

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Clippings and Pamphlets

Civil War Collection

8-11-1876

Speech of Hon. William A. Wallace of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, August 9, 1876

William A. Wallace

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar_clip



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wallace, William A., "Speech of Hon. William A. Wallace of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, August 9, 1876" (1876). *Clippings and Pamphlets*. 16.

https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar_clip/16

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Civil War Collection at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Clippings and Pamphlets by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

the offenses committed in the war were forgiven and forgotten. You were in due time, and very speedily, restored to political power. You have in your hands eleven or twelve of these Southern States. You are responsible for everything that occurs there. Every act of violence and murder is charged to your account, and you owe it to your manhood to put down these things. You must not teach the southern people that we hate you, or wrong you, or would do you injustice. So help me God I never have felt such a feeling, and I do not believe that is the feeling of the people of the State of Ohio. We would be glad to see you prosper. We share in your prosperity. Your development, your wealth, your growth all inure to our benefit as well as yours. God forbid that we should ever seek to oppress you in any way by unjust laws or the exercise of unjust power.

Go on and develop your country; cultivate your fields; build up your manufactures; improve your rivers and your harbors if you will, and we will aid you. Do all that you can to develop your country. What you do is for the benefit of us all. We are all of one country, under one flag and one Government. The worst thing that could happen to the people of the Southern States, in my judgment, would be the success of the democratic party in this election, because that success could only be brought about by a united South. In Louisiana and Alabama and Mississippi and South Carolina a majority of the people consists of negroes emancipated by republican policy and now in terror from innumerable murders committed in those States. If in the great convocation where the electoral vote is counted, we see the votes of States counted for the democratic party when we know that the natural instinct, the sense of duty, the sense of obligation, the natural feeling of the majority of the people, are with the republican party; if you bring the votes of those States by violence and fraud to your aid, it will be a short-lived power that you will exercise. We will not resort to arms; we will not make a revolution; we will not make a secession; but a public opinion will be aroused in all the free States that the Southern States must be just to those who have been freed by our policy or we will secure them justice. Otherwise the power of numbers in the North will be exercised against you again at the ballot-box. If you carry these States by fraud or force, watchful eyes will be over you; millions of free people will be watching you. If you give the negroes a fair vote, if you only use that influence which your superior wealth and superior intelligence give you over their minds, well and good, it is your right and duty; but if you violate the law, if you use intimidation, murder, or that nameless feeling of fear which may check an ignorant population from exercising their rights, you will gain no permanent results from it. That is my conviction.

I say again that for myself, although I claim to be a republican always, I never have felt and do not now entertain one single feeling of unkindness against the southern people. I know that the great body of them went into this war with honest motives; I feel that they were wrong. I know their success would have been to their injury. If they had succeeded in establishing a southern confederacy in the southern part of this country of ours, we should have been warring nations, hostile races, and ceaseless controversies would have been waged, as between England and Scotland, until both under one

banner were reunited again. Gentlemen, it was well for you that this war ended as it did. It was well for your future that it was so. It was best for us all.

And, gentlemen, allow me plainly to tell you that though we are willing to do you absolute justice and share with you all political power, yet we do feel that we were the victors in this great war, and that our ideas, our principles, and our policy should prevail in the administration of the Government while the issues of the war are pending. The arbitrament of war settled these issues in our favor. These issues are written upon the Constitution and are the supreme law of the land. We do not think it safe to trust you with the administration of these great safeguards of liberty over men whom you have held for generations as slaves. We frankly say we cannot trust to the democratic party the power to guard and protect the rights that have been won by the war. I deeply regret that political parties in this country are not based upon other issues than the issues of the war. It would be far better for the South if one-half of the white vote was now voting the republican ticket and one-half of the black vote with the democratic ticket. But when the white men by their policy seek to combine all the Southern States into a compact political power and by force and fraud vote the negro against his wishes, they establish a conviction in the mind of every man who supported the northern cause that they are determined to revive and to continue the old contest and the old issues. It is for this reason this conviction is now deepening upon the northern mind; and it is this conviction that more than all else impresses me deeply with the absolute necessity to preserve the power of the republican party in order to continue and establish upon a safe basis the enduring guarantees won in the war.

Now, Mr. President, why can we not enter into this great contest with a manly spirit, each man presenting his own clear convictions, boldly and fearlessly trying to secure a fair election, and by the vote of a majority of the people of the United States in the form of the electoral college select a President of the United States? I believe that the safety of all, north and south, east and west, the good of our country, the record of history, demand the success of the republican party. I am glad to say that the standard-bearer of that great party is one of the citizens of my State, a man in the full vigor of life, a man unblemished in name, character, and reputation, with a strong manly intellect, one of those self-made men who receive nothing from the mere factitious circumstances of fortune or wealth, but has made his own way from the time he entered a school-boy till he became a member of Congress and a general of your Army, a brave soldier without one particle of feeling against the South, and full of kindness to his countrymen in all sections of our nation. I believe it is for the best interest of the people of the United States that this man, thus taken from the ranks of the people, unaffected by political combinations, unembarrassed by any pledge whatever, should be intrusted with the high power of President of the United States. Governor Tilden with all his promises, with the record of the democratic party behind him, and with the tendency and action of the democratic party to guide him, ought not to be trusted with power.

APPENDIX.

Receipts of the Government from July 1, 1865, to July 1, 1876, inclusive.

RECAPITULATION OF NET REVENUE BY FISCAL YEARS.

Year.	Customs.	Internal revenue.	Direct tax.	Sales of public lands.	Miscellaneous sources.		Net revenue.
					Premium on loans and sales of gold coin.	Other miscellaneous items.	
1866	\$179,046,651 58	\$309,226,813 42	\$1,974,754 12	\$665,031 03	\$38,083,055 68	\$29,036,314 23	\$558,032,620 06
1867	176,417,810 88	266,027,537 43	4,200,233 70	1,163,575 76	27,787,330 35	15,037,522 15	490,634,010 27
1868	164,464,599 56	191,087,589 41	1,788,145 85	1,348,715 41	29,203,629 50	17,745,403 59	405,638,083 32
1869	180,048,426 63	158,356,460 86	765,685 61	4,020,344 34	13,755,491 12	13,997,338 65	370,943,747 21
1870	194,538,374 44	184,899,756 49	229,102 88	3,350,481 76	15,295,643 76	12,942,118 30	411,255,477 63
1871	206,270,408 05	143,098,153 63	580,355 37	2,388,646 68	8,892,839 95	22,093,541 21	383,323,944 89
1872	216,370,286 77	130,642,177 72	315,254 51	2,575,714 19	9,412,637 65	15,106,051 23	374,106,867 56
1873	188,089,522 70	113,729,314 14	315,254 51	2,882,312 38	11,560,530 89	17,161,270 05	333,738,204 67
1874	163,103,833 69	102,409,784 90	315,254 51	1,852,428 93	5,037,665 22	17,075,042 73	289,478,755 47
1875	157,167,722 35	110,007,493 58	93,798 80	1,413,640 17	3,979,279 69	15,431,915 31	288,000,051 10
1876	148,071,984 61	116,700,732 03	93,798 80	1,129,466 95	4,029,280 58	17,456,776 19	287,482,039 16
	1,973,589,621 26	1,826,185,813 61	9,947,330 84	22,790,357 60	167,037,384 39	193,083,293 64	4,192,633,801 34

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL.

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been fitted up in the Senate Post-Office, where a clerk is in constant attendance during the session of Congress, and where subscriptions, copy, &c., will be received and extra copies of the RECORD may be obtained.

It is indispensable that the postage on the DAILY RECORD mailed from this Office shall be prepaid. This will amount to about eighty cents for the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress, and a deposit of that sum with the Congressional Printer will secure the prompt mailing of copies.

Hamburgh Riots.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. WALLACE,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Wednesday, August 9, 1876.

The Senate having under consideration the resolution submitted by Mr. MORTON on the 2d instant, that 10,000 copies of the President's message and the accompanying documents in regard to the late massacre at Hamburgh, South Carolina, be printed for the use of the Senate—

Mr. WALLACE said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I shall not attempt to defend the outrage at Hamburgh. Like many another outrage upon society, it can neither be palliated nor defended, if the facts charged in the documents sent to us are true. But, sir, if this offense, heinous and outrageous as it is, shall be judicially investigated by the courts constituted to arrest, investigate, try, judge, and punish; and if these courts shall visit upon this outrage prompt, condign, and legal punishment, I shall rejoice. I shall rejoice, sir, because of the vindication of outraged law. I shall rejoice that in that community, among a people who claim to have the power to govern themselves, they have succeeded in vindicating that power and have vindicated the majesty of law. They will then have proved their capacity for self-government. But they are upon trial. It is for them to vindicate their capacity in the proof that comes from this very situation. If they shall thus vindicate themselves, it will add another proof to the theories of our friends on the other side.

But let me ask those who find in something else the cause of these outrages, why it is that they always occupy their minds and always vex the public ear when important elections are pending? Why is it that we hear so little of them on other occasions and at other times? Why is it that only when the people are upon the eve of an election in which the rulers of the country are to be changed that these outrages come to the public mind and communities are stirred to their very depths by accusations, by tergiversations, by charges of riot and bloodshed and of wrong and injury? Why is it that peace and order and the administration of the law, the vindication of the majesty of the law, are found in all the reconstructed States controlled, governed, and directed by democrats, while from those alone in which some other power is in control do we find these reports of outrages, of broken law, of riot, and of bloodshed?

Mr. EATON. Will my friend from Pennsylvania yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WALLACE. Certainly.

Mr. EATON. I have just received a dispatch which I desire to read in this connection. I had the pleasure yesterday to say here on the floor of the Senate that the election in Alabama had been carried on with absolute fairness. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPENCER] avowed that there had been intimidation. Doubtless he believed it; I did not, and I so expressed myself. I have just received this telegram, which I desire to read:

MONTGOMERY, August 9.

Senator W. W. EATON:

Alabama thanks you for your generous defense of her in the Senate yesterday. The election was conducted throughout the State with absolute fairness and without the slightest disturbance or complaint of intimidation that we have heard. The democrats have elected their State ticket by over forty thousand majority, and at least four-fifths of both branches of the Legislature. Negroes in large numbers voted with us.

W. D. GRAHAM,
Chairman Democratic State Committee.

Mr. SPENCER. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania allow me a moment? I desire to state, in answer to the dispatch read by the Senator from Connecticut, that the majority in Alabama is very large and that on Monday last large republican counties, for instance the county of Greene, which has, ever since the republican party was formed, given over 2,000 majority, voted the democratic ticket; that the county of Sumter, which has a republican majority of 2,000 in it, voted the democratic ticket; that the county of Marengo, which has a republican majority of 2,000, voted the democratic ticket. Those counties voted the democratic ticket simply because the colored people were afraid to go to the polls and vote. The colored people did not vote, and it was intimidation and nothing else, the chairman of the democratic State committee to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. President, what better answer is there to the arguments of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] than that the State of South Carolina, the State of Louisiana, and the State of Mississippi are the only placers in which they can find these outrages. Why is it that in democratic States, in States that are reconstructed and controlled by democrats, prosperity is returning, peace and order prevail? Why is

it that there the freedman is contented and industrious? Why is it that taxation is being reduced, that the communities are orderly, that material prosperity is increasing? Why is it that in all of these States under democratic rule order prevails, business is restored, material wealth grows, taxes lessen, interest on State bonds is being paid, the credit of the State is being restored? Why is this, I ask, while in States that are still under control of others than the democratic party in the South the freedman is discontented and riotous, outrages, blood, and murder are heard of, the people are discontented and unhappy, taxation is redoubled, and the only right that a white man has there is the right to be taxed? Why is it that in all these States material prosperity is lessening, prosperity decreasing? Why is this? Can there be any other answer than that in the latter the power, the control, the interference of the Federal Government exists, and men are not permitted to govern themselves as we do in the North, regulating and controlling our domestic affairs in our own way; our township affairs, our roads, our schools, everything that concerns us as a people from the bottom upward through the township, the county, the State, to the Federal Government; while in these States you undertake to rule them from the top through the power of the Federal Government with the bayonet, through the State, through the governor, through the power that the Federal Government only controls and directs. This is the true answer to it, and it is an answer that goes to the very essence of Saxon liberty. It is an answer that will come to you wherever and whenever you undertake to reverse the traditions of the governments and people from whom you get your liberty and your laws.

The old Saxon form of government, the government of the people themselves in their closest relations to their home life, the home government, home rule, is the only rule for any free people. When you give to these people the entire and absolute control of their institutions themselves; when you take away the Federal bayonet and cease to vex and oppress them by interfering with them, then you will have peace and order; taxation will be reduced; the credit of the Commonwealths will be restored, and you will have contentment and industry and peace and order and just administration of the law.

But it is charged that the free schools are disturbed; it is alleged that education does not prosper in the States that are reconstructed and under democratic control. Such is not the fact. Sir, but yesterday, this week certainly, we have the information from the trustees of the Peabody educational fund that in all the States south save and except alone the States of South Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida, their school systems are being properly managed and cared for, while in those States the report states that they are not being properly managed, that they are not being cared for. The report of Mr. Stearns, the general agent, is as follows:

The report shows the general flourishing condition of public schools in the Southern States, except in the three States of Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana. Mr. George Peabody Russell, who has been spending the last winter in the South, gave it as his opinion that nothing could be expected from these States in the way of advancing their educational interests until there was a change in their State governments.

Here is an answer to the educational argument of Senators, and you find this answer everywhere in the democratic South. The charge of the Senator who was last upon the floor in this regard may be placed side by side with the report of the general agent of a non-partisan independent educational fund, and let the people judge between them.

This is a political discussion. It has degenerated into such. We recognize it; it is declared to be such by our brethren on the other side. We have already had extracts from the letter of acceptance of Mr. Tilden; let me read another brief extract.

Speaking of the South and the negroes, he says:

But, in aid of a result so beneficent, the moral influence of every good citizen, as well as every governmental authority, ought to be exerted, not alone to maintain their just equality before the law, but likewise to establish a cordial fraternity and good-will among citizens, whatever their race or color, who are now united in the one destiny of a common self-government.

Place this declaration side by side with the concluding paragraph of the report of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BOUTWELL] on Mississippi, which reads thus:

3. The constitutional guarantee of a republican form of government to every State will require the United States, if these disorders increase or even continue and all milder measures shall prove ineffectual, to remand the State to a territorial condition and through a system of public education and kindred means of improvement change the ideas of the inhabitants and reconstruct the government upon a republican basis.

Follow this with the argument of the cool, clear-headed Senator from Vermont made on this question, in which he looks to reconstructing reconstruction, and then I ask Senators on whose side will those who love peace and order, who believe in the stability of government and in honest payment of the public debt, be found? Senators who occupy the vantage ground of leadership, as do these Senators, do not deliberately conclude their State papers or make their studied addresses without a purpose to execute the conclusions at which they arrive. Sir, is it to be questioned whether the order and law loving people of the North, nay more, sir, the capital of the North, will not scan these declarations with the closest scrutiny? I mistake much their temper if this programme be not the tocsin of danger, the fire-bell in the night, to arouse that capital and those people to the just apprehension of what the entertainment is to which they are invited.

Peabody fund

Tilden

But, sir, this is not all. One of your most pronounced partisan papers but yesterday denounced in unmeasured terms this programme in emphatic and decided language. The New York Times of yesterday, the mouth-piece of the capital of the city of New York on the republican side, emphatically denounces it.

It says:

A more outrageous proposition cannot be easily imagined. That in this centennial year, before the echoes of our national self-glorification have died away, grave Senators should propose to vest somewhere a power which on its face would be equivalent to a confession that the Republic is a failure, is a circumstance that would tax the credulity of any dispassionate observer. Here is the proposition, however, and in a form that leaves no room to doubt the earnestness of its authors. It is a proposition so far in excess of the needs of the occasion, so obnoxious to all who would preserve the administration of the Government in the spirit which has imparted all its vitality and earned for it all its glory, so directly in conflict with the feeling that dominates among the people and, therefore, in a party sense so inexpedient, that we would fain believe its acceptance by the Senate impossible. The reconstructed States are parts of the Union in the same sense that applies to New York or Massachusetts; and it is monstrous to suppose that the Government or any department of it may be clothed with an authority whereby it may "re-mand a State to a territorial condition," if in the opinion of the partisan majority for the time being the local administration be not "upon a republican basis."

Now, sir, if it shall be, as I said when I began, that in this matter South Carolina shall prove herself able to defend the majesty of the law, we shall all rejoice. If in this duty cast upon her, for it is a duty if she be a sovereign State, to protect life and property, to punish crime, to vindicate the broken law—if in the performance of her duty in this she shall be successful, I and all who act with me will be proud of its accomplishment. But she is upon trial. She cannot as a government controlled by people whom you claim can govern themselves, demand of the Federal Government interference and aid. These people are upon trial. Can they govern themselves? Can they punish crime? If they cannot, let those who can, come to their aid in public affairs through peaceful and home agencies.

Now, Mr. President, with my hand upon my mouth, and my mouth in the dust, with humiliation of face I am compelled to refer to what was said upon the floor of the Senate the other day in regard to the great State which I in part represent. It was in reply to a declaration of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. THURMAN] that my colleague said that all the murders committed in Pennsylvania by the Molly Maguires were committed by democrats. My colleague is mistaken, Mr. President. These men are of both political parties; many of them are unnaturalized citizens, desperadoes who come to our Commonwealth from other countries, who consort with the miners, band them together, and form organizations which are violent, arbitrary, and a terror to the people. They have honey-combed several of our counties with crime, and I am humiliated that I am compelled here on the floor of the Senate to admit it as the foulest blot upon the escutcheon of that proud old State. Yet the fact is here, and it is my duty as one of the representatives of her people to say what is the truth.

[At this point the honorable Senator yielded that the Senate might take a recess till half past seven o'clock p. m.]

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned I was endeavoring to express a sense of the humiliation that as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania I felt in being required to express here on the floor of the Senate any reason, any cause why she should be unable in any portion of her broad domain to vindicate law and punish crime. But it is here; the question is in the Senate. It has been brought here by the Senator from Ohio and my colleague; and it is my duty to say that however much there may have been of breaches of law and of order, of violence, crime, and bloodshed in that Commonwealth, it is not all attributable to one political party, that both political parties have members among the organization that has committed these violations of law, and that many of its members are unnaturalized desperadoes from other lands. But the communities in which they exist have become, through a species of terrorism they have exercised there, to a large extent demoralized; crime has honey-combed two or three counties, and officials, whether republican or democratic, have become in a manner under the control of this organization. That violence occurs, that murder has occurred, cannot be denied. That the power of the counties has been attempted to be exercised in vain also cannot be denied. I have no recollection that executive power has ever been called there; but, if so, it too has been powerless or weak to stem the tide of lawlessness. But, sir, recently an attempt has been made through the efforts, not, I am sorry to say, of executive power or the power that ought to control it—the police, the grand juries, the sheriffs of the counties—but through a great railroad organization, headed by a democratic president, which placed its police and its power among these desperate men, traced them to their lairs, and is now dragging them to the light and to justice. The courts before which they are being tried are presided over by democrats; the juries before whom they are being tried are selected under a non-partisan jury law; and I believe that six men have been convicted of murder in the first degree. These crimes are now being drawn to the light; the prosecutions are being pressed; these men are being driven to the wall; terrorism is ceasing and law and order is about to prevail in that State in which law and order originated, for from Penn and his followers and their theories came the system of law and obedience to constituted authority that now governs this country. From that Commonwealth more than from any other in the country proceeded recognition of law, of orderly methods, and of peace; and it is my pride to say that the people of

that great Commonwealth will immediately, if not through regular channels at least by some power, coerce order, vindicate law, punish crime, and permit no further outrages upon its peace.

I also read in reply to what has been said on this subject what was said to the jury in the trial of one of these men in the county of Schuylkill by the gentleman to whom I have alluded, the counsel for the Commonwealth. I read from the argument of Hon. F. B. Gowen in the court of Oyer and terminer of Schuylkill County in the trial of Thomas Munley for the murder of Thomas Sanger, a mining boss:

Then we knew we were freemen. Then we cared no longer for the Molly Maguires. Then we could go to Patsy Collins, the commissioner of this county, and say to him, "Build well the walls of the new addition of the prison; dig the foundations deep and make them strong; put in good masonry and iron bars, for, as the Lord liveth, the time will come when side by side with William Love, the murderer of Squire Gwither, you will enter the walls that you are now building for others." Then we could say to Jack Kehoe, the high constable of a great borough in this county, "We have no fear of you." Then we could say to Ned Monaghan, chief of police, and murderer and assassin, "Behind you the scaffold is prepared for your reception." Then we could say to Pat. Conry, commissioner of this county, "The time has ceased when a governor of this State dare to pardon a Molly Maguire; you have had your last pardon." Then we could say to John Slatery, who was almost elected judge of this court, "We know that of you, that it were better you had not been born than that it should be known." Then all of us looked up. Then, at last, we were free, and I came to this county and walked through it as safely as in the most crowded thoroughfares of Philadelphia.

Can you imagine the condition of the people of this country with murderers upon the bench and in the jury-box and in control of all the principal offices of the county? I lived in the apprehension of all this for two years and a half alone, and God knows that when the time comes that all I know may be told to the world it will reveal a history such as will make every American citizen hang his head with shame. I have seen a society of murderers and assassins having its members in the highest places of this county. I have seen them elected to fill the positions of constables and police officers. I have seen a trusted member of that band of murderers a commissioner of the county. I have seen this organization wield a political power in the State which has controlled the elections of a great Commonwealth. I have received the information of meetings between some of the highest officers of the State and the chief of the murderers, at which large sums of money were paid to secure the votes of this infernal association, to turn the tide of a State election. God knows if ever in the world there was a revelation as deep and damning as that now laid open to the people of this Commonwealth for the first time.

Now, Mr. President, can it be, is it to be said that the order-loving people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, that great German population, than whom none respect order and obey law more, that all of the people of that great Commonwealth are to be stigmatized with the crime of a single locality; yet this is the argument that comes to us in regard to the South.

Sir, I have done with this humiliating subject in regard to my own State. I regret that it has come here. I could do no less than I have done. I have given to the Senate what is the truth, the record.

Now I take up, and I am sorry that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MORTON] is not here, a speech of that Senator delivered in the Senate on the 18th of July, in which he produces a statement from the Treasury Department, which statement is lengthy and elaborate. That Senator said in introducing it:

I have the statement from the Treasury Department; I am going to read it. Some four or five months ago, on the 9th of February, I believe, the Senate passed a resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury to make a statement from the books of the Treasury of all the defalcations and failures to make settlement, from whatever cause, that had occurred in our country since the 1st of January, 1834. That embraced the last administration of General Jackson. That document was sent here and with it an analysis printed officially. It comes over the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury; it is true.

I propose to examine this valuable document, to test its value by recorded facts, and to see whether its statements are true, or, if they be taken as true, whether they help the cause that it was produced to serve. It is true that the Secretary of the Treasury on the 19th of June sent to the Senate a mass of documents, a mass of names, an immense, voluminous document at least five inches in thickness and eighteen inches square. The columns of that document were not added. It appeared upon the face of it that credits were to be entered; it appeared that charges were to be made to the men who were alleged to be defaulters thereon. It was incomplete and unfinished in every particular, and it showed this upon its face. It lies now in the office of the Secretary of the Senate incomplete, unfinished, buried in the tomb of the Committee on Printing. It was not honored by the poor credit of being printed. This was objected to by the Senator from Ohio, and it was sent to the committee as valueless. That document, which was not worthy of being printed, served to produce to the Senate and to the country a mass of figures, a tabular statement and compendium which has been sent to the country and is now being circulated broadcast as a veritable document. Sir, that statement is unreliable and untruthful to show the real defalcations due to the Government, and the Senator from Indiana in the concluding part of his remarks admits it. He says:

The statement is not correct in this, Mr. President, that there are defalcations put down that do not exist, that were afterward settled; but so far as the proportion is concerned between the different administrations, so far as my purpose is concerned in the comparison I propose to make, it is the same as if every defalcation here stated took place. The objection is that the statement is not too small, but too large. I stated wherein it does not present the facts, that some of these defalcations in all administrations were afterward settled or turned out to be nominal; but that pertained just as much to one as to another, and, so far as the object I have in view is concerned, it is a fair statement, because it shows the proportion in all administrations, and now I propose to give it just as it is furnished from the books of the Treasury Department.

But this is not all. The Senator from Indiana says this statement comes here over the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury. This is a mistake. A statement somewhat like that published did accom-

Read by friend
William
from desk

pany it, but it was neither signed nor certified; and the speech of the Senator demonstrates that. It was not signed nor certified in the paper. If the statement of the Senator from Ohio in reference to what was told him by a Treasury official be admitted to be true, if it were verity and intended to impart the truth, why is it not certified to? If true, it would be honored and not discredited as well by the Senator as by the Treasury officials whom he quotes. The published table nowhere shows his certificate, but says it was prepared under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. This statement, so elaborate and complete, so unfinished and mysterious, so untruthful and unreliable, is printed as Senate Document No. 118, and has upon its face the indorsement that it comes from the Treasury; but it has no signature. The documents themselves upon which it is based are not printed because they are unreliable, but the statement printed gives the figures they contain. Why was it not printed? Why is it not certified? Is it authentic? Does it give the truth? The Senator from Indiana admits that it does not, and they quote the officials of the Treasury as discrediting it. When the motion to print was up the Senator from Ohio said of this document as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN. In regard to the printing of the document I should like to have that question referred to the Committee on Printing. I will say that my attention was called to the document itself by an officer of the Government in the Treasury Department. It covers several volumes, most of them matters of no possible moment, which can be of no interest to any mortal man, woman, or child. I think it would do great injustice to thousands of worthy men to print this document. The Secretary of the Treasury in the letter read says he has commenced from the time the last report was made in 1830. There may have been some general statements made in the mean time, but nothing like the detail here. These papers were shown to me. As a matter of course, the Secretary of the Treasury felt bound to go back and do this work. Here [exhibiting] are some of the tables sent here—great, long tables. There are general results from these tables that are shown also in the tabular statements that accompany the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. I have no objection to printing this document except on account of the great cost that will be involved and the unfairness and injustice that will be done to innocent people now in their graves.

Mr. President, these tables show that most of the persons named as defaulting officers were men in the military, naval, and civil service of the United States, who are now dead. The names of their sureties are given here, many of whom are dead; the amounts range from \$1 up to \$100,000. Scandals without number all over this broad country of ours will be published to the world without any good whatever if we print this document. It gives the accounts of every officer of the Government from 1830 to this time. I notice many cases of this class. During the Indian wars, and during our recent civil war, a soldier may have been killed in battle who was charged with a lot of muskets, and against his account they all stand in the balance charged to him, while it was stated that he was killed in battle, &c. Consuls have died abroad and it has been impossible to settle their accounts, and yet balances are charged at the Treasury Department against the consuls. Honorable men, men of the highest rank in the public service, men of the greatest distinction in this country, have little balances charged against them, and they would now be published in the list of defaulters. There may have been nothing due from them, but if there were some little discrepancy in their accounts they are still unbalanced. Such a list would injure greatly the reputation of honorable officers in the civil, military, and naval service, if published, although they are little matters, sometimes amounting to but a few dollars.

The officer to whom I have referred called my attention to the fact that while the Department was obeying a simple, plain duty, no one pretended that this money was due by these people; and yet it is charged on the books of the Treasury Department as a claim against them, but it never would be and never could be settled.

On the objection of the Senator from Ohio this voluminous, this unreliable document was sent to the Committee on Printing. It came back to the Senate on the 27th of June with a report against printing the document, but for printing the tabular statement that contains its results. The aggregate of the document was reported in favor of, but the document itself was reported against. On that day the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ANTHONY] said:

It contains a list of all persons, including those not now in the public service, against whom there appears to be a balance on the books of the Treasury. In very many instances the balance is nominal, not real, sometimes so designated; in very many cases it arises out of misunderstanding between the disbursing officer and the accounting officers of the Treasury, which, when they come to be explained and adjusted, may be decided in favor of one party or the other. In very many instances it arises from balances due from officers of the Navy who have gone down with their ships with their papers upon them; officers of the Army who have fallen in battle or died in hospital and whose vouchers have been lost; while it is apparent from the supplies which they had purchased and from the men whom they had paid that the money entrusted to them had been expended for the purposes for which it was appropriated. According to the law these all appear upon the books of the Treasury as indebted for the unsettled balances; for, while the Treasury charges an officer with everything paid to him, it does not credit him with what he has paid out until it is ascertained and adjusted according to regulations of the Department. Many of these are charges for overpayments; that is, where officer has erroneously paid to some creditor of the Government more than he was legally authorized to receive; and of course the disbursing officer must suffer the consequence of his error. That is a blunder, but it is not a crime. He has not embezzled the money; he has not defrauded the Government; he has made a mistake and paid a man a thousand dollars, for example, when it appears from all the information yet in the possession of the Treasury that he only ought to have paid him \$990; and therefore he stands as a defaulter for \$10 on the books of the Treasury. This may in many cases remain yet open for adjustment. I am sure that nobody wants to publish the names of such men, living and dead, as embezzlers and defaulters in any criminal sense.

The great defalcations, the criminal defalcations, are all known; they are all made public; they cannot be concealed without criminal complicity of the accounting officers. They are put in suit against the defaulters and against their bondsmen; and other cases are put in suit, the results of which do not always show that the officer is a defaulter. There may be cases of honest differences of opinion between the officer and the Department as to the law, which are to be settled by the courts. A great many cases grew up before the present improved system of keeping the accounts of the Government, disbursed the expenses of their Departments, and turned over the balance to the Treasury. That system prevailed until it was reformed in our day, and under that system the result of every difference of opinion between a disbursing officer and the Department would stand as a defalcation

against him. Some of these cases are so trifling that I have collated a few of them. Although I should not read the name of any person who would suffer by it, I suppose the illustrious name of Washington Irving will not suffer if I say that he stands here as a defaulter to the amount of *three cents!* Here is another officer in the list whom I was instrumental, among others, in commending to the public service, in which he greatly distinguished himself. I shall hold myself responsible for his defalcation, principal and interest in gold. It amounts to *one cent.* I do not suppose anybody will think that Robert Walsh was an embezzler or defaulter to the Government, and yet he is put down for a small amount. Here I find an old colonel whom I knew well, who died in 1854, who is marked as a defaulter for \$3.60.

Mr. President, I do not wish to impair the credit of the great banking house of this city, but I am bound to say that Corcoran & Riggs stand down here as defendants under this call.

Baring Brothers are down, and, worse than that, the English government itself is put down as a defaulter. As we have just settled nearly all our old difficulties with England and got into a new one, I do not wish to see the credit of that government impaired, and for its relief I must say that a marginal note reads: "The Secretary of State says he has no doubt this was settled long ago." It occurred in 1813, but it stands on the books as over \$1,200 of default by the British government.

Mr. President, I might go over a great many illustrations of the same kind, but I have made quite sufficient to show that, while there are of course in the great operations of the Treasury many defaulters and many embezzlers, nothing could be more unjust than to mix them up with these persons who are marked in default in the Treasury, but who are not defaulters in any sense whatever, and probably do not owe the Government anything. Certainly it is not likely that Corcoran & Riggs, Baring Brothers, and the British government owe the Treasury anything.

That is what Senators said in regard to this document, and yet the table is printed. They discredit the source, they deny its truth, they repudiate its statements; yet they order its results to be printed and preserved, and it is used as a campaign document. They make campaign speeches upon it. They quote it as true, and they calculate results from it. What becomes of political fairness if such proceedings as these are to be countenanced by the Senate? What becomes of the verity, the truthfulness of the record of the Senate if statements of this kind are to be printed and filed with our records to remain there as official documents from the Treasury Department? The basis of this statement was bad, the structure unsound, and the results it produces are utterly and absolutely unreliable. The statement is incorrect in every particular; the losses are not truthfully stated, and necessarily the conclusions are not correct; and yet the Senator from Indiana prints the statement and relies upon it. A leader of the House—I dare not refer to what is said in the House; but in the RECORD of Sunday I find a speech that also relies upon this and quotes it *in extenso*, to a figure, administration by administration, the ratio of losses fixed by this most veracious document. It is quoted by the republican leader of the House, not by him alone, but another prominent republican gentleman of the House in his speech also quotes and relies on it.

It is for us to test this statement by known facts, ascertain whether it is true, discover for ourselves whether it can be relied upon, learn whether this is the kind of budget to be given to an intelligent people on the eve of a great political contest by the Senate of the United States from which the people are to make up a verdict which is to control their destinies for four years. Let us examine it by the tests of the record; let us examine it by printed documents; let us test its truth by that which cannot be gainsaid, and if we find that not only have Senators here discredited it, but that on its face it bears falsehood, then the cause that it attempts to serve must be baseless and bad indeed.

At the outset it may be said that it is of course difficult for those who are in opposition to obtain the necessary access to records to get the data on which to contradict a statement of this character.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. WALLACE. I mean by that that we are compelled to grope our way through printed records. We go for data to the Treasury Department, and find it occupied with something else; to other Departments, and printed orders intervene; and when we go to the Treasury we cannot get a voluminous mass of documents in time to serve our purposes, and yet Senators get it. I do not pretend to say that there is any willful disposition to refuse information, yet I say that printed orders are in the road, that time cannot be given to the officials to furnish the documents in time for use on such occasions as this.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator will allow me, because that is rather a serious implication, I wish to say for one, and I feel pretty sure that I am stating the truth, that no discrimination whatever is made in the Treasury, or any other Department, between Senators, with regard to their political faith, or their race, or color, or whatever, and the Senator can get all the information from the Treasury that my honorable friend from Massachusetts, an Ex-Secretary, can, at any time.

Mr. WALLACE. I have no doubt that I can get it; it will not be denied, but it will not come in time to serve the purpose.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It will come in the same time that it will for anybody else.

Mr. WALLACE. The Senator may have that opinion, but I am entitled to mine. We are obliged to grope through printed data; we are obliged to meet the accusations that we find on this printed statement in the best way we can. If we prove its falsehood in vital points we think we shall have disposed of it. If we prove that it is untrue and false in certain vital points, the maxim *falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus* applies, and we can rely on the people to fail to believe its reliability as a whole.

o
d
d
lo
H
fr
u
on
or
Th
th
Th
Co
\$2
be
\$2
fig
\$1
of
sta
pal
\$2
all
fr
Hon
debt
Pe
1833
1834
1835
1836
Total
Ratio
Whol
Total
Per
Total
Total
Ratio
Whol
Total
Total
Total
Ratio
Ratio
Error
Whole
Annua
Whole
Annua
Mr.
gress
cific
figures
The p
tion of
of the
the sma
designa
consist
sisting
were sm
the amou
1821, and
1833 to 18
Mr. M
tion to
if he h
the non
out flow
deduct
ment of
Mr. W
a speech
The P
Pennsyl
yield?
Mr. M
Mr. W
other Se
cal speed
Mr. E
interrupt
Mr. W
tler here

The Senator from Indiana states that during the last term of President Jackson, from January 1, 1833, to December 31, 1837, or as it should be, from March 4, 1833, to March 4, 1837, the ratio of loss by defalcations was \$10.55 per \$1,000, and he relies on this statement to demonstrate this and the figures given by it he says is the actual amount of defalcation. This statement shows, and he relies upon it, that there were losses by receiving officers of \$1,383,825, and there were losses by disbursing officers of \$1,163,000, a total loss of \$2,547,000. Here is a specific, distinct, and accurate statement apparently. Let us see how fallacious it is; how wild a statement these loose data furnish. It is fortunate that we have the data for these four years or we could not meet these charges; but it happens that on the records is found a report of Hon. Levi Woodbury, Secretary of the Treasury, made in 1839, to the House of Representatives, in which the real losses by defalcations from 1789 up to that date are stated. That report is found in House Document No. 10 of the Twenty-sixth Congress, first session. It shows the losses by receiving officers to be \$214,648, not \$1,383,000. It shows the losses by disbursing officers to be \$230,336, not \$1,163,000; total losses on both sides \$444,984, not \$2,547,601; thus making the trifling difference of \$2,102,000. On the figures of the Senator from Indiana this difference makes the ratio \$1.87 per thousand of losses in place of \$10.55. Can we rely upon data of this character, when we find upon the records of the Government a statement over the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury palpably, plainly, distinctly saying that instead of the losses being \$2,547,000 for those four years they were \$444,984? From one we learn all. I have extracted these figures, and have a table which I annex.

Extracts from statement of aggregate amount of defalcations and ratio of losses from 1789 to March 4, 1837, furnished December 30, 1839, to Congress and found in House Document No. 10, first session Twenty-sixth Congress, including public debt.

DISBURSEMENTS.

Period, March 4, 1833, to March 4, 1837.	Expenses, including public debt:
1833.....	\$22,049,297 95
1834.....	18,420,467 12
1835.....	17,005,418 55
1836.....	29,655,244 46
Total for four years.....	87,130,428 08
Total defalcations.....	230,336 32
Ratio of loss per \$1,000.....	2 60
Whole number of defaulters.....	84
Total loss by disbursing officers from 1789 to 1837.....	4,956,573 56

RECEIPTS.

Period from March 4, 1833, to March 4, 1873:	
Total receipts.....	\$136,531,971 64
Total defalcations.....	214,648 02
Ratio of loss per \$1,000.....	1 50
Whole number of defaulters.....	18
Total loss by receiving officers, 1789 to 1834.....	\$2,038,549 81
Total receipts and disbursements during Jackson's last term.....	\$223,662,399 72
Total defalcations during Jackson's last term.....	444,984 35
Ratio of loss per \$1,000.....	1 90
Ratio of loss during same term as stated in Treasurer's report.....	10 55
Error as shown by original official report.....	8 65
Whole amount of losses from 1789 to March 4, 1837, (48 years).....	6,995,123 37
Annual loss.....	145,731
Whole amount of loss from July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1875, (14 years).....	14,253,303 47
Annual loss.....	1,018,093 00

Mr. Secretary Woodbury in his report on the finances made to Congress December 3, 1839, discusses this subject so broadly and specifically and so thoroughly refutes this nameless statement as to its figures, that I quote him:

The particular losses in each presidential term being also desired by the resolution they have been ascertained; and as they furnish a striking solution of some of the general causes of those losses, the periods in which the largest and some of the smallest ones happened among each class of public agents might be usefully designated here. Among the banks the largest losses were from 1813 to 1817 then consisting entirely of depreciation on notes taken, and next from 1821 to 1824, consisting then chiefly of deposits; while from 1829 to 1833 and from 1833 to 1837 they were smaller than in any period since 1813. Among disbursing officers, looking to the amount disbursed, the largest losses were from 1821 to 1825, next from 1817 to 1821, and next from 1809 to 1813; and they were smaller from 1829 to 1833 and from 1833 to 1837 than in any other term whatever, except from 1789 to 1793.

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator from Pennsylvania is calling attention to some errors at the Treasury Department. I desire to ask him if he has noticed some of the errors in the statements of Mr. Tilden, the nominee of the democratic party. He states the amount of the outflow of gold from this country for a series of years, but omits to deduct what has flowed in, making a difference from the true statement of \$200,000,000?

Mr. WALLACE. The Senator has taken the floor and interjected a speech without asking my leave.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair asked the Senator from Pennsylvania if he yielded to the Senator from Vermont. Does he yield?

Mr. MORRILL. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. WALLACE. I will only say that, following the example of the other Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS,] I am making a political speech, and I trust I shall not be again interrupted.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But the other Senator from Vermont yielded to interruptions continually.

Mr. WALLACE. The Senator from Vermont is a much older settler here than the Senator from Pennsylvania. When he gets to be

as old in this Hall as the Senator from Vermont he will yield as often as the Senator.

Mr. MORRILL. I only desired to call attention to two errors, the one in regard to the outflow of gold and the other in regard to taxes amounting to from four hundred to five hundred millions.

Mr. WALLACE. I decline to yield. I continue to read from the report of Mr. Secretary Woodbury.

The loss on each \$100 from 1829 to 1833 was only nineteen cents, and from 1833 to 1837 only twenty-six cents, while in some previous terms it was as high as \$2 16. In this class the most numerous losses compared with all in office were from 1817 to 1821, next from 1821 to 1825, and next from 1813 to 1817. The smallest proportion in this respect, except during the first two terms under the Constitution, was from 1829 to 1833, and except those and the third term the next smallest was from 1833 to 1837.

Among collecting officers, if looking to the amounts collected, the highest losses were from 1797 to 1801, next from 1809 to 1813, next from 1817 to 1821, and next from 1805 to 1809. The most numerous defaults, compared with the whole number of that class in office, were from 1809 to 1813, next from 1805 to 1809, next from 1821 to 1825, next from 1817 to 1821, and next from 1825 to 1828. The ratio of them from 1829 to 1833 and 1833 to 1837 was not one-fourth as large as in some of the periods just enumerated. Indeed it was less than in any previous terms from the foundation of the Government except four, and the number of such defaulters was less than in any presidential term since 1804.

Mr. President, I might stop here and treat this veracious statement from the Treasury Department without signature as a discredited witness, but because the printed records give us no specific data with which to meet its falsity as to subsequent dates, I take it up as a whole and contrast it with such records as I can find on the subject and ask that reason and sense shall guide us to the truth.

It seems that the aggregate loss by the statement published between 1834 and 1861 is \$15,269,000. This is too large; the Senator admits it himself. It contains discrepancies with the figures that I have already read. If those four years are a test, it is \$7,000,000 too large. The whole sum of the losses for forty-eight years is less than \$7,000,000, as shown by this statement of Secretary Woodbury. The actual losses by death and hopeless insolvency are shown by Mr. Solicitor Streeter on the 25th of October, 1856, to be \$7,822,418. The defalcation shown by the books of the Treasury may have been larger, but those actually chargeable to profit and loss are stated by Mr. Streeter, as Solicitor of the Treasury, up to that date. This included debts in judgment for many years. It excluded all of which any hope remained for collection. This statement plainly contradicts the Treasury figures. He reports the ascertained insolvents up to October 25, 1856, and the statement of the Senator brought from the Treasury comes up to 1860.

Report of ascertained insolvents up to October 25, 1856, as per report of F. B. Streeter, Solicitor of the Treasury.

Debts originating in Navy Department.....	\$1,405,631 55
Debts originating in War Department.....	2,942,153 71
Debts originating in customs.....	570,393 16
Debts originating in foreign intercourse.....	24,360 84
Debts originating in Indians.....	89,490 40
Debts originating in lands.....	290,627 13
Debts originating in miscellaneous accounts.....	890,688 90

Balances due from banks, unavailable.....	6,213,345 69
Total losses.....	1,609,072 32
Total losses.....	7,822,418 01

Treating these figures as the actual losses down to July, 1856, we will follow the suits of the Government to 1859 through the reports of the Treasury in order to learn the aggregate losses to that date and ascertain if we can if the data given us are true. By them we learn that suits for \$4,100,000 were brought, that \$2,030,000 thereof were collected, and \$2,070,000 uncollected. If we add this latter sum to the lost debts, we find the whole loss to be \$9,880,000 and not \$15,260,000. These figures expressly contradict this statement, so that there is no possible escape.

This brings us to the conclusion irresistibly that the figures from 1834 to 1859 are not the real sums of the losses. But, for the sake of the argument, let us assume that this statement of losses from the Treasury is correct, its figures are true, its conclusions are justly drawn. Then let us glance at the results that follow. If this veracious paper be literally true, we find that the greatest total loss shown by the statement through receiving officers from 1861 to 1875 was \$4,348,000; from disbursing officers, \$9,905,000. In fourteen years the total loss was \$14,253,000; annual loss, \$1,018,000. Loss through receiving officers from January, 1834, to June 30, 1861, \$2,907,000; through disbursing officers from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861, \$12,361,000. Total loss in twenty-seven and a half years, \$15,260,000; an annual loss of \$555,255.

Taking the figures of the Treasury statement itself, it shows a loss of a million annually, while during the twenty-seven and a half years preceding there there was a loss of something over half a million annually. A loss of but a million annually—a trifle, a mere *bagatelle*; officials take but fourteen and a quarter millions in fourteen years, hence our economy is plain. The people are suffering and our expenses are increasing, hence our economy is plain. This is the logic of the argument and of the document I am commenting on.

Where have the losses occurred that this total gives as the aggregate thereof from 1861 to 1875? By report made to the House in 1874 we find that one hundred and fifty-seven paymasters in the Army are in arrears \$768,706. From the report of the Naval Committee of the House we learn that one hundred and twelve paymasters in the Navy

are in arrears \$1,154,000. From the unprinted document we find that one hundred and forty-eight collectors of internal revenue are in arrears about \$3,600,000; and that out of four hundred and ninety-five defaulters in the Indian service these papers show two hundred and seventy-seven in the past fifteen years, and but two hundred and eighty in the thirty years preceding. From the letter of Mr. Pratt, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue, we learn that of cash deficiencies of collectors of internal revenue between March 1, 1869, and February 28, 1876, there are \$592,751.

The statement that I have referred to is contradicted by the facts; leading Senators challenge the data and refuse to permit that data to be printed. Common sense and the rule of practice in ordinary affairs certify it not to be true, and the conclusions are irresistible that the figures given as the losses from 1834 to 1859 are not the sum of the losses sustained by the Government during those years, but are overstated. The unprinted document being untruthful, the data based upon it is necessarily false and the results deduced therefrom are without support in fact; but this table and these figures have gone to the country. Three leading members of the republican party have accepted and indorsed the statement, and it and their speeches are being sent broadcast over the land under the franks of members of Congress. How untruthful it is let us see further.

It states the receipts of the Government, after leaving out the war, since July 1, 1865, at \$3,039,184,922, and the disbursements at \$7,909,434,948; making a total of receipts and disbursements since the 1st of July, 1865, of \$16,048,520,870. The mind of the ordinary man is not more bewildered at the attempt to grasp the magnitude of the proportions of \$16,148,520,870 than it is amazed at the cool audacity which will parade these figures as the aggregate receipts and disbursements of the Government during a period of ten years of peace, and attempt to build thereon a superstructure of argument for an intelligent people. Excluding from the calculation everything but the actual expenditures of the Government, and ascertaining by the data given us by the Senator from Indiana the sum-total of the losses for ten years, from July 1, 1865, as well on account of receipts as of disbursements, we find that those actual expenses have been \$2,077,573,973; that the aggregate sum of the losses has been \$7,145,786; the average annual expenditures, \$207,757,397; the average annual loss, \$714,578; and the loss per \$1,000 of expenditure \$3.43 in the ten years.

I have the figures and the ratio of loss for the ten years ending June 30, 1875, tabulated, which I will not detain the Senate to read. For these ten years the Senator from Indiana says the ratio was in Johnson's administration forty-eight cents; in Grant's first administration forty cents, and in the last three years of Grant's administration twenty-six cents on the \$1,000; while we find it to be an average of \$3.43 on the \$1,000.

Let the people judge between us.

Losses and ratio of loss per \$1,000 for ten years ending June 30, 1875, upon the basis of the actual expenditures of the Government, excluding the public debt and interest:

Period, July 1, 1865 to June 30, 1869:	
1866	\$387,683,199
1867	215,695,113
1868	236,916,239
1869	190,526,355
Total	1,030,820,906
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873:	
1870	\$180,418,062
1871	166,600,623
1872	153,201,856
1873	180,488,638
Total	680,709,179
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1875:	
1874	\$195,514,058
1875	171,529,823
Total	367,043,886
Totals	2,077,573,973
Total loss receiving and disbursing	7,145,786
Loss per \$1,000	3.43

Now, Mr. President, I am done with this statement. Let what I have said on the subject and the references that I have given go to the country side by side with the statements and the speeches that have been made based upon it, and let an intelligent people judge between them as to their truth.

But if it all be true, how does it affect the question that is before us now? How do these figures help to give relief from business depression or in the reduction of taxation? How do they aid to give cheap government, honest government? These are the issues of the present hour, and no tirades on the past, or its corruption, or its figures of expenditures, or on sporadic grievances in isolated localities will divert the minds of the people from these, the real, the grave, the vital issues of the pending campaign. They who administered the Government in those days were tried before the great tribunal of the people, and in obedience to the law of our being, both natural and political, the safety-valve of the Republic, the only protection in a government of law when it is maladministered, the remedy of change, they were driven from the seats of power.

The issues of the present and of the recent past as they affect the people now and in the future are here. They confront you now and here. They are the issues that impend before the people and they are to be answered. It is not for you to arraign the past, but it is for you to answer for the present. Why do the people cry for bread? Why do they demand employment? Why are they found in thousands throughout all this broad land seeking employment, hunting bread for their children and their wives? Why are our manufactures destroyed, our business men bankrupted? Whence comes this universal distrust of those who rule? Why is it that the people in every part of this broad land distrust those who rule? Is your administration of the Government an honest one, is it a just one, is it a cheap one? Is your financial policy a wise one? These and kindred questions press now upon the people, and the people will have them answered. Those who suffer and who see those whom they love suffer, think deeply, think seriously, think earnestly. The people suffer and they think.

Why have the expenses of the Government increased since 1872? I speak now from official figures. The whole sum expended in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1872, was \$270,559,695. The whole sum expended for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1875, was \$274,623,392. The increase was \$4,063,697. The decrease on account of interest on the public debt, included in both items, was \$14,264,295, and the gross increase was \$18,327,992. Deduct increase in pension and Indian appropriations from 1872 to 1875, \$3,245,745, making an actual increase of expenses from 1872 to 1875, for civil service, War and Navy Departments alone, of \$15,082,247.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Will the Senator allow me to correct him? The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania decline to yield?

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot yield. I have already stated that I decline to be interrupted. The Senator can make his speech after I get through.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I have no speech to make, but I should like to have the Senator correct.

Mr. WALLACE. In those years the civil service increased from \$60,984,757 to \$69,100,884, making an increase of the civil service from 1872 to 1875 of \$8,116,127.

The civil service cost the people in the fiscal year ending June 30—

1867	\$51,110,027
1869	55,474,061
1872	60,984,757
1875	69,100,884

Showing a gradual increase since the war, until by the last report it reaches \$17,990,859 more than in 1867.

Expenditures of the Government for ten years ending June 30, 1865.

Year.	Total expended.	For interest on debts.	Civil service.	Pensions and Indians.	War.	Navy.
1866	\$220,750,940	\$133,067,741	\$41,056,961	\$18,852,416	\$284,449,701	\$43,324,118
1867	346,729,124	131,034,011	51,110,027	25,579,083	95,224,415	43,781,591
1868	377,340,284	140,424,045	60,011,018	27,883,069	123,246,648	25,775,502
1869	321,490,597	130,964,242	56,471,061	35,519,544	78,501,990	20,000,757
1870	309,653,560	129,235,498	69,234,017	31,748,140	57,655,675	21,780,229
1871	292,177,188	125,576,565	69,498,710	34,443,894	35,799,991	19,431,027
1872	270,559,695	117,357,839	60,984,757	35,595,130	35,372,157	21,249,809
1873	290,345,245	109,856,607	73,328,109	37,311,130	46,323,158	23,526,256
1874	302,633,873	107,119,815	69,641,593	35,730,876	42,313,927	30,932,587
1875	274,623,392	103,093,544	69,100,884	38,840,875	41,120,645	21,497,006
Total	3,306,303,898					

Mr. President, here is the plain proof that your expenses are increasing and your Government becoming more costly. You profess your desire to retrench. You cannot retrench if you would. Those who create abuses in governmental administration or suffer the necessities of their political being to press them forward and thus increase expenses can never reform them. It is as true an axiom in political theory as anything that exists therein, that those who create increased expenses or wrongs in administration can never reform them. The momentum of party organization, the hordes of needy retainers and the demands of officials who manipulate the primaries control and direct official action. You are in the groove of party and party necessity and you cannot get out if you would. The only remedy is the lever of change applied by the people.

Is your financial policy a wise one, or is it a fruitful cause of our present ills? Can a policy which has created and nourished a system by which \$48,000 in gold in February, 1865, has in eleven years produced \$112,000 in dividends and now aggregates \$108,000 in surplus and other outstanding profits in addition, and under which the owners thereof can now go into the market with their \$100,000 of bonds bought for \$48,000 in gold in 1865 and sell them for \$126,000, be anything else but a cause of distress and disaster?

Yet this is the record of a part of your system, and it is not an isolated case. I take eighteen cases of a similar character distributed through the State in which I live, not old organizations with their accretions, but new organizations dating from June, 1863, to March,

1865, and here again I speak by official figures. I have the data from the Comptroller of the Treasury in regard to what I say under date not earlier than the 1st of July. These organizations date from June, 1863, to March, 1865, when the greenback dollar was ranging from forty-two to seventy-six, averaging about sixty-five cents in gold. With a capital of \$2,800,000 these eighteen institutions have deposited bonds to the amount of \$2,819,000. Their dividends to July 1, 1876, are \$3,851,455. Their surplus and other profits are \$1,866,751, and the total dividends and surplus in twelve years on \$2,800,000 is \$5,718,204.

If the bonds that they deposited are sixes of 1881, they can go into the market to-day with the \$2,819,000 of bonds costing in gold in 1863 and 1864 \$1,832,350, and they can sell them for \$3,551,940 in legal-tenders. Thus the investment of \$1,832,350 in gold yields \$7,437,794, or more than 400 per cent. in twelve years. In these figures are found the traces of the ruin of manufactures, of merchants, of business men of every class. The system that permits such results is bad and only bad continually; the legislation that fosters, that produces, or that permits such a condition of things needs correction and amendment. That legislation lies at your door; it is not ours.

This is but one of the evils of this financial policy. It should be corrected by recognizing the existence of other powers and other interests than aggregated wealth. The time has come in this country when something else than aggregated wealth is to be recognized as the power of the country. There are men of brains and muscle, living, breathing men of this country in other vocations who have rights as well as those who represent aggregated wealth. The time has come for the pendulum to swing in the other direction, and those in power will mark well the query as to whether the hour has not struck now.

Is the country to tread remorselessly under the lead of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] the path to specie payment without preparation? Since July 1, 1865, we have expended for administration and paid debt amounting to \$3,861,502,508. This is equal to the debt of Great Britain. No more exhaustive labor was ever imposed upon any people. Is it strange that we are distressed, exhausted, and poor? Is it the part of wisdom to continue this destructive process or shall we make haste slowly in our march to specie payments? Is there to be no time to breathe? Is it strange that the people grow restive? Are there to be no moments of rest for those who have saved as well the faith as the unity of the Republic? Is this generation to be forced into bankruptcy in order that the next may be freed from debt? No wise government will do so for such an idea. It is the path of prudence to postpone resumption until the people are rested from the exhaustive processes of the past ten years, from the financial distress of the past three years, and until by natural and steady growth of confidence and business resumption will come with ease and with safety. This is no question of inflation. It is simply a question of the removal of a standing menace from the business men of the country, the removal of an appalling shadow which they believe, whether rightly or wrongly, is the cause of their present trouble. It is no question of hard money or soft money. The people I represent on this floor believe in paying their debts in honest money, in coin. And, sir, my vote will never be found here recorded either for the inflation of the currency to the extent of one dollar or for anything else than the honest payment of the public debt in coin. But, sir, they ask with the earnestness of an honest people, where are the evidences of your ability to pay your notes? Where are the signs of preparation for resumption? Is it the news that comes to us from the East but recently in which the A. W. Sprague & Co. mills are shut down and eight or nine thousand employes turned loose upon the world? See the picture in my own State. The thriving mechanic or laborer who but three years since bought his lot and built a house, paid upon them the half and gave his mortgage for the balance, finds that under this policy his house and his lot both go to the mortgage; the hard earnings of all his years are swept away to increase the value of the Government's obligations, which flows from the shrinking of the value of real estate and the swelling of the value of those obligations under your system of legislation, and his wife and children are to be turned homeless upon the world.

The enterprising man of business too, the man who is between capital and labor with his hand upon both, the scheming, active, energetic man of the middle class in this country, upon whom all of its interests, the live, energetic, business man with an intelligent managing hand, and an industrious body, this man having capital, hires money from the capitalists to conduct his business, and he too under the operations of this system sees himself deceived that which he has agreed to pay, and he too must go bankrupt.

Property decreases in value on every side. Money and securities appreciate as the threat continues; men grow suspicious are unsettled in every direction; sheriffs' sales in bankrupt merchants are found in every calling; the shadow of ruin falls upon the path of many. Your legislation in the aggregate wealth and against the business man has given occasion of things. Since the use of a mixed currency there has been an hour when all the paper obligations of the country were redeemed in coin. Credit and confidence were as essential as gold that was at its root. Can credit and confidence while values fall and business men quake and capitulate? To steady values and stay panics we must not legislate specie, but we must bring the public mind to the conclu-

sion that they do not need it. Can such a condition of things ever come while the shadow of enforced resumption without preparation appalls them with its unknown terrors? Sir, Pennsylvania, pointing to her record—and I speak for the vast majority of her people; I am as conscious of it as I am that I am here—Pennsylvania, pointing to her past record, her sacrifices, and her suffering, to her prostrated industries, to her manufactories closed, to her mines abandoned, to her factories untenanted, to her iron unsold, to her coal in heaps, to her lumber in piles, to her tens of thousands of unemployed men, artisans, laborers, and miners scattered all over that broad State; Pennsylvania, that great Commonwealth, here and now recognizing her obligation to pay her debt to the utmost farthing in coin—Pennsylvania and her people ask for time, for preparation, for an easier road to resumption.

Why do the people distrust those who rule? Is your administration of the Government an honest one in their view? It is for you to answer? Are the people justified in their belief that we have had an administration of the Government that has discarded statesmanship and sought inexperience, that has ignored integrity in official trust and patronized the corrupted and the vile, that has permitted wealth to be gathered from meager salaries, that has tolerated the jobber and the speculator on the threshold of the White House, that has reversed the philosophy of the Trojan who feared the Greeks and those bearing gifts, that has held complicity with gold-gambling and nurtured and petted a whisky ring, stolidly winked at corrupt practices in the custom-houses, disgraced the country in the San Domingo and the Secor business, lost an Attorney-General who resigned pending charges of misuse of the public money, a Secretary of the Interior by unrefuted charges of corruption in his Department, a Secretary of the Treasury forced from his place by public indignation, a Postmaster-General whose method and record were unsatisfactory to a discriminating people, a Secretary of War whose trial for bribery has just been concluded, and a minister to Great Britain whose methods are a unanimous committee declared to be improper and unjustifiable? Are the people justified in this belief? Are they right or are they wrong when they ask with impressive earnestness, Has not the rule of official accountability been held for naught, and have not positions of honor and of trust been made the bauble and the gift of personal preference, and capacity and honesty been among the last qualifications required? Have we not had bribery in the War Office? Are there not charges of swindling of pensioners, and of plundering in mail-lettings and in surveys of the public lands, of bribery at elections, of black-mailing of merchants, of conspiracies to cheat justice and acquit burglars, of disgrace in diplomacy and personal misgovernment? Are these charges not true? If the people be deceived in regard to these charges, if they be not true, give them the proofs and they will acquit you; give them the proofs, and they will not hold you responsible; but these issues are those to which the people at the present hour seem to apply their attention. They are the vital points, the pith and marrow of the struggle. If they are true, have they been indorsed? The seventeenth resolution at Cincinnati reads thus:

The national administration merits commendation for its honorable work in the management of our domestic and foreign affairs, and President Grant deserves the continued and hearty gratitude of the American people for his patriotism and his immense services in war and peace.

I make no assertion that these charges are proved; I say they are in existence. They are for you to answer, and you have indorsed the Administration under which the people believe them to have been in existence. If these be not true, it is for you to show their untruth. It is very plain that the issues sought to be made to-day in this Chamber are not those to which I have endeavored to call attention. The issue that you seek to manufacture relates to the South. Your issue is to be based upon the misdeeds of the southern people. It is not the questions of cheap government, of honest government, of a sound financial policy; but it is solely on the outrages you claim have been perpetrated by the southern people that you seek to have the issue fought. We have had this in the speeches of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from Indiana. We ask you, is your administration of the Government a cheap one? Let the increased expenses found in your annual Treasury reports answer that question. Is your financial policy a sound one? Let the condition of the business people of the country answer that question. Is your administration of the Government an honest one? Let the records of the past seven years and the belief in the minds of the people themselves answer that question.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS.

- Mr. Chief Justice Charles D. Drake 2117 G street, N. W.
- Mr. Judge Edward G. Loring 1512 K street, N. W.
- Mr. Judge Ebenezer Peck Chicago.
- Mr. Judge Charles C. Nott 826 Connecticut avenue.
- Mr. Judge William A. Richardson 1021 Vermont avenue.

OFFICERS COURT OF CLAIMS.

- Chief Clerk.—Archibald Hopkins 1601 I street, N. W.
- Assistant Clerk.—John Randolph 28 I street, N. W.
- Bailiff.—Stark B. Taylor 485 H street, S. W.
- Messenger.—Hugh Craigan 1361 Ohio avenue, N. W.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, August 10, 1876.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the resolution of the Senate to print four thousand copies of the report of the Special Committee to Investigate the Late Elections in Mississippi.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. No. 1021) allowing the Pacific Mail Steamship Company to carry the mails in their new iron steamships, asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. JONES of Nevada, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. KEY.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

Mr. LORD. I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution read. The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the right of suffrage prescribed by the constitutions of the several States is subject to the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows:

"ARTICLE XV.

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

and whereas the exercise of the right of suffrage so prescribed and regulated should be faithfully maintained and observed by the United States and the several States and the citizens thereof; and whereas it is asserted that the exercise of the right of suffrage is in some of the States, notwithstanding the efforts of all good citizens to the contrary, resisted and controlled by fraud, intimidation, and violence, so that in such cases the object of the amendment is defeated; and whereas all citizens, without distinction of race, or class, or color, are entitled to the protection conferred by such article: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, That all attempts by force, fraud, terror, intimidation, or otherwise to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage in any State should meet with certain, condign, and effectual punishment, and that in any case which has heretofore occurred or that may hereafter occur in which violence or murder has been or shall be committed by one race or class upon the other, the prompt prosecution and punishment of the criminal or criminals in any court having jurisdiction is imperatively demanded, whether the crime be one punishable by fine or imprisonment or one demanding the penalty of death.

Mr. LORD. I move the adoption of that resolution.

Mr. KASSON. I second the motion.

Mr. CONGER. I object to the resolution.

Mr. BEEBE. I rise to make a privileged report from the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Mr. LORD. I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONGER] is willing to withdraw his objection to the resolution.

Mr. CONGER. I would like to have the resolution read again.

The preamble and resolution were again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. REAGAN. I simply want to say that, as I understand, the preamble affirms a condition of things the existence of which may be controverted. If so, I do not want to vote to affirm a state of facts of which we have no knowledge.

Mr. LORD. The preamble merely declares that "it is asserted that the exercise of the right of suffrage is resisted," &c.

Mr. COX. I suggest to my colleague [Mr. LORD] that he strike out the preamble. We should allow the States to take care of this mischief, which is local.

Mr. LORD. This proposition has been submitted to a great many gentlemen from the South, among them the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. TUCKER,] who, though he thought no resolution necessary, suggested the first part as to the fifteenth amendment. The whole preamble was added, save one clause, to satisfy southern members. The resolution simply states the provision of the Constitution just as it is, and asserts that in the North and the South alike there should be protection for the free exercise of the right of suffrage under that constitutional provision, of course by the States, unless a State or States should refuse, when further legislation would be necessary. I think the resolution should be adopted unanimously.

Several MEMBERS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLYMER. My judgment is that this ought to go to a committee.

Mr. LORD. I demand the previous question, and shall call the yeas and nays on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. CLYMER. Pending that I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The demand for the previous question takes precedence.

The question being taken on seconding the demand for the previous question, there were—ayes 83, noes 53; no quorum voting.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. LORD and Mr. CLYMER were appointed.

Mr. BLAND. I ask that the resolution be again read.

The preamble and resolution were again read.

Mr. BLAND. I think that this proposition ought to be discussed. Mr. CLYMER. Is it possible to vote separately upon the preamble and the resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is now dividing. The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 79, noes 19; no quorum voting.

Mr. BLAND. I call for a further count.

Mr. HOAR. I make the point of order that the objection that there is no quorum can only be made by a gentleman rising in his seat.

Mr. BLAND. Well, I rise in my seat and make the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] is very well taken, and if uniformly enforced would save the Chair infinite trouble. Gentlemen frequently complain that they have not been recognized, when the difficulty is that they have not arisen from their seats. If a gentleman rises in his seat to address the Chair, the Chair is very likely to see him. The point is made that no quorum has voted upon the count by tellers.

Mr. STEVENSON. I move a call of the House.

Mr. HOAR. My point of order is that the objection of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] should be taken by him rising in his seat, so that it may be recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has been so done.

Mr. BLAND. I believe I rose in my seat to object. I simply desire that the previous question may be voted down and that we may have some discussion upon a resolution of this importance. I do not say that I will vote against the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The matter is not subject to discussion now.

Mr. CLYMER. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. KASSON. Is there any motion in order except to move that there be a call of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to adjourn is in order, or a demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KASSON. But not on seconding the demand for the previous question. Consequently I move that there be a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, only two motions are in order, to adjourn and that there be a call of the House.

Mr. CLYMER. I rise to a question of order, and it is that my motion to refer was made before the gentleman from New York demanded the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order pending the demand for the previous question, and the gentleman from Iowa declines to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KASSON. I ask for a vote on my motion that there be a call of the House.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make a suggestion. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] says he desires discussion on the resolution and does not know whether he will vote against it or not. I suggest to the gentleman from New York to agree by unanimous consent there shall be discussion on the resolution for half an hour.

Mr. EDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This can only proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. The Chair always entertains such a proposition.

Mr. EDEN. I object to debate and demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would be glad to entertain any proposition, but objection is made and there is a demand for the regular order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that there be a call of the House.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 46.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; and the following members failed to answer to their names:

Messrs. Abbott, Adams, Bass, Bell, Blackburn, Bliss, Blount, Buckner, Samuel D. Burchard, William P. Caldwell, Campbell, Candler, Cason, Caulfield, Chapin, Chittenden, Collins, Cowan, Crapo, Culbertson, De Bolt, Denison, Dobbins, Dunnell, Ellis, Ely, Faulkner, Fuller, Gause, Gibson, Glover, Goode, Goodin, Robert Hamilton, Haralson, Henry R. Harris, Harrison, Hartridge, Hatcher, Hathorn, Hays, Hendee, Henkle, Abram S. Hewitt, Hill, Hoge, Holman, Hoskins, Hubbell, Hunter, Hurlbut, Jenks, Frank Jones, Thomas L. Jones, Kelley, King, Lamar, George M. Landers, Lane, Leavenworth, Le Moine, Mackey, Maish, Meade, Milliken, Money, Neal, O'Brien, Oliver, O'Neil, Phelps, John F. Philips, Plaisted, Platt, Powell, Purman, Randall, James B. Reilly, Sobieski Ross, Scales, Schumaker, Seeley, Smalls, Southard, Sparks, Stowell, Swann, Teese, Martin I. Townsend, Tucker, Waldron, Charles C. B. Walker, Gilbert C. Walker, Alexander S. Wallace, John W. Wallace, Walling, Wash, Ward, Warren, G. Wiley Wells, Wheeler, White, Whitehouse, Whitthorne, Wike, Andrew Williams, Charles G. Williams, Benjamin Wilson, Alan Wood, jr., Fernando Wood, Woodworth, and Young.

Mr. FELTON. I desire to state that my colleague, Mr. HARTRIDGE, is sick in bed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not time to offer excuses.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, by unanimous consent, will announce the managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 1516) to regulate the issue of artificial limbs to disabled soldiers, seaman, and others, as follows: Mr. RUSK, Mr. RICE, and Mr. BAGBY.

Mr. KASSON. Mr. Speaker, how many members have answered to their names?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One hundred and seventy-three.