

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1886.

The Week.

THE votes taken in the Senate on the Morrison surplus resolution as amended by the Finance Committee, and on the various amendments offered by individual Senators, do not furnish much text for political discourse. In a broad way it may be said that if the Senate had been under Democratic control, the resolution would probably have passed as it came from the House, although this is not certain, the Democratic members having divided equally, 14 to 14, on the test vote. Twenty-three Republican Senators voted for the Finance Committee's amendment and 13 against it. The aggregate vote, 37 to 27, in favor of the amendment, is a very gratifying result, showing that no very bad financial measure can be carried through Congress until the composition of the Senate is very much changed. Perhaps the most gratifying exhibit is that made by the Southern Democratic Senators, twelve of whom voted for the amendment. While it is true that twelve Senators from the late slaveholding States voted the other way, the expectation was that there would be a considerable majority in favor of "cheap money." The debate at its close exposed the true character of the resolution. Everybody understood that it was a last desperate effort to force the silver standard on the country. The Senate has put upon this attempt a negative of so decided a character that Mr. Bland and his party in the House may well consider the question, whether they are likely to live long enough to see the silver standard established solely by the operation of the two-millions-per-month law.

Each party gave a slight majority in favor of the extraordinary amendment to the surplus resolution proposing that the Government pay 100 cents apiece for the 75-cent trade dollars; the Republicans standing 19 to 16 and the Democrats 15 to 13. Mr. Evarts voted with the majority. At the present price of silver the trade dollar is worth only 75 cents. It is not legal tender. It is an ingot manufactured expressly and exclusively for sale to the Chinese. It never had any circulation in this country until the price of silver fell so that 420 grains of it were worth less than 25 8-10 grains of gold. Then speculators began to buy them up in China and reimport them to the United States, and palm them off as the equivalent of gold. They had a brief and fitful circulation until business men refused to receive them. Then speculators bought them up a second time, and have been holding them, together with the stock that they were unable to get rid of, and besieging Congress to take them at par as the equivalent of gold dollars. The importation from China naturally ceased when the business community threw them out, but it will spring up with amazing rapidity as soon as it is learned that 75 cents' worth of them will bring a dollar at the United States Treasury. It is

simply amazing that such a measure could have passed, except in the way of burlesque, in order to put a fool's cap on the Morrison resolution.

The President's message approving the Oleomargarine Bill is an unusual but not an unprecedented proceeding. President Lincoln, we believe, set the example of stating his reasons for signing a bill which he did not altogether approve of, and the example was followed, if we recollect rightly, by President Johnson. The Constitution contains no warrant for such a method of procedure. At the same time it does not prohibit it. It must be held allowable because there are no means to prevent it, but it would be more consonant with the spirit of the instrument if the President would simply approve or disapprove the measures before him, and state his opinions regarding legislation in his annual messages to Congress. The reasons given by him for signing the bill will not be satisfactory to those who, like ourselves, consider it a very plain case of class legislation, and the most offensive specimen of its kind to be found on the statute-book. That this is its true character in the President's estimation is made plain by the following paragraph in his message:

"If this article has the merit which its friends claim for it, and if the people of the land, with full knowledge of its real character, desire to purchase and use it, the taxes exacted by this bill will permit a fair profit to both manufacturer and seller. If the existence of the commodity taxed and the profits of its manufacture and sale depend upon disposing of it to the people for something else which it deceitfully imitates, the entire enterprise is a fraud and not an industry; and if it cannot endure the exhibition of its real character which will be effected by the inspection, supervision, and stamping which this bill directs, the sooner it is destroyed the better in the interest of fair dealing. Such a result would not furnish the first instance in the history of legislation in which a revenue bill produced a benefit which was merely incidental to its main purpose. There is certainly no industry better entitled to the incidental advantages which may follow this legislation than our farming and dairy interests, and to none of our people should they be less begrudged than our farmers and dairymen."

Obviously the "revenue measure" which gains more or less support from the fact that it gives incidental advantages to a worthy class of people, is a crooked measure, a dangerous measure, and a blot upon the spirit of modern legislation. Although it bears striking likeness to the principles of the protective tariff, it differs from the latter in lacking the element of supposed patriotism, which constitutes the largest part of the sophistries underlying that system. It is a plain, unvarnished game of grab, taking from A to give to B, because B is an industrious man with a large family, and has a hard time to make a living.

The President makes the suggestion that the second section of the bill leaves some doubt whether the article oleomargarine is taxable unless it is made "in imitation or semblance of butter, or, when so made, calculated or intended to be sold as butter or for butter." There can be no doubt that the intention of the framers of the bill was to tax oleomargarine even if it were made as black as tar. There can be little doubt that when the bill comes before the

courts the latter will try to find some way of construing it so that it shall be conformable to justice and liberty. The bill certainly leaves a wide door open for construction. The first section defines the article butter and the second defines the article oleomargarine. The definition of the latter ends with the words quoted. Would a court impose a fine upon a man who made or sold untaxed oleomargarine not in imitation or semblance of butter, and not calculated or intended to be sold as butter? Probably not. How much "semblance" of butter will serve to warrant the imprisonment of an American citizen in the latter part of the nineteenth century? What facts shall be relied on to show that an article which is not butter is "calculated" to be sold for butter? These questions will certainly come up for adjudication. They present a fruitful vista for lawyers.

The President sent in two vetoes on Friday. One was of a bill proposing to erect an expensive public building in the little city of Springfield, Mo., where the only quarters required by the Federal Government are for the employees of the Land Office, now accommodated at a rent of \$300 a year, and the half-dozen employees of the post-office, now housed in rooms furnished the Government free of expense. The average taxpayer is sure to endorse the President's conclusion: "Upon the facts presented, I am satisfied that the business of the Government at this point can be well transacted for the present without the construction of the proposed building." The other veto was of an act to authorize the construction of a railway bridge across that part of the waters of Lake Champlain lying between the towns of North Hero and Alburgh, in the State of Vermont, regarding which the President says:

"On the 10th day of June, 1884, a bill was approved and became a law, having the same title and containing precisely the same provisions and in the exact words of the bill herewith returned. The records of the War Department indicate that nothing has been done toward building the bridge permitted by such prior act; it is hardly possible that the bill now before me is intended to authorize an additional bridge between the two towns named, and I have been unable to discover any excuse or necessity for new legislation on the subject."

The President's latest pension veto furnishes a most glaring illustration of the recklessness with which this sort of legislation is enacted. The act proposed to grant a pension to Mrs. Jennette Dow, on the ground that her husband's death from apoplexy on the 17th of December, 1882, was due to a gun-shot wound in his left knee received in September, 1863. It appears that Mr. Dow served for years after the war as a railroad conductor; that there was no medical testimony which attributed death to the wound, "and it would be hardly credible," Mr. Cleveland remarks, "if such evidence was found"; and that the widow's claim was rejected by the Pension Bureau last year upon the ground that her husband's death was not caused by the wound. "I am sure," says the President in conclusion, "that in no case, except in an application for pension, would an attempt be made in the circumstances

here developed to attribute death from apoplexy to a wound in the knee received nineteen years before the apoplectic attack." If Republican stump-speakers want to go before the country on the platform of condemning a Democratic President for blocking such claims as this, the Democrats ought to consider themselves very lucky.

Mr. Evarts's speech on the silver question has resolved all doubts regarding his position, and must be gratifying to the business men of the country. His idea is that the President should correspond with European governments between the present time and the reassembling of Congress, in order to find out what their views are in reference to international bi-metallism. Then, when Congress does reassemble, we shall know where we stand, and "if satisfied that there is no reliable determination in that regard, Congress can take up and debate and settle the whole basis of currency and coinage." This is so rational and hopeful that we wonder still more why Mr. Evarts held us so long in suspense.

It is not easy to get at the real opinions of Mr. T. V. Powderly on the various points in the "labor problem," for they seem to vary from day to day. But he has at all events made it quite clear that he is by no means the "moral suasion" apostle which some of his friends tried to persuade us he was last April. He talks like one now and then, but just as often talks like a striker and a boycotter. The other day he denounced the militia for "standing between the laborer and his rights," although the only interference with the laborer of which the militia has ever been guilty has consisted in preventing him from smashing other people's property, and hitting people for entering into lawful contracts. Mr. Powderly does, however, seem to approve cordially of the boycott. He has written to Mr. James Redpath, denying that he "opposes it altogether." He says "he regards it as too good a tool to be dulled by botch workmen; it should be used only where actually necessary, and then effectually." The phrase "actually necessary," of course, means that it should be used only when the laborers have failed in persuading an employer to hire them against his will on their own terms. Powderly would then, but only then, employ intimidation and violence against him—that is, threaten him with the ruin of his business if he did not submit; and he would not threaten him unless the boycotting arrangements were so perfect that he would be sure to accomplish it. The truth is, that behind all the philanthropic preambles and constitutions of the Knights of Labor there lies the fixed determination to use violence to gain their ends whenever they think it can be done with impunity, or, as Mr. Powderly calls it, "effectually." But every such utterance, we think, increases the determination of all good citizens that neither Mr. Powderly nor any of his followers shall be permitted to be "effectual" on American soil. If they want to revel in boycotting, they must start for some still unsettled region, and boycott each other.

The struggle between the Knights of Labor

and the two other organizations, known as the International and the Progressive Cigarmakers' Unions, for the control of the cigar manufactories of the country is a very interesting one. At present the manufacturers appear to adhere firmly to the Knights, and declare their willingness to have their shops continue in the control of that organization; but the other two unions are so firmly united, and control so large a number of cigarmakers, that the Knights are experiencing great trouble in filling the shops with men. Of course the contest derives its chief public interest from being a struggle of one body of laborers with another. The employers are not directly interested except as they take sides with one party or the other. There is no attack upon capital involved, but simply a question of whether one union or the other two combined in one shall control. The men who are locked out are not strikers, but are refused work because they decline the authority of one union in order to submit to that of another.

"The increase in the production of iron and steel in the United States," said the *Tribune* recently, "is an encouraging indication of returning business prosperity. The production of pig-iron in the first half of this year amounted to 2,954,209 tons, which is considerably more than was ever before produced in the same length of time. According to the official report of the Iron and Steel Association, more steel also will be produced in 1886 than in any previous year." If Mr. Blaine had been elected President in 1884, the *Tribune* would have attributed this unprecedented showing to the influence of his "brilliant" administration. It is hardly to be expected that it should ascribe any of the credit as the case stands to Mr. Cleveland, but even the *Tribune* will find it hard to convince its readers that the country is going to ruin under a Democratic President, when it is called upon to print such facts as these.

The nation has a special cause for thanking this year. For the first time there will be no "October election" in Ohio. Last year the voters ratified a constitutional amendment changing the time for the annual State election from October to November, and hereafter the country will be free from the demoralizing performances so often enacted in the past in order to secure the "moral effect" of a party victory for use in other States which voted later. Indiana made the same change earlier than Ohio, and Maine would have changed from September to November before now if Mr. Blaine had not wanted to save the chance for getting up a boom by fixing public attention upon an early campaign in his State. But the September election in Maine is of little consequence, and the November contests in the country at large will hereafter be hardly at all affected by earlier elections in the very few States which still cling to the folly of voting for State officers in the summer or early fall.

The post-office at Gloucester, Mass., employs a number of clerks to receive and distribute mail matter, to attend to money orders, etc., and a number of carriers to deliver letters, postal cards, and papers throughout the city and

bring back the contents of the street letter-boxes. These various employments have no more connection with national politics than have the employments of men engaged in receiving and sending telegraphic despatches or express matter for one or another of the corporations engaged in those lines of communication. A few months ago a Democrat was appointed postmaster, and, upon assuming charge, he investigated the condition of the office precisely as a man would do who should take charge of a telegraph office or an express office provided with a full force of employees—that is to say, he set out to discover whether they were capable and efficient workmen, knowing that, if they were so, their experience would make them more valuable to their employer than green hands could be. He found that his predecessor had left the office well organized, and he determined to retain the force of subordinates which he found, exactly as any sensible superintendent of a telegraph or express office would have done under similar circumstances. When the Democratic managers came around and insisted that he should discharge these old employees simply to make room for a lot of new men who needed to be "taken care of," he refused to comply, and told them the simple truth, that the business of the Government could not be conducted with equal despatch if he should turn it over to a set of men who knew nothing about it. For this sensible application of business principles the Postmaster has been formally "arraigned" by the Democratic City Committee, who have adopted resolutions declaring their belief that it is "for the best interest and prosperity of the party"—not, it will be observed, of the people of both parties who are taxed to support the post office—"that immediate changes should be made in the Post-office Department in this city"; and that "no branch in any department of the Government can be carried on systematically and with efficiency while men holding positions are antagonistic to the Administration." They ask for the present postmaster's removal because he believes in retaining as clerks and carriers efficient men who are not Democrats. No "mere theorist" could possibly expose the utterly ridiculous character of the spoils system of administering the Government so forcibly as these "practical politicians" have done by thus formulating it.

A compilation of the Vermont school statistics for the year ending March 31, 1886, furnishes an interesting basis for comparison with the Southern State which most resembles Vermont in the character of its territory and population. The last census showed that there were in Vermont 99,463 children between the ages of five and twenty years, while the whole number of children enrolled in the public schools last year was 71,667, or 72 per cent., and the average daily attendance of those enrolled was 46,625, or 65 per cent. In West Virginia there are 228,185 children of the school age, of whom the last report showed 166,272 enrolled, or 73 per cent., and the average daily attendance 102,012, or 61 per cent. It will thus be seen that the proportion of all children in West Virginia who attend a public school at some time

during the year already slightly exceeds the proportion in Vermont, while the ratio of average attendance is nearly as large in the Southern as in the Northern State. The school year is still decidedly longer in Vermont, the average number of days being 136, against 100 in West Virginia; but the latter State is steadily lengthening the school year, and the last report of the School Superintendent advocates as entirely feasible a legal provision that the minimum term shall be fixed at six months, whereas in Vermont, the Superintendent states, "the session in many districts is limited to twenty weeks." The absurdity of the Blair bill is fully perceived only when one makes such a comparison as this, and then reflects that that scheme proposed to tax the people of Vermont for the benefit of a State which already makes nearly as good a showing as itself, and is steadily improving its educational system.

The *Tribune* on Thursday revealed "a case of suffering and distress," as "deserving of immediate attention from charitably disposed people." It is the case of a young dry-goods salesman and his family of four children, who are in want of the necessaries of life and in danger of eviction for non-payment of rent. "The young man," it says, "is known in business and political circles, and his name is withheld out of regard for his feelings." It then adds:

"His troubles date from the last Presidential campaign. He worked zealously for Mr. Blaine's election, organized clubs, and, like many other enthusiastic Republicans, bet heavily on the result. He lost \$2,000 and this crippled him for a time. But he was getting over this all right when he lost his place, and that, together with sickness in his family, has driven him almost to desperation. A position is open for him in Philadelphia, but one of his creditors, to whom he owes \$42, threatens to put him in jail if he attempts to leave the city."

This young man is, however, by no means the only Blaineite in this city whose "troubles date from the last Presidential campaign." There are scores of them who have never been able to get their heads above water since they "worked" for Blaine and betted on his election in 1884. They were led into their troubles by the extraordinary confidence of the charlatans who had charge of the Blaine canvass in this city, and thought they had made his election sure by the arrangement between Jay Gould and Johnny O'Brien and Tammany. We think the editor of the *Tribune* is himself bound in morals to take charge of this young man and his four children, for the present at all events, for he is one of the principal authors of his woe.

Lord Hartington, as well as Chamberlain and Sir Henry James, have, it is said, promised Lord Salisbury their support in maintaining "the integrity of the Empire," and he is reported to find some comfort in this; but why, it is hard to see. As parties now stand in Parliament, no assaults on the integrity of the Empire can possibly come from anybody but the Ministry, so that the promise is really a promise to stand by the Ministry in *not* doing something—probably the oddest pledge ever offered in politics. It is as if Lord Hartington were to say: "I promise you my support and that of my colleagues in not attempting to alter the existing legislative union between

Great Britain and Ireland." A promise of this kind is, however, of no value to a Ministry. What it needs is support in what it does, and not in what it does not do. As matters stand, when it moves in any direction it will move in complete ignorance of what the Unionists will say. The course of the new Ministry towards the Irish is not yet shadowed forth. But they will probably shrink from coercion as long as possible; and get up some scheme of local government, "the autonomy of gas and sewage," as John Morley called it. The difficulty of making the Irish accept this as anything but an instalment of their claim, will probably soon begin to be seen. Either the Irish will not accept such a scheme at all, and will go to work to insure its failure if carried out, or they will accept it and then use the bodies it creates as aids in the agitation for home rule. The latter is the more probable supposition. With twenty-eight county boards in their hands, possessing considerable powers of taxation, and the right to meet and debate, the National Leaguers would be more powerful than ever. To silence them, the boards would have to be suppressed or the members put in jail. But then, suppression and imprisonment are temporary processes. They would soon have to come to an end, and then the old work of "pacifying Ireland" would have to begin over again.

Judging from an abstract of the speech from the throne with which King Milan of Servia on July 19 opened the newly elected Skupshchina, he has learned little wisdom from his disgraceful defeat in the late conflict with Bulgaria. He not only declares that in taking up arms he merely accepted, in accordance with the national desire, the state of open hostility created by the Bulgarian Government, but expresses his determination further to obey the popular will by jealously watching the equilibrium of the Balkan States, and protesting against any one-sided infringement of it. If this means anything, it means that in case either Bulgaria or Montenegro should attempt a further extension of her boundaries, or the former proclaim her perfect independence of Turkish dominion, he would again be ready to plunge his people into a fratricidal war and a deeper abyss of misery and public debt. That he meditates no such rashness in case Austria-Hungary proclaims the final annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is clear, for on the protection of that powerful neighbor he relies for his dynastic safety against the machinations of the partisans of the exiled house of the Karageorgevitches, the revolutionary leanings of a large portion of his subjects, and the secret hostility of Russia. The foolish utterance we cite is, in fact, a new bid for the good will of the Austro-Hungarian Government, which, unfortunately for Milan, is now very anxious to show itself friendly to Alexander of Bulgaria, since he has made himself so obnoxious to the Czar of Russia.

The result of the Congressional elections in Mexico, announced as showing a large majority for the Administration, was to have been expected under the present political conditions of that country. Whether so designed or not,

the electoral machinery of Mexico is admirably adapted to the work of suppressing rather than expressing the will of the people. All voting is indirect. The votes of the people simply elect electors, who then fill the offices with persons agreeable to themselves; successful candidates before these electoral boards never having been mentioned, often, at the time of general voting. Thus the public voting in the last election took place on the last Sunday in June; but, at that time, no candidates for Congress were mentioned. When the boards of electors, then chosen, proceeded to the choice of Congressmen two weeks later, it must have happened in many cases that representatives were chosen for districts where they were practically unknown. All the advantage of a personal canvass, with the possibility of direct and intelligent voting, is in this way destroyed. It is obvious, too, that the work of the political manipulator is made far easier in the case of such an intermediary electoral body than when he has to deal with the voters of the country as a whole.

All the traditional methods of a political contest in Mexico are also such as to make the overthrow of a Government in a peaceful manner exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Public political discussion is unknown. Attacks, however guarded and impersonal, on the policy of the Administration, can be made only under danger of arrest for disturbing the public peace. Revolution used to be the remedy most resorted to. That being now out of the question, with the aid furnished the Federal authorities by a large standing army, by telegraphic communication, and by railroads facilitating the rapid massing of troops at distant points, the only resource left to the Opposition is intrigue. It should be added, as giving another reason for the triumph of the Administration, that for the past year the most stringent measures have been adopted for the suppression of all public agitation against the policy of the Government. Obsolete laws of doubtful constitutionality, impairing the liberty of the press, have been revived and enforced to the letter. The right of public assembly has been practically denied. Since the 6th of July of last year no less than forty-four editors and students have been imprisoned in the City of Mexico alone, charged with no other offence than that of publicly dissenting from the policy of the Administration. A rigid censorship is maintained over the press, extending not merely to editorial comments, but also to matters of news. For example, the capital was flooded, a few days ago, with copies of the pronunciamiento of Gen. Negrete. It was a harmless document, as Negrete is known to be a man of chronic grievances, feeling that his country has not been duly grateful to him for the part he bore in the famous fifth of May battle of Puebla. But the *Diario Oficial* promptly came out with the warning that any paper so much as publishing the pronunciamiento would be prosecuted. We shall have to wait until the assembling of Congress in September to see how much is left of the small but determined Opposition, which for two years past has, with so great popular approval, assailed the favorite measures of President Diaz.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, TO TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE President on Thursday transmitted to the Senate, in compliance with a resolution offered by Senator Ingalls, statements from the heads of the executive departments relating to the changes in the classified service during certain periods. Summarized they make the following showing: The number of clerks now embraced within the provisions of the Civil Service Act removed from July 16, 1883, to March 4, 1885—Department of State none, Treasury Department 20, Department of the Interior 23, Department of Justice none, Post-office Department 6, War Department 29, Navy Department 1. Number of appointments during the same period (not including those excepted from examination by rule 19, Civil Service Rules): State 4, Treasury 159, Interior 204, Justice 5, Post-office 41, War 82, Navy 10.

President Cleveland on Friday vetoed the bill providing for a bridge across Lake Champlain between the towns of North Hero and Alburg, Vt., because there is a law already in existence providing for this bridge; and the bill for the erection of a public building at Springfield, Mo., saying: "No Federal courts are held at this place, and apparently the only quarters which the Government should provide are such as are necessary for the accommodation of the post-office and land-office situated there. The Postmaster reports that six employees are engaged in his office. The rooms used as a post-office are now furnished the Government free of expense, and the rent paid for the quarters occupied as a land-office amounts to \$300 annually."

President Cleveland on Monday signed the Oleomargarine Bill, and accompanied it with a long letter in which he said: "This, upon its face and in its main features, is a revenue bill, and was first introduced in the House of Representatives, where the Constitution declares that all bills for raising revenue shall originate. The Constitution has invested Congress with a very wide legislative discretion, both as to the necessity of taxation and the selection of the objects of its burdens. And though, if the question was presented to me as an original proposition, I might doubt the present need of increased taxation, I deem it my duty in this instance to defer to the judgment of the legislative branch of the Government, which has been so emphatically announced in both houses of Congress upon the passage of this bill." He also specially points out that he does not view the bill as class or protective legislation, but as incidentally a defence to the consumer against the sale of imitation for genuine butter.

The President sent the following nominations to the Senate on Wednesday: Alvey A. Ade of the District of Columbia, now Third Assistant Secretary of State, to be Second Assistant Secretary of State, vice William Hunter, deceased; John B. Moore of Delaware to be Third Assistant Secretary of State; E. Spencer Pratt of Alabama to be Minister Resident and Consul General of the United States to Persia. On Thursday he nominated George A. Jenks of Pennsylvania to be Solicitor-General, to succeed Mr. Goode. Mr. Jenks was recently Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The nomination is highly commended.

The Senate on Wednesday passed the Fortifications Bill. As the bill came from the House it appropriated \$620,000, although the estimates of the Department were about \$3,000,000. The amount added in the Senate was \$6,010,000, so that it now appropriates \$6,630,000.

At the close of the debate on the Morrison Surplus Resolution on Friday it was passed by the Senate—yeas 42, nays 20—as follows (Democrats in italics): Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Blair, *Brown, Call, Camden,* Cameron,

Chase, Conger, Cullom, Dawes, Dolph, Edmunds, Everts, Frye, *Gibson, Gorman, Gray,* Hale, *Hampton,* Harrison, Hawley, Hoar, Jones of Nevada, *Kenna, McMillan, McPherson,* Mahone, Miller, Palmer, *Payne, Platt, Pugh,* Riddleberger, Sabin, Sawyer, Sewell, Sherman, Spooner, Van Wyck, *Walthal* and *Wilson* of Maryland—42. Nays—Messrs. *Beck, Berry, Blackburn, Butler, Cockrell, Coke, Eustis, Harris,* Ingalls, Jones of Arkansas, *Maxey,* Mitchell of Oregon, Plumb, Stanford, Teller, *Vance, Vest, Voorhees, Whithorne,* and Wilson of Iowa—20.

The joint resolution as passed is as follows: "Resolved, That whenever the surplus or balance in the Treasury, including the amount held for redemption of United States notes, shall exceed the sum of \$100,000,000, it shall be and is hereby made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to apply such excess, in sums not less than \$10,000,000 per month, during the existence of any such surplus or excess, to the payment of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States payable at the option of the Government. The surplus or balance herein referred to shall be the available surplus, ascertained according to the form of statement of the United States Treasurer, of the assets and liabilities of the Treasury of the United States employed on June 30, 1886; provided that no call shall be made under the provisions of this resolution until a sum equal to the call is in the Treasury over and above the reserve herein mentioned, and provided, further, that the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion may have in the Treasury, over and above the foregoing sums, a working balance not exceeding \$20,000,000; and whenever in the case of any extraordinary emergency, and when, because thereof, in the opinion of the President, the public interests shall require it, he may, by written order, direct the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend further call for the payment of such indebtedness for such period of time as shall be necessary to maintain the public credit unimpaired; and that such suspension and the reasons therefor shall be reported to Congress within ten days after its next meeting, or immediately, if Congress shall be in session." The resolution as it passed the Senate also contained a provision for the redemption of trade dollars at their face value, which was, however, struck out in conference with the House Committee, who have agreed to the other Senate amendments.

The House on Friday resumed consideration of the vetoed pension bills, the first being that one granting \$50 a month to the widow of Gen. David R. Hunter. In advocating the passage of the bill over the President's veto, Mr. Butterworth (Rep., O.) cited the various precedents where the widows of general officers were granted \$50 a month, and he protested against the House making fish of one and flesh of another. The trouble in this case, he thought, was that Gen. Hunter had presided at the Fitz John Porter court-martial. If it were not for that, the President would have signed the bill. The House refused to pass the bill over the veto—yeas 111, nays 108—not the constitutional two-thirds in the affirmative. Others of the vetoed bills were put over till next session. The House on that day rejected the Senate Inter-State Commerce Bill offered as a substitute, and the bill brought forward by Mr. Baker of New York, and passed the House bill by a vote of 133 to 104.

On Saturday the House, by a vote of 102 yeas to 135 nays, refused to agree to the conference report upon the River and Harbor Bill. This is the final defeat of the bill unless the Senate shall recede from its amendments by which the Hennepin and Michigan Canals were put in the bill.

The House on Saturday passed, 209 to 6, the Alien Landlord Bill. On Monday the House concurred in the Senate amendments to the Naval Establishment Bill. It now goes to the President.

Congress on Monday, and Tuesday rapidly hastened business with a view to adjournment at four p. m. on August 4. The House passed the Senate bill increasing the pension of soldiers who have lost an arm or leg in the service. The conference committees reached agreement on the Deficiency Bill (appropriating \$6,850,000) and the Sundry Civil Bill. They disagreed, however, on the Northern Pacific Forfeiture and Timber Culture Bills, and they were abandoned. An incident of Tuesday was a partisan harangue by Senator Hoar, which called forth vigorous replies from Southern Senators.

Gov. Ireland of Texas received on Friday a report from the American Consul at Piedras Negras, Mexico, of the unlawful arrest at Eagle Pass, Texas, of Francisco Arresures, on a trumped-up charge of horse-stealing, his immediate delivery to the Mexican authorities, and his summary execution by them. The Consul says: "A protest against being delivered to the Mexican officers was strongly made by Arresures, who insisted that he should be killed by Mondragon (Captain of the State Rangers in Coahuila), his personal enemy. He appealed to me for protection on the morning of July 27, and I at once demanded his return to Texas on the ground of his being kidnapped, and also had Sheriff Oglesby to demand the prisoner's return on the same ground. Both demands were refused by Mondragon. At one o'clock at night Arresures was taken from jail and brutally murdered by three of Mondragon's troops. In 1873 Arresures made declaration of citizenship in Maverick County. He lived with his family in Eagle Pass at the time of his arrest." Gov. Ireland immediately wrote to Secretary Bayard, saying: "While no possible excuse can be given for the part taken by the Texas officers in the illegal arrest and delivery to the Mexican authorities, still nothing in palliation of the foul murder has or can be offered by the Mexican authorities. The persons, whoever they are, who were engaged in the illegal arrest will be prosecuted, and I demand in the name of the State and its people that this wrong by Mexico be atoned for and punished. If this State and her people must depend upon themselves for protection, the necessary redress can and will be obtained."

Secretary Bayard, on Monday, sent to Congress the Department correspondence in the Cutting case. The Secretary says that he made a demand for the release of Cutting, and was answered that Cutting was being tried for a violation of a Mexican Federal statute, which provides for the punishment of a foreigner who, in a foreign country, commits an offence against a Mexican citizen. To this Mr. Bayard replied that our Government could not tolerate the application of such a law to American citizens, and renewed his demand for Cutting's release, which has not been complied with. The charge against Cutting is that he published in Texas a libel upon a Mexican citizen living in Mexico. In calling the attention of Congress to the Cutting case and the Mexican Government's failure to release him on demand, the President says he has exhausted his powers, and the case now rests with Congress. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs have drafted resolutions approving the action of the Administration in this case, and asking it to renew its demands for Cutting's release.

A statement prepared at the Post-office Department shows that the total number of officers and employees of all grades of the Department on June 30, 1886, was 577. Of this number eighty-nine have either resigned or been removed, and their places filled by appointment since March 4, 1885.

Prohibition tickets were nominated on Wednesday in Wisconsin and Michigan. Gen. Gordon was nominated for Governor by acclamation in the Georgia Democratic Convention on Wednesday. For the other offices the incumbents were renominated. A resolution endorsing the administration of President Cleveland was adopted.