

SUPPLEMENT.

STARTLING EXPOSITION

OF DEMOCRATIC DEMAGOGISM,

BY SENATOR WINDOW,

Chairman Senate Committee on Appropriations.

False Pretenses of the Forty-Fourth Congress.

The Vaunted Democratic "Retrenchment and Reform" a Delusion and a Fraud.

APPROPRIATIONS INCREASED
\$28,752,265.49.

Expenditures Reduced by Republicans from 1868 to 1876 an Aggregate of \$73,-104,131—Average Annual Republican Reductions, \$9,133,016.

Expenditures of 1876 Reduced by Republicans Below the Previous Year \$14,718,991.

Appropriations This Year Increased Over Last Year \$28,752,265.49.

Taxes Reduced by Republicans From 1868 to 1875, Over \$250,000,000.

Taxes Reduced by the Democratic House from 1875 to 1878, \$800,000,000.

The following is the substance of an "interview" between the Washington correspondent of the New York Times and Senator Window, of Minnesota, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, published in the Times of June 6, 1878:

Correspondent—Have you compared the aggregate appropriations made by this Congress with those of last year, and, if so, how do they compare?

Senator Window—Yes, sir; I have carefully examined all the bills since the adjournment. The total for last year was \$147,317,253.92. The total for this year is \$176,069,519.11. The increase this year is, therefore, \$28,752,265.49. These aggregates cover all the regular appropriation bills.

Correspondent—Is this increase chargeable to the extravagance of this Congress?

Senator Window—No, it is mainly chargeable to the demagogism of the Forty-fourth Congress in making pretended "savings" for political effect when they were only creating "deficiencies."

Correspondent—Is it true that no reductions in expenditures were made until after the Democratic party got control of the House of Representatives?

Senator Window—By no means. Expenditures had been on a descending scale almost ever since the war. The finance reports show that in 1868 they were \$229,915,088, and that under the administration of President Grant they were constantly reduced, until for the year ending June 30, 1876, they were only \$164,857,815, or, after making the proper deductions for that year, for payments made upon the Geneva award claims and for the Department postages which latter counted in the nominal expenditures, but really took no money from the Treasury, the expenditures for 1876 were as we have seen, only \$150,810,557. The total reduction in expenditures during Grant's administration was therefore \$73,104,131, making an annual average reduction of \$9,133,016. The reductions made by the Republicans the last year (1876) were \$14,718,991.

DEMOCRATIC PROFESSIONS AND PERFORMANCES
IRRECONCILABLE.

Correspondent—How do you reconcile these facts with Democratic professions of economy?

Senator Window—Excuse me; I have never undertaken the impossible task of reconciling Democratic performances with Democratic professions, and certainly shrink from such an effort in this case. I think no one believes that their vaunted economy is anything but a sham to secure votes. It was well understood by everybody who gave attention to the subject that their boasted reductions in 1876 were effected by denying appropriations indispensable to the public service; by postponing necessary public works; by repudiating national obligations; by withholding large sums for deficiency bills; and when all these and other desperate expedients were exhausted, the figures themselves were so manipulated that they lost their proverbial truthfulness, and became the most mendacious puerilities. This sort of deception could be carried on for a year or two with some success, but it could have but one result. Already the logic of events and the imperative necessities of the Government have exposed the trickery which was then denounced and, by compelling an increase of nearly \$29,000,000, have uncovered the demagogism of 1876, by which it was sought to carry the Presidential election under pretense of economy and reform.

Correspondent—Have you read the speech of Mr. Atkins, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, published in the Record of June 25, in which he endeavors to show that there has been no real increase over last year's appropriations, and in which he charges the Senate with "violent opposition" to the "retrenchment and economy which the House inaugurated," and if so, will you please tell me what you think of it?

Senator Window—I have read it. Mr. Atkins had an extremely difficult task to perform, and in its execution he displayed a genius in manipulating figures only equalled by his courage in dealing with the facts which stood in his way. From his predecessors, Messrs. Randall and Holman, his committee had inherited an accumulation of unpaid national obligations, and "postponed appropriations," so imperative in their character that they could no longer be evaded or delayed. These vast sums thus postponed and withheld by the Forty-fourth Congress were credited to the Democracy as so much money "saved," but the time had come when a portion of them must be provided for, though to meet them would swell the total appropriations to an amount equal to, if not in excess of those made by the last Republican Congress. With an actual increase of \$28,752,265.49 staring him in the face, the chairman of the House committee still felt it to be his duty as a "reformer," even under such discouraging circumstances, to prove that, after all, this Congress had achieved another "triumph for retrenchment," which said "triumph" would have been still grander if the naughty Senate had not stood in the way.

A DEMOCRATIC "TRIUMPH OF RETRENCHMENT."

Correspondent—Give me an idea of how these "reformers" prove that an actual increase of \$28,752,265.49 is a "triumph for retrenchment."

Senator Window—It is the simplest process in the world—when you understand it. It is done by counting in all the appropriations made by their political opponent, and by counting out enough of their own to bring their total below his. By this one simple rule Mr. Atkins is able to commend his own party for economy, and to condemn the last Republican Congress for extravagance.

Correspondent—But how does this rule work when applied to their own party friends in the Forty-fourth Congress?

Senator Window—I am glad you have called my attention to that, for it enables me to show you one or two specimen curiosities in Democratic "economy."

Perhaps the most striking of these curiosities is their mode of creating and handling "deficiencies." Under the lead of Mr. Randall in 1876, very large arbitrary reductions were made in the appropriations. The heavy reductions which had already been made by the Republicans rendered it impossible to accomplish an honest reduction which would be sufficiently stunning for the party purposes it was designed to serve. They must be made, however, at any cost, for party emergencies demanded it. In making these forced and arbitrary reductions, "deficiencies" were created amounting to many millions of dollars. To meet only a portion of them, the Forty-fifth Congress, during its first year, has been compelled to pass nine deficiency bills, aggregating, as stated by Mr. Atkins, \$15,534,672.52. Nearly all of these immense "deficiencies" were rendered necessary by the unwarranted reductions made under the lead of Mr. Randall in 1876, and there are many millions more to hear from before we get through with those marvelous feats of economy, performed for political purposes. Mr. Randall and his party took credit for having "saved" the entire amount of that reduction, though it was well known by the initiated that from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 of it were only postponed for deficiency bills after election. These deficiencies came down on the present Congress, when they could no longer be postponed, and over \$15,000,000 of them were appropriated. Then there was a dilemma. How shall the account be stated? To what Democratic Congress shall these many millions be charged? To charge them to 1877 or 1878 would expose the fraudulent pretenses of those years, and to charge them to this Congress would never do. So they were simply counted out. Mr. Randall and the party have been credited for the reduction which created them, and Mr. Atkins declines to count the \$15,534,672.52 in his totals. A very convenient way to dispose of so many millions. Thus this huge sum is made the foot-ball between these two economists, and both take credit for saving that amount to the Treasury. If you will glance over Mr. Atkins' statement, you will find several other feats in book-keeping almost equal to this, but they are quite excusable in proving the proposition he had in hand—namely, that an actual increase of \$28,752,265.49 means retrenchment. Having worried the stubborn and honest figures in vain to induce them to prove that difficult proposition, the chairman of the House committee, evidently not gratified with his success, draws a sigh, and concludes: "Had there been economic accord between the two houses—in other words, had the Senate not added \$16,000,000 to the appropriation bills, as reported to the House—the grand result would have been a still greater 'triumph for retrenchment.' It must be admitted that an increase of \$29,000,000 is not a very brilliant 'triumph for retrenchment,' but notice the peculiar phraseology by which the failure to make it 'still greater' is charged upon the Senate: 'Had the Senate not added \$16,000,000 to the appropriation bills as reported to the House.' Now, Mr. Atkins' own figures show that \$1,914,436 of the \$16,000,000 were added by the House itself to the bills 'as reported' by the committee, before they even reached the Senate. I submit that this is hardly fair, even in proving that an addition of \$29,000,000 was really a reduction.

The River and Harbor Bill—Senate additions.....\$847,900

The items of the Senate additions are as follows:

Charleston Harbor.....	\$193,000
Cape Fear River.....	75,000
Red River of South.....	100,000
Missouri River.....	87,000
Mississippi River.....	29,000
Harlem River.....	150,000
Boston Harbor.....	25,000
Panama Harbor.....	50,000
Sanitation Harbor.....	25,000
Galveston Harbor.....	25,000
Total.....	\$772,000

You will observe that these additions are exclusively for works of an important national character. The small creeks and trout streams in the bill which could be best "improved" by macadamizing were all carefully taken care of by the House.

The Army Bill.—The entire addition of \$908,814, made by the Senate to the army bill was rendered necessary in restoring our little army to its present numbers from the reduced and mutilated condition in which it had passed the House.

The Navy Bill.—The small sum added by the Senate to the navy bill was mainly for "pay of the navy," for "equipment of vessels," and for repairs of hospitals.

The Pension Bill.—The Senate added \$35,000 to pay examiners \$2 for each examination, instead of \$1, as provided by the House. The Senate thought that when the Government was to be made liable to pay pensions for life by the report of these examiners, that \$2 was not too much to pay for faithful and intelligent service.

The Military Academy Bill.—The Senate added \$83,466 to this bill, mainly for "completing hospital building," "procuring a supply of pure water," and "completing the system of sewerage." It was shown that these things are much needed as sanitary measures and for the protection of public property in case of fire. The hospital building has been standing for two years without a roof or windows, with the winds and storms beating upon it, and serving, in its unfinished condition, as a standing advertisement of the bankruptcy of the Government or the incompetency of Congress.

The Consular and Diplomatic Bill.—The Senate added \$83,700, mainly in restoring the salaries of our foreign representatives to what they received last year. The compensation now paid them is disgracefully small. The Senate thought it ought not to be reduced.

HEEDLESS MANGLING OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

The Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Bill.—The House had regarded the clerical forces of the departments, in order to reduce their meagre salaries, which were fixed twenty-five years ago; it had abolished two Auditors' offices, which were established in 1817, when the entire money transactions of the Government were not one-sixth as much as are now those of one of the offices proposed to be abolished; it had cut down the pay of the laborers and watchmen, who can now barely exist on their pinched compensation, and in various other ways it had mangled the public service and impaired its efficiency. In order to cure this mischief and to provide sundry sums imperatively necessary in various branches of the service, the Senate added \$604,776.

The Post Office Bill.—To the Post-Office bill the Senate added \$856,000. This bill, as passed by the Senate, appropriated \$33,196,373 for the year 1879. The bill for 1878, with all the deficiencies that have been added by this Congress, appropriated \$35,584,143. It therefore appears that the bill, as it passed the Senate, including the additions, was still \$1,587,770 less than both Houses have agreed was necessary for 1878. The House, however, insisted upon a reduction in conference; and as the bill finally became a law it is \$2,117,770 less than was appropriated for 1878. There is, therefore, a manifest deficiency created for that amount, which will have to be supplied next session. The Senate can hardly be charged with extravagance for wanting to reduce that forthcoming deficiency as much as possible. I believe we have now glanced at all the items constituting the additions made by the Senate, and I think you must agree with me that, having a due regard to the public service rather than a care merely to reduce the aggregate of appropriations, the House should have incorporated them in the bills before sending them to the Senate.

Correspondent—How many deficiency bills did you say had been passed by this Congress?

Sundry civil bill.....	\$19,305,442
River and Harbor bill.....	847,900
Army bill.....	908,814
Post Office bill.....	856,000
Navy bill.....	200,844
Pension bill.....	35,000
Military Academy bill.....	83,466
Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.....	604,776
Consular and Diplomatic.....	83,700
Total.....	\$19,925,442

Glance at the items which make up these several bills:

Glance at the items which make up these several additions. First:

The Sundry Civil Bill—Total additions.....	\$19,925,442
For public buildings.....	\$1,675,000
Life-saving service.....	162,546
Light-houses, buoys, signals, &c.....	26,000
Navy-yards, arsenals, repairs of boats, racks, &c.....	486,540
Indemnifying the States for enrolling and equipping militia, &c.....	250,000
Deficiencies for Post-office, courts of justice, &c.....	1,573,964
Halifax award.....	5,500,000
Sundry small items.....	9,854,886
Total.....	\$19,925,442

The above amount for "public buildings" is in the line of economy in various ways: First, the buildings are needed, and if completed would save to the Government an amount in rent greater than the interest on their cost; second, that they can be built very much cheaper now than ever before, and much cheaper than hereafter, when business shall have revived; third, it being in the line of economy to finish them now, another powerful motive is added in the employment it would give to labor. The items for "life-saving service" and "light-houses," &c., are for the encouragement and protection of commerce and for safety to life and property. The items for "navy-yards, arsenals," &c., are rendered necessary by the dilapidated condition of this kind of public property by reason of the failure to make the necessary appropriations to take care of it during the last two years. The \$250,000 for "indemnifying the States" was simply in compliance with a law which requires these claims to be paid when audited.

DEFICIENCIES CAUSED BY UNWARRANTED REDUCTIONS.

The large amount of over \$1,500,000 for "deficiencies" was necessary because the House has been compelled to pass so many deficiency bills on account of former unwarranted reductions that they were unwilling to make these, and so throw the responsibility on the Senate. About \$1,000,000 of these deficiencies were for the Post-Office Department and the Department of Justice. The courts in some States had already been compelled to adjourn for want of funds, and the execution of justice would have been substantially suspended if the Senate had not insisted upon the appropriation. Several branches of the postal service would also have been seriously crippled, or actually suspended, without them. These facts were all understood by the House committee, but because the necessary deficiencies would have swelled their bills to an amount larger than was agreeable or seemed expedient, they declined to insert them, leaving them to be put in by the Senate, for which the Senate was to be charged with extravagance. The other item, \$5,500,000, for payment of the "Halifax award," was necessary to maintain the national honor. Had the Senate not inserted it as an amendment an extra session would have been avoidable. The balance of the amount (\$450,536), added for "sundry small items," is made up of many items, such as expenses of foreign intercourse, Paris Expedition, Silver Commission, military roads, bridges, and telegraph lines on the frontier and in the Indian country, investigations of diseases of swine, grasshopper and forestry investigations, publishing records of the rebellion, furnishing artificial limbs to soldiers, &c.

The River and Harbor Bill—Senate additions.....\$847,900

The items of the Senate additions are as follows:

Charleston Harbor.....	\$193,000
Cape Fear River.....	75,000
Red River of South.....	100,000
Missouri River.....	87,000
Mississippi River.....	29,000
Harlem River.....	150,000
Boston Harbor.....	25,000
Panama Harbor.....	50,000
Sanitation Harbor.....	25,000
Galveston Harbor.....	25,000
Total.....	\$772,000

You will observe that these additions are exclusively for works of an important national character. The small creeks and trout streams in the bill which could be best "improved" by macadamizing were all carefully taken care of by the House.

The Army Bill.—The entire addition of \$908,814, made by the Senate to the army bill was rendered necessary in restoring our little army to its present numbers from the reduced and mutilated condition in which it had passed the House.

The Navy Bill.—The small sum added by the Senate to the navy bill was mainly for "pay of the navy," for "equipment of vessels," and for repairs of hospitals.

The Pension Bill.—The Senate added \$35,000 to pay examiners \$2 for each examination, instead of \$1, as provided by the House. The Senate thought that when the Government was to be made liable to pay pensions for life by the report of these examiners, that \$2 was not too much to pay for faithful and intelligent service.

The Military Academy Bill.—The Senate added \$83,466 to this bill, mainly for "completing hospital building," "procuring a supply of pure water," and "completing the system of sewerage." It was shown that these things are much needed as sanitary measures and for the protection of public property in case of fire. The hospital building has been standing for two years without a roof or windows, with the winds and storms beating upon it, and serving, in its unfinished condition, as a standing advertisement of the bankruptcy of the Government or the incompetency of Congress.

The Consular and Diplomatic Bill.—The Senate added \$83,700, mainly in restoring the salaries of our foreign representatives to what they received last year. The compensation now paid them is disgracefully small. The Senate thought it ought not to be reduced.

HEEDLESS MANGLING OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

The Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Bill.—The House had regarded the clerical forces of the departments, in order to reduce their meagre salaries, which were fixed twenty-five years ago; it had abolished two Auditors' offices, which were established in 1817, when the entire money transactions of the Government were not one-sixth as much as are now those of one of the offices proposed to be abolished; it had cut down the pay of the laborers and watchmen, who can now barely exist on their pinched compensation, and in various other ways it had mangled the public service and impaired its efficiency. In order to cure this mischief and to provide sundry sums imperatively necessary in various branches of the service, the Senate added \$604,776.

The Post Office Bill.—To the Post-Office bill the Senate added \$856,000. This bill, as passed by the Senate, appropriated \$33,196,373 for the year 1879. The bill for 1878, with all the deficiencies that have been added by this Congress, appropriated \$35,584,143. It therefore appears that the bill, as it passed the Senate, including the additions, was still \$1,587,770 less than both Houses have agreed was necessary for 1878. The House, however, insisted upon a reduction in conference; and as the bill finally became a law it is \$2,117,770 less than was appropriated for 1878. There is, therefore, a manifest deficiency created for that amount, which will have to be supplied next session. The Senate can hardly be charged with extravagance for wanting to reduce that forthcoming deficiency as much as possible. I believe we have now glanced at all the items constituting the additions made by the Senate, and I think you must agree with me that, having a due regard to the public service rather than a care merely to reduce the aggregate of appropriations, the House should have incorporated them in the bills before sending them to the Senate.

Correspondent—How many deficiency bills did you say had been passed by this Congress?

Sundry civil bill.....	\$19,305,442
River and Harbor bill.....	847,900
Army bill.....	908,814
Post Office bill.....	856,000
Navy bill.....	200,844
Pension bill.....	35,000
Military Academy bill.....	83,466
Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.....	604,776
Consular and Diplomatic.....	83,700
Total.....	\$19,925,442

Glance at the items which make up these several bills:

Glance at the items which make up these several additions. First:

The Sundry Civil Bill—Total additions.....	\$19,925,442
For public buildings.....	\$1,675,000
Life-saving service.....	162,546
Light-houses, buoys, signals, &c.....	26,000
Navy-yards, arsenals, repairs of boats, racks, &c.....	486,540
Indemnifying the States for enrolling and equipping militia, &c.....	250,000
Deficiencies for Post-office, courts of justice, &c.....	1,573,964
Halifax award.....	5,500,000
Sundry small items.....	9,854,886
Total.....	\$19,925,442

Senator Window—Nine. It was thought at one time that it would be necessary to classify and number them, as it was feared there was not enough letters to indicate them in that way.

Correspondent—Why was it necessary to divide the amount into so many bills?

Senator Window—Our Democratic friends of the House knew that the people would understand these "deficiencies" to be a refutation of their former loud pretenses of retrenchment, and hence they reluctantly doled out in detachments such amounts as they were compelled to appropriate from time to time.

THE EMPTY BOAST OF DEMOCRATIC ECONOMY.

Correspondent—I notice that at a recent banquet given in New York to Speaker Randall, Hon. A. S. Hewitt is reported to have said that Mr. Randall and his friends in the Forty-fourth Congress "accomplished a saving in the entire Congress of \$54,000,000, and that it was the fruit of putting men in power who were able to do the work set for them to do. Allowing for all the deficiencies, it amounted to \$23,000,000 clear saving," &c. (See New York World of the 3d instant.) Now, Senator, you have been a member of the Appropriation Committee for many years. What do you say to this boast of Democratic economy, in comparison with the alleged Republican extravagance?

Senator Window—It is my turn to ask you a question. Don't you think this boast of having saved only \$23,000,000 "in the entire Congress" is a great letting down from the claim made by them in the Presidential campaign that they had "saved \$40,000,000" at one session? This modest claim now amounts to only about \$11,500,000 for that session, in which they insisted that they had saved 40,000,000. By their own confession there seems to have been only about 25 per cent. of truth in their economical pretensions in 1876. It will be noted also that Mr. Hewitt admits that it required about \$1,000,000 to make up the deficiencies created by the pretended retrenchments and reforms of the Forty-third Congress. In looking over the tables and statements in Mr. Atkins' speech, I notice that he makes the deficiencies appropriated since 1876 \$30,242,165, so that he and Mr. Hewitt are substantially in accord on that point. If you will permit me to turn the tables and question you for a moment, I should like to ask if anything could well be more disgraceful in the leaders of a great party than to go before the people with the pretense of having saved over \$40,000,000, when, in fact, they knew that \$30,000,000 of that sum would have to be made up by deficiency bills?

Correspondent—Were the \$23,000,000 which Mr. Hewitt claims to be a "clear saving" by the Forty-fourth Congress an actual saving, or only a postponement of appropriations, and a failure to provide properly for the public service, &c.?

Senator Window—Some portion of it was doubtless a "saving," but by far the largest part was not. On the 12th of August, 1876, after carefully analyzing every item on every appropriation bill for that year, and comparing each one with like items in the bills for the previous year, I stood on the floor of the Senate that "of the total pretended reduction of \$40,000,000 not \$5,000,000 could in any sense be called a saving of money to the Treasury," and that this sum fell far below the retrenchment effected by the preceding Republican Congress. I now repeat that statement, and am prepared at any moment to prove it beyond a doubt.

The mere "postponement of appropriations" for public buildings which were under way in 1876, as compared with the preceding year, amounted to \$3,286,533; the postponement of surveys of public lands to \$647,300; the failure to appropriate money to pay judgments of the Court of Claims, &c., to \$1,611,000. There were numerous other items, amounting to many millions, of like character, which were merely "postponed," not "saved." They are not "deficiencies," but simply "postponements," which will come in at some future time to swell the bills. The three items I have just named, amounting to \$5,544,983, were only a small part of such "postponements" made in the one year 1876. Deducting them from \$11,500,000, which is one-half of what Mr. Hewitt claims to be the total savings of the Forty-fourth Congress for 1876 and 1877, we have less than \$6,000,000 as the actual saving for that year. There were many other items of reduction made in 1876, which are in no possible sense a saving to the Treasury, but which, if deducted from the \$11,500,000, would wipe out the whole of the pretended economy of which so much boasting has been done.

Correspondent—Does the amount of appropriations always indicate the exact cost of administering the Government during the year for which they are made?

Senator Window—It does not. There are always large unexpended balances from various sources which come over from one year to another. These "unexpended balances," after standing two years subject to use, are "carried to the surplus fund," which means they are returned to the Treasury. It is, therefore, the annual "expenditures," rather than the "appropriations," which show what it really costs to carry on the Government any given year.

The exception to this rule is when "deficiencies" are created, which makes the "expenditures" of one year appear less than they really are. In such case the "expenditures" of the next, or succeeding year will show a proportionate increase. An instance of this kind is found in the apparently reduced expenditures of 1877, which will be fully balanced by the increase for 1878 and 1879, when all the deficiencies are charged up.

When the Executive Departments are honest and faithful, only so much money as is necessary will be used, and the balance of the appropriations will be returned to the Treasury. A striking illustration of this is presented under the last Administration. From 1868 to 1876, the amounts thus "carried to the surplus fund," as shown by an official Treasury statement, were very large, exceeding by many millions per annum the amounts so "returned to the Treasury" under late Democratic appropriations. This proves two things: First, that a mere comparison of "appropriations" does not show the relative cost of administering the Government; and second, it proves that the hue and cry of corruption and extravagance raised against the last Administration was without foundation.

You will see at once that their loud boasts of economical reductions, based upon the comparisons of mere "appropriations," without taking into account the sums respectively "carried to the surplus fund," are absolutely meaningless, or else a sham and a fraud. These facts may serve to explain how it is that with all their empty vapors about "diminishing the burdens of the people," they have hardly attempted to reduce taxation. From 1868 to 1875 taxes were reduced by the Republican party by various bills, an aggregate of over \$250,000,000 per annum, while during the three years of Democratic domination in the House of Representatives no bill reducing taxes had passed that body except the reduction of some eight cents per pound on tobacco. The reduction of expenditures by the Republicans meant a decrease of taxes. The reduction of appropriations by the Democrats meant only "deficiencies" and postponed national obligations.