecting the appropriation so far made for the purpose contemplated in that act, but that the same shall be available to be applied in effecting the objects sought under the provisions of this act.

Mr. MAYBURY. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the House that this bill is precisely similar in its text to the bill reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House. I have not the time to state all the facts which perhaps should be stated to this House, but I assume the House will take cognizance of the fact this building is asked for a city of 175,000 people, with two dependencies numbering some 25,000 more, making a community of 200,000 people.

I will devote the few minutes left to me in giving to the House a comparison of the appropriation made in this bill with those made for erection of public buildings in thirty-one cities of this Union. I have selected for the purpose of this comparison no mean cities. I have omitted the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Chicago, Saint Louis, and San Francisco, and have taken cities of like character with the city of Detroit, many of them, indeed most of them, not of the same commercial importance of that city. I have selected such cities as Albany, N. Y.; Charleston, S. C.; Hartford, Conn.; Louisville, Ky.; Memphis, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; Portland, Oreg.; Portland, Me.; Toledo, Ohio, &c. I have made a comparison of the appropriations made for the public buildings in those thirty-one cities with that proposed in this bill.

My comparison has been made first upon the ratio of population, and upon that the city of Detroit would receive a little less than three millions of money. I have made a comparison upon the basis of the receipts of public moneys—first, if you please, the postal receipts. The postal revenue for Detroit last year was \$303,126.02. The postal revenue from the thirty-one cities to which I have referred was \$3,361,220. Striking an average on this basis would give to the city of Detroit \$1,865,272.

Now I have made a comparison also upon the basis of the number of public buildings and the number of employes in the service of the Government, and it shows these figures: In the thirty-one cities I have mentioned the cost of public buildings is \$19,000,000; the total number of Government employes is 1,730. In Detroit there are three hundred and six public employes, one hundred and ninety-six of whom require office-room. On this plan of comparison the appropriation for Detroit would be \$2,430,000.

I have made also an estimate upon the basis of the customs revenue derived from these thirty-one cities, which aggregates \$5,150,600. At Detroit last year \$406,000 was collected. Taking this as the gauge of comparison, the appropriation for the city of Detroit would be \$1,580,528. The total internal revenue derived from these cities was \$24,537,236. The internal revenue collected at Detroit was \$1,251,000. Upon this basis the appropriation would be \$1,016,207.

I have made a further estimate, sir, based upon the total revenues

derived from these cities from all sources, which will be found to aggregate \$33,000,000. For Detroit it amounts to \$1,970,280, on which basis the appropriation for that city would be \$1,180,406.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time allowed for debate in support of this measure has expired.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to understand clearly the effect of this bill from the hasty reading, and I beg to make some inquiries of the gentleman from Michigan with reference to it. In the first place it proposes to limit the cost, as I understand it, to \$900,000, proposing either to build upon the present site or to select a new site. If a new site is purchased is it proposed that the proceeds of the sale of the old site shall be added to the \$900,000 for the new building?

Mr. MAYBURY. No, sir. The bill especially states that the money realized from the sale of the present site shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand, then, sir, that part of the bill.

Now I think, perhaps, the amount suggested—\$900,000—while in point of fact it is not larger than undoubtedly, as the gentleman says, we have appropriated for other large cities, is still, I think, a greater sum than is required.

We have been so extreme in our extravagance in regard to the erection of public buildings throughout the country for many years past that the country has protested against it. I think my friend ought to consent to the naming of a more reasonable sum for the erection of this building than the amount fixed in the bill. Nine hundred thousand dollars, as I understand it, is mentioned in the bill for that purpose—that is to say, for the purchase of the site and the erection of the building.

Mr. MAYBURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. For the purchase of the site and the construction of the building. Now I suggest that \$700,000, or at the extreme \$750,000, would be ample for all the purposes named.

The revenues mentioned by the gentleman do not indicate to any material extent the importance of this locality for a public building. Unimportant towns comparatively have the same claim. One in sight of where I live pays \$3,000,000 into the public Treasury, and yet that furnishes no reason for the erection of a public building there. I ask the gentleman, therefore, before the time expires for calling for objections to the consideration of this bill, that in the event of a new site being purchased the same proposition shall be incorporated in this bill which was adopted a short time ago with reference to another bill, the bill immediately preceding this, and that it shall apply to this; that if a new site is purchased the plan of this building shall not be adopted until after the purchase of such site, and that then the balance of the appropriation remaining only shall be applied to this purpose. Will the gentleman consent to that?

Mr. MAYBURY. Mr. Speaker, I will state, if permitted to do so, in answer to the gentleman from Indiana, that when this matter was considered before the Senate committee the appropriation to be reported was fixed at one and a half million of dollars; and at my own suggestion the committee of this House—acting on my recommendation—reported the amount now fixed in the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. But I am not asking as to the amount of appropriation, but to the limitation as to the remainder after purchasing the site; that the remainder only shall be expended in the construction of the building. The site is first to be purchased and the balance of this appropriation only applied to the building.

Mr. MAYBURY. As I understand the gentleman from Indiana, I see no objection to his suggestion. That is to say, that if the site shall be purchased with the \$900,000 the building shall be erected out of the remainder.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that there be considered also as pending the proposed amendment to reduce the amount to \$750,000.

Mr. MAYBURY. I think that there has been some controversy in the minds of gentlemen with reference to this question, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, of this extension of the appropriation for similar purposes. The statute in force would prevent that.

Mr. HOLMAN. But that is inoperative.

Mr. MAYBURY. But the statute exists and makes it a penal offense for any officer of the Government to extend the appropriation by plans or specifications involving a larger expenditure.

Mr. HOLMAN. Now I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not yet before the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. Before objections are called for I presume it is understood that both those amendments may be offered.

Mr. MAYBURY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. But there is the further question, Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAYBURY] accept that amendment?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Michigan has no power to accept any amendment. The Chair understands it is agreed the amendments shall be offered. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Objection was made by two members—not a sufficient number.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is before the House for action.

The question is on the amendments of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], which the Clerk will read.

Mr. HOLMAN. The first proposition is to strike out \$900,000 and insert \$750,000; and then I propose to add the following language—

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask for a division of the two propositions.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will order a division of the question.

The Clerk read the amendments proposed by Mr. HOLMAN, as follows:

Strike out "\$900,000" and insert "\$750,000."

And add as a proviso to the bill the following:

"Provided, however, That if a new site shall be purchased for said building, as heretofore authorized, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury after the site for said building shall have been purchased to cause a plan and specifications of said building to be prepared, which said plan and specifications shall not involve an expenditure in the erection and completion of said building and the approaches thereto exceeding the portion of said \$750,000 remaining after the site of said building shall have been paid for. And no plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the sum so remaining after paying for the site of said building."

Mr. SPRINGER. A division of the question being permitted, in the event of the first proposition being voted down it would be necessary to modify the second so as to make the amount correspond with the amount named on the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the question is susceptible of division. The question will first be on the first amendment of the gentleman from Indiana to reduce the amount.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that if the motion to decrease the amount is voted down, the amount in the second amendment can then be increased.

Mr. MAYBURY. I call for the previous question on the bill and amendments.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is understood the motion may be made to increase the amount in the second amendment if the first should be voted down.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands it will be in order to make the second amendment correspond with the effect of the vote of the House on the first amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MAYBURY moved to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is first on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to reduce the amount provided in this bill from \$900,000 to \$750,000.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 43, noes 107.

Mr. HOLMAN. A quorum not having voted, I ask that we may have the yeas and nays.

Mr. ANDERSON. I rise to a question of order. The hour under the special rule has expired.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move to dispense with the morning hour.

The motion was agreed to—two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Mr. TOWNSHEND rose.

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I desire to make a privileged report.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] after he has heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND].

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills; pending which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] rises to make a privileged report.

CLAIM AGENTS AND ATTORNEYS IN PENSION CASES.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I am directed by the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay to report back the Senate bill No. 2511, and to ask for its immediate consideration under the previous order of the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2511) relating to claim agents and attorneys in pension cases.

Mr. McMILLIN. I inquire of the Chair is this bill privileged for consideration?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will say it is. This bill was referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, with power to report it back at any time, which, in the view of the Chair, carries with it the right to consideration. The question of consideration, however, may be raised against the bill. The Chair holds the committee under the order of the House had the power to report the bill back at any time for immediate consideration in the absence of any question of consideration being raised.

Mr. HERR. How does the bill come before the House at the present time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has just stated, as plainly and distinctly as he can, that the House ordered this bill to be referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay, with power to report it back at any time; and the committee has now reported it back.

Mr. HERR. And it goes to the Calendar.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks not, and has just stated that the power to report back at any time carries with it the right to consideration, subject to the right of every member to raise the question of consideration to be determined by the House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I rise to a question of order. At the time this bill was reported the House was about to divide on my motion that the House should resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. I ask if a privileged report can intervene to prevent the question being taken on my motion?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House was not "dividing" on the gentleman's motion, which is the language of the rule.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. My motion was pending.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND], stating to the House at the same time that he would recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] to make a privileged report. The Chair does not think the point of order well taken. The motion of the gentleman from Illinois had not been voted upon.

Mr. HERR. I do not see how the gentleman from Illinois, who had taken the floor and announced his purpose to proceed with the appropriation bill, could be taken off the floor by another bill thrust in here without the knowledge of any one. It does seem to me a queer proceeding. It is different from anything I have ever seen in this House before.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Has the gentleman any point of order to raise?

Mr. HERR. I do raise a point of order.

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

Mr. HERR. I make the point that this bill can not come back to the House in this way except simply to be placed upon the Calendar, as it would be, in the first instance, when it came over from the Senate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair overrules the point of order, and states again, for the third time, this bill was referred to the committee with an order from the House to report it back at any time, which order, in the judgment of the Chair, in conformity to the uniform rulings of the Chair, carries with it the right of consideration, subject to the point of consideration being raised by any gentleman. The Chair goes further, and states that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] had moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for a certain purpose; the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] then rose with a motion of higher privilege, just as any gentleman in the House might have risen and moved that the House adjourn, which would have taken precedence over the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND], as did the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas. The Chair so ruled and still so holds.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Does the Chair hold that the motion I made does not take precedence of the report of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS]?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair holds that the report of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] takes precedence of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND].

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, is it not in the power of the majority of the House to proceed to the consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has stated more than once that the question of consideration may be raised by any member.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I demand the regular order, and I call for the previous question.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I rise to the question of consideration, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the demand for the previous question is not in order until the bill has been read.

Mr. HERR. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration upon this bill at this time, in order that the House may go on with the appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question of consideration was first raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND]. As many as are in favor of proceeding with the consideration of the bill reported by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] will say "ay"—

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the bill for the present.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws the bill, and the question recurs upon the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] that the House do now resolve

itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7785), with the Senate amendments, and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There being no objection, it will be so ordered. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND]. Before putting that motion the Chair will lay before the House a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

A bill (S. 235) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Augusta, Me.; and

A bill (S. 591) for the relief of the estate of Chester Ashley.

CIVIL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the following message; which was referred to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In compliance with the act of Congress approved January 16, 1883, entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," the Civil Service Commission has made to the President its second annual report. That report is herewith transmitted. The commission is in the second year of its existence. The President congratulates the country upon the success of its labors, commends the subject to the favorable consideration of Congress, and asks for an appropriation to continue the work.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 11, 1885.

REMOVAL OF CHEROKEE INDIANS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Interior for subsistence and removal of certain Eastern Cherokee Indians; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

GAS-PIPES IN PENSION BUILDING.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Interior of an appropriation for gas-pipes in the United States pension building; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Supervising Architect recommending an increase in the limit of cost of the public building at Brooklyn, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT DALLAS, TEX., AND OXFORD, MISS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, inclosing a recommendation from the Supervising Architect for the extension of the limit of cost of public buildings at Dallas, Tex., and Oxford, Miss.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. DUNHAM, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of important business.

BILLS REFERRED.

Mr. ROBINSON, of New York, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Pensions bills of the following titles; which were ordered to be placed on the Private Calendar:

A bill (H. R. 7513), with an amendment, granting a pension to Margaret B. Harwood; and

A bill (H. R. 4393) for the relief of Lieut. Nathaniel Johnson Coffin.

W. H. MURDAUGH.

Mr. TUCKER. I desire unanimous consent to report from the Committee on the Judiciary two bills removing political disabilities.

There being no objection, Mr. TUCKER reported from the Committee on the Judiciary a bill (H. R. 8183) to remove the political disabilities of W. H. Murdaugh, of Virginia; which was read a first and second time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest that we pass these bills at once; it will take but a moment.

Mr. COX, of New York. Bills of this character are usually passed as soon as reported.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill H. R. 8183; which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That all political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the

United States be, and the same are hereby, removed from W. H. Murdaugh, of Virginia.

Mr. KEIFER. I desire to know whether there is a petition in this case from the person whose disabilities are to be removed.

Mr. TUCKER. Oh, yes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed (two-thirds voting in favor thereof).

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

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNSHEND and others called for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] has sent to the desk two bills, only one of which has been acted on.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I must call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The remaining bill will be returned to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order now to ask unanimous consent to take up the Mexican war pension bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not think it would. The regular order has been called for, and the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8138) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to letter-carriers and the incidental expenses of the free-delivery system, \$4,100,000; \$45,000 of which may be used, in the discretion of the Postmaster-General, for the establishment, under existing law, of the free-delivery system in cities where it is not now established:

Mr. HERR. I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out "100" and inserting "535," so as to make the appropriation for payment to letter-carriers and incidental expenses of free-delivery system \$4,535,000. I yield my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTER].

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, in rising to urge the adoption of this amendment I wish to call attention to the vast importance of expediting as much as possible the delivery of letters in all the cities of the Union and all the large towns to which this free-delivery system is now and may be extended under the law. This is an era when we are saving as much as possible the time of the country. Time is business, it is commerce, it is progress, it is the advance of civilization.

The loss of half a day in all the great cities of the Union is so much lost from the executive capacity of the age in which we live. Nowhere can the amount of money now asked for be applied so as to affect so directly and potentially the welfare of the whole country as in the administration of the Post-Office Department. In this matter there is no question of constitutional law, there are no local jealousies, no sectional interests to embarrass us. Every dollar that we give goes directly to the people, goes directly toward the promotion of the business, the welfare, the progress of the country. One hundred thousand dollars spent in our cities and large towns in securing the delivery of the mails at an earlier hour than they are now delivered will be an actual saving of more than ten times that amount to the country.

I hold in my hand a letter received a day or two since from a gentleman in Chicago, stating that unless the mails arrive there so as to be given to the carriers before 11 o'clock in the morning they are not delivered until the next day. Those letters comprise, perhaps, business orders from all regions of the country whose trade centers there, so that delay in the delivery of a single day's mail is often the cause of the loss of vastly more than the amount which would be distributed to that city under this amendment.

I know that in the city which I have the honor to represent in part on this floor there were last year many thousand applicants in favor of increasing this appropriation. It was then somewhat increased, and the great advantages of the increase have been so apparent that there is to-day a unanimous sentiment in favor of continuing this increase until letters shall be delivered in these great centers of the country without the least loss of time.

But this question does not affect the great cities alone; it affects as well all the towns having commercial connections with these cities. If a letter sent to New York or Chicago can not be delivered on the same day it is received there, at least one day is lost to the business and enterprise of the country centering in those cities.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. If it will not disturb the gentleman, I would like to ask him whether this proposed enlargement of the appropriation is for the purpose of increasing delivery facilities or for increasing the salaries of carriers?

Mr. POTTER. Simply for increasing delivery facilities; nothing else.

Mr. HERR. The salaries are all fixed by law.

Mr. POTTER. The salaries are fixed by law. The object is that letters arriving at all the cities and towns of the country to which this system extends may be delivered at once, so that our constantly accelerating means of communication by steam, by telegraph, &c., may have due effect in the great centers of activity and commerce. The object is simply that mails arriving at these different places shall not be delayed unnecessarily, but delivered at once.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, we have in this item granted an increase of \$50,000 over and above the appropriation for the current year. The amount we have appropriated is over a half a million more, or about a half a million more than the amount which was expended for the last year ending on the 30th of June.

Mr. MONEY. Compare it with this year.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. We have given an appropriation of half a million of dollars to the free-delivery offices over and above the amount expended last year.

Mr. MONEY. But how as to this year?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It will be more. We have about reached the limit of the establishment of free-delivery offices. There are only nine, I understand, now in the United States not supplied with free-delivery service where it is possible to apply it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Do not interrupt me right here. The gentleman will get an opportunity in his own time.

Mr. BINGHAM. What, under the law as it now exists, will be required to pay the letter-carrier service without the extension to an additional city and without the addition of another man?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman's question is too long and he can explain it in his own time. Now, I wish to say about this item that the subcommittee on appropriations have considered it, and the majority of that subcommittee have reached the conclusion, in view of the fact the time has come when a limit will be put to the free-delivery service in other cities, and in view of the fact we have given half a million dollars over what was expended last year, that the point has been reached, in the opinion of that subcommittee, when we should call a halt in extravagant appropriations for free-delivery offices.

Mr. HERR. Did you take into account the fact of the increase under the law of \$150,000 in order to carry out the law itself?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. What \$150,000?

Mr. HERR. The increase of salaries under the law is \$152,150.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. This is one of those items.

Mr. COX, of New York. Answer that question.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Well, sir, as I said yesterday, so far as this service is concerned, the more you give the more will be demanded.

Mr. HERR. I beg pardon.

Mr. BINGHAM. Just the reverse.

Mr. HERR. The law fixes the salary at so much.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. And the number of free-delivery letter-carriers will be multiplied no matter how much we appropriate.

Mr. HERR. You do not answer my question. Did you take into account that fact?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. We took into account the whole situation and reached the conclusion that the sum we have appropriated is ample for that purpose.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can go on without being interrupted I will proceed with my remarks.

Mr. COX, of New York. Did you—

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have only five minutes—you will have your own time.

Mr. MONEY. Oh, let him go on.

Mr. COX, of New York. Allow me—

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Not now. These gentlemen are obtaining large appropriations every year.

Mr. COX, of New York. Allow me a question—

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Not now; wait until I get through.

Mr. COX, of New York. I never discarded you.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Well, then, put your question.

Mr. COX, of New York. It is whether this appropriation is in pursuance of existing law?

Mr. HERR. There is not money enough to pay them.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. When you get through with your questions I will proceed.

Mr. COX, of New York. That is all. I take but little of the time of this House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It is in pursuance of the present law, and in my judgment if economically administered, as I hope it will be, under the next administration, it will furnish ample means to supply the free-delivery service.

Mr. HERR. Do you propose the incoming administration shall pay these men less than the law says they shall receive?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not.

Mr. HERR. Then your appropriation lacks \$200,000.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I can not yield. I say there are millions and

millions of people in this country who do not get free-delivery service, who are taxed in order to furnish it to towns and cities of 20,000 inhabitants in other sections.

Mr. COX, of New York. That is not correct, because we make a surplus.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. That is not correct. New York city makes a surplus—

Mr. COX, of New York. And so does Philadelphia make a surplus, and so does Baltimore.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. There are but ten cities where the free-delivery service is self-sustaining.

A MEMBER. There is not a city that does not.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have the statistics here to show. I say only ten—I may be mistaken about the exact number—are self-sustaining. The vast majority of free-delivery offices are a burden upon the Treasury. They do not pay, a vast majority of them.

Mr. HERR. The gentleman can not mean that, unless he confines them to local postage.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Of course I do.

Mr. HERR. Why of course?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The last Postmaster-General declared that it should be so confined, and made that the measure of the self-sustaining quality of the free-delivery offices. He declared in his report that that should be and was the proper measure.

Mr. HERR. Does not the gentleman from Illinois know that, as a whole, they pay a considerable amount of surplus revenue?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I know that New York city furnishes nearly the entire bulk that comes from the free-delivery system.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONEY. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the honorable gentleman in charge of this bill is certainly misleading with reference to this portion of it. He takes occasion to say that the appropriation is half a million of dollars in excess of the appropriation of last year. Why did not the gentleman say of ten years ago, or make his basis of comparison any other ancient date?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Because that is too far off.

Mr. MONEY. If the gentleman undertakes to show the actual condition of the expenditures, why does he not compare it with the appropriations for the current fiscal year? Now, I say that it is only \$100,000 in excess of the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BINGHAM. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. MONEY. The increased business, according to the report of the Postmaster-General, for the current year is 16.30 per cent., and if the gentleman in the preparation of his bill proposed to make an appropriation for this service commensurate with the increased business of the Department it will be necessary to appropriate \$600,000.

Now, in the consideration of the provisions of this bill in its application to the postal service it should be remembered that it is neither a sectional nor a partisan service. It is a service that is performed for the benefit of the whole country, and I do not think that it is the intention of the people of the United States or their wish to cripple the Government in any manner in sustaining or in extending these facilities. It can not be so. In this particular item, therefore, not only would the appropriation, if made upon the basis of the increase of business, be over \$600,000, but how can the gentleman state so positively that there could be only nine offices that would be benefited by the extension of this system? How can the gentleman tell what will be the growth of our cities and towns during the year? How many towns throughout the country may reach the limit of 20,000 population or \$20,000 in gross revenue, which would entitle them to the benefits of the free-delivery system? That is a question that the gentleman has no means of determining.

And not only that, sir, but I wish to state also that the gentleman was mistaken when he said that he had considered the whole system of the postal service of this country, and had appropriated adequately to meet its necessities.

Why, taking into consideration the present force of carriers, if not a single one should be appointed during the fiscal year, and the system should not be extended to embrace a single town in addition to those where it is now in operation, the law regulating promotions would require more than the sum appropriated here to meet the demands of the service.

Mr. HERR. That is a fact.

Mr. MONEY. Of course it is. Even a blind man could see that. There can be no question but that the whole country is interested in the development of the free-delivery system. Every correspondent throughout this entire country is interested in the free-delivery system in order that his letter may get to his merchant or correspondent as speedily as possible. It is a service to the whole country and for the country and all the people and should not be hampered; and in addition to that if you cripple the service in one branch, so multiplied are the ramifications of the service and so sensitive is it, that you cripple it in every department.

And in point of fact, of the \$52,000,000 that is covered by this bill,

notwithstanding the stump-speeches which have been made here upon the subject of extravagance and economy, \$50,000,000 of the sum can not be affected in the matter of expenditures by the figures put into this bill. That expenditure is regulated by the law as it stands. I care not if you appropriate \$100,000 or \$1,000,000,000; \$50,000,000 in the application is governed by the law, and not affected by the provisions you incorporate here.

But, sir, this particular provision is limited by existing law. The Postmaster-General dare not go beyond that limit except in so far as the pay of the carriers at their present status and their promotion as regulated is concerned to meet the requirements of the service. Beyond that, however, the expenditure is limited by statutes already in existence, and it is for this House to say if it will cripple this branch of the service or develop it.

In my judgment, sir, it would be wise not only not to arrest the development of this service, but to extend it to cities of 10,000 inhabitants. After a while, as we progress in this country, I have no doubt whatever that it will be extended, and that we will eventually carry our letters into every town, village, and hamlet in the entire land. Today we are at least twenty-five years behind most of the other civilized nations in this particular of free delivery. Most of the countries of Europe that pretend to a properly arranged postal system deliver letters by a carrier to the minor towns and hamlets. In Great Britain the delivery is daily in the towns and villages, and even in the rural districts they have carrier-delivery three times a week, and the lowly tenant of the cottage receives this welcome visitor. In Hungary and Austria, Italy and Spain, Switzerland, France, and Germany the same system is in operation for the benefit of the public.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HARDEMAN was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. MONEY.

Mr. MONEY. I am obliged to the gentleman from Georgia for his courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, it is not worth while to speak here of a few thousand or a few hundred thousand dollars in connection with a great service like this. Does any gentleman imagine any of his constituents will call him to account for a provision that extends more liberally and more efficiently a great public function like this, which diffuses its benefits all over the land? In my section of the country thousands of people would not care though you should abolish the Supreme Court, though you should do away with the Army and Navy; but lay your hand on the slightest member of this great service and you will arouse a general indignation.

We are all interested in the Post-Office, a Department by means of which the Government lays its hand of benediction on the people, and nothing but blessing can flow from it. We want this service so perfected, so extended, so developed that every community in the country, however remote, shall be brought into more intimate, closer, and more rapid communication with every other part of the country.

And after a while we shall take in the postal telegraph, and shall make communication so rapid and so frequent that sectional lines will be blotted out, and States will exist, except as to their autonomies, as simple geographical divisions. Nothing will tend to unite the people so much as to perfect your postal system. Let us not linger in the rear in the glorious race of progress. Except in machinery and appliances of distribution, we are behind the world in that liberal and enlightened spirit which carries out measures for the general good.

Our neighbor the Dominion of Canada transports all its newspapers and periodicals free of any charge, because it recognizes in the press of the country—its religious, agricultural, and other periodicals devoted to science, arts, and industry, and the great news press—a great educator of the people. I would have the diffusion of these means of education as free as the wind of heaven, without cost and without price, without limit or restriction.

If we rise to a proper sense of our duty we will enlarge this system it is true by prudent and proper advances, but we will enlarge it until it embraces within its operation every facility that human ingenuity can devise to make it as widespread and far-reaching and as general in its application as it is to-day in the free-delivery cities.

Let me state another thing. If you restrict the number of letter-carriers in the great cities you will put the country to the expense of building store-room for its mails. In New York there are handled one hundred and forty tons of mail matter each day.

If we restrict the facilities of mail delivery in any particular you must enlarge your accommodation for storing and handling your mails until they can be called for by the citizens themselves. And besides, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTER], look at the time consumed by people visiting the office for their mails.

Another word, Mr. Chairman. In my opinion this amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERR] is necessary to preserve even the service as it is now. But we want its extension. We want these privileges carried further and further. And I assure you you never yet made an improvement in this service to which there has not been a response in the increase of its revenue. Talk of the cost of this service! The report of the Postmaster-General shows that the re-

ceipts of the free-delivery system amount to \$1,273,000 above its expenses. It matters not if New York furnishes the whole of the excess of receipts, or if it is distributed through a number of cities.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. A vast majority of the free-delivery cities do not pay expenses.

Mr. MONEY. What difference does that make?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It makes a great difference if New York and a few cities bear the expense of the service for the others.

Mr. MONEY. The people ask for this service, and the people cheerfully pay the money for it, and they should receive the benefit which it brings. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McMILLIN. I have listened to the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] with interest. If the expression of beautiful theories without reducing them to practice were either desirable or possible, we might all afford to follow his suggestion. He began on a proposition to increase the appropriation for this special service. Branching off from that in beautiful and eloquent and metaphorical terms, he launched into an extension of the service from cities of 20,000 inhabitants down to those of 10,000 inhabitants.

Mr. COX, of North Carolina. Villages.

Mr. McMILLIN. Villages, as the gentleman from North Carolina suggests. And what would it take to carry out the service in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi? Why, sir, in place of having a deficiency of from three to five millions of dollars a year we would have a deficiency of \$15,000,000 a year, and, as now suggested to me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUTCHINS], an increase of office-holders that would be almost, like the sands of the seashore, innumerable.

I am in favor of the free-delivery system. It is not my purpose to attack it. It has performed a good work, and may be made useful in future. But, like all other branches of the service, it should be kept within judicious limits.

The gentleman from Mississippi, passing from that, suggests a still further departure, in which I think we should not follow him. Not content with swelling this appropriation, not satisfied with suggesting a scheme that would increase the appropriation for deficiencies to \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a year, he goes into another project. What is that? That the Government ought to take possession of and control the telegraphs of the country. That is another beautiful scheme. But how practical! What would be the consequence of it? Already this free Republic is ruled over by 120,000 officers—selected how? It purports to be democratic; it is reputed to be a representative Republic; yet out of those 120,000 officers less than 500 are elected by the people. And the gentleman proposes a system which would vastly increase and probably double the number of these appointive officers, if the Government should ever assume to purchase or build a postal telegraph to be operated by Government officials. How many would it take to run that system? When would be the end of it? I enter my protest at this time against a system so problematical in its workings.

Mr. MONEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McMILLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. MONEY. How many officials or employes, in addition to the present number, does the gentleman think it would require to do the business under a proper postal-telegraph system?

Mr. McMILLIN. "In addition to the present number"—I know not, according to any plan that I have ever seen.

Mr. MONEY. I thought not.

Mr. McMILLIN. Nor does the gentleman.

Mr. MONEY. I can tell you.

Mr. McMILLIN. You can not tell, nor does the man live possessing powers of mind this side of Omniscience that can tell.

Mr. MONEY. If my friend will allow me—

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman has had his turn.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that on every bill that is brought in here for an increase of these appropriations the beauty of the postal system and its necessities are to be clamored about. I remember that in years gone by, in the star-route period, an appropriation of \$2,500,000 was demanded by the Postal Department to continue speculation, fraud, thieving. It was done under the guise of extending the mail service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERR. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX, of New York. I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to argue the value of the postal-telegraph system. Whatever it may have of value belongs to the future. But I do think my honored friend from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] in charge of this bill should have been more thoroughly candid and full in his statement when I asked him about the cost and the net proceeds of the free-delivery system. Why, sir, for the year which ended June 30, 1884, the excess of postage on local matter over the total cost of the service was \$1,273,278.35. The increase over the preceding year was \$251,384.34.

Every time we have increased the appropriations for this service we have added to the revenue, and any business man will readily understand what that means and how it comes about. The Postmaster-General has told you on this subject what I will not read, but I will em-

body in my remarks. This system of delivery is more acceptable than the old mode of office delivery. It is more accurate, more thorough in the delivery of letters. It reduces the number of dead letters. It diverts to the post-office many letters formerly delivered by express and private messengers. It stimulates mail and local correspondence, increases postage on local matter, saves time and money to the people and fruitless calls at the post-office. It yields a large surplus of postage on local matter above its cost, notwithstanding that the class of matter for which it gets credit is only about 25 per cent. of the matter handled by the carriers. There is no answer to these facts. There is no way of getting over them, or under them, or around them; and the Committee on Appropriations in appropriating money in pursuance of existing law should have brought in an amount adequate to meet every idea and requirement embodied in the legislation on this subject. I hope that this House will stand by the letter-carriers, stand by this increase of revenue, stand by the men who stand by the letter-carriers, who are our best friends in all our local and domestic relations.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERR. I yield a minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not accustomed to speak in this House upon subjects that I am not informed upon. When I undertake to express views upon any subject here, I do it only after careful study and preparation. I have had the honor to-day to draw the fire of my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], who, not having given himself the trouble to examine into this matter of the postal service, is able to speak out of the abundance of what he does not know, and consequently can say a great deal. [Laughter.]

The gentleman defies me or any other man to say what would be the number of additional Government employes required to perform the service under a proper postal telegraph system, and, as the matter is before the House, I think it a proper thing to reply to him now. I asked the gentleman whether he knew what the number would be, and he said he did not. That was the answer that I expected of him. Sir, I do know, because the committee to which I have the honor to belong has now upon your Calendar a bill reported by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS], which, if enacted into law, would give a fine postal telegraph system to this country with not one single added Federal official, not a single additional appointment, and would make a reduction in rates to a schedule under which every solitary telegraph company in the United States has signified its intention to bid if the bill should become a law. And yet, as I have said, that system provides for no additional Federal officials, no enlargement whatever of the Federal patronage. So much for that question.

Now, when gentlemen speak here about robbing the Treasury to give the people proper mail service, and talk about the people being taxed to support this great post-office system, I ask them if they are able to point to any system of taxation so universal in its application, so easy of collection, or borne with such general acquiescence in the levying of it as the tax that is paid in the form of postage for the conveyance of mail matter.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERR. I withdraw my formal amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. I renew the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I recognize the intelligence and the information that this general debate has given us, I fail to see its direct bearing upon the paragraph now at issue. If I can have the attention of the House for five minutes I think I can clearly demonstrate that the amount allowed in this bill will not conduct this service during the next fiscal year under the law as it now exists.

The letter-carrier service, like the "civil service," has come to stay in the future administration of this Government. It is the offspring of Republican administration, and came into being under legislation adopted in 1863. To-day, recognizing the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] as the spokesman of the next administration, the Republican party hands over this service to the incoming administration with a net profit of \$1,250,000 per annum.

This bill, as submitted by the committee, appropriates \$4,100,000 for this service. The law passed at the first session of this Congress gives for this service for the present fiscal year \$4,050,000. Before this same Committee on Appropriations is an application for a deficiency of \$50,000 in this service created under the law. When that deficiency is met, the appropriation in this bill will be exactly what it is for the present fiscal year. But that is not enough.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman will allow me to say that the appropriation last year was \$3,500,000—

Mr. BINGHAM. The year before last.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I mean the appropriation for the year ending the 30th of June last. The Postmaster-General reports that of that appropriation over \$10,000 remains in the Treasury unexpended.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why does the gentleman discuss the appropriations of last year? The issue is, what is the service costing this year and what will it cost next year? The gentleman undertakes to predicate the appropriations for the coming year upon those for the last year; but they should be predicated on the expenditures of the present fiscal year and the necessary increase of business. I hold in my hand

a letter from the chief of the letter-carrier division of the Post-Office Department, stating that, without extending this service to a single additional city, without the employment of one additional man, it will cost, under the law for the next fiscal year, \$4,297,950; for it is to be remembered that letter-carriers entering the service at \$600 receive after one year's service \$800, and after two years' service \$1,000. This is the amount they must be paid under existing law. So that \$197,950 will be required for the next fiscal year beyond the amount allowed in this bill; yet the bill provides that \$45,000 shall be given for the establishment of new offices.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to have about two minutes more.

Mr. BAYNE obtained the floor and said: I yield my time to my colleague [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a paying service. It does not come to this House with hat in hand asking for alms. Here is a common-sense business proposition. Four million and fifty thousand dollars has been given to this branch of the Post-Office Department to be expended during the present fiscal year. What is the result? I hold in my hand a dispatch from the chief of this service, stating that the net income to the Government from this service will be \$1,250,000. What business man of this House, if he could realize \$1,250,000 upon an investment of \$4,050,000, would not extend such a system? Since 1874, without the break of a single year, this service has returned a large net revenue to the Government.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? The Postmaster-General says that there are one hundred and fifty-six letter-carrier offices—

Mr. BINGHAM. I am speaking of these offices as a group.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. And of these one hundred and fifty-six offices only twelve are self-sustaining.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not care if only one is self-sustaining. You have established this system; it is now in successful operation; and the gentleman himself by his own bill is debarred from arguing against it, because the bill appropriates \$45,000 for the establishment of new offices.

Mr. McMILLIN. I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to state that according to official report the net revenue derived from this system during the present fiscal year will be a million and a quarter of dollars.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. In arriving at that result does not the gentleman take the net revenue from all sources in the cities that have this system?

Mr. BINGHAM. Let me explain. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question.

Mr. McMILLIN. I know that the city of New York and a few other cities pay a revenue, but I know also there are many others that do not.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad to have the opportunity to make an explanation. The letter-carrier service in the cities where it is established depends wholly for the payment of its expenses and for its revenue upon the postage on drop or local letters. It not only does its work and returns a million and a quarter of dollars profit to the Government, but every letter and every newspaper coming from every section of the country to be delivered at these local delivery offices is delivered by the carriers without the charge of a fractional part of a cent to the general Post-Office service.

It makes a million and a quarter of dollars per annum upon its own business, and does in addition the delivery of all other mail matter that goes into that office.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise so much to oppose the amendment as to call the attention of the committee to the fact that if this bill is to pass, as well as the other appropriation bills behind it, it will be impossible to allow so much time to be consumed as has been on this Post-Office appropriation bill up to the present moment. Gentlemen can not pass the appropriation bills if they are to drag as this bill has dragged. If, then, the intention be to pursue that policy in regard to all of the appropriation bills, this House may as well make up its mind to a called session and be done with it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it not perfectly competent for the gentleman at any time to move the committee rise and close debate?

Mr. BINGHAM. It is in the hands of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HERR. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERR. Could not all this trouble be avoided if they would bring them in right in the first place?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. They are brought in right.

Mr. HOLMAN. Undoubtedly, if we should throw wide open the doors of the Treasury and invite gentlemen to come in and help themselves we would be all right from my friend's standpoint.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Yes; that is their position.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have not taken up any time in this five-minute

discussion, and therefore will be indulged for a few remarks on the pending subject. Gentlemen assume this Committee of the Whole know nothing about it, that gentlemen have not examined the report of the Postmaster-General, that this is a fresh subject of discussion. Now, every gentleman knows last year three and a half millions of dollars were appropriated for this service, and that \$14,500 were afterward added, making in all \$3,514,500, of which ten thousand and more dollars went back into the Treasury.

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. In this the second year after that state of things it is proposed to add on the basis of that expenditure nearly \$600,000 to this branch of the service. Gentlemen know further it is these branches of the public service nearest to the people, in which they take the deepest and most earnest interest, on measures of public policy of the highest moment, that these branches of the Government are seized upon to inaugurate schemes of extravagance which sooner or later bring the blush of shame to honest men all over the land. But when gentlemen make appeal for extravagant and unwarranted appropriations in any given branch of the public service on account of its being nearest to the hearts of the people, they forget that in thus encouraging unnecessary and wasteful extravagance of public expenditure they are sowing seeds which always result in a harvest of humiliation and misery to the country.

Now, an increase of \$600,000 in this service is in my judgment ample and sufficient for all proper purposes. I am making no argument against the free-delivery system. I think it is good enough. There are about ten of these offices which pay their own way. The industry of the whole balance of the people supports the others. I am not inclined to complain of it. The system is fairly fastened upon the country, and there is a disposition to acquiesce in it. I do, for one. But, sir, I do protest against opening up here, because of the nearness of this service to the hearts of the people, a system of extravagant and discreditable expenditure of the public money.

The Committee on Appropriations believe this increase to be sufficient.

A MEMBER. There is no increase.

Mr. HOLMAN. The salary of letter-carriers is fixed, but the number to be employed is within the discretion of the Postmaster-General. If we make extravagant appropriations, of course the number will be increased beyond the wants of the public service, and you can not prevent it. If you furnish the money to the Post-Office Department the pressure will be irresistible to expend every dollar of it. It is because it is necessary to impose not only just restraints upon ourselves, but upon those charged with the administration of the Government, we appeal to you to make only a fair and reasonable increase of appropriation for the public service, and not to permit bills in which great public interest is felt to be made the agency of extravagance and corruption in governmental administration.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why does not the gentleman give us for the incoming administration sufficient to execute the law?

Mr. COX, of New York. That is what I wish answered.

Mr. HOLMAN. As I have already stated, and as every gentleman knows, while the salary is fixed by law, the number of persons to be employed is within the discretion of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. BINGHAM. They are there now.

Mr. HOLMAN. If you furnish the money irresistible pressure will be brought to bear upon the Postmaster-General to employ men beyond the needs of the service. Now, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will move the committee rise.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move the committee rise for the purpose of closing debate.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 77, noes 90.

Mr. TOWNSHEND demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. TOWNSHEND and Mr. BINGHAM were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 76, noes 77.

So the committee refused to rise.

Mr. HERR. I now call for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The *pro forma* amendment is withdrawn by unanimous consent, and the question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERR].

Mr. RANDALL. I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 100, noes 64.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Let us have tellers.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest to my colleague on the committee that he take a yea-and-nay vote in the House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will withdraw the demand for tellers, and give notice that I shall demand a yea-and-nay vote in the House.

So (no further count being demanded) the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wrapping paper—

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

Mr. HAMMOND. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. I give way for that motion, but let the amendment be stated.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I want to oppose the amendment; let it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The committee has just voted down a motion to rise. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I make the point of order that it is not competent to renew that motion; the last vote disclosed a large majority in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The last vote was on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, and there has been intervening business since the former vote on the motion to rise.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. I desire to offer the amendment now, to have it printed in the RECORD, and will then yield to the motion to rise.

Mr. HAMMOND. For the purpose of having the amendment read I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can then be printed for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 35 insert:

"Letter-carriers may be employed for the free delivery of mail matter as frequently as the public convenience may require at every place containing a population of not less than 10,000 within its corporate limits."

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. RANDALL. A point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk conclude the reading of the amendment. The point of order will be reserved.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment, as follows:

Provided, The gross revenue for the preceding fiscal year from the post-office or post-offices in such place shall have aggregated at least \$10,000.

Letter-carriers may also be employed at the principal and most central post-office of towns or places within short distances of one another, provided such towns or places contain in the aggregate a population of not less than 10,000, and the gross revenue for the preceding fiscal year from the several offices aggregate not less than \$10,000.

All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this provision are hereby repealed.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The point of order is made upon that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The points of order are reserved.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not reserve the point of order, but I make the point of order directly upon it. I am willing, however, that the gentleman from New York shall be heard if he desires it.

Mr. HAMMOND. I submit as a point of order that that was read simply for the purpose of allowing it to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Then I want my point of order to be considered as pending.

Mr. ANDERSON. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. My point of order is that the gentleman from New York rose to move this amendment and had the floor, but between the time that he sent it up to the desk and the time it was read by the Clerk the gentleman from Georgia interposed the motion that the committee rise. I make the point of order that the gentleman had not the floor for that purpose until the amendment had been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman subsequently yielded the floor for that purpose, and the amendment was read by the Clerk for the information of the House, at the suggestion of the gentleman from New York himself, in order that it might be printed in the RECORD.

The question is, Will the committee now rise?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman from Georgia yielded the floor to have an amendment of the gentleman from New York read. When it was read I immediately raised the point of order upon it. Now I insist that I have the right to have that point of order disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again state that the gentleman from Georgia yielded to have the amendment read for information in order that it might be printed in the RECORD. It has been read, then, simply for information, and is not now a pending amendment. The Chair distinctly stated that the points of order were reserved.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I make the point of order upon it now.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be in order when the amendment is proposed for consideration. The question is, Shall the committee now rise?

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move that the House do now adjourn, but yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WOLFORD] to make a motion. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. If the motion to adjourn is withdrawn I renew it.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BEACH: Petition of citizens of Middletown, N. Y., in reference to the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Haverstraw, N. Y., in reference to the Mormon question—to the same committee.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolutions of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., regarding the purchase by the United States of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. W. W. BROWN: The memorial of the directors of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, in behalf of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal—to the same committee.

By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of W. P. Sheaffer and 63 others, citizens of Pottsville, Pa., urging action on the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Papers relating to the claim of E. A. Harper, of Chattooga County, Georgia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of E. A. Harper, of Chattooga County, Georgia, asking compensation for property taken and used by the United States Army during the late war—to the same committee.

By Mr. G. R. DAVIS: Petition of Rencker, Linkhorn & Co. and 200 others, leading dealers and shippers of live-stock, of Pittsburgh and East Liberty, Pa., against the Hopkins resolution relating to shipping of live-stock—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN: Petition of citizens of Arkansas for the improvement of the Cache River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ELLIS: Memorial of the committee of the commissioners of the States to the World's Industrial and Cotton Centennial Exposition, praying for aid for said exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EVERHART: Resolution of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the discontinuance of the coinage of the silver dollar—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Board of Exchange, in regard to purchasing by the United States of Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FIEDLER: Petition of A. Van Vleet, Charles Williams, John Meeker, and others, citizens of New Jersey, in favor of legislation on the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petitions of Robert A. Clark; of Susan E. Scroggins, daughter of Mrs. Lucy Kirk, deceased, and of James Davis, all of Cherokee County, Alabama, for compensation for property taken and used by the United States Army during the late war—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE: Petition of citizens of Oregon for the improvement of Coquille River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HARMER: Resolution of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, in favor of the acquisition by the United States of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal—to the same committee.

By Mr. HAYNES: Papers relating to the claim of A. P. Burditt and James Fisk—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLTON: Preamble and resolution approved by the mayor, councillors, and aldermen of the city of Annapolis, Md., in favor of the Senate bill providing for the erection of a public building in that city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Resolution of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Brooklyn, in favor of stopping the coinage of the silver dollar—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolution of citizens of Karns City, Pa., upon the subject of river and harbor improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, in favor of the acquisition by the United States of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canals—to the same committee.

By Mr. HUTCHINS: Petition of citizens of Westchester County, New York, on the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. B. W. JONES: Resolution of the Young Men's Democratic Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the coinage of silver dollars—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Augustus P. Clarke, late surgeon of the Sixth Regiment New York Cavalry Volunteers, war of 1861, for arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOULTON: Petition of 200 citizens of Effingham County, praying for action against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of William M. Thomson, of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., and 28 others, asking that the United States acquire title to Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canals, and make the same free of tolls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Anna Shelmidine, of Lorraine, N. Y., and others, asking for an increase of widows' pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STORM: Petition of Rev. J. B. Woodward and 57 others, citizens of East Stroudsburg, Pa., praying for the passage of certain bills for the suppression of polygamy in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, praying for the enactment of a law for the acquisition by the United States of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Gloversville, N. Y., urging action by Congress on the bills now before them for the suppression of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES WILSON: Petition of William Mauler, for compensation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions for the passage of the Mexican war pension bill with Senate amendments were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Pensions:

By Mr. BURNES: Of numerous citizens of Mound City, of Ebony, and of Maryville, Mo.

By Mr. COBB: Of numerous citizens of Green and Knox Counties, Indiana.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 12, 1885.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. D. HUNTLEY, D. D.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of the 5th instant, a report of the Commissioner of Railroads and letters from the Attorney-General and the president of the Union Pacific Railroad Company on the subject of the settlement of the indebtedness of that company as provided in the Thurman act, so called. If there be no objection, the letter of the Secretary, with the accompanying letters and papers, will be printed, and they, with the accompanying printed documents, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in compliance with section 194 of the Revised Statutes, a list of all persons employed in his Department during the year ended December 31, 1884; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of the 4th instant, a report of the steps taken by him to establish an advanced course of instruction of naval officers at Coasters' Harbor Island, Rhode Island; which, on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 7522) for the relief of Joseph F. Wilson was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the Senator from Kansas not now in his seat [Mr. PLUMB] desired that this bill should be laid upon the table for the time being if he were not in the Senate at the time it was presented. If there be no objection the bill will be laid on the table.

The bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Jane Veazie was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 483) for the erection of a public building at Keokuk, Iowa, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 11, 1885.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee of three members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the House, and two members of the Senate be appointed by that body, to wait on Grover Cleveland, of the State of New York, and to notify him that he has been duly elected President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th of March, 1885; and also to notify Thomas A. Hendricks, of the State of Indiana, that he has been duly elected Vice-President of the United States for four years, commencing with the 4th day of March, 1885.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARLAND. I move to refer that resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If such a resolution be deemed proper or necessary, the language of this one needs some correction, and it is better for it to go to that committee for investigation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present a resolution adopted at a meeting of steamboat owners and managers held in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, in which they remonstrate against the repeal of section 4419 of the Revised Statutes, and state that if that section should be repealed a useless and unnecessary burden would be added to the already oppressed navigation interest. I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PENDLETON presented petitions of the Daily and Weekly Local, of Sandusky, Ohio; the Daily and Semi-Weekly Torchlight, of Xenia, Ohio; the Standard of the Cross, of Cleveland, Ohio; the Christian Witness, of Newark, Ohio; the Standard Publishing Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio; the Yellow Springs Review, of Yellow Springs, Ohio; the Weekly Echo, of South Solon, Ohio; the Western Tract Society, of Cincinnati, Ohio; the Independent Press, of Wakeman, Ohio; the East Liverpool (Ohio) Tribune; the Hocking Valley Printing and Publishing Company, of Athens, Ohio; the Ohio Educational Monthly, of Akron, Ohio; the Buckeye Vidette, of Salem, Ohio; the Republican Gazette, of Logan, Ohio; the Beverly Dispatch, of Beverly, Ohio; the Independent, of Richmond, Ohio; the Toronto Tribune, of Toronto, Ohio; the Free Press, of Fredericktown, Ohio; the Dennice Novověku, of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Portsmouth Blade, of Portsmouth, Ohio, praying for a reduction of postage on second-class matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the law which fixes the term of certain administrative officers at four years; which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. JACKSON. The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1400) for the relief of Edward C. Garlick, have directed me to report the same back adversely. At the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] I ask that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1999) for the relief of John K. Le Baron, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of George T. Dudley, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2503) for the relief of Charles E. Maris, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

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

A bill (S. 632) for the relief of the heirs of Manning R. Ariail and Sarah Fish, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1370) for the relief of Washington Ford.

Mr. HALE. By direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back a communication from the Secretary of War, with sundry papers accompanying it, on the subject of establishing signal stations upon the Island of Nantucket, Massachusetts, and ask that the committee be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAXEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1327) for the relief of J. H. Hammond, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BANK.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2571) to authorize the Merchants' National Bank of Little Rock, Ark., to change its name to the First National Bank of Little Rock, to report it favorably with an amendment. This is a very short bill, and it is rather necessary that it should reach the other House in season to be acted upon there. I therefore ask for its present consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.