

THE UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ACTION
1862-77

by

ROY W. TERFLINGER, B. A.,
MCPHERSON COLLEGE, 1922.

Submitted to the Department
of History and the Faculty
of the Graduate School of
the University of Kansas in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

James C. Malin
Instructor in charge

F. H. Hodder

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS

Chapter I Minor Participation-----pp 1-9

1. Introduction
2. Origin
3. London 1851
4. New York 1853
5. London 1862
6. Hamburg 1863
7. Oporto and Bergen 1865
8. Vienna 1866
9. Arcachon 1867
10. Havre 1868
11. Hamburg 1869
12. London Cannual 1871

Chapter II Major Participation-----pp 10-31

1. Paris 1867-----pp 10-21
 - A. Biglow-Beckwith correspondence
 - B. Early organization
 - C. Congressional aid
 - D. Results obtained
2. Vienna 1873-----pp 21-31
 - A. Importance to United States
 - B. Patent Question
 - C. Legislation of Congress
 - (1) Act of June 10, 1872
 - (2) Appropriation, March 3, 1875
 - D. Troubles at Vienna

Chapter III Centennial-----pp 32-61

1. Origin of idea and selection of place---
-----pp 32-36
 - A. Proposed New York Exhibition in 1876
 - B. Proposed Washinton Exhibition in 1871

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

- C. Proposed Centennial at Philadelphia
- D. Act of March 3, 1871

- 2. Early organization-----pp 36-43
 - A. Centennial Commission
 - B. Creation of Centennial Board of Finance-act of June 1, 1872
 - C. Operation of the Commission and the Board of Finance
 - (1) Election of the Board of Directors
 - (2) The Executive Committee
 - (3) Citizens Committees
 - (4) Financing the Centennial
 - (a) One hundred day stock subscription
 - (b) Councils of Philadelphia
 - (c) Legislature of Pennsylvania
 - (5) Commission's report to Congress February 1873
- 3. Inviting the foreign governments---pp 43-46
 - A. President's proclamation, July 3, 1873
 - B. Congressional invitation, June 5, 1874
- 4. Appropriation-----pp 46-61
 - A. Memorial of Centennial Commission
 - B. Three-million-dollar bill May 5, 7, 1874
 - C. One-million and-five-hundred-thousand-dollar bill
 - (1) Legislative history
 - (2) Memorials and petitions
 - (3) Arguments
 - D. Exhibition of the Executive Departments
 - E. Admission of articles of exhibition
 - F. Proposed legislation
 - G. Ceremonial
 - H. Results

Chapter IV Conclusions-----pp62-68

- 1. Alleged objectives
- 2. Promoters
- 3. Governmental aid
- 4. Sections of the country interested
- 5. Attitude of opposition
- 6. Results

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL ADMINISTRATION

Chapter I Methods-----pp 69-101

1. Executive orders-----p 69
 - A. Uniformit of tonnage admeasurement
2. Legislative action-----pp 69-71
 - A. Metric system of weights and measures
 - B. Coinage
 - C. Copyright
 - D. Patents
3. Executive action authorized by legislation
-----pp 71-88
 - A. Postal treaties
4. Bilateral treaties-----pp 88-96
 - A. Sound, Stade and Scheldt dues
 - B. Slave trade
5. Multilateral treaties-----pp 96-101
 - A. Actual--
 - (1) Wounded ratified 1882
 - (2) Submarine Cables signed 1885,
ratified 1887
 - (3) Cape Spartel Light signed
1865, ratified 1867
 - (4) Meter signed 1875, ratified 1878
 - B. Proposed
 - (1) Patents
 - (2) Coinage
 - (3) Neutrality rules
 - (4) Prisoners of war

Chapter II Stresses-----pp 102-

1. Navigation-----pp 102-107
 - A. Cape Spartel Light
 - B. Sound, Stade and Scheldt dues
 - C. Marine signals
 - D. Tonnage dues
2. Communication-----pp 107-111
 - A. Postal Union
 - B. Telegraphic rules
 - C. Submarine cable
3. Police-----p 111

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II

- A. Slave trade
- B. Submarine cable

- 4. War and sanitation-----pp 111-114
 - A. Medical Congresses
 - B. Cholera conferences
 - C. Sanitary conferences
 - D. Red Cross

- 5. Informational and scientific---pp 114-119
 - A. Exhibitions
 - B. Geographical congresses
 - C. Medical congresses
 - D. Penitentiary congresses
 - E. Statistical congresses

- 6. Uniformity-----pp 119-141
 - A. Postal Union
 - B. Telegraphic rules
 - C. Statistical congresses
 - D. Meter convention
 - E. Tonnage admeasurement
 - F. Patent and Copyright legislation
 - G. Weights and measures
 - H. Coinage

- 7. Promotion of peace-----pp 141-145
 - A. Exhibitions
 - B. Uniformity
 - C. Neutrality rules
 - D. Arbitration

Appendix-----pp 146-148

Notes-----pp 149-168

Bibliography-----pp 172-173

PART I

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS 1851-1876

Chapter I

MINOR PARTICIPATION

The international contacts between the United States and the nations as a group in the period from 1862 to 1877 may be divided into those contacts brought about, first, by participation in international exhibitions, and, second, by other participations and interests which were distinctly international. Exhibitions may be treated from the standpoint of the extent of government participation. There were those exhibitions in which the government took a minor part and those in which it took a major part. There were only two exhibitions which the government made a serious effort to aid. They were the Paris Exhibition of 1867 and the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. The Centennial was the one great exhibition attempted by the United States and as a result will receive separate attention. First attention will be given to the beginnings of the international exhibition movement and to those exhibitions in which the government played a minor part.

ORIGIN

National exhibitions were conceived and developed in France 1798-1849,⁽¹⁾ but the first international exhibition

was held in England. The Society of Arts contemplated the holding of a great national exhibition in 1851. The first suggestion of an international exhibition was accredited to Prince Albert who was the president of that society. The international exhibition of 1851 was an idea of private origin and remained a private adventure with government support. Organization was in charge of a royal commission appointed in 1850. Finance, at first, was left to private subscription, but failing in this a charter of incorporation was obtained. (2)

LONDON 1851

Interest in international exhibitions in the United States properly begins with the London Exhibition of 1851. A government vessel was furnished for the transportation of articles of exhibition. (4) The royal commission left the fitting up of the space allotted to each nation to the nation's commissioners. The exhibition of the United States would have been a failure in this respect had not George Peabody, a United States citizen resident in London, advanced \$17,000 for that purpose. It was not until March 3, 1855 that an appropriation was made of \$26,000 to repay the sums advanced in 1851 to maintain and fit out the allotted space for the articles of American citizens. (5) American exhibitors, however, met with success and secured a reputation. Particularly in farm machinery was there marked success. The American mower and the American reaper were not soon forgotten. (6) The nation gained a reputation for skill and ingenuity. New markets

were opened, especially, for agricultural machinery.⁽⁷⁾

NEW YORK 1853

Although the New York Exhibition of 1853 was countenanced by the government it remained the result of private and speculative enterprise. No official endorsement was made by act of Congress or proclamation by the President. The Treasury Department, however, made the exhibition building a bonded ware house in order that articles for exhibition from foreign countries could be admitted free of duty. The exhibition lacked sufficient time for organization and preparation. There was also a rival exhibition at Dublin in the same year.⁽³⁾

LONDON 1862

A joint resolution passed the Senate⁽⁸⁾ and House,⁽⁹⁾ July 24 and 25, 1861, authorizing the President to take such measures as shall to him seem best to facilitate a proper representation of the industrial interests of the United States at the London Exhibition of 1862. An appropriation of \$2,000 was included for incidental expenses. The joint resolution was approved July 27.⁽¹⁰⁾ The English commission would not admit articles for exhibition until approved by an American commission appointed by the government.⁽¹³⁾ President Lincoln appointed a commission consisting of W. H. Seward, Chairman, Caleb B. Smith, Edward Everett, Robert B. Minturn, Joseph Henry, John H. Kuppert, G. Dawson Coleman, James R. Patridge, B. P. Johnson, Richard Wollack, C. G. Kennedy, W. W. Seaton and Eli Whitney. The commission organized itself and appointed agents and assistant commis-

sioners throughout the country to carry out its purpose.⁽¹¹⁾

The commission created an executive committee consisting of B. P. Johnson, Chairman; J. R. Patridge, Secretary; J. C. G. Kennedy and W. W. Seaton. The executive committee was charged with the duty of making all necessary arrangements and reporting to the commission.⁽¹¹⁾ The Executive Committee reported to Seward as Chairman of the commission, Dec. 16. They advised him to request an adequate appropriation from Congress for the purpose of fitting out the space allotted to the United States. They also requested that definite action be taken with the President and the Secretary of the Navy to obtain a vessel to transport to England, articles collected for the exhibition. A vessel had been furnished in 1851 and the same service was desired again. As to the space to be fitted out, the English Commissioners left that to the Government Commissioners of each nation represented. Since the governments of several other countries assumed this expense, a similar plea was made of the United States.⁽¹²⁾

A memorial and documents stating the above plea was submitted to Congress and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, Dec. 20.⁽¹⁴⁾ Stevens of the said House Committee introduced a bill Jan. 8, 1862 making an appropriation of \$35,000 for American expenses at the exhibition.⁽¹⁵⁾ The Bill was laid on the table, Jan. 14, due chiefly to the objections of Lovejoy and Roscoe Conkling. The occurrence of the Trent affair and necessity for money at home were given as reasons of opposition.⁽¹⁶⁾ In the Senate, Summer introduced

a bill from the Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 28. Provision was made for an appropriation of \$35,000 which covered the expenses of such commissioners as the President would see fit to appoint to represent the industry of the United States at the exhibition.⁽¹⁷⁾ Sumner defended the bill against the opposition of Hale of New Hampshire and Grimes of Iowa. The bill failed by a vote 17 to 22.⁽¹⁸⁾

In the meantime the proposition of the government furnishing a ship had been referred to the Secretary of the Navy who replied that a naval vessel could not be supplied at present for that purpose.⁽¹⁹⁾ Lincoln, Jan. 2, 1862, recommended to Congress that authority be granted to charter a suitable merchant vessel.⁽²⁰⁾ From the report of the United States Commissioner to the London Exhibition of 1862 we learn that no provision was made by the government for the conveying of articles to be exhibited, and no appropriation was made for the expense involved in installation at London. The United States department received considerable recognition from the Jurors and the public considering the difficulties it had to confront.⁽¹³⁶⁾

HAMBURG 1863

The Hamburg Exhibition of July 1863 was limited to agricultural products and machinery ⁽²¹⁾ Mr. B. R. Wood, the American minister at Copenhagen wrote to Seward Jan. 27, 1863, that he thought the United States should be represented at Hamburg to make herself known in Europe in which there was a profound ignorance and misunderstanding of the United

States. He further stated that German emigration was desirable and a better knowledge of the United States would increase that emigration.⁽²²⁾ In the Senate a bill was introduced, Feb. 11, providing for the appointment of a commissioner and appropriating \$10,000 for the expense of transporting articles of exhibition and \$5,000 for an agent to take charge. The bill was introduced from the Foreign Relations Committee by Crittenden who made the statement that it was a matter of policy for this nation to show itself willing to engage in international courtesies even in times of war. Another bill of the same intent was introduced by Sumner from the same Committee on Feb. 20.⁽²⁴⁾ No Congressional appropriation was made but the President asked Hon. Joseph A. Wright of Indiana to be the American commissioner. Private subscriptions which made the exhibition possible were made by certain citizens of New York and Philadelphia. Delegates were sent by New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Illinois, Connecticut, Vermont and Indiana, also by certain agricultural societies. First prizes were won by sheep from Vermont and by McCormick's reaper. Yet, most of the machinery came from England. The American commissioner stated that America had been too unmindful of the European market for agricultural machinery. As a step in this direction the American contributors established a permanent agricultural museum at Hamburg.⁽²⁵⁾ The United States consul at Hamburg stated, Jan. 26, 1869, that the participation of the United States resulted in a large sale of American agricultural implements in Germany.⁽²⁶⁾

OPORTO AND BERGEN 1865

Documents were transmitted to Congress, Feb. 13, 1865, concerning invitations to exhibitions at Oporto, Spain, and, Bergen, Norway, to be held in the fall of 1865. The exhibition at Oporto(27) was concerned with manufacturers and industry and the one at Bergen was an exhibition of fisheries. A joint resolution approved, Mar. 3, 1865, provided that the President should, by proclamation make known to the people the facts in his possession relating to the exhibitions and invite the people to take part. However, no expense was to be incurred by the government in connection with these exhibitions(29).

VIENNA 1866

The Austrian management tried to obtain an American exhibit of machinery at the Agricultural exhibition at Vienna in 1866. Count Wydenbruck in a letter to Seward, Dec. 26, 1865 stated that the Austrian Agricultural Society was very anxious for American manufacturers to display their machines, as the English had dominated the Austrian Exhibition of 1857. Mr. Hunter, under Secretary of State replied that the governors of the several states would be notified of the proposed exhibition(30).

ARCACHON 1867

Coincident with the Universal Exposition of 1867, there was an exhibition of fishery and water culture conducted at Arcachon, France, under the control of private enterprise. Mr. Biglow recommended that the United States attend and learn from the scientific methods of France. The subject

was transmitted to the Senate, March 12, 1866. (99)

HAVRE 1868

On Jan. 3, 1868, an invitation to the Maritime Exhibition of Havre, to be held from June to November of that year, was referred to Congress. The joint resolution of March 12 provided that the Secretary of the Navy was, at his discession, authorized to detail one or more officers of the navy to be present and represent the interests of exhibitors from the United States. No additional pay or expenses was to be employed to convey the officers so detailed to or from this exhibition. (101)

HAMBURG 1869

Participation in the Hamburg Exhibition of 1869 was urged by the United States consul at that place. Horticultural products and implements were to be the chief feature of the exhibition. The Secretary of Agriculture recommended that Congress act favorably towards appointing a commission to attend in order that American horticultural implements may derive benefit, for the exhibition promised to open up a large market for American implements. (103)

LONDON 1871

Documents in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 8, 1870, announced the annual exhibition at London beginning in 1871. Foreign products must have a certificate from their government commissioner to be admitted. Mr. N. M. Bewittl was asked to fill this place for the United States. An appropriation of from \$10,000

to \$15,000 was sought to cover expenses. The English idea of annual exhibition was to cut down expense and still get results. It was suggested that the plan could be carried out simultaneously in the great Centers of Europe and America without interference, as the field of each would be limited to a single group of products.(102)

Chapter II

MAJOR PARTICIPATION

PARIS 1867

The United States was given a formal invitation to the Universal Exposition as early as March 27, 1865. The United States was advised to immediately appoint an agent at Paris and inform the imperial commission as soon as possible if she wished to take part.(31) The result was that upon April 7, Mr. Bigelow was instructed to inform France that the President regarded the exhibition with favor but was unable to proceed without special authority from Congress.(31) The French desired a trusty and competent person to communicate with agents located in various parts of the United States. Mr. Bigelow, thereupon, recommended that Mr. N. M. Beckwith, a citizen of the United States resident in Paris, be appointed as the central commissioner.(32) This fact was clarified by Mr. Beckwith's letter to Bigelow dated April 3.

In this letter Mr. Beckwith made definite suggestions as to organization necessary to bring a splendid exhibit of American products to Paris. He thought that the United States had not taken part in international exhibitions to the extent naturally suggested by their interests, intelligence and enterprise, nor derived the benefits she might have done. First, there had been a lack of suitable organization. Second, timely information had been needed. Third, there had been a lack of provision for transportation, placement and exhibition of articles. Last of all, there had been

a lack of government cooperation in aiding these exhibitions. He recommended that a commissioner be appointed to cooperate with the Imperial Commission and to keep constantly informed as to plans, designs, etc. This commissioner would require an agency at New York to organize the movement in the United States and to communicate with exhibitors and supply them with necessary information. The services of a Committee of professional and scientific persons would be needed to prepare a report of the exhibition. The commissioner would need agents appointed by the different states and associations to carry on the general work. Local committees should be appointed by the New York agent. All persons were to serve without pay except the New York agent and the professional and scientific men. (33)

Mr. Bigelow's letter of Aug. 2 advised the organization of the American exhibit before Congress met. He thought it best that representation of the states as such should be unaided. A large body of scientific men should be sent who were qualified and able to speak concerning the exposition. They should be chosen from Academies of Art and Design, agricultural societies, mechanic's institutes, literary and scientific societies, and artisans as a class. Mr. Bigelow had designated Beckwith as a special commissioner. (36)

The importance of the United States taking part in this exposition was pointed out by Mr. Beckwith, November 23. Before the war there had been a general lack of knowledge of the conditions existing in the United States upon the part of Europe. The war had advertised the United States in

Europe and her strength and magnitude was now fully acknowledged. Emigration of the productive and industrial classes of Europe had been acknowledged as a source of productivity. A good exhibit of American agricultural resources, manufacturing, machinery, etc. would bring revenue into the treasury and immigration of the desirable type to the United States.(137)

In the meantime Beckwith's suggestions were being carried out. Mr. J. C. Derby was appointed as the United States' agent at New York.(37) He was aided by an advisory committee consisting of citizens of New York. It was a self organized group which had the approval of the State Department. It held regular meetings and obtained experts to take charge of each of the ten groups represented at the exhibition. Its services were rendered free of charge.(38)

Nothing more could be done until Congress acted, and it became necessary for Mr. Bigelow to apply for further extensions of time from the Imperial Commission. A preliminary report was to have been made on Oct. 31, 1865, and a complete report on Jan. 31, 1866, relating to the allotment of the ground in the American quarters. Upon Jan. 15, 1866, Congress passed a joint resolution accepting the invitation, but no appropriations were made until July 5, 1866.

Among the documents submitted to Congress on Dec. 11 was the estimates of Mr. Beckwith. He thought that the minimum appropriation should be \$200,000 if Congress did not wish to construct an additional structure and \$300,000 if Congress did. This additional structure was needed for

there was not enough space to meet the demands of American exhibitors. The chief expenses to be covered were freight on articles to and from Europe, inland transportation in France and installation.(42)

Mr. Seward stated upon the same date that the executive had appointed the following men subject to the approval of Congress:

1. John Bigelow--Minister to Paris-Special Agent.
(without compensation)
2. N. M. Beckwith--Commissioner General of the
United States. (without compensation)
3. M. J. F. Lonbat--Honorary Commissioner General
of the United States. (without compensation)
4. J. C. Derby--General Agent of the United States
at New York. (with compensation)
(43)

Mr. Seward's reasons for the United States taking part were: First, a demand for American products would be created. Second, the exposition would promote the collection and diffusion of knowledge concerning agriculture, manufactures and arts. Third, a liberal representation of the United States following the Civil War would be of great value in its moral influence upon other nations.(44)

The joint resolution, approved Jan. 15, was introduced into the House and passed, Dec. 21, 1865.(46) It did not pass the Senate until Jan. 11, 1866, by a vote of 33 to 6. (47) The resolution approved the action of the Secretary of State in relation to the exhibition and authorized him to make further regulations. It, also, authorized the general

agent at New York to employ necessary clerks to receive one \$1,800, one \$1,600 and two \$1,400.(45)

Congressional action appropriating funds for participation was very dilatory. Mr. Banks tried to get action upon a joint resolution for that purpose February 16, but he could not get the necessary two-thirds vote.(48) This joint resolution, as intended by its sponsors, was to provide for an appropriation of about \$100,000.(49) After much alteration and amending, upon March 14, it was finally taken from the Committee of the Whole and passed by a vote of 70 to 50. It was next in the hands of the Senate Committee upon Foreign Relations from March 15 to April 5, when it was reported back with an amendment.(52) This amendment substituted a new joint resolution after the enacting clause of the old one. On June 15, the amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 18 to 17.(53) One major difference was that the House had intended that the President be authorized to furnish one or more public vessels for the transportation of articles from New York to Havre while the Senate amendment provided for the payment of freight instead. The House appropriation was to be \$100,000 while that of the Senate was to be \$156,000. The Senate appropriation was in coin while that of the House was to be in currency.(138) The joint resolution as amended passed the Senate by a vote of 21 to 13.(53)

On June 20, Banks moved that the House non-concur in the Senate amendment and call a conference. The leading objection to the Senate amendment seemed to be that it made the appropriation payable in coin instead of currency.

Mr. Washburne of Illinois moved to lay the Senate amendment on the table. This move would kill the joint resolution. It failed by a vote of 40 to 74. Mr. Bankers' motion was then agreed to. (54) The Senate agreed to conference and the committee reported that the House should agree to the Senate amendments while the Senate was to strike out the words "in coin", "return", going and coming. (55) The House got the concession of paying in currency and the freight was to be paid to France but not for the return of articles from France. The committee's report was agreed to in the House on June 30, vote 73 to 21, and in the Senate on July 2.

Mr. Seward said that the speech of N. P. Banks did much to promote enthusiasm for the exhibition among the people. (313) Mr. Banks pled for governmental action. Private enterprise had carried through other exhibitions and, so far, government representation had been a failure. The American army, navy, schools and industry should be exhibited. Some of the results expected was the immigration of the desirable, middle-class, skilled labor to America. The American people would gain new ideas, and Napoleon and the world would be impressed as to the importance of the United States. (57) Mr. Raymond of New York upheld this legislation on the grounds that the prestige of the United States in Europe would be increased if she were well represented. (58) Mr. Chandler thought of it promoting peace and amity among the nations, and also bring desirable immigration to the United States. (59) Mr. Grinnell of Iowa said that as a western man representing an agricultural district he favored

the appropriation because it would bring useful immigration to cultivate the unsettled lands.

In the Senate Mr. Harris of New York defended the bill because this exhibition was of a national character and not open to the states and individuals. Congress must either appropriate the money required for necessary expenses or abandon the proposition.(60) Mr. Doolittle of Wisconsin said that the exhibition was not an obeisance to kings or monarchical government, and the French dream in Mexico had been blasted because of the successful preservation of the Union.
(61)

In the House, Mr. Washburne of Illinois was the staunchest of the opposition. He opposed the bill because France was insulting to the United States. He referred to the personal attitude of the Emperor as well as the French in Mexico. He also opposed because the appropriation was a needless increase in taxes when private enterprise would take care of the expenditures.(62) Mr. Harding of Illinois stated that he preferred to see the money used for other purposes than showing friendship with France. It would be better to use it to drive the French out of Mexico or else to give pensions to the soldiers.(63) Mr. Washburne offered an amendment that the joint resolution was not to take effect until the French troops were withdrawn from Mexico. Mr. Banks replied that this appropriation had nothing to do with the maintaining of the rights of the United States in Mexico and that the Foreign relations committee intended to deal with that question as a separate issue.(65) Mr. Conkling offered the argument that Americans should not take their tools

to the exposition because foreign artisans will copy their secrets.(66)

In the Senate, Mr. Wade of Ohio opposed because of the insulting manner of the Emperor, the distance and the unnecessary expenditure.(67) Mr. Cowan opposed the expenditure and said that it should be left to the states (68). Mr. Grimes of Iowa opposed because of the expenditure and because of the French in Mexico. He, also, offered an amendment that no officer should be appointed or money expended until France gave assurance that her troops would be withdrawn from Mexico (69).

The principal items of the appropriation were:

1. Furniture and fixtures at Paris-----\$48,000
2. Additional building at Paris-----\$25,000
3. Office rent and clerk hire at New York
and freight from New York to Havre----\$33,700
4. Expenses from Havre to Paris-----\$35,703
5. Traveling expenses of the Commissioner\$10,000
6. Agent at New York to be paid at the rate of
\$2,000 per year--Services limited to sixty
days after the close of the exhibition.

Besides the ten commissioners of professional and scientific standing, it was provided that the President may appoint twenty more to serve without pay. Exhibitors and members of Congress could not be commissioners. A detailed account of expenditures was to be submitted to Congress by the Commissioner General at Paris and the General Agent at New York (70).

Three bills were introduced into Congress in 1866 pre-

taining to the exhibition. One provided for the appointment of commissioners to make photos and drawings of the patented machines at the exhibition. The purpose was to obtain records that would be useful to the Patent Office. It provided for an appropriation of \$15,000. On May 2 it was laid on the table by a vote of 68 to 57. The other two bills related to the representation of the mining interests at the exhibition (72).

A joint resolution providing for a cereal exhibit passed the Senate, Jan. 7, 1867 (73). It was amended in the House by Spalding of Ohio to the effect that no further appropriation would be required to carry out the resolution as amended past the House, Jan. 7, and was concurred in by the Senate (75). The Commissioner of Agriculture was instructed to collect and prepare as far as practicable, and with as little delay as possible, suitable specimens of the cereal products of the cereal products of the several states of the Union. They were to be forwarded to J. C. Derby at New York in condition for shipment(76).

Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Ruggles, two of the ten scientific Commissioners recommended that Congress be asked to allow the commissioners to appoint any number of technical men who would serve at their own expense (88). Mr. Derby asked that the appropriation be increased to \$300,000 which was Mr. Backwith's original estimate. These requests were transmitted to the Senate Jan. 18, 1867.

Mr. Summer introduced a joint resolution on Feb. 6 from the Committee on Foreign Relations (77). It provided for an

appropriation of about \$93,000. It easily passed the Senate on Feb. 22 by a vote of 26 to 13.(78) On March 2 Mr. Banks tried to get a suspension of the rules in order to obtain a vote upon the passage of the resolution. He failed to get the two-thirds vote.(79) Mr. Banks then amended the joint resolution so as to reduce the appropriation to \$50,000. The new commissioners to be appointed were to serve without pay. As amended it passed the House by a vote of 108 to 49. The Senate accepted the House amendments⁽⁸¹⁾ but failed to receive the necessary signatures in the rush at the close of the session. The same bill was introduced March 5, passed by the House and Senate, and approved by the President on March 12.
(82) (83) (84)

There was very little strongly voiced opposition in the Senate. Mr. Wade of Ohio, who had opposed the previous appropriation, voted for this one because the United States was now involved and must go through with the exhibition.(85) Mr. Banks stated in the House that the necessity for the additional appropriation arose from the fact that the House provision for transportation of articles in public vessels was disagreed to by the Senate upon representations from the Navy Department. All freight must be paid in coin. Another reason was that contributions to the exhibition had been much larger than expected and because of the lack of time steamers must be employed instead of sailing vessels. The western portion of the country seemed to be especially interested as resolutions asking for this appropriation had been received from Wisconsin and Minnesota.(86)

The act covered more than an appropriation. The organization of the commission at Paris was provided for. Twenty additional commissioners could be appointed besides the thirty that were appointed under the first joint resolution. This group of twenty were to be designated as honorary commissioners and to serve without pay; therefore, only ten of the fifty possible commissioners could receive any compensation for their expenses. It was interesting to note that the expense involved in collecting the cereal exhibit was covered by the \$50,000. Other expenses covered were additional freights, insurance, power, erection of agricultural and educational buildings, collection of specimens of mineral wealth and clerk and labor expense.(87)

On Oct. 13, 1866, the United states was requested to be one of the twenty nations represented by an exhibit of coins, weights and measures. This has an interesting connection with the Monetary Conference held at Paris during the exhibition for the unification of coinage. Mr. Ruggles was appointed to represent the United States.(89)(90) In addition to coins, weights and measures, paper money, postage stamps, trademarks and documents were also to be exhibited.(91) Secretary Mc Culough permitted the weights, measures and apparatus of precision in the hands of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey to be taken to the exhibition.(92) The United States was also represented by coins and paper money.(93)

As to the actual expenditure the financial reports of Beckwith and Derby submitted to Congress, July 13, 1868, gave the following enlightenment:

Beckwith received from the United States	
Government-----	457,036.05F
He spent-----	<u>453,630.68F</u>
Balance	3,399.37F

Derby spent-----\$54,473.33

Was the participation of the United States a success?

M. D. Conway visited the exposition and wrote in Harpers that at first the American section was a failure. The American display, he thought, was neither impressive or adequate but showed improvement as the exhibition progressed. This was partly due to the fact that Americans were forced to make small models of their machines because of the distance.(94) According to the report of the commission the United States carried off three grand prizes, sixteen gold medals and five rewards of the Chevalier of the Legion of Honor.(95) In his third annual message, Dec. 3, 1867, President Johnson said that making due allowance for the recent political derangement of industry here, the part which the United States had borne in the exhibition could be regarded with high satisfaction.(96) The Commissioner of Agriculture thought that the United States was not adequately represented, especially, in cereals. European competition was growing and the United States would soon have to look else where for markets.(97)

The House made a special call for the report of Abram S. Hewitt, Jan. 22, 1868. The subject of his report was the production of iron and steel in its economic and social relations.
(98)

The government did more to aid the Paris Exhibition than for any other not, excluding the Centennial. Other interesting

features were the collection of cereal and mineral at government expense.

VIENNA 1873

The executive was more hesitant in taking action upon its own responsibility in reference to the Vienna exhibition of 1873 than in the case of the Paris exhibition. Mr. Fish received the invitation to attend, June 29, 1876.(104) On July 13, he wrote Baron Lederer that no action could be taken by the President without authorization from Congress. He asked whether American citizens might be admitted anyway if they complied with the rules in case of no congressional action. He referred the question to Congress Dec. 7, 1871.(104)

Mr. Jay, the American minister at Vienna was very much interested in American representation. In his letters to Fish he urged that this was the opportunity for the introduction of American manufactures into eastern Europe and western Asia. Furthermore, American representation will aid the Centennial. Baron Schwartz expressly desired to see the common school system of the United States represented (105).

A joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Mr. Banks, May 18, 1872, (106). It passed the House, May 20, and the Senate, June 8. It provided that the President may appoint one or more agents to represent the United States at the Exposition (108), but that such appointments shall not impose upon the government any liability for expense which they may occasion.

The President appointed Thomas B. Van Buren as chief commissioner. Jay in a letter to Fish, Aug. 27, urged further

action. He suggested that there should be an expert appointed for each of the twenty-six groups of articles to be represented at the Exhibition. Agents should be sent from each state, important city and interested institutions. There was need for one or more commissioners at Vienna immediately, for rents were increasing and offices should be leased. Funds were needed by the commissioner for the collection of representative American products. This letter was submitted to Congress on Dec. 6 (109).

In the meantime the question arose as to whether the Austrian patent laws were a sufficient protection to American exhibitors. Two articles in the Scientific Americans of Dec. 23, 1871, and Feb. 29, 1872, discussed the Austrian patent laws and concluded that unless American inventors were better protected American products would not be well represented at Vienna (110). Jay brought the questions to the attention of Count Andrassy on March 7. Austria then passed a special law for the protection of the patents on articles exhibited at the exhibition. Mr. Jay suggested a Convention, Aug. 21, for further (111) protection as the United States was not satisfied with the European patent laws and was planning upon securing better treaty arrangements.

The Secretary of the Interior reported to Congress, Oct. 31, 1872, that he is making an effort to exhibit the resources and products of the United States. Complete reports of the land office, the ninth census, the patent office, the Indian office, pensions, the bureau of education and the geological survey would be sent (112).

The Jay letter of Aug. 27 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Dec. 6 (113). Mr. Banks reported a joint resolution from this committee on Dec. 17 providing for a \$100,000 appropriation and for the use of two store vessels of the navy to transport the articles of exhibition (114). Mr. Morgan attempted to amend the resolution by striking out "\$100,000". In effect this would cancel the resolution if passed. His amendment failed--yeas 47, nays 85, not voting 109. Mr. Holman moved to amend the resolution by striking out \$100,000 and inserting \$50,000. The Amendment failed, 51 to 75. Mr. Hoar proposed an amendment that the President be authorized to appoint twelve artisans who shall attend the exhibition and report. An expense of \$1,000 was to be allowed each from the fund appropriated. His amendment passed. The joint resolution passed the House Dec. 19 (115).

On Jan. 9, 1873, a memorial was sent to Congress signed by the governors of six New England states. They asked Congress for a liberal appropriation in the interests of furthering foreign appreciation of the contribution of the United States to Civilization and furthering the stimulus towards productive activity given by these great schools of international exhibition (116). This memorial may partly explain the action of the Senate.

The joint resolution was reported from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 16, 1873, with four amendments. The First amendment was to strike out \$100,000 and insert \$300,000. The amendment was adopted, 30 to 18. The Second amendment provided for eight artisans, in the place

of twelve and scientific men not to exceed seven. It was agreed too. The third amendment provided for \$2,000 each in the place of \$1,000 each to cover the expenses of the artisans and scientific men. It was agreed too. The fourth amendment agreed to provided for fifty honorary commissioners to serve without pay. Mr. Carpenter of Wisconsin submitted an amendment providing for a \$300,000 appropriation for the completion of Washington's monument. The amendment was withdrawn. Mr. Saulsbury proposed to amend the amendment by inserting "\$150,000" for "\$300,000". His amendment failed, 13 to 26 (117). The words "not to exceed fifty honorary commissioners" was stricken out and "not to exceed one hundred honorary commissioners" was substituted and agreed to. On January 17, the resolution as amended passed the Senate-- yeas 29, nays 17, not voting 28 (118).

On Jan. 20 Mr. Banks proposed to submit a motion to non-concur in that Senate amendment which substituted "\$300,000" for "\$100,000". The question was taken upon the suspension of the rules in order to introduce the motion. The motion to suspend the rules failed, 101 to 74 (307). On January 23, Mr. Banks reported the resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs with two amendments to the Senate amendments. The first one was to substitute "\$200,000" for "\$300,000". It passed, 108 to 63. The second, which was agreed to, provided that the salaries of the scientific commissioners and artisans should be \$1,000 instead of \$2,000. A motion to lay the resolution and the amendments on the table was defeated, 60 to 24 (119).

The Senate wanted a larger appropriation for it disagreed to the House Amendments to the Senate Amendments and voted for Conference (120, and appointed Schurz, Harlan and Casserly to be on that Committee (121). In the meantime the Senate must have discovered that it was rather unwise to try to get a larger appropriation through the House; for Mr. Schurz on Jan. 28 moved that the Senate concur in the Amendments of the House to the Amendments of the Senate and recede from the Amendments which the House would nonconcur in. His motion was agreed to (122). On Feb. 26 Morrill of Vermont offered an amendment to the effect that not more than \$50,000 shall be expended on salaries and expense of persons and not more than \$5,000 shall be expended for any one person receiving appointment under this joint resolution. It was agreed to and the House amendments to the Senate amendments were concurred in as thus amended. The House concurs in the Morrill amendment on Feb. 12 (124). It was approved, Feb. 14. Another element in the Senate's action was the lack of time for any further quibbling because the appropriation was already late.

In the House discussion of December 17 several interesting points were brought to light. Mr. Banks of Massachusetts urged the passage of the resolution on the grounds that the exhibition of American products would induce emigration to come to America by showing the desirable classes of Europe what America had. The American people also desired participation because of the increased advantages to trade and the familiarity with foreign countries resulting from it. Mr. Shellabarger of Ohio brought up the question of patents, Amer-

ican inventors afforded by Austrian laws. He quoted from the Scientific American to show the existing dangers. In fact the exhibition of American products might bring positive injury through infringement not only by Austria but by other European countries. He did not favor governmental aid until Austria guaranteed Americans the same privileges that Austrians enjoy under the patent laws of the United States. Mr. Banks then pointed out that the State Department was negotiating to make the situation safe and the was willing to have the joint resolution amended to the effect that no money will be spent until sufficient guarantees are obtained. Mr. Garfield of Ohio objected to Congress' method of legislating. First, a resolution was passed authorizing the appointment of commissioners with the express provision that there will be no appropriation. Then, the United States found itself obligated and Congress passed the appropriation. He further objected to gross appropriation and insisted that the items of expenditure be enumerated in the act. Morgan of Ohio stated that the bill was for the benefit of individual enterprise and not the United States as a whole. It was just aiding a few inventors and manufacturers to advertise themselves. Government aid for such purposes was unconstitutional. He branded the act as sectional legislation and a burden upon the agricultural West for the benefit of the East. Mr. Wood of New York stated that international exhibitions had pacified nations and created a mutual understanding between nationalities and peoples. They encouraged the emigration of the mechanical and industrial classes to America. This exposition was not only beneficial

to a class but to the government and the whole people. Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania stated that inventors and manufacturers would not be favored; in fact, they might be injured by exhibiting. He pled for an exhibition of the mineral resources of the United States in Europe as that would bring to America the much needed immigration and capital and give her a home market for her agricultural products (308).

The chief discussion in the Senate took place, January 16 and 17. Mr. Saulsbury of Delaware thought that Congress was not careful enough in its expenditures and favored restricting the appropriation of \$300,000 to \$150,000. Mr. Hamlin of Maine stated that if America participated at all she should appropriate enough to make a respectable appearance. Mr. Morton of Indiana favored the proposition of no exhibition at all or else make this one a good one. He stated that the exhibition will be an advertisement of the resources, wealth and attractions of the United States; thus, emigration would be invited to America. The United States, then, must be careful of misrepresentation and make this exhibition worthy of our country. Mr. Sawyer of South Carolina stated that everything the United States could do to aid immigration added to the national wealth. Mr. Trumbull of Illinois stated that at first there was to be no expense. Now, it was only trifling. At the next session it would be \$1,000,000. Mr. Chandler of Michigan said that he was opposed because foreigners were stealing American inventions. Mr. Schurz of Missouri replied that sufficient protection was granted by the Austrian law of Aug. 15, 1872, the treaty on

trade marks of November 21, 1871, and the Austrian law of certification which extended protection until December 31, 1873. Foreign patentees were now as amply protected in Austria as they were in America. He said that, if the United States expected foreign nations to be well represented here in 1876, she must extend plenty of facilities for a proper representation at Vienna. Mr. Chandler of Michigan attacked the appropriation because the exhibitors were corporations and men of wealth. He was apposed to paying any of the expenses of corporations like the Pulman Car Company. He also opposed Congress' method of legislating. At first, the Commissioners were to serve without expense; then, Congress gradually appropriated large sums (126). Mr. Casserly of California complained that Congress had delayed action too long for the appropriation to be of any real benefit (127).

Mr. Jay strongly recommended the exhibition of a large map showing the United States and Europe upon the same scale. European peoples scarcely realized the vastness of the United States and this map would correct this error of their thinking. Furthermore, it would be very suggestive to those who might be inclined to emigrate to America. A letter from the Secretary of Interior asking for an appropriation of \$1,500 for that purpose was transmitted to Congress, Jan. 25, 1873, where it was referred to the Committee on appropriations (128).

Several letters of Jay to Fish, during April and May of 1873, discussed a quarrel between the British and American Commissioners over the space allotted to each. The Americans

claimed that the British had been given the space promised to the United States. A grave diplomatic situation was threatened. Mr. Jay finally succeeded in reaching a satisfactory decision with Baron de Schwarz--Senborn, the Austrian Commissioner in charge of the exhibition (129).

In the editor's historical record of Harpers, June to November 1873, the statement was made that the American department was empty at the time of the opening owing to the mismanagement of the United States Commission. President Grant had suspended the Commission and appointed a new one headed by Jackson S. Schultz.

The Nation of June 19, 1873, said that the Vienna scandal has reflected upon the American reputation in Europe. General Van Buren was appointed because of his stump speaking in the last campaign and the other members of the Commission were obscure men. The United States should learn a lesson and appoint men of ability to take charge of the Centennial, if she expected European countries to attend (306).

Beginning in March of 1874 a movement was set afoot to relieve the Commissioners to the Vienna Exposition. A bill to that effect was introduced in the House by Myers (131). Another was introduced in the Senate by Howe. It was to enable the Secretary of State to pay salaries to certain commissioners appointed under the authority of the joint resolution of Feb. 14, 1873. The Secretary of State was to be authorized to pay six artisans, five commissioners and four honorary commissioners \$500 each of extra pay from the unexpected balance in the treasury already appropriated for

the exhibition. These men had worked for a period of more than seventy-five days and had borne unanticipated burdens because of the dismissal of the original commission (132). On March 3, 1875, the House refused to suspend the rules to pass the bill (133). The general appropriation bill approved on the same date provided that the sum of \$500 was to be paid to each of the fifteen commissioners who, in addition to making reports upon special subjects, served upon international juries and were detained by duties imposed by the State Department for a period of more than seventy-five days (134).

A resolution calling for the report of the special Commission appointed to supervise the Commission to the Vienna, certain Jay correspondence and other information connected with the disavowal of the Commission passed the House, March 20, 1876. The resolution received its stimulus from a petition submitted by Jay and the members of the Commission of investigation appointed by the President to Supervise the American Commission at Vienna. Their petition asked Congress to ask for this information for these irregularities should be investigated so that the country could judge from the facts concerning this national disaster (135). Judging from this information the part that the United States played at Vienna was not very creditable.

Chapter III

CENTENNIAL

As early as 1869 Congress was considering the possibilities of a great international exhibition. On March 31 of that year a resolution introduced in the House requested the Committee on Manufactures to ascertain whether the government should give aid and countenance an international exhibition to be held at New York in 1876. The preamble stated that it would increase the immigration of skilled labor to the United States. This proposal came from the American Institute of New York (139).

On December 7 a memorial from certain citizens of the District of Columbia was received in Congress. Congress was requested to support an exhibition at Washington in 1871 by incorporating a joint stock company for that purpose. The citizens of the District were said to be willing to invest \$1,500,000 in the enterprise (140). Bills for this purpose were introduced in the House by Welker (141) and in the Senate by Patterson (142). The Senate bill was indefinitely postponed on December 12, 1870 (143). The failure of the bill was attributed to the lack of accommodations in Washington and to the lack of money in the treasury for so great an enterprise. Thus the capital which was the usual place for the holding of great international exhibitions was ruled out.

To find the earliest suggestions of holding a centennial exposition was rather difficult. By 1866 suggestions were being made by Charles B. Norton, United States Commissioner

to Paris in 1867, and John Bigelow. It was suggested by Hon. D. S. Gregory to the American Institute of New York and by John L. Campbell to Mayor Mc Michael of Philadelphia (144).

In 1869 the Franklin Institute applied to the city authorities for the use of Fairmount Park. A Citizen's Committee was formed--Daniel J. Morrell, a member of Congress, took an active part (145). In January of 1876 the Franklin Institute requested the Councils of Philadelphia to memorialize Congress for aid. The Pennsylvania Legislature did the same; also appointed a committee which jointed the committees of the Franklin Institute and the Councils of Philadelphia under the chairmanship of J. L. Shoemaker. Every effort was turned towards getting action from Congress. On April 6 the mayor invited the House Committee on Manufactures to visit Philadelphia and examine its industries and accommodations for the location of an international exhibition. The committee accepted and many other Senators and Representatives took the opportunity to visit Philadelphia (146) with the result that Philadelphia was recommended favorably to Congress.

The bill which initiated the Centennial movement was before Congress for nearly a year. On March 9, 1870, it was introduced in the House by Mr. Morrell of Pennsylvania (147). In spite of the decision of the Committee on Manufactures there was enough opposition by rival cities to delay legislation (148)(149). On January 10, 1871, an amendment to strike out Pennsylvania and Philadelphia and insert Missouri and St. Louis in their place failed by a vote of 38 to 102. On the same day

the bill passed the House (151). In the Senate its reference was contested between the Committee on Manufacture and the Committee on Foreign Relation. Decision was rendered in favor of the latter (152). On Feb. 25 Mr. Conkling's amendment providing for a combined exposition at New York and Philadelphia failed (153). On the same day the bill passed the Senate with an amendment (154). The amendment provided that the United States was not to be liable for any expense attending said exhibition or by reason of the same. The Senate amendment was concurred in upon Feb. 28 (155) and approved, March 3 (156).

The contest was largely between Congressmen of Pennsylvania and Congressmen from New York. Mr. Morrell of Pennsylvania advocated Philadelphia because of her patriotic associations as the cradle of the American nation and because of her industrial supremacy. Mr. Cleveland of New Jersey and Mr. Sargent of California advocated New York where the exhibition would be sponsored by the American Institute (159) (158). Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania stated that the object was not local but national. One result would be the immigration of skilled labor and trade expansion which would benefit the whole country. He defended the Franklin Institute as being older than the American Institute. Philadelphia should be chosen for patriotic reasons; furthermore, she was the leading manufacturing center of the country. She employed a greater amount of skilled labor and produced a larger share of manufactured products used in America than any other American city. He based his proof upon figures obtained from the Superintendent of the Census. He thought the total expenditure

would be about \$500,000 (160). Mr. O'Neill of Pennsylvania held that Philadelphia was the logical place because of patriotic association, housing accommodations and the sponsorship of the Franklin Institute (161). Mr. Brooks of New York stated that Philadelphia was no more the center of American independence than Boston or Richmond. Philadelphia was just a Populous suburb of New York. New York had been holding her own exhibitions and asked no appropriation or responsibility on the part of Congress. In the Senate there was a great duel between Conkling of New York, who was using delaying tactics, and Cameron of Pennsylvania, who was doing everything possible to get the bill passed (163).

This act was a definite beginning for the Centennial. What were its provisions? Philadelphia was designated as the place. The management was placed in the hands of a commission consisting of one delegate from each state and territory. Its functions were to prepare, superintend and put into execution a plan of exhibition after conferring with the authorities of Philadelphia to fix a suitable site. The President was to appoint the commissioners within one year from nominations made by the governors of the states and territories. Alternate commissioners should be appointed, one from each state and territory to serve in case of the absence of the Commissioner. Meetings of the commission were to be held at Philadelphia. A majority of its members had full power to make all needful rules. It must report to Congress at the first session after appointment as to the dates of opening and closing, ceremonies of opening, plans of building, plans for the reception and

classification of articles and suggested custom house regulations. The President, when notified by the Governor of Pennsylvania that sufficient provisions had been made, was by proclamation to give the time of opening and the location of the exhibition. This proclamation was to be communicated to all the diplomatic representatives accompanied by the commission's regulations (164). The bill gave national recognition to the exhibition, but left the labor, expense and responsibility to private citizens (165).

The Centennial Commission was created according to the terms of the act and assembled on March 4, 1872, to start the preparations. The first session lasted eight days and by the time of its close thirty-two commissioners from twenty-eight states and territories were present. It found that it had a peculiar status. It was the creature of the government to perform a public service, but it must rely upon private and individual purse if it should perform its duties. The commissioners paid their traveling expenses to Philadelphia from all parts of the Union. Their first meetings were provided for by the Councils of Philadelphia by appropriations amounting to \$75,000. The commission saw the impropriety of allowing a local body to conduct a great national celebration. What could it do? The act creating it had made no provision for raising capital. As a step in the right direction, the commission created an Executive Committee to take charge of the raising and expenditure of money. The committee took steps to place the enterprise upon a fair business basis by enabling those who furnished the means to share in the risks, profits and management. The whole Union was to have a chance

to contribute to the Centennial funds. It decided to ask Congress for a charter of incorporation for a Centennial Board of Finance which should have power under the direction of the Centennial Commission to raise ten million dollars by stock subscription. The proposed corporation was intended to conduct the work to a successful termination (166). The commission in the face of odds had shown plenty of initiative and no lack of faith in the performance of its duties. What would Congress do about incorporating the Centennial Board of Finance?

Congress very readily consented. The bill was referred to the committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to amend so as to include in the body of incorporators suggested by the Centennial Commission (168) Congress proceeded to strike out these names and to distribute the pie to its own liking (169). The bill passed the House on May 21 and the Senate on May 29. In the Senate, Congress' power to form such a corporation within a state was questioned upon constitutional grounds by Mr. Morell of Maine and Mr. Trumbull of Illinois (169). The President gave his approval upon June 1.

A corporate body, The Centennial Board of Finance, was to be created by stock subscribers and designated incorporators. It was empowered to secure subscriptions to the capital stock at ten dollars per share to the amount of \$10,000,000. Its accounts were always to be open to the inspection of the Centennial Commission or any of its members. Prior to incorporation the commission was to open the subscription books on a pro rata basis to the citizens of each state and

territory. After the expiration of ten days the commission was to call a meeting of the stock holders and the incorporators at Philadelphia for the purpose of electing a Board of Directors. This Board consisted of twenty-five stockholders for a term of office of one year or until their successors were qualified. The directors must be chosen from a list of one hundred stockholders nominated by the commission. The Board of Directors were then to take possession of the stock subscription books. The grounds and buildings were to be prepared according to the plans of the Centennial Commission. The Centennial Board of Finance so constituted could issue bonds if not in excess of capital stock and mortgage its property. The Secretary of the Treasury was to have prepared stock certificates; otherwise the United States was in no case liable for any debt, claim, or pecuniary assistance either from Congress or the Treasury. After the close of the exposition the corporation was to convert its property into cash and after payment of its liabilities it could divide its assets pro rata to shares of capital stock. The Centennial Commission was to audit the accounts of the corporation and report to the United States. The Centennial Commission was also incorporated. Alternate Commissioners were to have all the powers of Commissioners in case of their absence and Alternate commissioners could participate in debates and serve on committees at all times. The Centennial Commission was to make reports to the President of the United States from time to time including a final report upon the results of the exhibition (170).

The exposition was by this act not only recognized but also organized by the government. However, the creation of these two corporations was rather accidental and the fault of circumstance instead of consistent planning. One was to legislate for and to supervise the other. Each had important executive duties and the lines separating the duties of each was often indistinct. However, the check and balance relationship between the two corporations although cumbersome had its virtues (171). As the following facts will show, the major difficulties were overcome by centralizing the work of each corporation in the hands of a small group.

After opening the subscription book for one hundred days, the commission proceeded to organize the Board of Finance. One hundred stockholders were selected by the commission, and the stockholders and incorporators elected the Board of Directors on April 22, 1873. From fifteen to eighteen of these directors were either from Philadelphia or Pennsylvania. On May 3 a joint conference between the two corporations helped to determine the relative rights of each (172).

The Executive Committee was to the Commission what the Board of Directors were to the Board of Finance. A resolution passed by the Commission, Dec. 1872, provided that this committee should make its own rules and elect its own officers. During the sessions of the Commission the committee should have all the powers usually exercised by the executive committee of corporate bodies, and, in the recess of the commission, it should have all the powers and authority of that commission. This Committee performed many of the important

functions of the commission and a large cumbersome body was reduced to a small compact effective unite (293).

The acts provided that the commission was to do the planning and the general advertising. The general plans, architecture of buildings and the classification of exhibits were placed in the hands of the various standing committees. To obtain finance the commission now saw that the first and most essential thing was to sell the exhibition to the American public. It must, according to the terms of the act, have the appearances of being an accomplished fact before foreign participation could be invited by the President's proclamation. It was obvious from previous exhibitions that foreign nations must be notified early enough to have sufficient time to participate. The commission, therefore, started a campaign of advertising upon a large scale (173).

The exposition was first sold to Pennsylvania by Citizens Committees which cooperated with the Commission and the Board of Finance. The first citizen's committee consisted of the incorporators in Pennsylvania. It was organized as early as November 2, 1872. It appointed a sub-committee of twenty five to prepare and report a plan for popularizing the sale of stock. Another committee of three hundred, known as the Citizen's Centennial Finance Committee, was organized. It represented the various trades, occupations, professions and organizations. Stock subscriptions were solicited from every class in Philadelphia and letters were sent to influential people throughout Pennsylvania (174).

The problem of finance was by no means going to be an easy one. This was shown by the one hundred day stock subscription campaign conducted by the Commission. There were 72,274 ten dollar shares subscribed by the state of Pennsylvania and 69,864 of these were accredited to the city of Philadelphia. Oregon subscribed 412, New Jersey 135, Connecticut 117, Arizona 102, Wisconsin 41, Maryland 36, Alabama 32 and eight other states subscribed less than 30 shares. The result was that Pennsylvania had raised the bulk of \$722,740 worth of stock (175).

Pressure was brought at the beginning of 1873 upon the Councils of Philadelphia and the Legislature of Pennsylvania for appropriations. The Citizen's Committees were of considerable value in getting action. The City Councils appropriated \$500,000 in addition to \$75,000 previously mentioned. On March 27 the legislature appropriated \$1,000,000 to erect a permanent centennial building in Fairmount Park. It was to remain the permanent property of the State of Pennsylvania (175).

The Commission in its report of February 1873 gave Congress many suggestions of what it was doing and what it wished Congress to do. The commission had a standing committee which was to consider the legislation needed from Congress. The House appointed a Select Committee on the Centennial Celebration, December 9, 1872. (175) This later committee was a permanent fixture until the close of the exhibition (181).

What did the Commission expect the exposition to accom-

plish? Mr. Joseph R. Hawley, President of the Commission said that the great and immediate function of the exhibition was to stimulate and educate (178); certain commissioners as Mr. Byrd of Alabama did want the exhibiton to be sectional. Mr. Spooner of Massachusetts said that it would bring good will between the sections. Mr. Atwood of Wisconsin and Mr. French of Mississippi wished to see it bring about a more friendly spirit within the Union (179). Mr. Hawley quoted Seward's estimates of the value of expositions. They advanced human knowledge, broke down prejudice, fraternized nations and brought about a better understanding between capital and labor. Exhibitions have become national necessities and duties; as such, it may be expected that they will be repeated again and again (180).

The Commission suggested a variety of legislation. Congress was asked if it thought that it was within the dignity of the United States to require the commissioners, who were duly appointed officers of the government, to be dependent upon the generosity of Philadelphia for the payment of expenses incurred in the performance of duties. The Commission intimated that time was a necessary element to the success of the exposition and Congress must be its own judge in taking action to insure the success of the exhibition at an earlier date, for national dignity was connected with its success. It was pointed out that the participation of the United States in the Vienna Exposition would have a bearing upon the sentiment of Europe towards the Centennial. Special agents had been sent to Vienna from the Commission and

the Board of Finance to gain information which would aid the Centennial. A further suggestion was that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to adopt regulations as liberal as those adopted by foreign countries for the admission of articles. Articles of exhibition should be admitted and forwarded to the Centennial grounds without the collection of duties or custom house inspection. Such inspection should be made at the exhibition which should serve as a bonded warehouse. Mr. Edward Young, United States delegate to the Statistual Congress at St. Petersburg suggested that the commission invite the Statistual Congress to hold its tenth meeting at Philadelphia in 1876. The invitation was extended but the Congress was reluctant to accept private invitations. The President referred the matter to Congress (182). Another suggestion was a special memorial inscription for all new coins (195). A special census of the population and resources of the United States to be taken June 1, 1875 was asked for. The object being to strike a comparison with the conditions in 1776. (183)

Inviting the foreign powers, also, required legislation, after the first attempt at invitation was bungled. The governor of Pennsylvania felt that the success gained in Pennsylvania was sufficient to justify notifying the President that sufficient provision had been made for the Centennial buildings (185). The President proclaimed the event upon July 3 and the exhibition grounds were formally transferred to the Commission on July 4. The proclamation commended the celebration and exhibition to the people of the United States

in behalf of the government and the people of the United States, to all nations who may wish to take part (186). Copies of the proclamation and the Commission's general regulations were immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the diplomatic representatives of all nations. The general regulations stated that formal acceptance of this invitation was required previous to March 4, 1874. Privileges of exhibitors would be granted only to citizens of countries whose governments have formally accepted the invitation to be represented and have appointed a governmental commission to supervise the work (305).

One could little wonder that the proclamation was being accepted by thirteen or fourteen nations as an invitation to attend. The Secretary of the State now got busy and addressed a circular letter to all diplomatic and consular representatives to inform them that the President only commended the exposition to the nations but did not invite them. He based his action upon the fact that the two acts did not authorize an invitation (187). The Commission's plan to initiate the movement in foreign countries as soon as possible received a serious check. In a Nation editorial, dated April 9, 1874, it was stated that the announcement of the exhibition was so badly mismanaged as to deceive the foreign powers and to conceal from them its real character. The exhibition was managed by a joint stock company and not like European Exhibitions, a government enterprise. No invitation was extended by the government (188).

A bill extending an invitation was introduced in the House on January 21 by Kelley from the Committee on Centennial Celebration. A motion to lay on the table failed, 42 to 106, and it passed the House 189. It was reported from the Senate Committee upon appropriations with an amendment on May 26. This amendment was that the United States should not be liable, directly or indirectly, for any expenses attending such exposition or by reason of the same. The bill as amended passed the Senate May 26, by a vote of 25 to 17 (191). The Senate amendment was concurred in by the House, June 1. Mr. Randall stated that concurring in the Senate amendment did not bind him to refuse to vote for an appropriation and that he believe the whole Pennsylvania delegation felt the same way (192). The President's approval was given on June 5. (194)

From the general attitude of Congress it was evident that it was unwilling to incur any more expense or assume any more responsibility. Mr. Hawley of Connecticut advanced argument to prove that Congress had already committed itself and could not retreat without embarrassment for several nations had already accepted the proclamation as an invitation. No appropriation was asked for, only an authorization of the invitation. (Some enlightenment would be thrown upon Mr. Hawley's position when one discovered that he was the Mr. Joseph R. Hawley, President of the Centennial Commission.) Mr. Wood of New York argued that the exhibition was national in character and not local. Foreign governments had invited the United States and

she should invite them. Mr. Frye of Maine said he was willing to make any appropriation necessary, and Mr. O'Brien of Maryland expressed the same sentiment. Mr. Scudder of New Jersey said that his state legislature had asked its congressmen to support the Centennial. Mr. Parker of New Hampshire was also willing to back the exhibition. Mr. Dunnell of Minnesota and Mr. Crocker of Massachusetts were willing to appropriate. My Sypher of Louisiana characterized the exhibition as a great national love feast and was willing to appropriate. Mr. Williams of Wisconsin was willing to support the Centennial. There was, therefore, about a dozen men in the House who expressed a willingness to support the exhibition. Mr. Butter of Massachusetts was afraid that the bill would oblige the government to appropriate. Mr. Smith of Ohio and Mr. Hale held the same view. Mr. Kasson argued that the bill should be so amended that no liabilities would be incurred (193). The Senate attitude was clearly shown by their amendment.

Another serious rebuff to the Centennial was the financial depression which settled over the country in the autumn of 1873. The Commission's plans to sell stock throughout the Union came to naught (195). The editor of the Nation in commenting upon the situation, February 19, 1874 stated that the Centennial was about to perish through lack of funds. It was too big for Philadelphia and the states were not coming to her aid. The Executive Committee sent a memorial to Congress asking for aid at a time when the government was paying its expenses by issuing large amounts of irredeemable paper money.

The Nation thought that the idea of holding an international exhibiton should be given up. It was a false notion that exhibitions secured peace. Also, there was no body of people capable of organizing such a movement. The corporations now functioning were composed of no less than ninety politicians. Would it not be better to hold just a little centennial for American~~A~~alone?(196)

The Commission reported, February 23, that Congress' plan of raising money had proved successful only in Pennsylvania because of the financial storm. The time had arrived to proceed with the erection of buildings. It wished to know if under the circumstances, Congress would raise the money. President Grant's message, transmitted to Congress along with the memorial, suggested that Congress should either make a complete success of the Centennial or else suppress it and acknowledge that the United States was unable to give it the international character to which her self esteem aspired (198). The Commission stated that North Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, New Jersey and ^New Hampshire had passed resolutions supporting the Centennial and asking Congress to promote its success (199).

The Nation expressed the opinion that according to the acts of Congress on the Centennial all persons who took office under those acts agreed not to apply to Congress for aid. Congress in passing the acts had notified the world that this enterprise was a commerical adventure, subject to the ordinary risks (200). Whether legitimately or not the question was submitted to Congress. What would Congress do?

In the House a heated debate, from the fifth to the seventh of May, took place over a \$3,000,000 appropriation which had been introduced from the Committee on Centennial Celebration by Mr. Kelley on April 16. (201) He defended on the grounds that the national honor had been committed to the support of the exhibition by both the legislative and executive. The resources of the United States would be better and more thoroughly advertised than in previous exhibitions and would thereby bring desirable immigration to America. It would prove that America had recovered from war and that republicanism represented peace, order and liberty. The people were ignorant of the resources of their own country and ought to learn of them (202). Tremain of New York stated that the regulations accompanying the proclamation were the same as an invitation from the viewpoint of the foreign nations. Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland, Ecuador, Chile, Argentine Confederation, Brazil, Hayti, Liberia, Hawaii, Mexico and Sweden had formally accepted it as such. (It should be noted that his speech was made on May 5 and the bill providing for the invitation was not approved until June 8). Assistance of Congress was necessary as the Centennial was launched by Congress, labeled international, proclaimed by the President and accepted as an invitation by the powers. Mr. Packard of Indiana stated that the exhibition would open world markets. If the country was depressed, it was time to advertise and get new markets. Congressional legislation had bound the United States to support the Centennial, and the

people of Indiana were supporting this appropriation (204). Mr. Crocker of Massachusetts stated that it was false economy to withhold the appropriation. The exhibition would be a unifying force, a great throb and pulsation of national spirit and fraternity. Mr. Cain thought that the war wounds would be healed (205). Mr. Harrison expected the exhibition to bring about a unity of feeling which nothing else could do. He thought that it was foolish to say that the United States was poverty stricken when she had great resources. Mr. Albright of Pennsylvania defended the constitutionality of the measure upon the basis of previous legislation (206).

Mr. Hale of Maine headed the opposition by stating that the treasury was depleted. By previous acts Congress had pledged itself not to give monetary aid. If the exhibition was a failure it was because the people had refused to support it. The government had not committed itself and if the bars were let down now the treasury would be called upon to stand the whole expense (207). Mr. Ward of Illinois sighted the financial distress in Chicago as sufficient grounds for his opposition. Mr. Phelps of New Jersey opposed because of the financial distress. Mr. Cobb of Kansas opposed on the same grounds; also, he sighted the lobbying which was being done for the bill. Mr. Smith of Ohio said that the appropriation was extra--governmental. Mr. Genckel of Ohio thought that it was unconstitutional (208).

The voting on May 7 showed an even division of the House. When the question occurred upon ordering the bill to be engrossed and read the third time the vote was yeas 92,

nays 138 and 60 not voting. On the motion to reconsider the vote and lay the motion to reconsider on the table the vote was yeas 117, nays 120, not voting 53. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to order the bill to be engrossed and read a third time passed--yeas 114, nays 112, not voting 64.(209) This was the last consideration of this bill.

What took place from May 1874 to December 1875 to finance the Centennial? Only a small amount of data has been discovered. The Councils of Philadelphia appropriated one million dollars more than has been accounted for thus far and the capital stock increased to \$2,312,350. Perhaps this was done largely at this time. Two articles in the Nation suggested what was happening. The first article dated December 16, 1875, stated that the work was well under way. Some of the buildings were complete and the Centennial was a definite creation. Although smaller than Vienna it would be finer in many respects (300). The editorial of January 27, 1876 gave even a greater revelation. It said that the "World" was carrying on an attack against Centennial appropriation. Its argument was based upon grounds of unconstitutionality. The Nation said that the "general welfare clause" as now interpreted easily covered the exhibition; since many private corporations had received government aid and so wide a range of other things had been done under "general welfare". If the people admitted that the United States was a nation, they conceded the grounds of the applicants for the Centennial appropriation. The "Nation" had opposed the exhibition in the

beginning because its beginning was bad; yet, stripped of dependence upon government appropriation the managers have relied upon themselves and had won public confidence. The "Nation" thought that Congress was now morally bound to contribute for the discredit of failure will not fall upon any state or corporation but upon the Union (301).

A memorial dated December 7, 1875, of the Commission asked Congress for an appropriation of \$1,500,000. (210) President Grant in his seventh annual message stated that the powers of Europe, South America and the East have manifested their friendly sentiments towards the United States by taking steps to join her in celebrating the Centennial. He strongly recommended that a more national importance be given to the exhibition by such legislation and appropriation as would insure its success (302).

A variety of influences were brought to bear upon Congress to obtain the passage of the bill, January 17, 1876, the Legislature of Pennsylvania instructed her Senators and Representatives to vote for the appropriation. Such instruction, as we shall see, was needed as five of her congressmen did not support the bill (311). On December 14, 1875, a memorial was referred to the Select Committee on the Centennial Celebration from the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce and Merchants Exchange asking for the appropriation (212). On January 13, a memorial was received from the Womans Suffrage Society of New York protesting against taxation for the Centennial without representation (213). A resolution was received from the New York Produce Exchange, January 17, asking for the appropriation. A

petition came from the New York Stock Exchange, January 20, for the appropriation (215). January 22, three petitions were received: One was from the Board of Cotton Exchange at Cincinnati for the appropriation; another from the Ladies of Allegheny County Pennsylvania for appropriation. The other from Seelye Massachusetts Temperance Alliance, against appropriation if any of buildings or grounds were to be used for the sale of liquors (216). On the 24th of January two were received. One was from the Grand Temple of Honor of Massachusetts--against appropriation if intoxicating liquors were sold in the buildings or on the grounds. The other was from the Board of Trade of Baltimore pleading for the appropriation (217). On January 25 a resolution was received from the Franklin Institute asking for aid (218).

The Bill for the appropriation was introduced from the Select Committee on Centennial Celebration on January 6 with the recommendation that it pass. The Committee stated in its report that the conditions of the country had been depressed and it was impossible to raise the money from the people. The failure of the last Congress to pass an appropriation cannot be claimed as a precedent for the present situation. Congress in 1871 had declared an international exhibition and had re-asserted its international character by asking the President to invite the foreign powers in the name of the United States. The only course Congress could take was to furnish such adequate buildings as foreign nations had a right to expect (219).

On January 25, several amendments were proposed. Mr. Eden proposed to amend by substituting \$1,000,000 for \$1,500,-

000. It failed, 107 to 155. Mr. Sheakley proposed that the entrance to the grounds on July 4, 1876, and each Thursday thereafter be free. It also failed. Mr. House's amendment likewise failed. It was to set aside \$100,000 to cover terminal charges on articles from the several states. Mr. Mills of Texas failed to attach an amendment providing for the appointment of two new commissioners from Texas in the place of the old ones (202). Mr. Kasson's amendment passed. It provided that the Treasurer and the President of the Centennial Board of Finance must give a suitable \$500,000 bond to the Treasury of the United States before receiving any of the appropriation. The other amendment which passed was introduced by Springer of Illinois. It provided that in the distribution of the moneys left in the treasury of the Centennial Board of Finance, after the payment of debts, the appropriation must be paid to the Treasury of the United States before any dividends or profits were paid to the stockholders (221). On the passage of the bill, Mr. Springer voted against it. The vote was yeas 146, nays 130, not voting 14.

In the Senate the struggle was chiefly to get the bill passed without amendment. Cameron was the leader in this move. Several were in favor of the appropriation but opposed to the Springer amendment. It was realized though that it was not wise to return the bill to the House with any important changes. The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill without amendment and recommended its passage, January 28, (222). To test the strength of the bill Edmunds of Vermont proposed to amend by striking out the preamble. The amend-

ment failed 18-34.(223) A similar amendment was proposed by McCreery of Kentucky. It failed 12 to 45.(224) Mr. Edmunds next proposed that the Centennial Commission and Board of Finance file resolutions in the Treasury Department declaring their assent to the act--failed.(225) On February 11, 1876, the bill passed by voting first on the main part and then the preamble. The vote on the main part was 41 to 15, and the preamble, 37 to 16.(226)

The strongest forces of opposition were found in the House. The constitutionality of the bill had to be justified. What were the alleged clauses or powers under which this appropriation came? The debate began January 17 and intermittently occupied the House until January 25. Mr. Hardenberg of New Jersey stated that the General assembly of New Jersey had given \$110,000. He said that the Centennial must be a national endeavor; foreign governments would not commit themselves unless it was. The exhibition would revive patriotic feeling, peace and prosperity.(237) Mr. Waddell of North Carolina asked that the Southern members support the bill for it would bring understanding between the sections and, in general, elevate the interests and character of the republic (229). Mr. Robbins of North Carolina pleaded for the bill upon the same principle (245) Mr Morey of Louisiana said that it would create commercial, patriotic and unifying bonds which would hold the Union together (238). Mr. Dunnell thought that old issues should be buried, now that they are dead (261). The idea that the government was already committed to support the bill was the essential thought of Mr. Phillips of Kansas. He also

advanced the argument that hard times would disappear as the result of the reopening of trade (232).

Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Lawrence advanced the revival of trade argument. Mr. Jewitt began by stating that the Board of Finance was a national public corporation and not a state or a private affair. Yet, of the money contributed Pennsylvania had raised \$4,700,000 out of \$5,187,000. The government was bound to act by its invitation to the powers. How would the passage of the bill be a paying proposition? The expenditures of American and foreign visitors at the exhibition would reopen the channels of business. Foreign capital would be attracted to America and the government could borrow at lower rates of interest. The reduction of the national debt depended upon commerce. To get markets the people must understand their defects as well as the merits of their competitors. The exposition of 1867 brought Bessemer steel to America while the exposition of 1873 brought and increased exportation of American leather (231). Mr. Lawrence of Ohio thought that the United States should seek commerce, revise her commercial treaties and fund the national debt. Exhibitions increased commerce before and they will again. If Europe was convinced that fraternity and peace has been restored between the states she would be free to invest in American securities. National credit would be established and the debt would be funded 3%'s in place of 5%'s. The general result would be that new demands would be made upon American industries and prosperity would follow (237).

As to constitutionality the arguments vary greatly. Mr.

Hewitt said that the United States had the power under the constitution to promote education. International exhibitions were really just great industrial universities (231). Mr. Lawrence said that anti-centralization led to the rebellion. One of the heresies of the rebellion had been that the constitution was a creature of the states. Specific grants of power from the constitution to Congress authorized Congress to promote and increase commerce. The term "increase" was included in the term "regulate". Since the exhibition would increase commerce the bill promoting it was constitutional. He next based his argument upon constitutional usage (237). Mr. Lapham of New York thought the national government had a right to act in this case (240). Mr. Fry based his argument upon usage. Webster, Calhoun and Benton had voted money to permit Lafayette to visit the United States. An appropriation had been made for Kasson. The government had builded domes, bought pictures, and furnished food to the South under the constitution. Surely this public spirited bill cannot be ruled out on the grounds of constitutionality. Mr. Swann of Maryland was opposed to any further restrictions upon the national government. Appropriations had been made for scientific work, education and the embellishment of public buildings (235). Mr. Kasson of Iowa wished to know the constitutional basis for railway post office, custom house and railway legislation. The constitution was elastic and adaptable to new inventions and conditions. It was not an expressed but an implied power that Congress had the right to regulate commerce. This bill was plainly covered by that right (241).

Mr. Jones of Kentucky based his constitutional argument upon the general welfare clause (244). Mr. Banks of Massachusetts used the treaty making power. In passing the bill the United States was carrying out preengagements with foreign powers (243). Mr. Williams of Wisconsin said that the United States was a nation and not a partnership of states. As a nation she could extend common politenesses to foreign nations (245).

The opposition thought the bill was neither in accordance with the constitution nor the present condition of the treasury. Mr. Willis thought the constitution should not be twisted and stretched to meet every fancy and caprice. The administration of the government had been extended to the railroads. It had become a parent, a schoolmaster and a banker. The next move was to extend it to the show business. The people had begun to expect Congress to lavish contributions on this cause and that. Frauds and credit mobiliers were the result. Mr. Cochrane of Pennsylvania said that if Congress had the power to appropriate in this case, there was no limit to her power of appropriation. The bill amounted to the application of a corporation for a subsidy and the House had resolved that no subsidier in money, bonds, etc. should be granted by Congress to corporations engaged in or proposing to engage in public or private enterprise. No national honor was involved; but the violation of the constitution for this proposed preudo-patriotic celebration would be very unpatriotic (357). This view was held by Tucker of Virginia. Obedience to the constitution was better than sentimental patriotism. All the previous legislation had stated that the

United States could not be held for any expense. It must be remembered that her government was a government of granted and enumerated powers and not unlimited powers. To limit corruption the powers of government must be limited so as to prevent runs upon the treasury under the blanket clause of general welfare (248). Mr. Caldwell thought that the act of invitation had only been passed with the object of committing the government (252). Mr. Savage of Ohio said that if the appropriation was made at all it should be a loan. He opposed making the bill a test as to whether the South was properly reconstructed (253). Mr. Baker of Indiana opposed the diverting of money from the treasury for any other than governmental purposes. Only a few people would be benefited, for the great majority would not attend; therefore, this was the work of private enterprise (254). Mr. Holman of Indiana thought the act was inexpedient as corruption sprang from subsidies. Since the nation was oppressed with debt, private enterprise should bear the burden (256).

The contest in the Senate was mild in comparison to that of the House. Mr. Cameron urged the passage of the bill in spite of its form because the present state of the House would not permit amendments. To amend would lead to delay and perhaps the defeat of the purpose of the bill. Pennsylvania would gladly appropriate the money needed but her new constitution prevented it. Mr. Morrill did not like the form of the bill, but he lined up with Cameron in preventing amendment (258). Mr. Sherman preferred to make the appropriation a simple gift. Congress knew that there would be no profit to

divide and the capital stock would never be refunded (259). Mr. Maxey of Texas thought that peace and common understanding would follow the success of the exhibition. It would also bring prosperity (260). Mr. Mitchell of Oregon thought that the United States was obligated to the foreign powers by her invitation. The act was constitutionally based upon the general welfare clause (261).

Mr. Norwood of Georgia said that the people were not interested in the exhibition. It did not celebrate the Declaration of Independence. It was only an industrial exhibition. The constitution limited the powers of Congress not as an exhibitor in the exhibition. It appropriated a total of \$649,250. Part of this was for the printing of stock certificates and for custom house expenses. The larger part was spent for an exhibit of the executive department which required a special building. The total appropriation by July 19, 1876, for this purpose was \$568,000. (269) This exhibit was begun under an executive order of President Grant, dated February 23, 1874. A board composed of one person named by each of the departments and the Smithsonian Institute and the Secretary of Agriculture was, thereby, created. Mr. Hawley commended the work of this board in making a prominent and honorable showing at the exhibition. The board's final report was transmitted to Congress on December 3, 1877. (270)

The problem of admitting goods to be exhibited required several acts of Congress. By the Act of June 18, 1874, they were to be admitted free of duty provided that were not sold or withdrawn and sold in the United States (271). On April

17, 1876, \$40,000 was appropriated for the purpose of examination and appraisal and other incidental expenses connected with the admission of Centennial exhibits (272). This measure was taken to prevent smuggling (274). The act of July 20, 1876, provided for the sale and delivery of foreign goods now in the exhibition buildings subject to such regulations and collections of duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion prescribe. The entire stock of an exhibitor was liable for duties if removed without the payment of lawful duties (275).

During 1875 and 1876 a large number of bills were introduced into Congress in connection with the Centennial. One bill proposed a peace Congress. Another sought to prevent traffic in intoxicating liquors around the Centennial buildings and grounds (278). There were several bills introduced to give the government employees a vacation so they could attend the Centennial (277). Several other bills sought to direct the Secretary of War to detail and assign to duty certain army officers, or else check out camp equipment to state troops or war veterans (279). One bill proposed the coinage of a Centennial coin (280). Another would send a Commission of mechanics and another a delegation of Indians to the exhibition (281). It was even proposed that Congress should invite Lafayette's grandson to attend (283).

There were four special days at the Centennial, May 10, 1876, was the day of opening. July 4 was celebrated as the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. September 27 was the date for the distribution of awards. November 10

was the closing date (284). All important national officials, the state governors, diplomatic corps and the foreign commissioners received formal invitations to attend the opening. Congress adjourned for the occasion (285). Congress refused to adjourn in order to permit its members to be present at the Centennial on July 4. (287).

After the close of the exhibition Congress was asked to erect a building at Washington to house the combined collection of the government exhibit and foreign exhibits which had been donated to the government (288). President Grant recommended that Congress act (289). Bills were introduced for that purpose in January 1877. (290)

The dissolution of the Centennial Board of Finance was a slow process. An act of June 6, 1892, authorized the Judge of the United States District Court to audit the books and report to the President the amount if any of unclaimed money which was to be paid to the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art. All officers were thereupon discharged (291). The final report of the Centennial Commission was made March 3, 1879. (294)

President Grant in his eighth annual message, December 5, 1876, said that the Centennial had been a great success (292). The conclusions of the encyclopedia Americana were that the exhibition was a most important landmark in the history of the country. Not only did it make later exhibitions possible and successful here, but it diffused inventions, broke down stolid self conceit and immeasurably advanced the knowledge of all nations which took part (295).

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

The alleged objectives for the participation of the United States in international exhibitions varied somewhat during the period from 1851 to 1876. It was the period of infancy and youth for this new form of international contact. Naturally this variation was in accord with the changing process experienced by the United States in those years.

International exhibitions were regarded as a means of advertising the United States in Europe. The gains from this advertising were commerce and immigration. The former was a desire to get new and enlarged markets for manufactured products. The latter seemed to be a bid for the skilled laborers of Europe to come to America and work in her factories or else settle in the West. The question might well be asked: Was there an alliance between the manufacturing East and North with the agricultural West for mutual benefit. The one wanted markets for manufactures; the other, wanted markets for cereals; both wanted immigration.

During the war one objective seemed to be to keep up appearances abroad. After the war it was to maintain our acknowledged strength and prestige. Following the examples of foreign countries not only national aid but national leadership was the expected thing.

According to another argument peace and good fellowship with other nations would be gained. Exhibitions were thought to cut down the possibilities of war. The American people should enjoy friendly rivalry with the peoples of other nations

in the fields of the arts of peace. This peace giving contact had the added feature of defusing knowledge. Exhibitions were regarded as great schools in which all could learn their good points and their defects. Knowledge and inventive skill would thus become the universal possessions of the race.

The fields of exhibition continually increased in number. After the war there was a movement on foot to exhibit such things as the school system, army equipment and the government departments as well as private accomplishments.

In the case of the Centennial a new objective was alleged. Patriotism became the subject for stirring debates. Strengthening the fraternal relationship by a mutual intermingling of sections and the healing war wounds was kept before Congress and the people. The essence of it all would be to create a national spirit. National honor was the basis of appeal for the passage of appropriation bills.

Another argument was based upon obtaining European capital by properly advertising the United States. This began as early as Vienna Exhibition of 1873 and was a well matured argument at the time of the Centennial. The Centennial would promote the recovery of prosperity by reopening the channels of business. Europe would be convinced that peace and fraternity actually existed and foreign capital would flow into America making it possible to fund the national debt at much lower rates of interest. There was also a cry for commerce and new commercial treaties which as had been pointed out would result from this type of advertising.

The post-war forces were seen at work. By 1876 the constitutionality of these measures was being seriously questioned and their supporters were ready to allege that the constitution was elastic enough to cover them. Exhibitions were therefore held to be within the power of the government. Several openly stated that they were for the centralization of the national state.

The strongest force behind the exhibitions was the manufacturing class. This included the holders of valuable patent rights and the corporations which would be benefited by the advertising which their products would receive. Of course, there were others such as the mining interests who were seeking capital; artists who had their work to show and agriculturalists with special breeds of animals or varieties of plants for exhibition. In the first exhibitions the manufacturers of agricultural machinery had a prominent place. Later every type of manufactured product was receiving its honors. This does not mean that agricultural products were not exhibited for they got their share of honors.

It is hard to place the responsibility of promotion upon one section alone although undoubtedly the section that had the most cities with their manufacturing plants was the most responsible. The New York Board of Trade had a big part in the organization of the Paris movement in the United States. Minnesota and Wisconsin memorialized Congress to appropriate for this exhibition. The governors of six New England states petitioned Congress for an appropriation to aid the Vienna

movement of 1873. Congress received memorials from the Boards of Trade at Cincinnati and Baltimore. The Chamber of Commerce and Merchants Exchange of Cincinnati, The New York Produce Exchange, New York Stock Exchange and the Anamati Board of Cotton Exchange asking for an appropriation for the Centennial. The Franklin Institute and the American Institute were interested in these movements. Pennsylvania, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, New Jersey and New Hampshire passed resolutions favoring the Centennial.

Such names as John Wanamaker, Daniel J. Morrell, William Sellers, George H. Corliss, R. C. McCormick, and John Welsh being either upon the Board of Finance or the Commission readily suggest the interest that were involved.

Certainly the agricultural districts had little direct gain in prospect. Indirectly of course they would be benefited by any measure that would promote the prosperity of the country. Immigration would develop the West, but immigration was also a good source of labor for the manufacturing centers. To whose benefit was the development of the West? Agricultural interests or capitalistic interest? The South had nothing to gain unless it was in those undeveloped regions awaiting capital such as Alabama which was feeling a new impetus by 1876. Perhaps too the short staple cotton growers sought new markets in Europe. Perhaps it would not be too great an exaggeration to say that the regions benefited were the industrial and the undeveloped which had industrial and mining possibilities that were beginning to be utilized.

From 1862 to 1867 the executive branch of the government was very willing to promote these exhibitions. It assumed responsibility and went ahead trusting that its actions would be sanctioned by Congress. Following the Civil War, the executive usually waited upon Congress to act. This was not entirely true though for President Grant lauched the movement to provide for an exhibition of the executive departments at the Centennial. Of course the executive might be ever so willing but it could spend no money until Congress was ready to appropriate it.

Congress generally speaking was slow to act. This slowness was detrimental. In fact if the money actually appropriated had been appropriated earlier in almost every case greater benefits would have been received. There was something to the statements that Congress was drawn into these exhibitions by a simple acceptance of an invitation with the proviso that there would be no expense to the treasury. Once under way appropriations were gradually pushed through with the prod that Congress was not obligated and the national honor was at stake. The minor European exhibitions of a special nature were usually ignored. Congress acted in almost every case because of strong outside pressure. In the case of the Centennial the number of congressmen on the Commission and the Board of Finance was rather significant. The Paris exhibition had more of the aspects of a national movement promoted by congressional legislation than any of these movements, but much of its real success was promoted by or-

ganized groups of individuals. Congress sanctioned what was done and furnished a large part of the necessary money. In the case of all the exhibitions in which United States citizens participated many men gave their time and services without pay from the government. When money could not be gotten from Congress much of it was raised from New York and Pennsylvania.

Government aid first came in the form of appointing a commissioner or a commission to take charge. This commissioner gathered the exhibit together and selected the articles to be sent. The government lent public vessels or else paid the freight upon the articles from New York to Europe in most cases. The government was expected to stand the expense of fitting up the space of that part of the exhibition building which was allotted to the United States. If extra room was needed a building was expected to be built at government expense. In the case of the Centennial government sanction was expected to give it recognition with other nations as that was international custom. The admission of foreign articles free of duty was another accepted custom followed by the government. Also following European example the idea of celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence added to the grandiosity of the occasion.

Political and economic conditions had much to do with the attitude of the opposition. In the case of the London Exhibition of 1862 it was the Trent Affair, Paris of 1867--the French in Mexico, Vienna of 1873--the patent question, Centennial of 1876--financial depression and scandals.

The opposition based a large part of their argument upon

constitutionality. They regarded these appropriations as extra-governmental and not within the authority of the constitution. Exhibitions should be left to private enterprise and the states. The constitutional fight was the strongest with reference to the Centennial. The Centennial was the work of a joint-stock company. Governmental scandals as the credit mobilier, had already caused the House to pledge itself not to grant any subsidies to any corporation engaged in or proposing to engage in any public or private enterprise. This group of the opposition desired to prevent the centralization of power in the hands of the national government and opposed stretching the constitution to cover any and every case of appropriation.

Exhibitions were often branded as sectional and as promoting private and corporate interests to the disadvantage of the great mass of people, for it was they who paid the taxes. Congress showed poor judgment in legislating. The propositions were submitted piecemeal instead of as a whole; thus promoting blind action.

After the war the financial argument was strong. Defending the treasury and the taxpayer was the ideal of many congressmen when the national debt was so large and the monetary system so abnormal. The financial depression of 1873 only added strength to the argument.

In the case of the Centennial there was a considerable rivalry chiefly between New York and Philadelphia for the location; however, when it was once located New York cooperated very readily in making the Centennial a success.

PART II

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL ADMINISTRATION

Chapter I

METHODS

Between 1862 and 1877 the United States played a significant part in world affairs in various fields of international activity. The field of action to be discussed is limited to participation in enterprises which depend upon the cooperation of three or more states--multilateral action. It is also limited to include only civil as distinguished from military and political matters. The prevailing tendencies are presented from two aspects, first, according to the method of adherence or participation, second, according to the type of activity or stresses.

There are five distinct methods of cooperation:

1. Executive order.
2. Legislative action.
3. Executive action authorized by legislation.
4. Bi-lateral treaties.
5. Multilateral treaties.

The first method was used when the United States adhered to the uniform tonnage admeasurement adopted by certain powers for the Suez Canal (1).

The second method of cooperation was by legislation which followed some scheme or uniform plan previously agreed upon by the international group. This was attempted but only parti-

ally and ineffectively carried out in the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures. From the early years of the Republic the idea of a uniform system of weights and measures had been growing. By the early sixties international opinion was leaning towards the metric system. The Statistical Congress of Berlin, 1863, adopted certain resolutions recommending the adoption of the system by the nations (3). On July 27 and 28, 1866, Congress adopted three measures with the intention of introducing the metric system into the United States as the accepted system (4).

In general the movement to adopt a system of universal and uniform coinage followed this method. The Statistical Congress at Berlin, 1863, recommended the alteration of the American dollar and the British sovereign so as to reduce them to multiples of the franc (5). A monetary conference consisting of delegates met at Paris in 1867.(6) The scheme adopted provided for the adjustment of the coinage of all countries into a decimal system based upon the five franc piece as a common unit. During the years of 1868 and 9, Congress seriously considered legislation which would be in line with a universal coinage (7).

With certain limitations the solution for the international copyright was by legislation. Most of the important powers had more liberal copyright laws than the United States. There was a demand for adjustments to be made with Great Britain but some wanted a truly universal copyright (8). A number of bills were introduced into Congress for the purpose of giving

foreign authors their just protection in the United States (9).

In patent legislation the United States was ahead of most nations as to liberal regulations. An unofficial body representing several nations met at Vienna in conjunction with the exhibition of 1873. It drew up a series of resolutions which were to serve as a guide for uniform patent laws to be adopted by the legislative bodies of the various nations (10). The American patent system was already in harmony with the major features of these resolutions (11).

The third method of cooperation was illustrated by the treaty which created the International Postal Union. After 1851 the making of postal treaties became the special power of the Postmaster subject to the approval of the President. This power was delegated to him by the two acts of Congress approved March 3, 1851. One gave him the power to enter into contracts with foreign countries in reference to transporting the mails across their territories. The other gave him the power to reduce and enlarge rates of postage on mails conveyed between the United States and foreign countries; also, to make better arrangements with foreign countries with the advice and consent of the President (62). The revised postal legislation of June 8, 1872 specifically gave him the power to conclude postal treaties (63). Therefore a new type of treaty was instituted which was authorized by a general act of Congress. It was not a treaty in the sense of the constitution as it was not ratified by the Senate but merely approved by the President.

The general conditions of the international mail service

in 1862 was given by the Blair report. He characterized it as being extremely loose and defective. Between nations there existed no common standard of weight for the single rate and no common rate for sea and overland transit. Inland transit rates on domestic correspondence furnished no rule for overland transit rates of foreign correspondence. Rates upon closed mails were not uniform by distance or by other common rules, and they varied greatly according to the route of carriage. The foreign mail system was too complex to be readily understood by postmasters, and as a result many mistakes and unfortunate delays occurred. A general congress of the powers was the only hope of remedying these evils as the task was too difficult for bilateral treaties (64).

Mr. Blair took definite steps to bring about an international conference. His letter outlined fourteen points for discussion and action and it was transmitted to the various powers by the State Department. The points he suggested were:

1. A uniform standard of weight for the single rate on written correspondence.
2. A uniform standard for adjusting the postal rates upon printed correspondence.
3. Uniformity of rates to destination by whatever route of intermediate transit.
4. Uniform conditions of prepayment--whether compulsory or optional; if optional a double rate, if not prepaid.
5. An uniform scale for the increase of weights.
6. Whether each country may collect and retain the postage on mail matter--whether compulsory or optionally prepaid or remaining unpaid. (The object here was to avoid postal accounts between nations except for intermediate transit charges).
7. Transit postal charges overland by intermediate countries to be established upon a uniform basis.

Should the charges be accounted for by the ounce? By the dispatching country? By closed bags? Or otherwise?

8. The same proposition as point seven was to be discussed for ocean transit.
9. Disposition of letters not delivered in the country of destination.
10. A uniform system for the registration of letters and affixing postal charges thereon.
11. Classification and reservations with reference to printed matter.
12. Reserved rights of a country with respect to the route of transit for correspondence dispatched by it.
13. The practicality of an international limited money order system.
14. Other topics offered by the post-departments of other countries (65).

It was evident that Mr. Blair wished to simplify, standardize and give uniformity to the entire international system which was now being administered by various governments along the lines of their own selfish advantages. To accomplish this uniformity certain national rights and privileges had to be given up.

The postal conference met at Paris from May 11 to June 8, 1863.(66). The post-departments of Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Spain, United States, France, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Sandwich Islands, Switzerland and the Hanseatic Cities were represented. The Government of Ecuador adhere by letter (67).

Thirty one rules were established in harmony with the suggestions of the Blair letter. Some of the most significant were:

1. Uniform classification was to be established according to six classes.
2. The prepayment of postage on ordinary letters, when ever possible, was to be at the option of the sender, but in such cases unprepaid letters must bear a moderate additional charge.
3. Letters insufficiently prepaid in the dispatching country must be rated as unpaid--deducting the value of the stamps affixed.
4. Registered letters must in all cases be prepaid to destination.
6. Prepaid international correspondence aught not to be charged with an additional rate on delivery.
7. Rates of international correspondence was to be established according to the same scale of weights in all countries.
8. The metrical decimal system was to be adopted for all international postal relations.
9. The single rate upon international letters was to be applied to each standard weight of fifteen grams or fractional part thereof.
10. The sigle rate was to be applied to each forty grams or fractional part in fourth and fifth class matter.
16. Whereever intermediate transit charges render it practicable, the rates upon international correspondence should be the same by whatever route taken.
17. Correspondence was to be dispatched by the route indicated by the sender or by the rate of postage paid. In absence of indication the dispatching office determined the route.
20. International postal accounts could not be suppressed by a rule of general application, but they should be simplified as far as possible.
25. Transit charges were never to be higher than one-half the interior rate of the tansit country and in small countries less.
26. The cost of sea conveyance claimed by a nation

was to be no higher than the rate charged upon its own correspondence.

27. In the adjustment of uniform postal rates the greatest number of countries possible should be included in the same zone subject to the same rate.

30. Free conveyance of the official communications of each administration should be granted by the other administrations (68).

These rules were ideal enough when compared with the system then in use, but the inauguration of the new order was left to bilateral treaties in which the bargaining of individual countries would not always measure up to the ideal. President Lincoln said that the rules were well adapted as a basis for future postal conventions which would inaugurate a general system of uniform international charges at reduced rates of postage (69). Mr. Blair said that he would adopt the thirty-one rules in the making of treaties. He hoped, thereby, to reorganize the foreign mail service of the United States (70).

By 1874 the United States had made definite progress in obtaining more liberal postal treaties; however, the first treaty adopting these rules was not signed until 1866 with Venezuela (71). Analysis of the first nine treaties, formed between 1866 and 76, showed that reforms were being made, and according to the statements of the Postmaster General they adopted the leading reforms of the Paris Conference (72). The single rate was being reduced. The single weight was fixed at one-half ounce or fifteen grams. In five cases out of nine there were no transit charges. In the others they were

fixed at one half the inland charges except in the case of the North German Confederation where the charge was to be agreed upon when used. In seven cases the dispatching routes were to be determined by the dispatching office. In the other two cases mail was to be sent by subsidized packets. The first nine treaties were with Venezuela, Hong Kong, Great Britain, Belgium, North German Union, Italy, Switzerland, Netherlands and Brazil (73). Additional treaties were made from time to time, and as a result the transit charges and the single rate were greatly lowered. More liberal treaties were concluded with New Zealand in 1870, Denmark in 1871, Ecuador in 1871, Newfoundland in 1872, New South Wales in 1872, Norway and Sweden in 1872, Japan in 1873 and France in 1874. France deserves special attention because she refused to more liberal measures until adopted by a considerable number of powers (74).

The British treaty of 1867 was considered a model treaty. It reduced the single rate on letters from twenty-four cents to twelve cents. It fixed the standard weight of letters at one-half ounce or fifteen grams. The prepayment of letters was optional, but unpaid letters were subject to a fine. Prepayment upon all other matter was made compulsory. The postage collected in each country upon the international mail of the two countries was to be equally divided between them. Transit charges on letters in closed mails were to be one half the domestic rate of each country. Each country was to make its own arrangements for the dispatching of mails. Extra-territorial mails were to be transferred free of charge in the

sea ports of each country (75).

By 1870 the single rate in most cases had been reduced as much as one-half or even two-thirds of what it had been in 1867. The following table showed how great the reduction was upon letter (77).

	1867	1870
1. Great Britain-----	24¢-----	6¢
2. Germany direct-----	15¢-----	7¢
3. Switzerland-----	42¢-----	10¢
4. Italy-----	40¢-----	10¢
5. Belgium-----	27¢-----	10¢
6. Netherlands-----	27¢-----	10¢
7. Japan-----	59¢-----	27¢

The reform served to wipe out the large balances due foreign countries against the United States department (76).

The French negotiations between 1867 to 1874 illustrated clearly the forces at work for and against liberal postal treaties. The last postal treaty signed with France was Mar. 2, 1857. It was negotiated between departments. There were three ways of dispatching mail: By the direct route between France and the United States on French packets, by United States packets between United States and Great Britain and by British ships between United States and Great Britain. France was to pay the expenses by the direct line to or from France except when carried by United States mail packets; also the expenses on all mails between France and England including the British transit charges and sea transportation by British vessels. The United States was to pay expenses of transportation by the United States mail packets whether to France direct or to Great Britain. Prepayment was optional with no fine for nonprepayment. The single weight was seven and one-half grams or one-fourth ounce, and the single rate was fifteen

cents or eighteen centimes. The sea rates to the United States were three cents at the expense of the French office; nine cents at the expense of the United States office to the British frontier, and twelve cents at the expense of the United States to the French frontier. To France the charges were three cents at expense of United States office; six cents at the expense of the United States office to the British frontier, and twelve cents at the expense of the French office to the French frontier. The transit charges in France ranged from twenty-one to thirty-three cents; besides custom duties were charged ranging from nine to twenty-seven cents. To say the least the system thus established was very expensive and complicated in operation (78). France monopolized the direct route, and it was necessary to use the indirect route or else pay the French rates. The single rate on inland postage in the United States had been reduced to three cents (79).

On December 12, 1866, the Postmaster General asked for a modification of the French treaty upon the basis of reduced rates on international postage, and territorial and sea conveyance of closed mails on a basis of reciprocity. The French department requested that the Postmaster General send a delegate. Mr. John A. Kasson, who had been a delegate to the postal conference at Paris was appointed. He was sent to Europe to arrange the details of postal conventions, not only with France but Great Britain, Prussia, Belgium, and other European countries subject to the approval of the Postmaster General. His instructions were to negotiate upon the basis

of the principles laid down by the Paris conference of 1863. He was to stress the reduction of rates on international mails, the reduction or total abolition of territorial transit charges upon correspondence in closed mails, the establishment of uniform postage rates in all parts of Europe for United States mail and generally to simplify the rules governing the exchange of correspondence with foreign countries (81).

The Kasson negotiations immediately struck a number of difficulties. The only satisfactory concession the French would give was the elevation of the single weight on letters to ten grams, and the United States wanted fifteen grams (82). Kasson succeed in the reast of Europe but not in France (83).

France wished to retain her old privileges with reference to sea and territorial charges. She was unwilling to make any concessions commensurate with those made by Great Britain. Mr. Kasson pointed out that the postage between the United States and France upon thirty-three per cent less weight was twenty-five per cent higher in rates than the postage of Great Britain. Mr. Kasson wanted a fine to be imposed by each country for its own use upon unpaid letters. He further insisted that each office retain all the postage collected or else make an equal division of all postage collected in each of the countries on the basis of the amount of mail exchanged. The French were asked to lower their outrageously high intermediate transit charges, but they refused (84). The French on their part stated that they did not admit the correctness of the opinions expressed by the Paris Conference relative to the dispatching

of closed mails. Reduction of these rates was favorable to both England and the United States but their trade over subsidized lines would be injured (85). France wished the United States to pay an equal share in subsidizing a line between the United States and France as a concession for cheaper sea rates. She flatly refused to reduce domestic rates (86).

During the next year negotiations were carried on between the departments directly. Mr. Randall gave the French one year's notice that the treaty of 1857 would be terminated on February 1, 1869. He invited a French agent to Washington, but France refused to send one. His basis for negotiation was essentially the same as the instructions he had given Mr. Kasson. Mr. Vandal, the French head of posts, asked for a diplomatic convention between the governments instead of between the departments. He would elevate the single weight to ten grams. If the United States persisted in sending her mails via England he would make no reduction in rates, but if she would establish a subsidized line to operate along with French line he would make some reductions. He argued that accommodations given by France were far greater than any the United States could give as to intermediate transit; especially since the United States transit competed with established French packets. He offered to agree that neither country would ever pay a higher transit rate than that charged other countries for the same transit. He also argued that there could be no reciprocity as to sea carriage under the present arrangement because the service given by the United States was small when

compared with French service. France could not lower her inland transit rates until new treaties were formed with other countries.

Mr. Randall replied that no advantage could be gained by the United States by negotiating through the regular diplomatic channels. Independence of the administrations in selection of route would not impair efficiency, but on the contrary would simplify the service. He fully appreciated the advantages of direct mail service but it was impossible without the consent of Congress to establish a subsidized line between New York and Havre to compensate for the French line. A single rate of ten grams would require the buying of new scales and the use of the gram system by the American post offices while fifteen grams approximated one-half ounce. Fifteen grams was the weight adopted by other countries. He would accept either fifteen grams at a fixed rate of fifteen cents or seven and one-half grams at ten cents. He could see no satisfactory reason for France demanding double the amount of the United States for inland postage, as the French subsidized line would not justify this claim. The American department would not allow France an unequal share of letter postage. French transit rates were now prohibitory to American mails and if France wanted this trade she must reduce her rates or the United States would continue to send her mails via other countries (87).

Mr. Vandal asked for delay and Mr. Randall extended the date of expiration to April 1, 1869, when Mr. Creswell became Postmaster General. Mr. Creswell further extended the

date to January 1, 1870. He appointed Mr. Alexander Ramsey chairman of the Senate Committee on Post offices and Post Roads as commissioner to negotiate at Paris. Mr. Chandler, also a senator, was authorized to assist him (88). He was instructed to get an equal share of the interior rates of postage, and he must insist that each department should make its own arrangements for the dispatching of mails and pay the cost of transportation thereof from the port of debarkation to the receiving country. A further requirement was the levying of a fine to the exclusive use of the delivering country upon unpaid or insufficiently prepaid letters. The standard weight of ten grams could be yielded to if necessary, and if France refused to grant cheap rates no provision for territorial transit of closed mails was to be made. Sea and intermediate charges must be sufficiently low. When in doubt the Belgium and North German Union treaties were to be followed (89).

The French laid down certain inviolable conditions that had to be met before they would negotiate. First the standard weight must not be above ten grams. Second, France must receive her twenty centimes four sous for the interior postage. Mr. Ramsey was informed that the negotiations might as well end if this interior rate was not conceded (90). He also discovered that the French had exacted the twenty centime interior postage from every government in Europe. A treaty with Italy after eighteen months of negotiation had renewed this feature. A French treaty with England was along similar illiberal lines.

It reduced postage from forty to thirty centimes and increased the single weight to ten grams. England got three-eighths of the postage collected and France got five-eighths (91). From these facts the conclusion was inescapable that France was the leading obstacle in the way of definite postal reform.

The Postmaster General referred the French conditions to the President who decided that the United States should assent to the ten gram standard but not to the twenty centime inland rate unless the United States was permitted to charge an equal rate. The French would not make any concessions as to inland rate. They said that if this was done the same terms had to be granted to all the nations in Europe and they did not intend to do that (92).

Mr. Creswell was forced to explain to Congress the difficulties involved, for certain citizens resident in France were protesting against the excessive rates that were being charged (93). He said that France refused to make liberal terms and reduce rates. Her rates upon American letters were higher than those charged by any other civilized country. France would not make reciprocal agreements. She was thus just the exact opposite of Great Britain (94).

The French again asked for a further extension of time but Mr. Creswell refused to grant it; therefore, direct postal intercourse with France was suspended after January 1, 1870. Mr. Creswell was very willing to reopen the negotiations whenever France would consider liberal terms (96).

A summary of the difficulties involved showed that France

refused to put inland rates upon a reciprocal basis. She would not grant more than ten grams as the standard weight for letters. She flatly refused to lower intermediate transit rates and sea rates. Also she would not agree to an equal division of postage receipts. Naturally no agreement was reached when much more favorable concessions were being obtained by the United States from other countries (97).

After the severing of postal relations for over four years a treaty was signed, April 28, 1874, between departments. Three routes for the dispatching of mails were specified: The French mail packets, the packets of the Hamburg line and via England over packets employed between England and the United States. Expenses were to be defrayed by the dispatching office. The rates by the French packets were to be whatever the American office would pay, but not lower than rates charged the French over the Hamburg line. Single weights and rates were compromised. On letters from France to the United States the charge to be fifty centimes per ten grams. On letters from the United States to France the charge was nine cents per fifteen grams. Twenty-five centimes or five cents extra was to be levied upon unpaid letters. Rates upon sample of merchandise, engravings, books, etc. were to be fixed by the country of origin. In the case where one country served as an intermediary for mails of the other the rates were to be equal to those charged the inhabitants of that particular country upon their foreign mails (98). This last point was clearly one of the concessions made by the United States for the renewal of postal

intercourse. The French gave a much more liberal treaty than they had formerly offered to give, but this treaty was less liberal than other postal treaties which the United States had secured with other countries (99).

As a result of the Berne Congress of September 15 to October 9, 1874, the Postal Union was created (100). Mr. Blackfan, Superintendent of the Foreign Mails, was selected to represent the United States department. He was authorized to affix his signature subject to the approval of the Postmaster General and the President (101). The treaty was signed, October 9, 1874, by Germany, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, United States, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Luxemburg, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey. The powers exchanged ratifications at Berne on May 3, 1875. France gave her adhesion with certain conditions. She reserved her right to make tariff charges, and the treaty was not to go into effect for her until January 1, 1876. On March 8, 1875, the approval of the Postmaster General and the President was given, and the attached protocol making the treaty obligatory upon all the signers, except France; was approved on May 21, 1875.(103)

The treaty outlined the general principles as well as the detached regulations that were to govern the Postal Union. The Postmaster General pointed out some of the more important features from the viewpoint of the United States. A uniform letter rate of six cents per fifteen grams was established. This greatly reduced the existing rates established by bilater-

al treaties with the exception of postal treaties with Great Britain and Germany. All keeping of accounts upon international correspondence was abolished. The Postmaster General thought that this would add to the postal revenues of the United States as she would retain the large excess of foreign postage which had been collected by the United States and paid to foreign governments under the old arrangements. The countries composing the union formed a single postal territory for all of their offices as to rates, regulations, etc. The relation of countries within the Union to those outside was still to be regulated by special conventions. Domestic postal legislation of any country was not affected or altered, nor was the right of parties to the union to form more restricted unions for the further improvement of postal conditions limited. The International Bureau of the General Postal Union acted under regulations designated by the general congress. Its expenses were to be paid by the contracting countries according to six classes based upon importance of mail service. The United States was in the first class. Liberty of transit throughout the entire Postal Union and across any of the contracting parties as an intermediary was guaranteed. The sending office was to pay the transit country two francs per kilogram for 750 kilometers and four francs for longer distances. The treaty conceded that this provision did not apply to the Indian mails nor the transit across the United States from New York to San Francisco. These must continue to be the subject of special agreements. Another provision of the treaty particularly wanted by the United States was the elevation of the single

weight upon printed matter including newspapers to two ounces. A provision which France objected to and which created a need for legislation in the United States was that neither the senders nor the addressees of letters and other postal packets were to be asked to pay additional duties other than those contemplated by this treaty (104).

Entrance into the Postal Union simplified postal relationships and reduced the rates of postage for twenty three countries. Other countries were seeking admission and it was hoped that the accession to the Postal Union treaty would soon be universal in order that international accounts would be entirely abolished. Such an extension would promote peace and fraternity among the nations (105). Since accounts had been discontinued the American office found it necessary to record only the weights of the Postal Union mails (106).

The Postal Union was functioning and growing. Two minor disagreements over the interpretation of certain treaty details were settled through the bureau by the unanimous vote of the postal administrations. Other points at issue were postponed until the next Congress to be held at Paris in 1878 (106). Under a special arrangement signed at Berne, January 27, 1876, Hong Kong, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, Labrian, Mauritius and dependencies, British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica, and Bermuda Islands were to be admitted, April 1; Spanish colonies and the Netherland colonies were to be admitted May 1; Japan, Brazil and Portuguese colonies were to be admitted June 1; Persia, Greenland and Danish West Indies were to be admitted September 1, 1877. (107)

According to Mr. Key's report of November 9, 1877, there was no portion of the world with which the United States had as unsatisfactory mail arrangements as South America. The adhesion of these countries to the Postal Union would greatly liberalize and perfect the postal intercourse of the United States. Special efforts by the Associated Industries of the United States, an organization of the leading merchants of the city of Philadelphia, to urge these countries to join the Postal Union (108).

There was one source of embarrassment between the United States and the Postal Union. Duties were being charged upon books received of foreign countries by mail. The International Bureau held that, if a postal administration could not deliver a book without revenue charges within its territory, the book was to be returned to the sender. The Postmaster General recommended that Congress make provision for the delivery of books through the mail free from duty.

The fourth method of cooperation was by the bilateral treaty. In these treaties the United States pledged herself to adopt or carry out certain measures which an international group had adopted or carried out.

Three examples of the bilateral-treaty method were the treaties with Denmark, Hanover and Belgium concerning the capitalization of dues levied upon commerce by each of these countries in certain waterways falling under their jurisdiction. The treaty with Denmark was concluded in 1857, (15) the one with Belgium in 1863, (17). In each case a concert of nations agreed

to capitalize the dues. In the Danish case the bilateral treaty preceded the general treaty, but in the other two cases the bilateral treaty followed (263).

The supreme example of this method of cooperation was the bilateral treaties with Great Britain for the abolition of the slave trade. As early as the Congress of Vienna in 1815 Great Britain had been getting treaty sanctions from the nations against slave trade. In 1850 she was a party to twenty-four treaties denouncing it. Ten concede a mutual right of search with trial before home tribunals. Two provided for naval cooperation. The quintuple treaty of 1841 between Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, Austria and France substituted for naval cooperation a limited right of search. France withheld every ratification. In 1842 the United States was placed upon the same basis as France by signing the same treaty for naval cooperation (43).

This treaty with Great Britain of August 9, 1842, provided that each power should provide and equip an adequate squadron in African waters. The laws, rights and obligations of each were to be enforced, separately and respectively, with reference to this nefarious trade. Said squadrons were to be independent of each other, but such orders were to be given the commanding officers of each so as to enable them to work most effectively in concert. A further provision was that the two powers would join in remonstrances with other powers with whose dominions a market for slaves was found (18).

On May 5, 1854, a move was made in the Senate to abrogate

the article which provided for the cooperation of the fleets. It was alleged that the operation of the squadrons was ineffective, inefficient and expensive. Secrecy was removed, June 25, 1856.(20)

One could gain an idea as to the general conditions of enforcement from the reports of Secretary Seward and Secretary Caleb B. Smith. Mr. Smith's report of November 30, 1861, revealed the fact that the President had by an executive order of May 2, 1860, placed the responsibility for the execution of the act of March 3, 1819, upon the Department of Interior. The negroes taken were being removed by the expense of the government to Liberia. Through the agency of the American Colonization Society 4,500 African, captured upon the high seas were removed to that republic (23). On March 22, 1862, Mr. Seward said that since 1842 no slaves had been carried into the territories of Great Britain and with one exception none had been carried into the United States. Slaves had been carried into the territory of Spain by persons resident in other countries by the fraudulent use of flags.(21)

The treaty signed April 7, 1862, provided: The war vessels of each nation which have been provided with special instructions could visit merchant vessels of the other reasonably suspected of engaging in slave trade. Suspected vessels could be detained and brought to trial. This right of search could be exercised only by war vessels in certain limited waters. These limits were within two hundred miles of the coast of Africa and southward from 32° north latitude; also

within thirty leagues of Cuba. Search could not be exercised within the limits of a port and in the territorial waters of the other party. Losses incurred by wrongful detention were to be made good by the offending party. A vessel could be detained if certain specified things were found among its equipment and no damage could be asked. Persons found on board were to be turned over to the government under whose flag they were sailing, or else to the country of which they were known to be citizens, for punishment. Negroes on board were to be liberated by the nation making the capture.

Three mixed courts were established to adjudicate with as little delay as possible the cases arising. The courts were formed by an equal number of persons from each of the nations named for that purpose by their respective governments. One court was located at Sierra Leone, one at the Cape of Good Hope and one at New York. There was to be no appeal from the decision reached by anyone of these courts. Decisions were to be based upon the treaty and its instructions. The general expenses of the courts were divided equally between the two powers, but the salaries of judges and assistants were paid by the appointing government (22).

The ships of war were to be furnished with a copy of the treaty and instructions and each nation was to give the other the names of vessels so employed. Search was to be made in all cases by an officer of the rank of lieutenant or by the officer who was second in command at the time of the search. Search was to be conducted with the courtesy and the dignity

which ought to be observed between two allied and friendly powers (18).

Great Britain wished to make the treaty of unlimited duration, but the United States would sign for only ten years. The government lost no time in putting the treaty into effect. It was ratified, April 24 (24) and proclaimed, June 7, (25). An additional article was concluded February, 17, 1863, ratified March 5, and proclaimed April 22. It extended the regions in which search could be exercised to include within thirty leagues from Madagariar, Porto Rico and San Domingo. The article was to have the same effect as if attached to the former treaty (26).

Why did the United States give up her scruples about the right of search? Mr. Perry wrote on July 11, 1862, that Calderon Collanter, the Spanish prime minister, was much surprised that the United States should have yielded on this question of search after combating it so long. Mr. Perry, also heard that Great Britain was considering the negotiation of similar treaties with France and Spain (27). Mr. Seward replied on August 2 that slave trade had been carried on in defiance of laws by corrupting the administrative justice. The treaty contained no provisions that could embarrass an honest and lawful trade or wound the national pride. It was freely offered to Great Britain. The Senate unanimously ratified it, and it was distinctly approved by Congress and the country (28). Perhaps, there was another angle. Could it have been a move to establish more friendly relations with England at a time when there were most needed?

What were the results of enforcement? President Lincoln in the message of December 1, 1862, said that the treaty had been put into operation with a good prospect of success. The execution of it on the part of England had been marked with a jealous respect for the authority of the United States and the rights of her moral and loyal citizens (29). In the message of December 8, 1863, he said that the supplementary treaty had been carried into execution. It was believed that as far as American ports and American citizens were concerned that this inhuman and odious trade had ceased (30). Evidently, though the results were not what had been expected. Documents transmitted to Congress in July, 1864, revealed the difficulties. The French squadron was absent and the Spaniards were carrying on the trade under the French flag. The American members of the court at Sierra Leone stated that inter-tribal wars were regularly waged for the purpose of getting slaves to sell, as they were the African standard of value. It was suggested that commissioners should be appointed, from the United States and such other nations as would cooperate, to treat with the African tribes and get them to refrain from selling prisoners as slaves. The introduction of agricultural implements and general civilization would be an important step in preventing the trade. In Cuba the Spanish officials were accused of receiving bribes to tolerate the trade, and the many key and secret landings made capture extremely difficult. Perhaps, the most important obstacle was that the American navy had other occupations besides stopping the slave trade (35).

The United States took diplomatic action with Spain to stop the trade. On February 6, 1864, Mr. Seward wrote Koerner that upon the basis of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain of 1842, he was to protest against the Cuban situation and the Cuban laws. He was to say that the laws of the United States classed slave trade as piracy and he hoped that Cuban laws would be revised. The treaty relations of the United States and Great Britain were to be carefully explained (32).

Great Britain was earnestly pushing enforcement. On December 7, 1864, Earl Russel suggested that the United States and Great Britain make a public declaration denouncing slave trade as piracy and pass legislation affixing the death penalty. He addressed similar suggestions to all the European powers (33). On June 10, 1865, Mr. Bruce asked Seward if the joint cooperation of the navies could not now be put into effect. Mr. Seward replied that the Secretary of the Navy would carry this provision of the treaty of 1862 into effect (34).

President Johnson said in his third annual message, December 3, 1867, that slave trade from American ports or by American citizens had altogether ceased. He raised the question whether the United States should not propose to Great Britain a suspension and discontinuance of the stipulation for maintaining a naval force to suppress the trade (36).

The mixed court system proved unsatisfactory to the United States. President Grant's message of December 6, 1869, stated that in conformity with the recommendations of Congress

Great Britain was asked to abolish the mixed courts. Thereupon, an additional convention was signed, June 3; ratified, July 8, and proclaimed, September 16, 1870. Provisions as to the mixed courts were to cease, and their jurisdiction was to be exercised by the prize courts of each country. Appeal was permitted in the same manner as in cases of maritime prize. Vessels belonging to citizens of one of the two nations were to be turned over to the prize courts of that particular nation. All negroes captured by the vessels of either country were to be handed over to British authority. This treaty was to have the same duration as the other treaty of April 7, 1862, was to remain in effect until terminated.

(38)

Diplomatic correspondence, March 6 to October 30, 1872, showed that the United States cooperated with Great Britain by placing pressure upon the Sultan of Zanzibar. The Sultan had a treaty with Great Britain that permitted him to transport the slaves of his own dominions by sea. This became a cloak for slave trade and Great Britain wished to have the objectionable parts of the treaty annulled. She asked the United States to cooperate. The United States Consul at Zanzibar was instructed to tell the Sultan that the United States desired annulment. A war vessel was also given orders to stop at Zanzibar and state the same wishes. As a result the bad features were removed from the treaty, thanks to the aid of the United States Consul (41).

The Congressional appropriations give some insight into the zeal manifested by the United States in enforcement.

1860-----	\$ 40,000
1861-----	\$900,000
1862-----	\$900,000
1863-----	\$ 17,000
1864-----	\$ 17,000
1865-----	\$ 17,000
1866-----	\$ 17,000
1867-----	\$ 17,000
1868-----	\$ 12,500
1869-----	\$ 12,500

Salaries of officials were not included in the above figures. After 1869 the appropriations ceased (42).

The British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society and Universal alliance, on January 28, 1875, invited the United States to appoint a delegate to a conference which would renew by a diplomatic act the declarations of the Congress of Vienna, 1815, and the conference of Verona, 1822 in regard to slave trade. Mr. Fish replied that the date of reception prevented the United States taking part; however, it was not a practice of the government to participate in conferences instigated by private authority (44).

The fifth method of international participation was the multilateral treaty. The United States was invited to send an official delegate to the congress for the amelioration of the wounded (45), but she only sent an observer. A multilateral treaty was signed at Geneva, August 22, 1864, and the President of the Swiss Confederation invited the United States to accede to it on November 26. (56) It was finally acceded to on March 1, 1882. (57)

On November 23, 1869 the President proposed a multilateral convention upon submarine cables. No results followed the proposal until March 14, 1884, when a convention was signed at Paris. It was ratified by the United States on January 28,

1885.

Probably the first multilateral treaty signed by the United States in conjunction with the powers was that of the Cape Spartel Light. Mr. McMath, United States consul at Tangiers wrote, March 26, 1864, that a treaty was proposed by the Sultan of Morocco. The Sultan had constructed a light house at Tangiers. As he had no ships he thought that the powers should pay the expense of maintaining the light. Mr. McMath said that the United States had no commercial interests in Morocco and he could discover no reason why she should contribute to the perpetual maintenance of a light house there any more than the South American states should (50). The State Department on November 7, 1864, approved Mr. McMath's action and gave him full power to treat with the representatives of the foreign powers with regard to the said light (51).

The treaty was concluded at Tangiers between the United States, Austria, Spain, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Netherlands, Portugal and Sweden on the one part and the Sultan of Morocco on the other. It was signed, May 31, 1865, but was not transmitted to the Senate until April 23, 1866. It was ratified on July 5, and proclaimed, March 12, 1867. (264)

The light house was constructed at the expense of the government of Morocco, but the superior direction and administration of it were to be devolved upon representatives of the contracting powers. The expenses of the light house were to be borne by the contracting powers by annual and equal contributions. Superintendence of the light was placed in

the hands of representatives of the powers, but a light house guard was to be furnished by the Sultan. The powers guaranteed the neutrality of the light, and stated that the sovereignty of the Sultan was not to be encroached upon (264).

The annual appropriation beginning with 1871 for the next twelve years was \$285.(53) What were the interests that led the United States into this treaty? The Consul's statement showed that they were not commercial. Perhaps, it was the Civil War which caused the State Department to realize the advantage of keeping up appearance with other nations.

The interest of the united States in the metric system could be assigned as her reason for signing the multilateral treaty which established the International Bureau of Weights and Measures at Paris. To understand the origin of this treaty one must investigate the beginnings of the International Standard Commission. This commission was organized to furnish metric standards to the nations represented upon it (61). France invited the United States to become a member of this commission in the spring of 1869. In 1866, Congress had adopted measures making the system legal and optional, so it was very natural that Prof. Henry represented the United States at the first session of this commission at Paris in 1870. At the second session in 1872 Mr. J. E. Hilgard was the representative. As a result of this meeting an international bureau was recommended. On January 10, 1873, France asked the United States to participate. The object of the conference was to conclude a diplomatic convention and it must, therefore,

be composed of both diplomatic and special delegates. The United States was asked to designate a special delegate in addition to her minister at Paris. Participation was urged by the National Academy of Science and by Benj. Pierce, Superintendent of the Coast Survey. The Secretary of the Treasury said that it was not possible to send special delegates. Mr. E. B. Washburne, United States minister at Paris was instructed to act for the United States, but he was not to make any definite engagements until duly considered at home. The conference was convened in March 1875, and the convention was signed on May 20 by seventeen countries. Great Britain and Holland declined to take part (55).

The United States hesitated about ratifying the treaty, and the date of final ratification had to be extended several times for her benefit (58). On March 10, 1876 it was transmitted to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was brought to light again on April 2, 1878 and reported on April 10. It was finally ratified on May 28 and proclaimed on September 27. (57)

The treaty established the permanent International Bureau of Weight and Measures at Paris. It was to be managed by an international committee which in turn was controlled by a general conference composed of the delegates of the contracting powers. Its duties in general were the comparison and verification of the new prototypes of the meter and kilogram. Periodic comparison was to be made with the standards to prevent variation in the copies given to the contracting powers. Non metrical weights and measures used in the various countries

for scientific purposes were to receive a similar comparison. Similar care of thermometers, geodesic bars and scales of precision was to be given when requested by contracting governments and by men of science. The expense of maintenance was to be distributed among the contracting powers in proportion to actual population. International conferences must be summoned by the committee at least one every six years (59). After the Expiration of ten years the treaty could be abrogated by any power as far as itself was concerned.

Appropriations for maintenance from 1879 to 1886 were as follows:

1879-----	\$13,124.00
	1,900.00
1880-----	\$ 1,900.00
1881-----	\$ 2,347.75
1882-----	\$ 2,270.00
1883-----	\$ 2,270.00
1884-----	\$ 2,270.00
1885-----	\$ 2,275.00
1886-----	\$ 2,270.00

The general conference met on June 30, 1886, and \$1,200 was appropriated for the expenses of the American delegate.(60)

A number of other multilateral treaties were proposed. Mr. Jay suggested a convention between England, Austria and the United States upon the patent question (110). The United States was asked to join the Latin Monetary Union (111). Several individuals recommended treaties for the unification of coinage (111). The Washington treaty, signed May 8, 1871, had three rules of neutrality which the contracting powers, Great Britain and the United States, were to bring to the knowledge of the other maritime powers. The United States noticed that she was not invited to the Brussels conference of 1874 for the

amelioration of the prisoners of war (114). She refused to enter the Telegraphic Union.(115)

Chapter II

STRESSES

International action followed certain lines and could conveniently be divided into stresses from the standpoint of the major objectives involved. It was a means for:

1. Improvement of navigation and communication.
2. The exercising of international police.
3. The amelioration of the horrors of war and disease.
4. The gathering of information and the promotion of science.
5. The removal of international complexities by uniformity.
6. The preservation of peace.

The United States took a very definite part in the improvement of navigation. Examples were the abolition of the Sound, Stade and Scheldt dues; the Cape Spartel light, and the unification of tonnage specifications and dues for the Suez Canal. She was asked to adopt the marine signals. As has been stated they were formed by a Franco-British commission. France asked the government to control the publication of this code to prevent any variation from the original French and British editions. The question of adopting this code was laid before the Treasury Department on July 24, 1867. (116)

An international commission was called to fix the tonnage admeasurement and dues for vessels going through the Suez canal. The United States was invited, but misunderstood the invitation. The distance also prevented her from taking part. She was asked by the Turkish government to accede to

the agreement reached by the commission. Tonnage admeasure-
ment was regulated by an act of Congress of 1864, but the
Secretary of the Treasury decided to give vessels bound for
Europe and likely to visit the canal a special certificate
of admeasurement conforming to the agreement of the com-
mission (117). A further modification of the tolls was
acceded to on March 23, 1877.(118)

The Cape Spartel light as an aid to commerce has been
discussed. The Sound, Stade and Scheldt dues deserve further
attention.

The Sound dues negotiation did not come in the period
under discussion but its close relation with the Stade and
Scheldt dues justifies giving it some discussion. The third
annual message of President Pierce outlined clearly the gen-
eral situation. He was of the opinion that the United States
ought not to submit to the payment of the Sound dues on prin-
ciple as such submission would recognize Denmark's right to
treat one of the maritime highways as a closed sea. He was
for the freedom of the Baltic Sounds. Denmark invited the
interested governments including the United States to be repre-
sented in a convention to consider the capitalization of the
Sound dues and distribute the sum among the nations concerned,
but she would not allow this convention to question her right
to levy Sound dues. The President had expressed a willingness
on the part of the United States to share liberally with the
other powers in compensating Denmark for any advantages to
commerce which would hereafter be derived from expenditures
made by her in the improvement and insurance of the safe

navigation of the Sounds (119).

The treaty, concluded April 11, 1857, and proclaimed January 13, 1858, showed the insistence of the United States upon the principle announced by President Pierce. After the treaty went into effect perpetual freedom of navigation in the Sound and Belt was given to American vessels and cargoes. American vessels were not to be detained, and both nations promised to take steps to prevent the abuse of the free flag of the United States when necessary. Denmark was to keep up the light and buoys, and she could make no extra charge for any improvements which might become necessary. On the day when the convention went into effect the United States agreed to pay Denmark, once and for all time, \$393,011. If an earlier date was fixed upon for any other power or powers for free navigation the same was to be simultaneously extended to the United States in anticipation of the payment of said sum. From the latter statement the conclusion was evident that the United States acted ahead and independent of the powers (120).

The bilateral treaty with Hanover on the Stade dues was signed November 6, 1861, and proclaimed June 17, 1862. A general treaty between the powers and Hanover was signed June 22, 1861. The United States, therefore, acted independently in the defense of principles. Hanover abolished forever the toll which had hitherto been levied upon the cargoes of American vessels ascending and descending the Elbe and passing the mouth of the river Schwinge. No toll or levy would ever take the place of the Stade dues. Hanover promised to maintain the works necessary for the free navigation of the

Elbe. She was to receive from the United States 6, 353 thalers as this was the proportional quota for the United States to pay as stipulated in the general table for the abolition of the Stade dues. The capital sum was to be paid upon the day of the exchange of ratifications with interest at the rate of four per cent commencing October 1, 1861, until paid. An attached provided that, until all the powers which were parties to the general treaty of June 22, 1861, shall have fulfilled their engagements under articles six and seven of that treaty, Hanover could demand proof of nationality of American vessels, but she must not detain them (121). The Act of March 13, 1862, appropriated \$43,454.16 as the capital sum and \$1,042.90 as interest in order to put this treaty into effect (122).

This adherence to independent actions and principle characterized President Lincoln's action in reference to the Scheldt dues. In his third annual message, December 8, 1863, he said that he thought it proper, subject to approval by the Senate, to concur with the interested commercial powers in an arrangement for the liquidation of the Scheldt dues upon the principle which had been, heretofore, adopted in regard to the impost upon navigation in the waters of Denmark.

There were two treaties; one was signed, May 20, and the other July 20, 1863; both were proclaimed, November 18, 1864. Differing from the treaties with Denmark and Hanover, Belgium entered into no obligations to maintain improvements in this waterways. From and after the day when the capitalization of the Scheldt dues had been secured by general agreement,

tonnage dues in Belgium ports were to cease; fees for piloting in Belgium ports and the Scheldt, as far as controlled by Belgium were to be greatly reduced, and port dues at Antwerp were likewise to be reduced. The United States, in view of the proposition made by Belgium to regulate, by common accord, the capitalization of the Scheldt dues, consented to contribute to that capitalization under the following conditions. The capital sum should not exceed thirty six million francs. Belgium assumed one-third of this amount for her part. The remainder was to be apportioned among the states pro-rata to their navigation of the Scheldt. The portion which the United States was to pay must not exceed 2,779,200 francs. The payment of this portion was to be made in ten equal installments including the capital and interest at four per cent. These conditions were to be inserted in a general treaty to be adopted by a conference of the maritime states in which the United States was to be represented (124).

The treaty of July 20 took special note of a treaty concluded, May 12, 1863, between Belgium and Netherlands by which the king of the Netherlands renounced forever the dues established upon navigation in the Scheldt and its mouths. For this renouncement Belgium paid 17,141,640 florins. A further declaration by the King of the Netherlands stated that this extinguishment of the Scheldt dues applied to all flags. This declaration and treaty were annexed to the treaty with the United States, 1863. This treaty provided that tonnage dues abolished by the treaty of May 20 cannot be reestablished and the other dues lowered by it cannot again be increased and

they were to be the same for the United States as set down in the protocols of the Conference of Brussels (125).

From the evidence presented it seemed that nothing was gained by independent action. The principle avowed was completely disregarded by the powers and was not evident in the Scheldt settlement. The United States acted with the powers and ate their food but insisted upon a separate table.

The capitalization of the Scheldt dues cost the United States approximately \$591,840. There were ten installments of \$55,584 each and interest was paid at four different times amounting to \$46,000.(126)

The Postal Union as a great step towards improving international communication has been discussed. Two other important fields of action were the telegraph and the submarine cable.

International action in the case of the telegraph was largely concerned with the adoption of rules for its regulation. On December 14, 1870, Mr. William C. Barney presented a memorial to Congress praying for action in regard to rules. He said that the uncertainty of the nature of rules and regulations which Congress would make for the governing and operation of telegraphic lines between the United States and foreign countries was an obstacle to further progress in the building of new lines between the United States and foreign countries. Foreign governments under this uncertainty were refusing to permit cables to land on their shores. The rules which Congress adopted should be in accordance with the rules

adopted by the International Telegraphic Congress of 1868. Most of the international submarine cables contracted to be laid were in the hands of British capitalists. Mr. Barney and his associates intended to lay a cable between the United States and Europe as soon as Congress should make acceptable rules governing cables (127).

The State Department showed its ignorance of these international rules. A concession had been granted by France to a British concern to connect the United States and France by cable. The concession provided that the rules of the Telegraphic Convention of Paris or of any international convention which may be substituted for it were to govern the proposed line. On July 30, 1869, Mr. Fish instructed Washburne to investigate those rules as the United States did not have a copy (128). This was indeed a revelation for the Universal Telegraphic Union was an outgrowth beginning as early as October 4, 1852. Conferences of the interested powers had been held at Paris in 1865 and Vienna in 1868.(129)

Russia urged the United States to attend the Telegraphic Conference at St. Petersburg in 1872. The first invitation was declined on the ground that telegraphing in the United States was a private enterprise. Private companies, however, refused to attend. Upon further urging Mr. Schuyler was authorized to attend and report. Various persons at the conference asked him how soon it would be that the United States government would take over the administration of the telegraphs. From these facts it is easily seen as to why the United States

stood aloof from the Telegraphic Union (130).

Another memorial, dated February 6, 1871, was sent to Congress. It was signed by Robert Squares, Lyman Treman, Erastus Corning, Jr., Herman Barney, George W. Riggs, J. H. Lathrop, George Harrington and W. C. Barney. The men wished to lay a cable between Belgium and the United States. Permission had been gained from Belgium provided that the cable was operated under the rules of the Vienna convention. They claimed to have invented a more rapid method of transmitting messages and rates as a result would be greatly reduced. They asked the Senate to pass the House bill No. 2591 without amendment (131). This bill laid down certain rules for the governing of international telegraphs connecting with the United States. It had passed the House on January 16, 1871. It passed the Senate on March 3 with an amendment fixing the rate upon telegrams. The amendment was concurred in by the House. The bill was enrolled by both House, but pocket vetoed by the President (132).

President Grant's annual message of December 6, 1869 stated that a telegraphic company incorporated under British laws proposed to land a cable upon the shores of the United States and to operate under a concession of the French Emperor. It gave the company a monopoly upon telegraphic communication between the United States and France for twenty years. All messages conveyed were to be subjected to the control and scrutiny of the French government. By this concession capital of United States citizens was excluded from competing upon the

shores of France. The President said that he would negotiate to secure the abandonment of the principle of monopoly and he recommended that congressional action be taken to prevent monopoly by foreign countries (133). It was at this juncture when Mr. Fish became anxious to know what the International Telegraphic Rules were (134).

In a letter to Washburne, dated November 23, 1869, a joint convention was proposed with the special recommendations of the President. Cables were to be protected whether in peace or war. Crimes against them were to be deemed as piracy and punished as such. Exclusive grants of monopoly to a corporation by one nation without the consent of the other nation concerned must be prevented. Such concessions must be based upon joint action of the powers. Provisions should be inserted to prevent scrutiny by government officials. Government messages should be privileged over private messages. Provisions of proposed convention were to be enforceable by any contracting power upon the high seas. The President asked that the diplomatic representatives at Washington of Great Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy, North German Union, Austria, Russia, Belgium, Holland, Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Turkey, Greece, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentine Confederation, Columbia, Balivia, Peru, Ecuador, Mexico and Chili be empowered to enter into negotiations with the object of embodying these proposals into a convention (135). The President evidently failed to get any response.

Conferences for the protection of submarine cables had

been held at Paris as early as May to June 1863. A Convention was formed May 16, 1864. Other conferences were held at Paris in 1882 and 1883. The United States ratified the convention of March 14, 1884, on January 28, 1885. Twenty seven nations had signed this treaty. It did not provide against monopoly grants by a single country to a corporation building a cable between two or more countries. Also the scrutiny of messages by government officials was not mentioned. The only contention of the United States embodied in the treaty was the protection of submarine cables against injury by fishermen and others (136). A further declaration and protocol was signed December 1, 1886 and ratified March 1, 1888.(138)

Examples of the necessity of international police were the slave trade and the submarine cable. How could these international crimes be stopped? The treaties provided that the contracting powers could seize the criminals and bring them to trial before certain specified courts under certain enumerated rules. In the case of the slave trade the United States gave up her old and much spoken cry against the right of search. Safeguards were in each case established against infringement upon national pride.

Considerable attention was given to combating the horrors of disease and war. One example was the medical congresses. A medical congress was held in connection with the Vienna Exhibition, and another was held in connection with the Centennial (139). These Congresses received very little government aid or attention at first, but an appropriation was made,

March 3, 1887, for the purpose of entertaining and providing for the expense of the ninth annual meeting of the International Medical Congress to be held at Washington in September of 1887. (140)

Ravages of cholera and yellow fever were sufficient to cause the nations to take international action as a means of prevention. The Cholera Conference at Constantinople was promoted principally by Napoleon III who got Turkey's consent to hold it. It was a congress of medical experts as well as diplomatic agents. The causes of cholera, its origins, methods of preventing spread, etc. were sought. Its findings were left to each nation to carry out as it saw fit (141). Mr. Morris wrote, February 17, 1866, that the governments represented were Turkey, England, France, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Greece and Egypt. The United States, Belgium, Holland and the Papacy had been invited but as yet had not sent delegates (142). On March 17, he stated that a committee had been appointed to consider the nature and origin of cholera and measures of prevention. It was to draw up certain resolutions for the adoption of the Congress. The general impression was unfavorable to the conference as it was not considered a practical body (143).

In 1873 the cholera epidemic broke out in the United States. The report of Mr. John M. Woodworth, supervising surgeon of the United States Marine Hospital Service, stated that international sanitary action was too remote and steps towards it had been too vacillating in the past to admit much

hope for it in the future (144).

In 1874 an international sanitary conference was held at Vienna. It was an outcome of the medical conference held in connection with the Vienna Exhibition of 1873. Its chief concern was the cholera epidemic. The United States was invited, and the Secretary of war recommended to certain surgeons of the army that they should attend, but notice of its termination was received before the United States had taken any action (145).

A joint resolution, approved May 14, 1880, authorized an international sanitary conference at Washington. The powers having jurisdiction over ports likely to be inflected with yellow fever or cholera were to be invited. Delegates were to be properly authorized so that an international system of notification as to the actual sanitary conditions of ports and places under the jurisdiction of such powers and the condition of vessels sailing therefrom could be readily ascertained (146). A clerk was employed at the salary of six dollars per day (147). The date of meeting was fixed for January 1, 1881, and \$7,500 were appropriated for expenses (148).

The Swiss Confederation invited the United States to participate in a Congress for Wounded men in time of war. It was to be held at Geneva beginning August 8, 1864. Mr. George G. Fagg, diplomatic agent at Berne, was authorized to attend as an informal delegate. On July 20, Seward received a letter from Mr. Geofroy expressing Napoleon III's sympathy with the project. He hoped the United States would send a delegate to the Congress (150). On November 26, Mr. Fagg wrote that the governments not represented could become parties to the inter-

national convention. He stated that he had not committed the government as he had no authority to do so. He had stated that action on the part of the United States was doubtful because it was impossible either to make the Rebel authorities parties to the convention or to compel them to respect its provisions (151).

The President of the Swiss Confederation invited the adherence of the United States on May 23, 1866, but she was very slow in acting upon the invitation. On March 22, 1867, Mr. Morgan introduced a resolution in the House directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to inquire into the propriety of the United States becoming a party to this convention (153). By October 20, 1868 the powers had extended the field of the convention to the navy. The treaty and additional articles were transmitted to the Senate on March 3, 1882, and the Senate's consent was given on March 16. (154) On June 9, Switzerland, on behalf of the powers, accepted the accession of the United States to the convention and additional articles.

In general the treaty and additional articles neutralized all ambulances, military hospitals and hospital ships when used for the relief of wounded and sick. Persons employed in the service were neutralized. The red cross badge or flag was the emblem of the service. All wounded and sick were to be cared for whether friend or enemy (156).

Certain movements stressed their informational and scientific aspects. This was an avowed objective of the great international exhibitions and the medical congresses which

have been discussed. Three other movements with objective particularly in mind were the Geographic, the Penitentiary and the Statistical Congresses.

The United States was invited to appoint special commissioners to the International Geographical Congress to be held at Paris in 1875. She declined to take part officially, but the American Geographical Society and the Cooper Institute of New York were represented by Joseph P. Thompson, W. Bierring and W. W. Hawkes (157). The United States did not attend another Geographical Congress at Brussels in September 1876, for the exploration of Africa (159). An act of Congress, approved August 3, 1882, authorized the President to call an international conference to fix and recommend universal adoption a common prime meridian to be used in the reckoning of longitude and the regulation of time throughout the world. The conference was to meet at Washington and the President was authorized to appoint three delegates (160). The appointment of two additional delegates and \$5,000 for expenses were provided for by the act of July 7, 1884. (161) On February 5, 1889, the United States accepted the invitation of the Imperial German Government to become a member of the International Geodetic Association (162).

Penitentiary congresses seemed to have been the special work of the United States. A joint resolution, approved March 20, 1871, authorized the appointment of a commissioner to a proposed congress to be held in Europe, but no expenditure was to be made from the treasury upon this project (163). Yet,

on April 8, 1872, Mr. Kerr asked consent to amend the civil appropriation bill in order to provide for the expenses of the United States commissioners to the International Penitentiary Congress at London beginning July 3, 1872. (163)

By the act of June 10, 1872, \$5,000 was appropriated (164).

Since it was understood although not expressly stated that it was the duty of the commissioner to arrange the preliminaries of the congress, his appointment was made a year and a half ahead of time. The President chose Dr. E. C. Wines, Secretary of the National Prison Association, as commissioner. In 1871 he visited Europe and negotiated with Great Britain, France, Prussia, Holland, Netherlands, Italy, France, Prussia, Austria and Switzerland. The Secretary of State had furnished him with a letter addressed to the diplomatic and consular representatives abroad for that purpose. In the countries which he could not visit he was assisted by the United States ministers. Each country was asked to name commissioners to London, and appoint a committee to collect certain information upon prisons and prison administration in that particular country. This information was taken to London for the use of the Congress. Dr. Wines desired a complete representation from the states, cities and prisons of the United States.

On May 17, Congress authorized the printing of 5,000 copies of the commissioners preliminary report (166). On March 1, 1873 a resolution to print 5,000 copies of the final report passed, and on March 3 an appropriation of \$1,000 was approved for the printing of 500 copies of the proceedings (167).

A second movement for a Penitentiary Congress began with the joint resolution of February 16, 1875. It authorized the appointment of a commissioner to an international congress to be held at Rome in 1876. On March 3, \$8,000 was appropriated for expenses (168).

The congress did not meet in 1876. This made reappropriation necessary if the money could be utilized for that purpose. On February 29, 1876, Mr. Morrill of Maine introduced a bill to clear up the difficulties involved (169). On May 29 a letter was received from Governor Horatia Seymour, President of the National Prison Association by the Speaker of the House. It stated that preliminary organization was expected, of Dr. Wines this time as it had been in 1871. The permanent International Penitentiary Commission of which Dr. Wines was president decided to postpone the congress until 1877. It was thus necessary to ask Congress to make the appropriation they had made available in that year. From the beginning the whole movement had been originated and organized by the National Prison Association of the United States (170). An amendment to the civil appropriation bill to make the \$8,000 available in 1877 failed in the Senate on July 1, 1876 by a vote of 19 to 20. (171) Mr. Bogy of Missouri took the occasion to characterize such gathering as visionary and humbug. Mr. Sargent thought that a precedent was being established for getting such appropriations from Congress at will (172). On March 3, 1877, \$6,000 was appropriated to cover expenses incurred by the commissioner in his work of preliminary organization (173). The special message of President Hayes, dated

October 15, 1877, recommended that the \$8,000 he made available for the year of 1878. (174) As the time and place of meeting had been changed to August of 1878 at Stockholm (175). This was done by the act of December 15, 1877. (176) From 1881 to 1885 Congress regularly appropriated \$250 a year for the maintenance of the International Prison Commission (177).

The idea of Statistical Congresses originated at the London Exhibition of 1851. After that date they were regularly held every two or three years. At Brussels in 1853 there were twenty five states represented by official delegates. The United States had three unofficial delegates present. The Superintendent of the Census, Mr. Kennedy, attended at the direction of the Secretary of the Interior. The other two were Mr. Bayard and Prof. De Blow. At Paris in 1855, Mr. Charles L. Fleischman, Daniel C. Gilman, J. C. G. Kennedy and George Summer were unofficial delegates (178). Judge Longstreet was sent as the official delegate to London in 1860. The American Statistical Association was represented by Dr. Edward Javris (179). (There were no delegates from the United States at Vienna in 1857 and Florence in 1867). Thirty three states were represented at Berlin in 1863. (180) The official delegate was Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles and Mr. E. B. Elliot was the American Statistical Association's delegate. Mr. Ruggles was again the official delegate at the Hague in 1869. Besides seven unofficial delegates at St. Petersburg in 1872, Dr. Edward Young of the Bureau of Statistics, Dr. Edwin Snow and Mr. William Barnes were official delegates (181).

At two different times there were moves to get the Stat-

istical Congress to meet in the United States. President Grant recommended that Congress invite the Statistical Congress to meet in the United States in 1876. (182) The Centennial Commission also had invited the congress to hold its ninth meeting in connection with the centennial, but private invitations were not accepted. The act of March 3, 1873, authorized the President to extend the invitation (183). On July 13, 1873, Mr. Anthony introduced a bill to invite the tenth meeting to the United States (184).

The primary purpose of these Statistical Congresses was to promote a uniform and comprehensive collection of national and international statistically adopting a set method of classification and approach. Some of the general subjects dealt with were population, resources, agricultural products, commerce and survey of land. They also had a secondary purpose of promoting the unification of coinage weights and measures (185).

The act of June 10, 1872, appropriated \$5,000 for expenses of the commissioners sent to St. Petersburg (186). The act of March 3, 1887 appropriated \$1,500 for the investigation of European statistical methods and representation at the International Statistical Institute (187).

Along a large number of lines there was a tendency to stress uniformity. Uniform regulations, weights, rates and methods were being adopted in the international postal service. The Telegraphic Union had adopted uniform rules of operation. Uniformity of method and classification was stressed by the Statistical Congresses. The International Bureau of Weights

and Measures sought to preserve the uniformity of certain standards. Uniformity of tonnage admeasurement for the Suez Canal was established. Uniformity as it applies to the patents, copyrights, weight and measures, and coinage will not be discussed.

Two methods were suggested for solving the copyright question--by legislation and by treaty. An international copyright treaty with Great Britain, signed February 18, 1853 was transmitted to the Senate on February 21, but it was never ratified (188). Efforts to obtain legislation were numerous. As early as 1837 a memorial of fifty seven authors was presented to Congress. American authors presented memorials in 1848 and 1852. In 1866 a number of petitions were presented by American authors and publishers. A memorial of fifty prominent English authors was published in 1872 and 1873. Bills were introduced by Mr. E. J. Morris in 1858 and again in 1860. Mr. J. P. Baldwin introduced a bill on November 21, 1868. (189) Another was introduced by Mr. Cox of New York on December 6, 1871. (190) Two resolutions were introduced into the House in 1872 instructing the Committee on the Library to inquire into this question and report its findings as to the practicability of establishing an international copyright and as to the wisest plans to be adopted (191).

Mr. Sumner wrote, February 17, 1868, that he was very much in favor of the International Copyright from the standpoint of justice to authors and as a new stage in the unity of nations. He thought that if authors should have a copyright anywhere they should have it every where within the

limits of civilization.

Mr. James Parton wrote in the Atlantic Monthly that many American authors such as Harriet Beecher Stowe, Motley and Bancroft had lost considerable money due to the present arrangement. No returns were received when their works were published in foreign countries. Works of this type often represented years of labor and should have the world for a market. They were now simply stolen by European publishers. England, France, Germany, Sweden, Denmark and Russia were willing to make international agreements to remedy the situation. American publishers were stealing from foreign authors. One publishing company often took careful pains to translate a foreign production only to be robbed of the profits of their expenditure by rival publishers. Publishers were therefore in favor of the international copyright. It was a necessity to protect the author, translator and publisher (192).

According to the Nation editorial of November 9, 1871, American authors had begun to lose at nearly the same rate as English authors. American publishers were willing to concede the copyright to English authors but not free trade to the English publishers. English authors, therefore, must have their work done by American publishers (193).

Two interesting speeches on the subject were made in the House. Mr. Archer on March 23, 1872, asserted that there were two bands of literary pirates, English and American. Not only England but all Europe were willing to stop this pillaging. He asserted that Henry C. Carey's argument was

was based on the assumption that authors had no claims to the books they had written as their books were the property of the world. A protected market would give books of learning a wider circulation and enable the authors to produce works that would otherwise be impossible (194). On April 13, Mr. Storm stated the author should be made a citizen of the world and have his works protected from mutilation in all countries. The gist of the proposed legislation was to give foreign authors the same rights as native authors provided that the author's country granted American authors the same privileges. Translation could be done by the author but the American publisher was to have the job of publication (195).

There was a wide contrast between the report of the House Committee on Library and the Senate Committee. The House Committee reported, February 21, 1868, that it was expedient to pass legislation which would protect the rights of American authors in foreign countries and give foreign authors similar protection in the United States. Such laws should be established as a sense of justice to the authors right of property. They would improve the business of manufacturing, publishing and selling books. The interests of American book buyers would be promoted. The development of American literature would be aided and it would become more national (196).

The Senate committee report was made on January 7, 1873 --five years later than the House report. It labeled the international copyright as doubtful in expediency and questionable in authority. The principal American publishers were willing to grant the demands of the authors, but a large

number of American publishers were either hostile or else thought that such action was questionable. The international copyright was not contemplated by the constitution or the constitutional convention as both antedate all legislation upon the subject. Such legislation was of doubtful value to American authors as a class and a positive injury to the manufacturing interests. It would hinder the diffusion of knowledge and universal education. Under the present system American books were cheap in England and English books were cheap in America (197).

According to an article in the Atlantic Monthly of February 1879, foreigners were still refused the benefit of a favorable copyright law (198). The United States, therefore, refused to pass legislation which would be uniform with legislation in other countries in giving authors protection.

The United States was very illiberal in the treatment of the foreign author, but she was more liberal than most nations in her treatment of the inventor. The Vienna Exhibition of 1873 brought the international patent situation to the front. Mr. Jay's international court scheme has been mentioned. England, Austria and the United States were to adopt the principles of the Vienna Patent Congress of 1873. Further than that his scheme was that each country should employ a patent expert from each of the other two to assist in the examination and procuration of patents. Disputed questions were to be decided in the courts of the country where they arose with the right of appeal to an international tribunal

composed of a judge from each of the three countries (199).

Since the United States thought that the patent congress to be held at Vienna in 1873 would be an official meeting of the various governments, she sent Mr. John M. Thacher as an official delegate. Upon his arrival he found that Austria-Hungary had withdrawn all official sanction. The so called Congress became a kind of a mass convention open anyone willing to pay the price of the admission ticket. Under the circumstances Mr. Thacher did not present his official credentials, but remained in Vienna to observe the proceedings. He addressed the assembly upon one occasion with the American patent system as his subject. Many noted inventors and men of science were present, and a majority of the speakers warmly applauded the American patent system. Discussion was directed to certain fundamental principles which would serve as the basis of patent legislation within the different countries. The details were to be left to the law making power of the various states. Mr. Thatcher stated that with a few exceptions these resolutions were perfectly in harmony with the American system. Since American inventors were greatly interested in securing liberal patent legislation in other countries he thought that cooperation with England would probably be the best method for securing a change in the patent systems of Europe (200).

The rules of this so called congress provided that the protection of inventors should be guaranteed by the laws of all civilized nations under the condition of a complete publication of the same. Patent laws should be based upon the

following principles: Only the inventor or his legal representatives were to be entitled to a patent. Patents should not be refused because the holder was a foreigner, and they should be granted for fifteen-year periods. The nations should reach an international understanding as soon as possible. For this purpose a committee was organized and empowered to continue the work of this congress, and make the principles adopted widely known. It was also authorized to call conferences of the friends of patent protection from time to time. No evidence has been sought as to whether the United States took any action upon these principals (201).

International uniformity of weights and measures was before the public eye in the United States for nearly a half century. On February 22, 1821, John A. Adams emphasized the importance of uniformity between the United States and England. He designated the French system as ideal but not sure of success even in France. He recommended that Congress should fix a temporary standard excluding any innovations and the ultimate establishment of a universal and permanently uniform system. The first part of his two-fold program was carried out. He suggested to President Monroe it would be desirable to establish a uniform system of weights and measures by a general convention (202). In the report of Mr. R. J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury, to Congress on December 9, 1847, the idea was revived. The statement of Prof. Backe, Superintendent of Weights and Measures, on July 30, 1848, gave the idea that the present system was merely provisional. He thought a change could be made within a generation through the

elementary schools. He suggested that Congress invite the nations to meet and consult for the purpose of establishing a permanent, universal, uniform and international decimal system of weights, measures and coins (203).

All indications seemed to be pointing towards the metric system as the one which would ultimately be adopted. The adoption of a decimal system was urged by the legislatures of New Hampshire in 1859, Maine in 1860 and Connecticut in 1861. In 1861 the Secretary of the Treasury suggested the expediency of a small appropriation to promote the interchange of opinions between intelligent persons of our own and other countries for the promotion of the cause (203). The rules of the Postal Conference of Paris in 1863 adopted the metric system. Also in 1863 the Statistical Congress at Berlin seriously recommended this system should be exclusively adopted for international commerce. The arrangement and construction of the standards should be confided to an international commission. The country which adopts the system should make it compulsory within the shortest possible period. To superintend the introduction each government should create a department of weights and measures. It should first be introduced into the custom houses and the schools as a means towards complete adoption. The countries using or partly using the metric system at this time were: France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Belgium, Netherland, Austria, Bavaria, Wurtemberg Saxony, Hanover, Mecklenburg, Baden, Hesse, and Hamburg. Those countries not using the metric

system were: Great Britain, United States, Russia, Norway, Peru, Denmark, Costa Rica, Prussia, Sweden and a number of minor powers (204). England made it permissive in 1864.

(203)

In 1866 the United States took definite steps towards adopting the metric system. On May 23 the House created a standing committee on coinage, weights and measures (205). The January report of the National Academy of Science stated that the metric system was the best in present use and recommended its introduction into the United States by an act of Congress (204). As has been pointed out congress took three definite steps to introduce the system. First, it was made permissive and legal. Second, the Secretary of the Treasury was to furnish each state with one set of the metric standards. Third, its use was authorized for the post office and metric scales were to be furnished to offices dispatching foreign mails (206).

Joining the international meter commission in 1870 was an important step towards the metric system. Mr. Hilgard and Joseph Henry attended its meeting in 1872, and Mr. Hilgard became its vice-president (207). The treaty which created the International Bureau of Weights and Measures was signed May 20, 1875, and proclaimed September 27, 1878. The commission treaty and bureau have already been discussed.

While France was encouraging the use of the metric system by promoting the creation of an International Bureau of Weights and Measures, the United States was taking definite steps to make the use of the metric system obligatory.

February 3, 1876, Mr. Allison introduced two bills in the House. One provided for the transaction of business in all public offices of the United States by the metric system if anyone desired to use it. The other aimed to bring the metric system into general use. On January 24, 1876, a memorial of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers asked Congress to adopt the metric system. A joint resolution of the Legislature of Massachusetts asked Congress to introduce it as the sole legal standard throughout the United States (209). A House resolution of January 25, 1877, requested the Secretary of the Treasury to report to Congress the feasibility of providing that the metric system be exclusively used in the assessment of duties for the custom service, and as to the earliest date such provision could be put into effect (210).

In response to Congressional request the opinions of the War Department were transmitted to Congress on December 5, 1877. Should the metric system be made obligatory for all government business? Also for all private business? How long would it take to make the change from the present system? The Paymaster General believed that it was highly desirable to eventually introduce the metric system into common use and that it was advisable to gradually make the metric system obligatory in certain of the government departments. The Chief of Engineers said that his office would require five years to make the change. He thought that the demand for change did not come from the business man, but rather de-

signed for the general public and international good. Trade relations with Great Britain made it extremely undesirable to adopt new standards without similar action on her part. The Inspector General thought that a compulsory change was in expedient. The Commissary General of Subsistence thought that exclusive use by the government alone would be very detrimental. It was also inexpedient to make the metric system obligatory between individuals without the cooperation of Great Britain. The Quartermaster General could put the system into use within one month. He opposed its adoption because if made obligatory upon the government alone confusion would arise in dealing with the people. He thought that Congress did not have the power to make it obligatory with the people. All machinery, engines, gauges, scales, etc. built under the present system would have to be rebuilt or else discarded. The metric system was not the most convenient for common use, for it could be readily divided into one-half, one-third, one-fourth, etc. as in the present system. Furthermore, the metric was as arbitrary and unscientific as a standard as either the yard or the foot. The Surgeon General feared grave consequences if the metric system was made obligatory on government officials. Since all doses were calculated in the apothecaries weight considerable amount of figuring would be necessary before medicine could be given. Land measurement and machinery would be thrown into great confusion if made obligatory for the people. The Ordinance Department could adopt the system with twelve month's notice. They recommended that

one foot be made equal to three decimeters and one yard to nine decimeters in order to make introduction easier. They thought that the metrical system would prove to be of great value for their work(211).

The Treasury Department reported on March 2, 1878. The General Land Office stated that its expense and labor would be greatly increased and the public would suffer great inconvenience for years to come. Land survey would be upset almost beyond readjustment. The change was considered immaterial by the Geological and Geographical survey and the Patent office. The Chief Clerk thought that two years would be necessary for the government and fifteen years for the people to make the change from the present system. The Superintendent of the Coast Survey thought that at least thirty five years were required to make the system compulsory. Mr. E. B. Elliot of the Bureau of Statistics said that the metric system should be used in all international relations, but should not be made compulsory with the people (212).

Agitation for international coinage began at about the same time at that of weight and measures. Both movements were closely related. Jefferson, Hamilton and Gallatin had hoped that the adoption of the Spanish milled dollar would lead to an international unit of coinage (213). On December 9, 1847, the Secretary of the Treasury stated that uniformity of coins would benefit all nations. If the American decimal system of coinage should be more simple and perfect than that of any other nation it ultimately would be adopted by the nations (214). In 1856 the Treasury at the direction of Congress

appointed a commissioner to confer with Great Britain as to the adoption of a decimal system of coinage. According to the plan the units of coinage were to be exactly commensurable. Prof. Alexander was sent, but his mission accomplished nothing as the British were willing to confere but unwilling to take the initiative in changing their pound, shilling and pence (214).

In December of 1862 Secretary Chase reported to Congress that the demonitization of gold made the present very opportune to make changes. The half eagle should be made equal to the gold sovereign in widht and fineness. No injury could possibly arise from such a change and great advantages would follow upon the resuption of specie payment. Great Britain would probably adopt the federal decimal division of coins and a great reform would have resulted (213). The Berlin Statistical Congress of 1863 adopted certain resolutions upon the unification of coinage. First, the existing units of money should be reduced to a small number. Each unit should be decimally subdivided. Coins in use should be expressed in the weights of the metric system. Also, they should all be made nine tenths fine. Second, the different governments should be invited to send delegates to a special Congress which would take important steps along the line of the preceding propositions. Third, a special communication of these resolutions should be made to the different governments (215). In 1865 the United States was asked to join the Latin Monetary Union (216). The result was that by 1866 the govern-

ment was again ready to take action.

The Committee on coinage, Weights and Measures reported on May 17, 1866, that conditions were now very favorable to secure the international unification of coinage. The variation of the gold dollar, if necessary, would not materially effect the United States as all gold coin was withdrawn from circulation. International uniformity was of the utmost importance to trade and intercourse with foreign nations. At this time it was the duty of the government to prosecute with energy its efforts to reach an agreement with the leading nations of Europe. The consent of England, France and the United States would ultimately mean the consent of all commercial nations (214).

The United States received her opportunity in the French invitation to attend the Monetary Conference at Paris in 1867. Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles, one of the ten scientific commissioners to the Universal Exhibition was authorized to represent the United States and General Dix was to cooperate with him (217). Mr. Ruggles had represented the United States at the Statistical Congress of Berlin and Brussels and had been a warm exponent of the unification movement. His instructions permitted him to encourage the expectation that the United States would give her adhesion to anything reasonable. The sentiments of the Sherman letter in particular would meet with public approval and the consent of Congress and the executive. This letter stated that the United States could change better now than at any other time. It would not be

necessary changes for the United States. A common standard of gold should be established for commerce. The five franc piece was the best unit for gold coinage. The regulation of silver coinage should be left to the regulation of each nation as it desired (218).

The states represented at the conference were: Austria, Baden, Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, United States, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Wurtenburg, and Holland (219).

In conference discussion the English delegates opposed the adoption of the five franc piece. They recommended a ten franc piece instead. Mr. Ruggles insisted upon France coining a twenty-five franc piece, and the French said that they were willing to do so. The United States would then reduce her gold dollar to equal five francs and bring her other gold coinage in line with the same standard (220). Some of the delegates objected to the double standard. Mr. Ruggles in reply insisted that the United States had a double standard legislatively but not practically (221).

The conference decided that: First, there was to be a single standard of gold. Second, coins were to be of equal weight and diameter. Third, coins were to be nine-tenths fine. Fourth, all gold coins were to be multiples of the five franc piece. Fifth, five francs was to be the unit of gold coinage. Gold coins of each nation were to continue with their old names and emblems, but were to be accepted

as legal tender in all countries (222).

In the House Mr. Kelley introduced three bills to promote the establishment of an international metrical system of coinage on July 21, 1868, April 9, 1869 and February 7, 1870.(223) Another bill for a similar purpose was introduced by Hooper of Massachusetts on March 16, 1870, and another by Stephens of Georgia on December 14, 1876.(224). On April 9, 1869 the House agreed to print 2,300 copies of E. B. Elliot's letter upon international coinage (225).

Mr. Frelinghuysen introduced a bill on the subject, March 3, 1868.(226) It was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. In its report of June 9, 1868, the committee recommended that the bill should be postponed until the next session in order to elicit fuller discussion from the people. The committee asked to be relieved from considering the President's message upon the International Monetary Conference at Paris, resolutions of the Toledo Board of Trade protesting against any change in the system of coinage, a memorial from the American Statistical Association and Mr. Frelinghuysen's bill. The duty of the committee was discharged (227). On December 8, 1869, Mr. Sherman introduced a bill upon international coinage (228).

Mr. Kelley's bills upheld what was known as the German dollar scheme. They provided that each gold dollar shall contain one and one-half grams of pure gold and shall weigh one and two-thirds grams, the portion of alloy being as one is to ten. Weight and fineness was to be stamped upon each

coin (229). On March 30, 1869, Mr. Kelley gave further enlightenment as to what he was trying to accomplish. He was replying to an objection to the term gram in a coinage bill. He said that the thirty eight and thirty ninth Congresses had required the mint to use the term. It was the language of the English, German, Belgian and Swiss mints, and a small step towards the unification of the coinage of the world by the adoption of the metric system. He then championed the American dollar as the basis for unification. It was within one-third of one per cent of being precisely decimal while the French coinage which Mr. Ruggles recommended lacked three per cent of being decimal. The German double eagle like the American dollar was decimal. Through the adoption of the gram the American dollar instead of the Franc would be groomed as the basis for unification. This was the reason for his anxiety and efforts in getting the Elliot letter printed and before the people (230). On April 13, 1870 he said that scientific men in Europe and America favored his scheme and opposed that of Ruggles. The coinage of France was debased and would have to be entirely recoined no matter what system was adopted. The dollar system would be metrical and in accordance with the gram standard of weight. He claimed that less change would have to be made to conform the coinage of the world to the dollar standard than the franc standard, and less population would be affected (231).

Mr. C. M. Potter of New York defended Ruggles and the findings of the Paris Conference. He attempted to prove from the amount of money in circulation that it would be

less difficult for the United States to change than for Great Britain and France. He thought that legislation at the present time was premature and attention should be turned towards negotiation with England and France (232).

On April 14, 1870, Mr. Samuel Hooper stated that there were three essential conditions to the unification of coinage. The Scheme adopted must be approved by the leading commercial nations. It must be a close approximation of existing coinage. A simple relation must exist between the weights of coins and the weights of commerce. The French franc scheme would reduce the gold dollar three and one-half per cent, the English sovereign would be changed from eleven-twelfths fine to nine-tenths fine, and the French franc would remain unchanged. In the German dollar scheme the American dollar would be changed three-tenths of one per cent, the English sovereign two and three-eighths per cent beside a change to nine-tenths fineness, and the French franc would be increased three and one-third per cent. Certain coin in the German States, Prussia, Denmark, Russia, Spain and Netherlands varied less than one concurrence of Great Britain was required for the franc scheme and the concurrence of Great Britain and France for the dollar scheme. He recommended negotiation with Great Britain. The great good of international coinage cannot be accomplished with out sacrifice (233).

The Senate Committee of Finance report of June 9, 1869, gave the Senate viewpoint. Mr. Sherman presented the main report, and Mr. Morgan the minority report. Since the gold dollar was not in circulation the time was ripe to secure an

international standard, because of this fact it was unreasonable to demand a dollar standard. As the most interested nation the United States should be ready to yield something to secure her object. The franc was the smallest coin of largest use of which existing coinage after a slight reduction would be a multiple. France sowed her willingness to cooperate by promising to coin the twenty-five franc piece. Every obstruction to the free use of gold diminished its value. The United States was the most effected from any change in value since she was the greatest gold producing country of the world. Exchange between the United States and Great Britain was a standing reproach. Other nations were waiting for the United States to act. Private and public debts could easily be taken care of (233).

Mr. Morgan stated in the adverse report that the value of the gold dollar was already too small and it should be increased instead of decreased in size. Silver was the favorite coin in China, Japan and India and it deserved recognition in the American Monetary system. American commerce with Great Britain was nine times that with France. It was, therefore, unwise to make a change until England does. The monetary unit of 1620 millegrams was more adaptable as a unit than the French franc. The United States must avoid hasty legislation upon coinage. She should wait till the other countries act (233).

In 1870 the United States attempted to negotiate with foreign powers. On February 8 the Senate requested the President to invite correspondence with Great Britain and

other foreign powers with the view of adopting by legislation a common unity and standard of international coinage. All correspondence was to be referred to Congress (234).

On June 11 the following instructions were sent to United States Legations at London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Hague, Lisbon, Stockholm and Berne. United States commerce those using the:

	Population
1. Dollar--trade was greatest-----	373,379,812
2. Sterling--Trade was second-----	494,427,331
3. Franc--trade was third-----	70,077,588
4. German unit--trade was small---	73,228,826

The requirements of an international coinage acceptable to the United States were: First it must not vary materially from existing coinage. Second, it must be one that will be accepted in Great Britain and the franc countries. Third, gold must be made the sole standard. The instructions further stated that the British government had not shown its willingness to adhere to the plan proposed by the conference of 1867. One bill in the Senate and two bills in the House were waiting to be acted upon. At present it seemed likely that the House, as well as the Senate, was unwilling to act without further communication with Great Britain. In the dollar system three dollars would weigh five grams and two dollars would contain three grams of fine gold. The instructions also recommended the uniformity weights and measures for commerce (235).

On July 2, Mr. Bancroft reported from the North German Union that the tendency there was towards adopting the five franc and twenty five franc pieces with decimal divisions but nothing as yet was decided (236). On May 17, 1871, Switzer-

land replied that it recommended the Hooper bill which would establish a monetary system (franc system) by simple equations to the existing types. However, Switzerland would hold to the convention of 1865 until her monetary allies acted (237). Sweden was revising her monetary system and close attention was given by the Swedish monetary commission to any possible change which the United States might make. The commission tended towards the franc system but viewed present monetary unification as rather hopeless (238). It was a significant fact that the first conference of the Scandinavian monetary Union was held in 1872.(239)

By 1876 the attention of the United States was turned away from the question of unification to that of the remonetization of silver by international action though perhaps the pretensions along this line were insincere. A joint resolution was introduced into the Senate on June 17, 1876 by Mr. Sherman. It provided that should the government of one or more countries invite a conference to consider the important change in the relative value of gold and silver and the adoption of international measures for the removal of embarrassments arising therefrom, the President was authorized to appoint three properly qualified persons as commissioners. It passed the Senate on June 21 and was referred to the House Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures on January 4, 1877. (240) The committee reported the bill on January 9 with an amendment to the effect that the President was to propose such a conference if he should deem it desirable (241). On

January 16 the resolution was rejected, yeas 127, nays 104, not voting 59. (242)

On January 10, a memorial from the Boston Board of Trade was received in the Senate. It asked the United States to appoint commissioners to meet such commissioners as may be appointed by European governments to consider the expediency of the remonetization of silver. It protested against making silver coins legal tender for sums larger than ten dollars until the commercial nations of Europe should join in an international agreement for the remonetization of silver and in fixing the relation of silver to gold (243).

An idea of the forces at work may be gained from the House debate on January 10. According to Mr. O'Brian of Maryland the invitation was for a conference of scientific men who would help Congress to gain some definite opinion in regard to the variation of the value of gold and silver currency of the world. He quoted the Director of the Mint as saying if silver was adopted as a standard a uniform ratio must be established between gold and silver by the principal countries of the world. He also stated that the conference was called to convince those that favored the silver standard of their error (244). Mr. Hewitt thought that such an agreement was necessary if silver was made legal tender. If the relative value of gold and silver was not thus established and silver declined in price from that fixed by the American government, the United States would have to buy all the rest of the silver of the world and lose all of her gold. An ad-

visory report and nothing more was sought from the conference (245). Mr. Kasson of Iowa stated that the action of foreign governments did effect the gold and silver of the United States. The Latin Monetary Union was created to save the silver money interests of France and neighboring countries. He wished to find out if the relative value between gold and silver can be fixed so as to prevent foreign countries from cheapening silver and thereby expelling all the gold from the United States (246).

For the opposition Mr. Reagan of Texas said that American and English interest were not in common. The United States was a debtor nation and England was a creditor nation. Any restriction of the currency in which English bonds were paid will please England. He was not willing to submit American interests to a commission composed of governments of opposing interests. What Congress should do was to recognize gold and silver as currency and let their value regulate itself. Mr. Fort of Illinois said that this was an attempt to get some proof to show the people that silver should be demonitized because of its fluctuating values in the markets of the world. Mr. Bland of Missouri thought that this was just another effort to delay the remonitization of silver by having an excuse to wait until the commission reports. The legislative was transferring its discession upon this subject to the executive. He hoped that the United States would act independently of the powers. He asked the House to demand that the Senate act upon the silver bill and take the sole responsibility for non action (246).

By the act of February 28, 1878, the President was authorized to invite the countries composing the Latin Union and European nations he deemed advisable to adopt common ratio between gold and silver for the purpose of establishing bi-metalism internationally and thus secure a fixity of value between those metals (247). By June 10, 1878, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherland, Russia and Switzerland had accepted the invitation for a conference (248). Countries present at the conference of 1878 were Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, and the United States (249). The share of the joint expenses allotted to the United States was \$7,500.(250)

Another monetary conference was held at Paris in 1879. (239) The United States appropriated on June 21, 1879, \$20,000 to continue the negotiation upon the remonetization of silver. Further appropriations were made in 1881, 1882 and 1884.(251)

The stress upon the promotion of peace has been seen in the case of the exhibitions. All means of producing uniformity, also, was thought to promote peace. An interesting side light in this field was the Neutrality Rules, but the major remedy for war was international arbitration.

The Washington treaty of May 8, 1871, established three rules of neutrality. A neutral government was bound: First, to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it had reasonable ground to believe was intended to cruise or to

carry on war against a power with which it was at peace, and also to use diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been especially adapted, in whole or in part within such jurisdiction to warlike use. Second, not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as a base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms or the recruitment of men. Third, to exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and, as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties. The treaty further stated that the high contracting powers agreed to observe these rules as between themselves, and to bring them to the knowledge of the other maritime powers, and to invite them to accede (252).

These rules became a subject of diplomatic correspondence between England and the United States from 1871 to at least 1876. At first a joint note to the powers was proposed and discussed. It was drafted by the English, and Mr. Fish amended it. By 1873 it began to be indicated in an unofficial way by certain powers that they would not accede to the rules. The United States was on the initiative and seemed anxious to dispose of the matter. Mr. Fish showed his readiness to concede to the English form of the note by giving up the amendments which the British objected to. Great Britain was hesitant in proceeding with the matter. In 1876, Mr. Fish ex-

pressed himself as willing for action upon three different occasions, but nothing but delay seemed to be manifested by Great Britain (253).

Mr. Charles Sumner was one of the strongest supporters of international arbitration. As early as 1850 he had taken definite steps in organizing a movement in the United States which hoped to interest the government in a proposed legislation on the subject (254). However, very little information on arbitration was found before 1872.

On May 31, 1872, Mr. Sumner introduced resolutions in the Senate to the effect that arbitration should be substituted for war in determining international difficulties. The withdrawal from an arbitration treaty or the decision of a tribunal performing the function of arbitration was hostile to civilization. The United States recommended the adoption of arbitration as a just and practical method of determining international differences with the hope of its permanent establishment among the nations (255).

On July 10, 1873, Mr. Sumner wrote to Mr. Richards, a member of parliament, congratulating him upon supporting arbitration. Mr. Richards had introduced a motion in the House of Commons asking that communications be sent to the foreign powers with the view of establishing a general and permanent system of arbitration. Mr. Sumner said that Gladstone was mistaken in denoting this scheme as Utopian; arbitration was a practical thing (256).

Congress was soon flooded by memorials and petitions up-

on arbitration Congress was usually asked to take steps to provide for cooperation with other governments so that difficulties would be settled by a system of arbitration. Two memorials were introduced by Sumner in December of 1873. During 1874 at least twenty one were introduced in the House and forty three in the Senate. At least eight of the total number presented to both Houses were indicated as being from the Societies of the Friends. Several recommended the adoption of an international code as the basis of adjusting disputes between nations, and a few suggested a court of the nations. The majority of them came from the East and Northwest: New York 8, Iowa 7, Ohio 7, Pennsylvania 5, Illinois 5, Michigan 5, Indiana 5, New Hampshire 4, Massachusetts 3, Wisconsin 2, and Maine, Rhode Island, West Virginia, New Jersey, Texas, and North Carolina one each (258).

On June 9, 1874, the Senate Committee upon Foreign Relations reported that the United States, having at heart the cause of peace everywhere and hoping to help its permanent establishment between the nations, hereby recommended the adoption of arbitration as a just and practical method for the settlement of international differences (259). On December 8, 1874, Mr. Townsend introduced a bill in the House authorizing the President to correspond with foreign countries concerning the establishment of international arbitration (260). A joint resolution on the subject had passed the House, and on March 2, 1875, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from its further con-

sideration (262).

Movements initiated by the United States were:

1. Postal Conference of 1863 at Paris.
2. Penitentiary Congresses of 1872 at London and 1878 at Stockholm.
3. Conference on the remonitization of silver at Paris in 1878.

Conferences and Congresses invited to or proposed to be held in the United States were:

1. Statistical--ninth and tenth sessions invited.
2. Submarine cables--about 1870.

Conferences and congresses held in the United States were:

1. Medical Congress in 1876 at Philadelphia.
2. Sanitary Conference in 1881 at Washington.

APPENDIX

My purpose here is to give some of the untouched material that further research would bring to light. My thesis has only made a small beginning in the vast fields of international civil administration and international exhibitions.

As to exhibitions the Congressional Globe has material upon the Paris Exhibition of 1855 in which a certain Mr. Riddle the carriage maker took part. The facts concerning the scandal of the Vienna Commissioners of 1873 has not been uncovered. Neither has the ten volume set of papers published by the government on the Centennial been touched. Facts as to the successes of the exhibitions and the people interested in them are needed in order to further develop the subject.

The following are some of the international exhibitions to be studied next:

Paris 1878
Sydney and Melbourne 1879-80
Berlin 1880
Philadelphia 1880
Denver 1882-3
London 1883
New York 1883
Boston 1883
Louisville 1883
Philadelphia 1883-4
New Orleans 1884
Brussels 1888
Barcelona 1888
Melbourne 1888

For a more complete study of international civil administration it is necessary to go much farther than 1877. This date had no significance whatever as a stopping point. Neither the E. B. Elliot letter nor the correspondence with foreign countries on the unification of coinage has been found. Be-

APPENDIX

tween 1869 and 1877 there was a considerable amount of proposed legislation on telegraphic rules which should be investigated. The question of trade marks has been neglected, but it undoubtedly has some connection with such later action as the signing of the convention for the protection of industrial property in 1883. Valuable material on the Monetary Conference of 1881 will be found in the Senate Executive Document No. 58, 3d Session 45th Congress. The international conferences on the remonetization of silver are practically untouched. The Senate Executive Document No. 6, 1st Session 47th Congress has valuable material on the Red Cross movement.

Some new fields opening up are the international commission for the establishment of electrical units from 1882 to 1884 and the International Customs Bureau of which the United States was a member by 1889. By 1882 Congress was appropriating to promote the exchange of documents and books between the United States and foreign countries. This was done in accordance with the Paris convention of 1867. In 1886 two multilateral treaties were signed to promote the exchange of official, literary and scientific publications and documents.

In the postal question no attempt has been made to analyze the bilateral treaties from 1870 to 1874 to gauge their influence upon the later multilateral treaties. To determine the part played by the United States in directing the course of international postal arrangements one must give more study to the proceedings of the international congresses on this

APPENDIX

subject.

In general it may be said that newspaper and periodical material has received practically no attention. This material would be very useful in gauging popular reaction as well as giving other lines for development not likely to be uncovered from public documents. A study of the lives, memoirs and works of certain men who had a special part in international civil action would also add materially to this thesis.

NOTES TO PART I

1. House executive document No. 327, 2d Session 42d Congress p 292.
2. Report of Commissioners to International Exhibition at Vienna in 1873. Vol.1 pp.34-5.
3. Report of Com. to Vienna. Vol. 1 pp 41-3.
4. H. ex. doc. No. 25, 2S. 37C. p 1.
5. -----No. 15, 2S. 37C. p 6.
6. Senate executive documents No. 46, 3S. 37C. pl.
7. H. ex. doc. No. 15, 2S, 37C. p4.
8. Congressional Globe, 1S. 37C. p232.
9. C. G., 1S. 37C. p255.
10. 12 United States Statutes P328.
11. H. ex. doc. No. 15, 2S. 37C. p3.
12. ----- pp4-6.
13. ----- p8.
14. ----- pl.
15. C. G., 2S. 37C. p227.
16. ----- p333.
17. ----- p505.
18. ----- p580.
19. J. ex. doc. No. 25, 2S. 37 C.
20. ----- No. 25, 2S. 37 C.
21. H. ex. doc. No. 28, 2S. 37C.
22. Foreign Relation 1S. 38C. Vol. 1 pl190.
23. C. G. 3S. 37C. p883.
24. ----- pl300
25. H. ex. doc. No. 28, 1S. 38C.

NOTES TO PART I

26. H. ex. No. 93, 3S. 40C.
27. S. ex. No. 21, 2S. 38C.
28. S. ex. No. 20, 2S. 38C.
29. 13 U. S. Stat. p572.
30. F. R., 1S. 39C. pp 688-9.
31. Report of Commissioners to Paris Exhibition of 1867,
Vol. 1 pp 10-13.
32. Report of Com. to Paris Vol. 1 pp 13.
33. ----- Vol. 1 pp 13-17.
34. ----- Vol. 1 pp 17.
35. ----- Vol. 1 p 19.
36. ----- Vol. 1 pp 20-21.
37. ----- Vol. 1 pp 21-27.
38. S. ex. doc. No. 5, 2S. 39C. pp 3-12.
39. H. ex. doc. No. 12, 1S. 39C. p 1.
40. Rept. of Com. to Paris Vol. 1 pp 24-5.
41. ----- Vol. 1 pp 47-51.
42. H. ex. doc. No. 12, 1S. 39C. p 55.
43. ----- p. 2.
44. ----- p 2.
45. 14 U. S. Stat. p347.
46. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 127.
47. ----- p 138.
48. ----- p 1035.
49. ----- p 1371-5.
50. ----- p 1407.
51. ----- p 1413. .

NOTES TO PART I

52. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 1773.
53. ----- pp 3184-5.
54. ----- pp 3302-5.
55. ----- p 3521.
56. Rept. of Com. to Paris Vol. 1 pp 3-5.
57. C. G. 1S. 39C. pp 1871-5.
58. ----- p 1398.
59. ----- pp 1393-6.
60. ----- p3162.
61. ----- pp 3158-9.
62. ----- pp 1390-3
63. ----- pp 1399-1400.
64. ----- pp 3302-4.
65. ----- pp 1399-1400.
66. ----- p 1403.
67. ----- p 3156-8.
68. ----- p 3161.
69. ----- pp 3138-9.
70. 14 U. S. Stat. pp 362-3.
71. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 2342.
72. ----- p 3522.
73. ----- p 302.
74. ----- p 323-4.
75. ----- p 314.
76. 14 U. S. Stat. p 563.
77. C. G. 2S. 39C. p 1038.
78. ----- p 1721.

NOTES OF PART I

79. C. G. 2S. 39C. p 1782.
80. ----- p 1790.
81. ----- p 2004.
82. C. B. 1S. 40C. p 6.
83. ----- p 16.
84. ----- p 38.
85. C. G. 2S. 39C. p 1721.
86. ----- p 1782.
87. 15 U. S. Stat. p 19-20.
88. S. ex. doc. 5, 2S. 39C. p 48.
89. ----- p 22.
90. ----- p 44.
91. ----- p 39.
92. ----- p 44.
93. Rept. of Com. to I. E. Vienna Vol 1, p 3.
94. Harpers New Monthly Magazine Vol. 35, p 238, 777.
95. Rept. of Com. to I. E. Vienna Vol. 1 pp 4-20.
96. Richardson J. D.: A Compelation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents. Bureau of National Literature 1913, Vol. 5 p 3776.
97. H. ex. doc. No. 327, 2S. 42C pp 296-7.
98. H. ex. doc. No. 126, 2S. 40C.
99. S. ex. doc. No. 29, 1S. 39C.
100. Senate reports No. 9, 2S. 40C.
101. 15 U. S. Stat. p 249.
102. H. ex. doc. No. 181, 2S. 41C.
103. H. ex. doc. No. 93, 3S. 40C.
104. House miscellaneous documents No. 10, 2S. 42C.

NOTES TO PART I

105. F. R. 3S. 42C. pp 46-53.
106. C. G. 1S. 42C. p 3617.
107. ----- p 4404.
108. 17 U. S. Stat. p 389.
109. H. misc. doc. No. 7, 3S. 42C.
110. F. R. 3S. 42C. Vol. 1 pp 47-9.
111. ----- Vol. 1 pp 49-59.
112. H. ex. doc. No. 1 pt t, 3S. 42C p 28.
113. H. misc. doc. No. 6, 3S. 42 C.
114. C. G. 3S. 42C. pp 252-3.
115. ----- pp 313-4.
116. S. misc. doc. No. 32, 3S. 42C.
117. C. B. 3S. 42C. p 621-5.
118. ----- p 661.
119. ----- pp 813-4.
120. ----- p 821.
121. ----- p 841.
122. ----- pp 898-9.
123. ----- p 1151.
124. ----- p 1295.
125. ----- pp 252-5.
126. ----- pp 621-5.
127. ----- p 661.
128. H. ex. doc. No. 140, 3S. 42C.
129. F. R. 1S. 43C. pp 64-72.
130. Harpers Vol. 47, p 311.

NOTES TO PART I

131. Congressional Record 1S. 43C. p2653.
132. ----- p2383,5419.
133. C. R. 2S. 43C. p2244.
134. 17 U. S. Stat. pp 418-9.
135. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 1811.
136. H. ex. doc. 1, 1S. 38C. Vol. 5 p 135, 156, 222.
137. Rept. of Com. to Paris Vol. 1 p 26-7.
138. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 1405.
139. C. G. 1S. 41C. p398.
140. H. misc. doc. No. 4, 2S. 41C.
141. C. G. 2S. 41C. p 21.
142. ----- pp 1391-1401, 16.
143. ----- p 56.
144. H. misc. doc. No. 99, 3S. 49C. p 8.
145. S. ex. doc. No. 74 3S. 45C. p 107.
146. ----- p 108.
147. C. G. 2S. 44C. p1813.
148. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p 108.
149. C. G. 3S. 41C. p 103.
150. ----- p 422.
151. ----- p 423.
152. ----- pp 448-50.
153. ----- p 1681.
154. ----- p 1871
155. ----- p 1870
156. ----- p 1910
157. ----- pp 103-106.

NOTES TO PART I

158. C. G. 3S. 41C. pp 106-7.
159. ----- pp 306-7.
160. ----- pp 420-2.
161. ----- pp 304-5.
162. ----- p 306.
163. ----- pp 1477-9, 1559-61.
164. 16 U. S. Stat. pp 470-1.
165. H. ex. doc. No. 327, 2S. 42C. p288.
166. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. pp 115-7.
167. C. G. 2S. 42C. p 2887.
168. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p 116.
169. C. G. 2S. 42C. p 2887, 3991, 3693, 2929.
170. 17 U. S. Stat. pp 203-11.
171. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p11.
172. ----- p 120-1.
173. ----- p 122.
174. ----- p 123-4.
175. ----- pp 119-20.
176. H. misc. doc. No. 99, 3S. 39C. p 19.
177. C. G. 3S. 42C. p92.
178. H. misc. doc. No. 99, 3S. 39C. p37.
179. ----- pp 61-3.
180. ----- pp 58-9.
181. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 251.
182. H. misc. doc. No. 99, 3S. 39C. pp 190-1.
183. ----- pp 195.
184. ----- p 193.

NOTES TO PART I

185. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p 125.
186. 18 U. S. Stat. p 844.
187. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p11-12.
188. Nation Vol. 18 p 235.
189. C. R. 1S. 43C. pp 809-16.
190. ----- pp 4257-9.
191. ----- p 4264.
192. ----- p 4430.
193. ----- pp 809-16.
194. 18 U. S. Stat. p 53.
195. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p 12.
196. Nation Vol 18, p118.
197. S. ex. doc. 30, 1S. 43C. p 7.
198. Richardson Vol 6. p 4215.
199. S. ex. doc. No. 30, 1S. 43C. p 7.
200. Nation Vol. 18. p31691. 43C. p 7.
201. C. R. 1S. 43C. p 3118.
202. ----- pp 3600-4.
203. ----- 3611-13.
204. ----- pp 3609-11
205. ----- pp 3671-82.
206. ----- pp 3635-60.
207. ----- pp 3604-9
208. ----- pp 3635-60.
209. ----- pp 3681-2.
210. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 185.
211. H. misc, doc. No. 50, 1S. 44C.
212. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 214.

NOTES TO PART I

- 213. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 402.
- 214. -----69----- p 450.
- 215. ----- p 531.
- 216. ----- p 570.
- 217. ----- p 599.
- 218. ----- p 636.
- 219. House Report 1S. 44C.
- 220. C. R. 1S. 44C. p632.
- 221. ----- p 632,635.
- 222. ----- p 652.
- 223. ----- 968.
- 224. ----- p 966.
- 225. ----- p 968.
- 226. ----- p 1037.
- 227. ----- p 448.
- 228. ----- pp 482-5.
- 229. 6----- pp 480-1
- 230. ----- pp 478-80
- 231. ----- pp483-5.
- 232. ----- p 501.
- 233 ----- p 503.
- 234 ----- pp 508-9.
- 235. ----- pp 528-9.
- 236. ----- p 557.
- 237. ----- pp 553-5.
- 238. ----- p 560.
- 239. ----- p 561.

NOTES TO PART I

240. ----- p 561.
241. ----- p 564.
242. ----- p 567.
243 ----- Appendix p 11.
244. ----- Appendix p 3.
245. ----- p 624.
246. ----- p 481-2.
247. ----- p 505.
248. ----- pp 509-15.
249. ----- pp 525-6.
250. ----- pp 527.
251. ----- p 527.
252. ----- p 559.
253. ----- p 563.
254. ----- p 551
255. ----- p 565.
256. ----- p 631.
257. ----- p 963.
258. ----- pp 964-70.
259. ----- pp 964-5.
260. ----- p 970.
261. ----- p 10000.
262. ----- p 996.
263. ----- p 971.
265. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. pp 140-1, 12.
266. ----- p 12.
267. Richardson Vol. 6. p 4271.

268. S. ex. doc. No. 30, 1S. 43C. pp 368-9.
269. U. S. Stat. P 400.
C. R. 1S. 44C. p 1996.
S. Ex. doc. No. 84, 3S. 45C. p13.
h. rept. No. 144, 2S. 44C.
270. Richardson Vol. 6, p 4429.
271. 18 U. S. Stat. p 82.
272. 19 U. S. Stat. p 34.
273. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 2035, 2362, 2513.
274. 19 U. S. Stat. p 214.
275. ----- p 213.
276. C. R. 2S. 43C. p 377.
277. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 4288, 4301.
278. ----- p 439.
279. ----- p 1069, 1825, 1983, 4604, 2565, 3082, 3575.
280. ----- p 2592.
281. ----- p 2713.
282. ----- p 3367.
283. ----- p 3769.
284. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p23.
285. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 2998, 2883.
286. Harpers Vol. 53, p 315.
287. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 4156, 4359.
288. H. rept. No. 144, 2S. 44C.
289. Richardson pp 4364-5.
290. C. R. 2S. 44C. p 632, 7955.
291. 27 U. S. Stat. p 45.
292. C. R. 2S. 44C. p 24.
293. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. pp 139-42.
294. ----- p 1.

NOTES TO PART I

295. Encyclopedia Americana Vol. 6, p 200.
296. Nation Vol. 16, p 413.
297. C. G. 3S. 42C. p 723.
298. ----- pp 252-6.
299. S. ex. doc. No. 74, 3S. 45C. p 153.
300. Nation Vol. 22, p 56.
301. Nation Vol. 22, p 56.
302. Richardson Vol. 6, p 4308.
303. Rept. of Com. to Paris.
304. H. ex. doc. No. 334, 2S. 40C.
305. S. ex. doc. 30, 1S. 43C. pp 323-4.

NOTES TO PART II

1. F. R. 1S. 43C. p 1130, 1136-37.
2. F. R. 2S. 39C. p 244.
3. H. ex. doc. No. 49, 1S. 38C.
4. 14 U. S. Stat. pp 339-41, 301, 367.
5. S. ex. doc. No. 11, 1S. 38C.
6. S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 40C. p 26, 81, 87.
7. C. G. 2S. 41C. p 28, 652.
S. rept. No. 117, 2S. 40C.
C. G. 2S. 40C. p 1621.
C. R. 2S. 44C. p 197.
8. Works of Charles Sumner, Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1875,
Vol. 12, pp 270-1.
9. Didier, Eugene, Congress and International Copyright, Scrib-
ner's Monthly, Vol. 20, p 132-38.
10. F. R. 1S. 43C. p73.
11. S. ex. doc. No. 27, 1S. 43C.
12. Postmaster General's Report 3S. 41C. pp 19204.
13. -----3S. 40C. pp 10-14.
14. ----- 1S. 38C. p 9.
15. Haswell, J. H., Treaties and Conventions of the United
States of American and other Powers, Washington: Govern-
ment Printing Office, 1889, pp 238-9.
16. Haswell-----pp 867-8.
17. 13 U. S. Stat. pp 647-50.
18. Haswell-----pp 436-7.
19. 3 U. S. Stat. p 532-33.
20. Senate Executive Journal No. 9, pp 330, 334-6.
21. S. ex. doc. No. 57, 2S. 37C.
22. 12 U. S. Stat pp 1225-32.
23. S. ex. doc. 1, 2S. 37C. pp 453-4.

NOTES TO PART II

24. S. Ex. J. No. 12 p 256.
25. 12 U. S. Stat. p 1225.
26. 13 U. S. Stat. p 645-6.
27. F. R. 3S. 37C. Vol. 1, p 509.
28. ----- Vol. 1, p 473.
29. Richardson Vol. 5, p 3328.
30. -----Vol. 5, p 3380.
31. S. ex. doc. No.56, 1S. 38C.
32. F. R. 2S. 38C. pt. 4, p7.
33. F. R. 1S. 39C. pt. 2, p+55 57.
34. F. R. 1S. 39C. pt. 2, p 173, 190.
35. Richardson Vol. 6, p 3989.
36. ----- Vol. 5, p 3779.
37. S. Ex. J. No. 17, pp 468-9, 472, 514.
38. 16 U. S. Stat. pp 777-80.
39. F. R. 3S. 42C. p 208-15.
40. F. R. 3S. 42C. p430.
41. ----- p 208-15.
42. 12 U. S. Stat. p 6, 39.
13 U. S. Stat. p 139, 434.
43. 14 U. S. Stat. p 226, 415.
44. 15 U. S. Stat. p 58, 321.
43. Works of Charles Sumner Vol 6, p 474-86.
44. F. R. 1S 44C. p 589.
45. F. R. 2S. 38C. p 386.
46. F. R. 1S. 39C. p 211.
47. 22 U. S. Stat. p 940.
48. F. R. 2S. 41C. pp LII-LBV.
49. 24 U. S. Stat. p 989.
50. F. R. 2S. 38C. p 428.

NOTES TO PART II

51. F. R. 1S. 39C. p 350.
52. Haswell pp 734-36.
53. 17 U. S. Stat.p 474, 355, 124.
 18. U. S. Stat. p 71, 327.
 19. U. S. Stat. p 175, 238.
 20. U. S. Stat. p 98, 274.
 21. U. S. Stat. p 140, 345.
 22. U. S. Stat. p 135, 430.
54. F. R. 1S. 43C.
55. H. ex. doc. No. 96, 2S.45C. pp 68-86.
56. F. R. 1S. 44C. pp 474-5, 476-7.
57. S. Ex. Jr. No. 20, p 195.
58. H. ex. doc. No. 96, 2S. 45C. pp 68-86.
59. 20 U. S. Stat. pp 709-24.
60. 20 U. S. Stat. p 217, 283.
 21 U. S. Stat. p 265, 487, 455.
 23 U. S. Stat. p 172, 402, 324, 235.
 22 U. S. Stat. p 135, 430.
61. F. R. 1S. 43C. p 263.
62. 9 U. S. Stat. p 589, 645.
63. 17 U. S. Stat. p 304.
64. Postm. Gen. Rept, 3S. 37C. p 124.
65. Postm. Gen. Rept., 3S. 37C. p 165.
66. Myers, D. P.: Manuel of Collections of Treaties, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1922. pp 457-9.
67. Postm. Gen. Rept., 1S. 38C. pp 6-10.
68. ----- pp 6-8.
69. Richardson Vol. 5, p 3387.
70. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 38C. p9.
71. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 39C. p 5.
72. ----- p 5, 7.

NOTES TO PART II

- 73. 15 U. S. Stat. p 577, 569, 563, 565, 601, 545, 573.
16 U. S. Stat. p 1109, 1105.
- 74. 18 U. S. Stat. p 831, 809, 802, 832, 795, 801, 800, 810, 762.
19 U. S. Stat p 557, 569.
17 U. S. Stat p 939, 935, 859, 887, 903, 879, 945.
20 U. S. Stat. p 699.
- 75. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S 40C. p 16.
- 76. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 40C. pp 13-20.
- 77. H. misc. doc. No. 72, 3S. 42C.
- 78. 16 U. S. Stat. p 871.
- 79. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 40C. pp 13-20.
H. misc. doc. No. 72, 3S. 42C.
- 80. S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 41C pp 2-3.
- 81. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 40C. p 15-16.
- 82. S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 41C. p 12.
- 83. ----- p 21.
- 84. ----- pp 13-16.
- 85. ----- pp 16-18.
- 86. ----- pp 22-24.
- 87. ----- pp 25-59.
- 88. ----- p 59.
- 89. ----- p 64.
- 90. ----- p 78, 90.
- 91. ----- pp 92-3, 109.
- 92. e----- pp 109-111
- 93. ----- p 69.
- 94. Postm. Gen. Rept., 2S. 41C. pp 15-17.
- 95. S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 41C. p 117, 119.
- 96. ----- p 125.

NOTES TO PART II

97. ----- pp 110, 118, 122-7.
98. 18 U. S. Stat. pp 810-5.
99. Postm. Gen. Rept. 2S. 43C. p 16.
100. Myers pp 457-9.
101. Postm. Gen. Rept. 2S. 43C. p 17.
102. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 44C. p 13.
103. 19 U. S. Stat. p 577-625.
104. 19 U. S. Stat. p 577-606.
Postm. Gen. Rept. 2S. 43C. pp 18-19.
105. Postm. Gen. Rept. 1S. 44C. p 15.
106. Postm. Gen. Rept. 2S. 44C. p 9.
107. Postm. Gen. Rept. 2S. 45C. pp 1-10.
108. ----- pp 11-12.
109. ----- pp 13.
110. F. R. 1S. 43C. p 75.
111. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 2653, 2664, 3825.
112. Works of Charles Sumner Vol. 2 pp 393-7.
113. 17 U. S. Stat. pp 863-77.
114. F. R. 2S. 43C p 413.
115. F. R. 1S. 44C. p 1070.
116. F. R. 2S. 39C. p 244, 382.
117. F. R. 2S. 43C. pp 1136, 1136-37, 1664-5.
118. F. R. 2S. 45C. p 456, 612.
119. Richardson Vol. 4, pp 2867-8.
120. Haswell pp 238-9.
121. ----- pp 630-32.
122. 12 U. S. Stat. p 354. .

NOTES TO PART II

123. Richardson Vol. R. pp 3381.
124. 13. U. S. Stat. pp 647-50.
125. 13. U. S. Stat. pp 655-61.
126. 13. U. S. Stat. p 655.
 14. U. S. Stat. p 226.
 15. U. S. Stat. p 58, 321.
 16. U. S. Stat. p 221, 419.
 17. U. S. Stat. p 8, 145, 476.
127. S. misc. doc. No. 15, 3S. 41C.
128. F. R. 2S. 41C. p 39.
129. Myers p 485.
130. F. R. 1S. 44C. p 1070.
131. S. misc. doc. No. 53, 3S. 41C.
132. C. G. 3S. 41C. p 271, 537, 549, 689, 1945, 1908.
133. F. R. 2S. 41C. p 11.
134. F. R. 2S. 41C. p 39.
135. ----- pp 52-54.
136. 24 U. S. Stat. pp 989-92.
137. Myers p 474.
138. 26 United States Stat. pp 1424.
139. C. R. 2S. 44C. p 629.
140. 24 U. S. Stat. p 524.
141. S. ex. doc. No. 23, 1S. 39C.
142. F. R. 2S. 39C. p 236.
143. F. R. 2S. 39C. p 239.
144. H. ex. doc. No. 95, 2S. 43C.
145. F. R. 2S. 43C. pp 31-38.
146. 21 U. S. Stat. p 306.

NOTES TO PART II

147. 21 U. S. Stat. p 266.
148. ----- p 515, 415.
149. F. R. 2S. 38C. p 386.
150. ----- p 227.
151. F. R. 1S. 39C. p 211.
152. F. R. 2S. 39C. p 382.
153. C. G. 1S. 40C. p 281.
154. S. Ex. J. No. 23, p 311, 317, 328-9.
155. Haswell-----pp 1150-61
156. 22 U. S. Stat. p 960-51.
157. F. R. 1S. 44C. p 477-8.
158. ----- p 104.
159. F. R. 2S. 44C. p 44.
160. 22 U. S. Stat. p 217.
161. 23 U. S. Stat. p 194.
162. 26 U. S. Stat. p 1019.
163. 17 U. S. Stat. p 21.
C. G. 2S. 42C. p 2274.
164. 17 U. S. Stat. p 368.
165. S. ex. doc. No. 39, 2S. 42C. pp 1-5.
C. R. 1S. 44C. p 4326.
166. C. G. 3S. 42C. p 1990, 2089, 2072,
167. C. G. 3S. 42C. p 3573, 4344, 3398.
17 U. S. Stat. p 540.
168. 18 U. S. Stat. p 390, 524.
169. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 1355.
170. -----p 4326.
171. ----- pp 4284-5, 4327.

NOTES TO PART II

173. 19 U. S. Stat p 361.
174. Richardson Vol. 6, p 4406.
175. F. R. 2S. 45C. pp 547-8.
176. 20 U. S. Stat. p 12.
177. 21 U. S. Stat. p 455.
22 U. S. Stat. p 135, 430.
178. 23 U. S. Stat. p 235.
178. H. ex. doc. No. 289, 1S. 43C. p 3.
179. C. G. 3S. 42C. p 2005.
180. S. ex. doc. No. 11, 1S. 38C.
181. F. R. 3S. 42 C. pp 491-2, 495-6.
182. Richardson Vol.6, p 4142.
183. 17 U. S. Stat. pp 638-9.
184. C. R. 1^S. 44C. p 4534, 4677.
185. C. G. 3S. 42C. p 1345, 1523, 2005,
H. ex. doc. No. 49, 1S. 39C.
186. 17 U. S. Stat. p 368.
187. 24 U. S. Stat. p 498.
188. S. ex. J. p 33, 36, 69, 146, 181, 216, 240, 249, 237, 238, 259.
189. Didier, Eugene, Congress and International Copyright
pp 132-8, Scribner's Monthly.
190. C. G. 2S. 42C. p 29, 881.
191. C. G. 2S. 42C. p 973, 67, 199.
192. Parton, James: "International Copyright", Atlantic Monthly,
Vol. 20, pp 430-51.
193. Nation Vol 13, p 301.
194. C. G. 2S. 42C. pp 1931-5.
195. ----- pp 2410-2.
196. H. rept. No. 16, 2S. 40C.

NOTES TO PART II

197. Harpers New Monthly Magazine Vol. 46, pp 906-11.
198. Sedgwick, Arthur G.: "International Copyright by Judicial Decision", Atlantic Monthly Vol. 43, pp 217-30.
199. F. R. 1S. 43C. pp 74-6.
200. S. ex. doc. No. 27, 1S. 43C. pp 1-8.
201. F. R. 1S. 43C. pp 74-6.
202. S. ex. doc. No. 7, 1S. 42C.
203. H. rept. No. 62, 1S. 39C.
204. H. ex. doc. No. 49, 1S. 38C.
205. Works of Charles Sumner Vol. 10, p 525.
206. C. G. 1S. 39C. p 2671, 3825, 4219.
207. H. ex. doc. No. 96, 2S. 45C.
208. C. G. 2S. 41C. p 1086.
209. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 699, 1981, 1965.
210. C. R. 2S. 44C. p 929.
211. H. ex. doc. No. 8, 2S. 45C.
212. H. ex. doc. No. 71, 2S. 45C.
213. S. rept. No. 117, 2S. 40C.
214. H. rept. No. 62, 1S. 39C.
215. H. ex. doc. No. 14, 1S. 38C.
216. S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 40C.
217. S. ex. doc. No. 5, 2S. 39C. pp 22-39.
 C. G. 1S. 39C. pp 2653-4, 2664, 3825.
 S. ex. doc. No. 14, 2S. 40C.
218. S. ex. doc. 14, 2S. 40C. pp 106-110.
219. ----- p 28.
220. ----- p 10, 36, 65.
221. ----- pp 40-1.
222. ----- p 73, 86.

NOTES TO PART II

223. C. G. 2S. 40C. p 4293.
C. G. 1S. 41C. p 652.
224. C. G. 1S. 41C. p 1999.
C. R. 2S. 44C. p 197.
225. C. G. 1S. 41C. p 125, 220, 714.
226. C. G. 2S. 40C. p 1621.
227. C. G. 2S. 40C. p 2959.
228. C. G. 2S. 41C. p 28.
229. H. ex. doc. No. 76, 3S. 40C.
230. C. G. 1S. 41C. p 373.
231. ----- Appendix pp 281-4.
232. ----- Appendix pp 610-11.
----- Appendix pp 284-5.
233. S. rept. No. 117, 2S. 40C.
234. C. G. 2S. 41C. p 1097.
235. F. R. 3S. 41C. p 240-51.
236. ----- p 251.
237. F. R. 2S. 42C. p 873.
238. S. ex. doc. No. 16, 2S. 42C. p 3-6.
239. Myers p 490.
240. C. R. 1S. 44C. p 3879, 3945.
C. R. 2S. 44C. p 423.
241. ----- p 521.
242. ----- p 663, 665.
243. S. misc. doc. No. 26, 2S. 44C.
244. C. R. 2S. 44C. p 594.
245. ----- p 549.
246. ----- p 548, 550.
247. 20 U. S. Stat. p 25.

NOTES TO PART II

248. S. ex. doc. No. 58, 3S. 45C.
250. 20 U. S. Stat. p 218.
251. 21 U. S. Stat. p 26, 455.
 22 U. S. Stat. p 503.
 23 U. S. Stat. p 194.
252. 17 U. S. Stat. pp 863-77, 865.
253. S. ex. doc. No. 26, 3S. 45C.
254. Works of Charles Sumner Vol. 11 pp 393-7.
255. ----- Vol. 15 pp 30-2.
256. ----- Vol. 15 pp 273-4.
257. C. R. 1S. 43C. p 325, 187.
258. C. R. 1S. 43C. p 247, 504, 603, 693, 727, 771, 965, 1796,
 2348, 2437, 3137, 3426, 2477, 3782, 3976,
 4000, 4139, 4198, 4214, 4245, 4448, 4538,
 4934, 1255, 1712, 1976, 2183, 2209, 2210,
 2255, 2288, 2348, 2851, 3331, 3420, 3447,
 3848, 3783.
259. S. rept. No. 426, 1S. 43C.
260. C. R. 2S. 43C. p 20.
261. ----- p 5114.
262. ----- p 2036.
263. Haswell pp 238-9, 530-2.
 13 U. S. Stat pp 655-61.
264. Haswell pp 734-6.
 S. Ex. J. No. 14, pt. 2, p 750-1,870.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Public Documents

1. Congressional Globe 1855-1873
2. Congressional Record 1873-
3. Foreign Relations 1861-80
4. Secretary of the Treasury Report 1849-78
5. Secretary of the Interior Report 1862-70
6. Postmaster General Report 1860-1880
7. Senate Committee Reports 1862-1878
8. House Committee Reports 1862-1878
9. Senate Executive Journal 1852-1890
10. Final Report of Centennial Commission, Senate Executive Document No. 74, 3d Session 45th Congress
11. Reports of Commissioners to Paris Exposition of 1867, 2d Session 40th Congress, 6 vol.
12. Reports of Commissioners to Vienna Exhibition of 1873, 1st Session 44th Congress, 4 vol.

II. Other Sources

1. Haswell, J. H. : Treaties and Conventions of the United States and other Powers, 1776-1887, Washington, Government Printing office, 1889
2. Myers, D. P. : Manuel of Collections of Treaties and of Collections relating to Treaties, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1922
3. Sumner, C. S. : Works of Charles Sumner, Boston, Lee and Shepard, 15 vol.
4. Sherman, John : Recollections of Forty Years in the House, Senate and Cabinet, New York, The Werner Co, 1895, 2 vol.
5. Sanger, G. P. : United States Statutes at Large, Boston, Little Brown and Company, vols. 9 to 25
6. Richardson, J. D. : A Compilation of the Messages

BIBLIOGRAPHY

and Papers of the President, Bureau of National Literature, 1913 vols. 3 to 7

III. Secondary Books

1. Reinsch, P. S.: Public International Unions, Boston, Ginn and Company, 1911
2. Sayre, F. B.: Experiments in International Administration, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1919
3. Potter, P. B.: An Introduction to the Study of International Organization, New York, The Century Co., 1922

IV. Magazines

1. Atlantic Monthly, Boston, Houghton, Osgood and Company, vols. 18 to 44
2. Harper's New Monthly Magazine, New York, Harper and Brothers, vols. 20 to 50
3. The Nation, New York, E. L. Godkin and Co., vols 1 to 28
4. Scribner's Monthly, New York, Scribner and Co., vols. 10 to 21