CONGRESS.

The Apportionment Bill Amended in the Senate.

OUR GREAT GEYSER LAND.

An Immense National Park on the Yellowstone River.

Continued Debate on the Amnesty Bill.

THE PUBLIC LANDS FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The Legislative, Executive and Judicial Appropriation Bill On Its Passage.

CHANGES IN THE MINING LAW.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23, 1872.

Mr. SCHURZ, (rep.) of Mo., presented several petitions for the repeal of the duty on coal, salt and pig iron.

Mr. SUMNER, (rep.) of Mass., presented several petitions for the passage of his Supplementary Civil Rights bill.

BRITISH GOLD!

Mr. TRUMBULL, (rep.) of Ill., presented petitions of citizens of Illinois, Michigan, Iowa and Wisconsin for the reduction of the tariff to a revenue basis, and particularly for the repeal of the duties on coal, salt and pig iron, and commended them to the attention of Mr. Morrill (Vt.), who, he said, appeared to be alarmed at the number of petitions for this object.

Mr. MORRILL (rep.) of Vt., said he had the utmost respect for spontaneous petitions, but none at all for petitions like those which showed by the uniformity of their language and of their yellow covers that they all emanated from the British Free Trade League in New York. (Laughter.)

THE TRUE CHEVALIER.

Mr. JOHNSTON, (dem.) of Va., called attention to the fact that the petition of Mrs. Robert E. Lee asserting her right to the Arlington estate, presented by him yesterday, was reported in the papers to have been reported by his colleague, Mr. Lewis.

THE APPORTIONMENT BILL.

Mr. TRUMBULL reported the Apportionment bill, with the amendments and accompanying tables, and said he hoped the Senate would consider and pass the bill as soon as possible, in order that the Legislatures of the States might have an early opportunity to act upon it.

The following is the House Apportionment bill, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee:—

An act for the apportionment of Representatives to Congress among the several States, according to the ninth census. That from and after the 3d day of March, 1873, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 243 members, to be apportioned among the several States in accordance with the provisions of this act; that is to say:—

Maine	4	Kentucky	9
New Hampshire	2	Tennessee	9
Vermont	2	Indiana	11
Massachusetts	9	Illinois	16
Rhode Island	1	Missouri	11
Connecticut	3	Arkansas	3
New York	28	Michigan	8
New Jersey	6	Florida	1
Pennsylvania	22	Texas	7
Delaware	1	Iowa	8
Maryland	5	Wisconsin	8
Virginia	9	California	4
North Carolina	7	Minnesota	2
South Carolina	4	Oregon	1
Georgia	8	Kansas	3
Alabama	6	West Virginia	3
Mississippi	5	Nevada	1
Louisiana	5	Nebraska	1
Ohio	17		

Provided that, if after such apportionment shall have been made any new State shall be admitted into the Union, the Representative or Representatives of such new State shall be added to the number of 243 therein limited.

SEC. 2.—That in each State entitled under this law to more than one Representative the number to which said States may be entitled in the Forty-third and each subsequent Congress shall be elected by districts composed of contiguous territory, and containing, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of inhabitants, and equal in number to the number of Representatives to which said States may be entitled in Congress, no one district electing more than one Representative; provided, that in the election of Representatives to the Forty-third Congress in any State which by this law is given an increased number of Representatives the additional Representative or Representatives allowed to such State may be elected by the State at large, and the other Representatives to which the State is entitled by the districts as now prescribed by law in said State, unless the Legislature of said State shall otherwise provide before the time fixed by law for the election of Representatives therein.

SEC. 3.—That the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in the year 1872, is hereby fixed and established as the day in each of the States and Territories of the United States for the election of representatives and delegates to the Forty-third Congress, and the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in every second year thereafter is hereby fixed and established as the day for the election in each of said States and Territories of Representatives and delegates to the Congress commencing on the 4th day of March next thereafter; provided, that in any State in which by law the polls are held open more than one day for the election of State officers, the polls for the election of Members of Congress in such State, in A. D. 1872, shall be held the same length of time, beginning on the day above specified in this section.

SEC. 4.—That if upon trial there shall be a failure to elect a Representative or Delegate in Congress in any State, district or Territory upon the day hereby fixed and established for such election, or if after such election a vacancy shall occur in any such State, district or Territory from death, resignation or otherwise, an election shall be held to fill any vacancy caused by such failure, resignation death or otherwise, at such time as is or may be provided by law for filling vacancies in the State or Territory in which the same may occur.

SEC. 5.—That no State shall be hereafter admitted to the Union without having the necessary population to entitle it to at least one Representative according to the ratio of representation fixed by this bill. Should any State, after the passage of this act, deny or abridge the right of any of the male inhabitants of such State—being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States—to vote at any election named in the constitution (article 14, section 1), except for participation in the rebellion or other crime, the number of Representatives apportioned in this act to such State shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

HOUSE BILLS REPORTED.

House bills were reported as follows:—

By Mr. CAMERON, (rep.) of Pa., from the Committee on Foreign Relations, authorizing the survey of the Northwestern boundary between the United States and British America; and the bill to raise the salary of the United States Consul at Tien-tsin.

By Mr. SPENCER, (rep.) of Ala., from the Committee on Commerce, amending the act protecting guano discoveries.

By Mr. OSBORN, (rep.) of Fla., from the Committee on Public Lands, creating additional land districts in Florida.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced and referred as follows:—

By Mr. POMEROY, (rep.) of Kansas—For the sale of coal lands.

By Mr. BLAIR, (dem.) of Mo.—Amendatory of the act granting aid to the Iron Mountain Railroad.

By Mr. FENTON, (rep.) of N. Y.—Authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of War to sell or lease swamp lands on the Niagara River and Lake Erie.

THE AMERICAN GEYSER LAND.

Mr. POMEROY, from the Committee on Public Lands, reported the bill setting apart certain lands near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a public park. This valley, he said, was about forty by forty-four miles in extent, full of natural curiosities, but without any good agricultural lands, and he thought it important to pass the bill before private parties should go in and establish claims, as they had done in the Yosemite Valley.

Mr. JOHN SHERMAN, (rep.) of Ohio, from the Committee on Finance, reported a bill to allow the importation, free of duty, of certain machinery designed for experiments in mining in Louisiana, which was passed.

The expiration of the morning hour brought up as unfinished business

THE AMNESTY BILL.

It was laid aside to take up the bill for the relief of the Chicago sufferers.

Mr. CHANDLER, (rep.) of Mich., proposed an amendment, extending the provisions of the bill to certain towns in Michigan, which are threatening to go into decay.

Mr. MORTON, (rep.) of Ind., called for the regular order, the Amnesty bill, and addressed the Senate upon it. He declared himself opposed to universal suffrage, and characterized the arguments in favor of it as based upon sickly sentimentalism and spurious generosity. He thought there was a good deal of misapprehension throughout the country in regard to the disabilities now resting upon those who engaged in the rebellion. It was, perhaps, not generally known that Jefferson Davis and all his followers had as much right to vote as any man who served in the Union Army. He reviewed the history of the fourteenth amendment, and argued that the provision in it authorizing Congress to remove disabilities by a two-third vote was not designed to authorize the removal of disabilities from classes, but only from individuals. It seemed, therefore, to be straining the fourteenth amendment to pass the Amnesty bill as it came from the House. He was willing, however, to vote for that bill, but he never would vote for it with the exceptions stricken out. The disability proposed by that amendment upon the Southern leaders was the last remaining legal mark of disapprobation of the rebellion, and he could never consent to its removal, because to do so would be to acknowledge that the rebellion was not wrong; that it was merely a difference of opinion, and that the leaders of the rebellion have

THE SAME RIGHT AS LOYAL MEN

to hold the highest offices of the government. The question of amnesty had generally been argued heretofore on the grounds of expediency and experience, but he wished to consider it upon a higher plan. He thought there was a great principle involved; a principle of consistency of duty to the government, and especially a principle of the greatest importance to posterity. It was argued that amnesty would conciliate the people of the South; but he believed that the leaders could no more be conciliated in that way than rattlesnakes could be conciliated by restoring their extracted fangs. They would die as they had lived—rebels. Whatever dignity history might give to their characters must depend upon their consistency in maintaining that attitude; therefore they could not be conciliated by this measure, and if it would conciliate the masses of the Southern people it would be by their taking it as an admission that they were always in the right and that the people of the North were in the wrong. If universal amnesty were to be granted now it would be impossible to convince the next generation that there was anything wrong in the rebellion, and the republican party could not concede the guilelessness of the rebellion without falsifying its whole record and disgracing itself before the world. The consequences of the rebellion were far greater than the consequences of all the other crimes committed in the United States up to this time. If a man took a single life or stole a $10 bill, he would be executed on the scaffold or sent to the Penitentiary. Yet it was proposed that here men who had brought untold calamities upon the nation should be relieved from the last mark of disapprobation that remained upon them. If anybody believed that we should never have any troubles in this country hereafter, that opinion was contradicted by the history of all nations. Disagreements, heartburnings and more serious troubles were sure to occur, and it was a dangerous thing to teach the coming generations that rebellion was no crime, and that the only penalty incurred by a rebel was the risk of losing his life while actively engaged in warring upon the government. Again, if amnesty ought to be granted to conciliate the people of the South the argument was strong for pensioning rebel soldiers, because that would be a far more conciliating measure. It would be also a legitimate consequence of the argument for amnesty. For if Davis and Breckenridge should be admitted into the sense to make laws for the nation there certainly would remain no good reason why the rebel soldiers should be excluded from the benefit of the pension laws, and he predicted that if general amnesty were granted the next step would be to pension the rebel soldiers, the next to pay rebels for their property taken by the Union armies, the next to pay them for their slaves, and the next to consolidate the rebel debt with the national debt.

Mr. A. G. THURMAN, (dem.) of Ohio, inquired how all these things could be done in the face of the fourteenth amendment?

Mr. MORTON replied that the democratic party did not recognize the validity of the amendment.

Mr. THURMAN, (dem.) if Ohio—The Senator assumes, then, that the democratic party is to get into power and to disregard the fourteenth amendment. I wish he would state how soon he expects that event to happen. (Laughter.)

Mr. MORTON—I hope that the democratic party will not get into power during this generation. I believe it would be the greatest national calamity that could happen. I believe that the best interests of this nation and of civilization upon this Continent are involved in the continued supremacy of the republican party for many years. But great calamities have happened. Great plagues have come upon the world, earthquakes have swallowed up cities, Chicago has been burned, and it is among the possibilities that the democratic party may come into power. (laughter)—and I say that the democratic party does not acknowledge the validity of the fourteenth amendment. Mr. Vallandigham attempted last summer to bring his party up to the acknowledgment of the fourteenth amendment, but he has passed away, and the "new departure" which he inaugurated was buried with him in the same grave. In conclusion, Mr. Morton said he would vote for Sumner's amendment, "The Supplementary Civil Rights bill." He agreed with Mr. Sumner in putting

JUSTICE BEFORE GENEROSITY

or spurious magnanimity. What might be mercy to the individuals amnestied would, in his opinion, be cruelty to future generations; and, while he was willing to vote for a general amnesty, he believed universal amnesty would be inhuman and immoral, because it would be an admission of the innocency of a rebellion whose consequences will linger in the country for centuries.

Mr. THURMAN said he was at a loss to comprehend the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton); that Senator asserts that universal amnesty would be inhuman and immoral, and he was prepared to vote for this bill of universal amnesty provided Mr. Sumner's amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MORTON explained that what he had denounced was universal amnesty. He would vote for this House bill, because it made exceptions of persons who might be regarded as among the authors of the rebellion.

Mr. THURMAN said that if this House bill was so satisfactory to the Senator, he was at a loss to account for his denunciation of universal amnesty on this occasion, as no one had proposed to amend this bill so as to make it apply universally. He thought there was only one way to account for it. The Senator from Indiana had seized this opportunity to make a speech which would strike the key note of the coming campaign. That function had so often devolved upon him or been resumed by him that it had passed into the common law of the radical party that he should do this at the beginning of every campaign, and the only regret he (Mr. Thurman) had on the subject was that in all the years during which the Senator had been studying that music he had not discovered a new tone or even a single new note. (Laughter.) It was the same old story about the wickedness of the rebellion and of the democratic party, and the same old array of terrible results which would follow if the democrats should get into power, and which were to be found nowhere else but in that Senator's imagination.

Mr. BLAIR suggested that it was not the same note that Mr. Morton struck in 1868, when he made a speech in favor of President Johnson.

Mr. THURMAN—I leave that to be settled between the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blair) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton). The Senator from Indiana makes the same old charges against the democratic party—dangers which he believes, of course, or he would not make them, but which I venture to say that no human being in his senses and intelligent enough to form an opinion does believe or can believe for one single instant. Payment of the rebel debt! How is it to be paid in the face of the fourteenth amendment, which prohibits even a State from making any payment of it. Payment of pensions to rebel soldiers is also positively prohibited by the fourteenth amendment. The payment of the national debt is guaranteed by the Constitution. The re-institution of slavery is positively prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, and yet a leading Senator, one who is looked upon, perhaps, as the leader of his party next year, and the particular mouthpiece of the administration, has the boldness to hold up those preposterous statements to frighten the American people out of their propriety. Sir, it may do very well on the stump in the swamps of Indiana—(laughter)—but it is not too much to say that to men who are accustomed to reflect the apprehensions which the Senator expresses are preposterous and ridiculous. Now, I find great difficulty in understanding this administration. The President, in his annual message, recommends an amnesty, and here is the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Morton), one of his chief supporters, denouncing it. The President recommends civil service reform, and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Carpenter) pours out upon it the vials of his wrath and his ridicule. I can hardly understand it. But if I were a suspicious man I would say that this is the old trick of throwing a tub to the whale. I would suspect that when the President says, "Let us have civil service reform," there is a mental reservation that it shall be killed in Congress; and that when he says, "Let us have amnesty," there is a mental reservation that the radicals in the Senate

SHALL KILL AMNESTY.

I do not charge any such hypocrisy upon the President; but it does look wonderfully strange that every important recommendation made by the President is ignored by his friends in this Chamber. Mr. Thurman, in conclusion, argued the question of rights of States under the constitution.

Mr. MORTON, in reply, said that Mr. Thurman had just made an old speech about the dangers of centralization, which, also, had been often heard in the swamps of Indiana. It was the same old democratic State rights speech. The Senator had just said he could not understand this administration. That was true: the whole democratic party were unable to understand this administration—(laughter)—or the times in which they lived. They were like a man riding in a car backwards, who never sees anything until he is clear past it. (Laughter.) As to the dangers that would result from their coming into power, he would ask when the democrats were not committed to pay for the rebels' slaves? To show that they were he sent Mr. Blair's Broadhead letter to the desk to be read, and said it was because of the sentiments expressed in that letter that Mr. Blair was given the second place on the democratic Presidential ticket.

Mr. BLAIR—If you had not backed out of your speech in 1868, in favor of President Johnson, you might have got my place. (Laughter.)

Mr. MORTON thought Mr. Blair must be ignorant of what he had really said in that speech. He had expressly declared that he was in favor of universal suffrage, but had favored a period of probation for the colored people of ten or fifteen years. The Southern whites, however, following the lead of the democracy, had made it necessary to enfranchise the colored element at once, in order to get a loyal basis on which to reconstruct the State governments. The Senator from Missouri (Mr. Blair) had once been a member of the republican party and had left it.

Mr. BLAIR—I left it because of its usurpations. I joined it when the whole party could have

SAT DOWN AT A DINNER TABLE,

and I left it when it was in power all over this country to join a party that was out of power. As to the Senator's speech, I remember that when he delivered it he was thought to be a very fit person for Mr. Johnson's Cabinet. And if the people of the South were misled by any person it was by the Senator himself in that speech.

Mr. MORTON—The Senator attributes more importance to that speech than I ever did. As to my being thought a fit person for Mr. Johnson's Cabinet, I know nothing about it. But I can say this much—that there never was an office in the gift of Mr. Johnson that I would have accepted; I say this without disrespect to him. I have heard it said that I sought a place in his Cabinet. That is false. There never was an hour in which I would have resigned the governorship of Indiana for any place except a seat in the United States Senate. Mr. Morton said, further, that this was the most important question before Congress—far more important than civil service reform or the tariff revision.

Mr. SCOTT, (rep.) of Pa., followed with an argument in favor of the Amnesty bill as it came from the House, but said he was not prepared to vote for universal amnesty.

Mr. ROBERTSON, (rep.) of S. C., gave notice that he would endeavor to press the bill to a vote to-morrow.

THE HOMESTEAD LAW AND ARMY SETTLERS.

Mr. WINDOM, (rep.) of Minn., presented a petition signed by General Sheridan and other officers, representing 300,000 soldiers of the Army of the Cumberland, praying that the time they served in the army may be allowed in the five years required by the Homestead law after two years actual residence.

At four o'clock the Senate went into executive session and soon after adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23, 1872.

Mr. HALSEY, (rep.) of N. J., presented the petition of the tobacco manufacturers of New Jersey for a uniform tax of sixteen cents a pound on all manufactured tobacco.

Mr. KELLOGG, (rep.) of Conn., presented the petition of certain citizens of New Haven for repeal of the law taxing spirits.

MINING.

Mr. SARGENT, (rep.) of Cal., from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported a bill to promote the development of the mining resources of the United States, and moved that it be put upon its passage. The first section declares all valuable mineral deposits in lands belonging to the United States, both surveyed and unsurveyed, free and open to exploration, and the lands open to occupation and purchase, under regulations prescribed by law, and according to the local customs or rules of miners in the several mining districts, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the laws of the United States. The remaining thirteen sections of the bill make detailed provisions regulating the manner of making locations, contesting claims for mineral lands. The most important section seems to be the fourth, which provides that where a tunnel is run for the development of a vein or lode, or for the discovery of mines, the owners of such tunnel shall have the right of possession of all veins or lodes not previously known to exist discovered in such tunnel to the extent of 500 feet on each side of the same.

An amendment was reported and concurred in that the bill should not in any way impair or affect the rights granted to the proprietors of the Sutro Tunnel.

Mr. MAYNARD, (rep.) of Tenn., remarked that this was a very important piece of legislation, changing the mining laws of the country. The bill had been printed only a week, and therefore there had been no time to send it into the mining districts of the country and elicit public opinion about it. He therefore asked for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SARGENT said he would explain it. It did not make any material change in the mining laws; it did not change in the slightest degree the policy of the government in the disposition of mining lands, nor did it increase the quantity of land which a miner might acquire. It did not increase nor decrease the price to be paid to the government for the land, but its main purpose was to facilitate the acquisition of title. He explained that although the bill had been only recently printed at this session, a similar one had been introduced by himself in the last Congress and printed; that like it had actually passed the Senate but had not been acted on in the House. The bill only oiled somewhat the existing machinery of the mining laws.

After a further explanation the bill was passed without a division.

PUBLIC LANDS FOR EDUCATION.

Mr. PIERCE, (rep.) of Miss., from the Committee on Education and Labor, reported a bill to establish an educational fund and to apply the proceeds of the public lands to the education of the people, and asked that it be put upon its passage. The bill sets apart and consecrates forever the proceeds of the public lands for the education of the people. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to invest one-half of the annual net proceeds of the public lands in United States bonds, and requires the other half and the income from that invested to be distributed to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, upon the basis of population, and after certain conditions as to the schoolhouses, &c., are complied with fifty per cent of the amount thus apportioned may be applied the first year to the instruction of teachers of common schools, and ten per cent after the first year. Afterwards the whole amount is to be applied to the payment of teachers.

The morning hour expired and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE APPROPRIATION BILL,

Mr. WHEELER, (rep.) of N. Y., in the chair.

Mr. GARFIELD, (rep.) of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, remarked that revenue and their expenditure might be almost said to be the whole scope of the government of modern nations. The amount to be taken from the people for revenue and the disposition of the amount thus taken seemed to be almost the whole of the subject. It was the motive power of the government. The expenditure of revenue was the grand level by which all heights and depths were to be calculated. It formed the best test of the healthiness, the wisdom, the virtue of the government. The late events in France afforded an illustration of that fact. When the French people realized the extravagance and corruption of the imperial government by the figures showing the amount of its expenditures, that government went down. He had been considering recently the question of when the financial effect of a war usually expended itself. There was almost a law governing that matter. In looking over the statistics of England he had discovered the curious fact that at the close of every war the expenditures immediately and naturally leaped up enormously to a higher level, and, the war ending, the expenditures graded down rapidly and at last struck a level below which they did not go. That level was

ALWAYS A GOOD DEAL HIGHER

than the level from which the country had started when the war began. Not only so, but the level was higher than it would have been at that time but for the war. The nation had accustomed itself to a wider range of expenditure and was never able to get down to the point where the ordinary increase would have carried it. But what had struck him as most remarkable was the length of time it took after the war for a nation to get down as far as it would go in the reduction of expenditures. It appeared to be the law in the United States that the length of time was about equal to double the time of time that the war lasted. It has taken England twenty years after the Napoleonic wars to reach her new peace level of expenditure. She had commenced in 1793 with an annual expenditure of about £20,000,000, and reached her lowest peace level in 1835 at £45,500,000. He calculated that the United States would reach its lowest peace level in 1876, when he thought that the ordinary expenditures of the government would be about $125,000,000, and the interest on the public debt $85,000,000. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury had placed the expenditures of the last fiscal year at $277,000,000; but there were several items in that not justly chargeable to expenditure. For instance, there was about $9,000,000 charged to premium on bonds purchased for the government, being offset on the credit side by about an equal amount received as premium on gold in the same transactions. The difference in the figures was the only thing that should have been charged. So, too, with drawbacks on imports, which were not really expenditures and should not figure as such. The amount of these and other items improperly placed among expenditures was $14,853,000. He had divided the expenditure into three great heads and found the proportions thus—amount referable to the late war, exclusive of interest on the public debt, sixty and a half per cent; the present army and navy establishment, fourteen per cent, and all other departments of the government, twenty-five and a half per cent. The same heads in the expenditures of the English government were thirty-eight and a half, thirty-three and twenty-eight and a half per cent. Coming down to the bill itself, he said that it appropriated $2,336,000 less than the like bill last year and $8,000,000 less than asked for in the estimates.

Mr. BECK, (dem.) of Ky., remarked that he served on the Appropriation Committee two years, and that it was the stingiest committee he ever knew. It had to come back with a deficiency bill, and he predicted that the present committee would have to do the same after the Presidential election. (Laughter.)

Mr. WOOD, (dem.) of N. Y., criticised while he professed to admire the beautiful generalities of Mr. Garfield's speech. He instanced the item of stationery for the Executive Department, which, in the bill of June, 1869, under Mr. Buchanan's administration, was only $750, and which in this bill was $4,500. That item showed about the relative increase in all the expenditures of the government since the republican party came into power. He thought that Mr. Garfield should have given a portion of his time to the study and explanation of the lamentable and extraordinary fact stated in the civil service report that the cost of collecting the taxes amounted to one-fourth of the revenue. He thought that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should have proposed some means by which Congress would curtail those enormous expenditures and restrict them within their legitimate boundaries.

Mr. HALE, (rep.) of Me., defended the administration from the aspersions of Mr. Wood. He thought the charge of extravagance in general terms he should have particularized more than the one item to which had referred. President Buchanan, to whom Mr. Wood had alluded in contrast with the present administration, had increased the debt of the government $28,000,000 in a time of profound peace. He held that the difference between the expenditures of President Buchanan's administration and that of the present administration was not proportionately greater than that which every man would recognize between the cost of his household or his business establishment in the two periods. As to the statement quoted by Mr. Wood from the civil service report, no one would claim that it was borne out by the facts and figures. On the contrary, the cost of collection was not more than five or six per cent of the aggregate revenue.

Mr. MAYNARD suggested that the expense of collecting the revenue was only four per cent.

Mr. HALE explained that what the Civil Service Commissioners meant to convey in the remark quoted was not that one-fourth of the revenue was stolen, but that, owing to the system, one-fourth of what ought to be received by the government was lost, and that was owing to the spoils, a system handed down from democratic days. All these appeals to economy amounted to nothing less than a repudiation of the public debt and the stoppage of pensions.

Mr. RANDALL, (dem.) of Pa., said there had been taken from Kansas, last year, about $500,000,000, and he wanted to know what had become of that money.

Mr. KELLEY, (rep.) Pa., asked his colleague where he had found that out.

Mr. RANDALL said he had seen it currently stated, but he had just now been informed that the amount was $400,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY—The real amount was $383,000,000.

Mr. WOOD remarked that the cost of collecting customs ten years ago, under the democratic party, was $3,000,000 a year. Now it was $9,000,000. Then there were no such outrageous expositions of wrong and fraud and plundering as it now being brought to light by the investigation in New York.

Mr. KELLOGG, of Conn., inquired what had become of the Collector of the port of New York and of the Postmaster of New York during the last part of Mr. Buchanan's administration?

Mr. WOOD replied that nothing wrong had become of them to his knowledge. Mr. Augustus Schell was the Collector under Mr. Buchanan, and a more honorable and upright citizen did not live in the United States. Mr. Herman Redfield, another esteemed citizen, was also Collector of that port, and under that administration there had been no such wrong-doing, no such scandalous investigation, as was now taking place.

Mr. KELLOGG remarked that at that time the amount of customs duties collected was less than $100,000,000, and it then cost $3,000,000 to collect, whereas the amount collected last year was $206,000,000.

Mr. WOOD remarked that it should cost very little more to collect $200,000,000 than it costs to collect $100,000,000, because the machinery of collection was all the same.

The Senate's debate closed, and the Clerk proceeded to read the bill by clauses for amendment.

After progressing through thirteen pages of the bill, which contains fifty-six pages, the committee rose.

MEXICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of N. Y., introduced a bill to authorize a mail steamship service between the United States and Mexico. Referred.

The Senate amendments to the bill authorizing the importation of machinery were non-concurred in, and a Committee of Conference ordered.

Mr. DAWES mentioned privately that the plate glass machinery had been already imported, and the duty paid on it.

The House then, at four o'clock, adjourned.

THE TOBACCO TAX.

Tobacco Dealers Before the Ways and Means Committee—Increased Facilities of the Bonded Warehouse System and a Uniform Tax of Sixteen Cents Advocated.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23, 1872.

The Committee on Ways and Means to-day continued the hearing of the tobacco dealers, twenty-five or thirty of whom were present. Mr. J. H. Pleasants, of Baltimore, representing nine-tenths of the receivers of tobacco in that city, said a uniform tax of sixteen cents was of importance and would yield as much as the present rates, with an increased manufacture and consumption. If the present system of bonded warehouses was to be continued they ought to be increased in the tobacco districts. He said that drawbacks should be paid at once on the withdrawal of tobacco for transportation without waiting for the lading certificate.

Mr. Cyrus Losser, of New York, representing the fine cut interest, said he was not here to oppose a uniform sixteen cent tax; he opposed the twenty-four cent tax; the poor man should not be required to pay this tax on his smoking tobacco.

Mr. M. E. McDowell, of Philadelphia, advocated the continuance of the bonded warehouse system. If it were extended West the dealers in that section would sell more tobacco. No one ever heard of the government having lost anything by the system.

Mr. J. J. Bagley, of Detroit, in the fine cut interest, said that after an experience of twenty-five years he had never known a man to stop using tobacco on account of its price. The consumption increases in a direct ratio with the increase of population. The men in the tobacco trade are more prosperous now than ever; people's taxes have changed, and cut tobacco was now extending all over the South, and as a consequence the plug interest has been hurt.

Mr. Isaac Eppinger, of New York, was here to represent, by request, the interests of the Pacific coast. All they wanted was the continuance of the bonded warehouse system to accommodate their trade and facilitate their exports, those to China and Japan having opened a market which is now on the increase, 160,000 pounds of tobacco having been exported thither last year.

Mr. W. M. Abbey, of Philadelphia, said those whom he represented were not only satisfied with the bonded warehouse system, but desired it to be extended to every point. There were so many guards that frauds were impossible.

Mr. E. H. Frazer, of Virginia, in behalf of the plug manufacturers, thought they ought to be placed on an equal footing with others. They wanted a uniform rate of sixteen cents, as thirty-two cents was hard to carry. The tobacco trade was almost paralyzed in Virginia owing to the uncertainty of legislation. Many hands were idle and factories closed. A reduction in the tax to sixteen cents would increase the consumption of plug tobacco. There was no reason why it should now pay twice as much as cut tobacco.

Mr. Christian Sieeper, of St. Louis, stated his objection to the bonded warehouse system, and said that the tobacco dealers ought to be placed on the same equality as other merchants. The cutters were satisfied to leave the tax as it was, because in five years they would run the plug men out of the trade. Put the plug men on the basis of justice and they would recover their trade.

Mr. G. W. Gail, of Baltimore, proceeded to show it was sound policy for the government to remove all embarrassments to the export trade.

To-morrow morning at ten o'clock the committee will hear those who have not yet expressed their views, and on the 30th inst. will hear the representatives of the leather interest.

GUSHING OIL WELLS.

The Old Story Farm—A Man Learns After Six Years' Consideration That He Has Been Defrauded—The Evidence and Court for Defendant, But the Jury will Award the Plaintiff—The Judge Indignant and Repudiates the Verdict.

ERIE, Pa., Jan. 22, 1872.

The great Story oil farm case, after over two weeks' trial in the United States Circuit Court, before Judge McKennan, was concluded to-day.

Richey & Co. conditionally bought the Story farm, on Oil Creek, in April, 1860, and were to wind up the bargain in April, 1861. Nobody knew of the existence of other than sand wells on the ground at that time; these failed rapidly. On April 1, 1861, the bargain for the land was consummated at a less figure than specified in the original agreement, Richey & Co., saying they would lose $2,000 already paid rather than pay more than $20,000 for the property. It was worth only $5,000 for farming purposes at that time. There were seven wells on the land, but none were pumping. Two months afterwards the Steiner well, the first flowing well in the oil region, flowing 500 barrels a day, was struck there, and the territory became immensely productive. Six years after Story thought he had been defrauded, and brought this suit.

The charge of Judge McKennan was direct for defendant, as was also the weight of evidence; but the jury found for plaintiff in the sum of $51,095. Judge McKennan indignantly set aside the verdict, on the ground that it was against law and evidence, and awarded a new trial. An attempt was made by the plaintiff to impeach the integrity of C. E. Taylor, of Franklin, Story's former attorney; but this signally and utterly failed.

THE FISK TRAGEDY.

The Loadon Press on the Assassination—The Spirit of Which Fisk Was the Incarnate Representative—His Life a Scandal—The Creature of Surrounding Circumstances.

The London *Times* of the 9th says:—

* * * The death of James Fisk by the hand of a man whose enmity he had gained in one of the scandalous intrigues for which he was notorious is not in itself surprising. The escape of McFarland last year, when charged with the murder of Richarison, has naturally confirmed the faith of the lawless class in New York in the morality of the *vendetta*, and Stokes, the murderer of Colonel Fisk, had probably worked himself into the belief that he had wrongs which called for vengeance. We know, indeed, that he and the woman whose cause he was supporting against the daring chief of the Erie Ring had threatened him with revelations which, in the present temper of the people, might have brought upon him the fate of his allies of Tammany Hall, and that Fisk had met the peril by obtaining an injunction from one of his judicial hirelings to prevent these revelations, and by indicting Stokes for conspiracy. But it is not on the grim ending of Fisk's career so much as on its incidents of daring conflict with the law and magnificent squandering of the fruits of victory that we are concerned to dwell. * * * Of late, however, Fisk must have felt the edifice of his autocracy—for he had completely asserted his supremacy over his colleague Gould—crumbling under his feet. The courts in which he sought refuge whenever he was threatened seemed to be no longer safe against the intrusions of justice, and it was doubtful whether the old policy of issuing fraudulent stock could be tried again with success. New York was waiting with curious expectancy to see what new move the crafty "Admiral"—so they admiringly dubbed the conqueror of "Commodore" Vanderbilt—would try. The assassin's bullet has cut short all such questionings and left us in doubt whether James Fisk was indeed at last "played out," or whether his fertile mind was not prepared with an expedient adequate for the coming crisis.

James Fisk was born in the Puritan State of Vermont, and, like all "the Green Mountain Boys"—the Scots of the Union—he had an early liking for business. But it was not in a steady, plodding way that James Fisk wanted to get on. His father was a pedler, who travelled with goods in the Valley of the Connecticut; but when the son took to the business he started an immense, gorgeously painted wagon, which alarmed the conservative instincts of the old man. The wagon, however, brought custom to its proprietor, and his enterprise soon gave him an opening in Boston, where during the war he made a fortune. But having made his money, he was impatient to multiply it or get rid of it; and a natural attraction drew him to Wall street. There it was that he met Drew and Gould, and entered upon the ambitious path which led him, through so much mire, to such an eminence of successful, vainglorious, epicurean infamy. Even in New York, in the atmosphere of Wall street itself, he might have used his undoubted abilities, his versatility of resource, his command of expedients and combinations to amass wealth by means not dishonorable. But the taint of venality that has hitherto infected all the public life of the Empire City does not permit men who make the pursuit of wealth the first object of their lives to be honest. They know they can purchase power and enjoyment and riches by bribery, and they do not hesitate to seize the chance. Until the tone of public sentiment in New York is raised to a higher level such men as James Fisk, the monstrosities of speculative money-making, will always be possible; and while they are possible, not only will the commercial capital of the Union be discredited by such an apotheosis of successful fraud as the career of the Erie chief has exhibited, but public liberty will sometimes be gravely imperilled by the concentration of power so vast in the hands of a single unscrupulous man. The pistol of the assassin only killed James Fisk; the spirit of which he was the incarnate representative is still living and strong in New York.

The London *Standard* of the same date treats the subject in this manner:—

The man may have been better than his reputation. It may be said of him that his vices were all gross and striking ones, without any alloy of meanness or pettiness. He was roughly generous and munificent within the resources of other people of which he possessed himself. He was no hypocrite, and deceived nobody as to his character. His villany and his vice were on a grand scale, and plainly set out. No one can say that he believed James Fisk, Jr., to be an honest man, and, believing that, has suffered. Oblivion—we cannot say peace—to him! He will be remembered, as we have said, for a long time, but it will not be on his own account, but for the illustration his career affords of republican simplicity and virtue. There have been men quite as vicious and quite as regardless of public opinion as James Fisk in the Old World; there are probably several such men still living in England, France and Germany; but there is no country in Europe in which a man could flaunt his profligacy and proclaim his utter contempt for the ordinary decencies of society in the way James Fisk, jr., did in New York, and in the fashionable summer resorts in which the plutocracy of the United States assemble. The sayings and doings of this man, whose character and whose antecedents were thoroughly well known, filled columns of American newspapers. His wealth had been obtained by robbery; it was spent in shameless dissipation. Yet New York rather chuckled over his excesses and followed greedily the newspaper reports of them. The journals read by the "solid men" and by the virtuous women of New York contained almost every day some notices of the proceedings of this man, whose very life in New York was a sin and a scandal. The sin was nothing very new; New York has long been notorious for its profligacy. The vigorous descriptions of some of the better or more decent phases of its dissipation, given in "Manhattan's" remarkable book, fall short of the facts. But until James Fisk, Jr., appeared upon the scene vice had not been presented to New York as a development of liberty, which some might decline to adopt for themselves, but which nobody could object to in persons outside his or her own family, and the newspapers had not made themselves the sympathetic chroniclers of the complaisances of swindlers for harlots. Whether Fisk debauched New York in this regard, or New York was ready to acclaim Fisk, are questions it is not worth while discussing. The man has gone to his last account, and those who firmly believe that he was a thief and a blackleg will regret his untimely end. For the offences for which he really was responsible he suffered no punishment. He died by the hands of a man who seems to have been one of his fellows in profligacy, and it is not improbable that his death will bear an even stronger testimony to the demoralization of New York than his life. The man who shot him was a murderer, an assassin, who, so long as a State maintains capital punishment, deserves to lose his head by the guillotine or to have his neck broken by the halter. But who can venture to believe that the murderer of Fisk will get this justice? Who will dare to say that Fisk out of the way, a great moral outburst against the man and his fellows will not arise, and that Stokes will not be regarded as a person who had rid the city and State of a nuisance, and ought, therefore, to go scot free? New York the now feels shame of its toleration of its applause of Fisk, and it will be only in the order of things and in accordance with the habits of democracy if it should consider itself absolved of its part as an accomplice in his outrages upon decency by letting his murderer go scot free.

The London *Telegraph* of the 8th expresses the following opinion:—

It would be a great pity, however, were we to bid farewell to this man Fisk, who has been shot like a dog, without indicating all that his life teaches. The occasion may be most appropriately improved without either cant or common-place. Fisk's career teaches two lessons—one to the Americans, one to Englishmen. In the Erie ring and its illustrious chief Americans may see the natural issue of a most vicious and unhealthy public sentiment. Certain States of the Union—New York being the first and chief sinner—had almost seemed to erect into a maxim of public life and a first article in trading morality the cynical advice of the old usurer to his first-born, "Make money, my son—honestly