

o'clock so that we could close the legislative day, and I now move that the Senate adjourn, the order having already been entered, as I understand, that when we meet again it be at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Michigan moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator withdraw his motion for a moment?

Mr. BLAIR. The pension bills are the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will withdraw his motion for a moment.

Mr. CONGER. But I do not yield the floor.

Mr. HALE. I only wish to make a suggestion. If the Senate adjourns and we begin a new day at precisely 1 o'clock, we have got to go through with all the formal proceedings required on beginning every new day. Certain motions can not be made for an hour after we begin that day, and the Journal must be read unless there is unanimous consent to dispense with it.

Mr. CONGER. The motion is not debatable. I have not yielded for debate. I insist on the motion.

Mr. HALE. I only wish to say—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

Mr. HALE. If we do not adjourn we can go right on.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan that the Senate do now adjourn. [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to prevail.

Mr. CONGER. I desire the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. All this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent. The Senator from Michigan calls for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONGER. As I stated, one objection—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order. The yeas and nays are called for on the motion to adjourn.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 41, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—41.

Aldrich,	Colquitt,	Jonas,	Saulsbury,
Allison,	Conger,	Jones of Florida,	Sewell,
Bayard,	Dolph,	Kenna,	Sherman,
Beck,	Garland,	Lamar,	Slater,
Brown,	George,	McPherson,	Vance,
Butler,	Groome,	Maxey,	Vest,
Call,	Hampton,	Mitchell,	Walker,
Camden,	Harris,	Morgan,	Williams.
Chace,	Harrison,	Platt,	
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Pugh,	
Coke,	Jackson,	Ransom,	

NAYS—19.

Cameron of Pa.,	Frye,	Miller of Cal.,	Plumb,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hale,	Miller of N. Y.,	Sawyer,
Cullom,	Hoar,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Dawes,	Ingalls,	Pendleton,	Wilson.
Edmunds,	Manderson,	Pike,	

ABSENT—16.

Blair,	Gibson,	Lapham,	Palmer,
Bowen,	Gorman,	Logan,	Riddleberger,
Fair,	Hill,	McMillan,	Sabin,
Farley,	Jones of Nevada,	Mahone,	Van Wyck.

So the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (at 1 o'clock p. m., March 3). The Senate stands adjourned until March 3, at 1 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, March 2, 1885.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. S. LINDSAY, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask for the regular order.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on Printing, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Printing, to which was referred the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1885, as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 copies of the communication of the Secretary of State, containing a list of claims against France by reason of spoliations prior to the 31st of July, 1801, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives"—having duly considered the same, recommend that the House concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRATTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RETURN OF A SENATE RESOLUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resolution, which is rendered necessary in order to correct a mistake which has been made in the transmission of a resolution to the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the concurrent resolution of February 27, 1885, providing for the printing of the first and second volumes of decisions relating to the public lands, which was by mistake communicated to the Senate as having passed the House.

The resolution was adopted.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, under instructions from the Committee on Appropriations I report back the bill (H. R. 8239) making appropriations for the naval service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask unanimous consent to consider the same immediately in the House as in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union under the five-minute rule.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Senate amendments will be reported.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask that these amendments be read, and I will then state after each has been reported to the House the recommendations of the committee in regard to the same.

Mr. HISCOCK. I think these amendments should be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TALBOTT. I was just going to make that suggestion.

Mr. RANDALL. That is the effect of my motion, unless some gentleman objects to it.

Mr. HISCOCK. There will be no objection to their consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole with the understanding, of course, that they are to be considered under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. That of course will be the order of the House. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 13 of the printed bill, strike out "one."

Mr. RANDALL. That is a mere clerical error, this word being printed twice in succession. The committee recommend concurrence. I must request, Mr. Speaker, that there be order upon the floor, as it is almost impossible to proceed in the prevailing confusion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that at this stage of the session it is very important to transact business as rapidly as possible; and but little progress can be made unless order is preserved upon the floor. The Chair hopes gentlemen will preserve order.

Mr. RANDALL. In this first amendment, as I have said, the committee recommend concurrence.

The motion was agreed to.

The second amendment was read, as follows:

In line 21 of the printed bill strike out "nine" and insert "ten;" so that it will read "ten naval constructors," &c.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend concurrence in the second Senate amendment, as also in the third amendment, as they bear relation to each other.

The amendment of the Senate is in obedience to the requirement of existing law.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 3 was read, as follows:

In line 22, strike out "ten" and insert "nine."

Mr. RANDALL. As I have just said, the committee recommend also concurrence in this amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 4 was read, as follows:

On page 74 of the printed bill, line 75, strike out after the word "pilotage" the words "bringing home the bodies of naval officers who have died or may hereafter die abroad while on duty."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the House inserted that provision because we believe that where a naval officer died while on duty abroad his remains should be brought home at the expense of the Government. It is a question that appeals to our good feelings, and what I deem to be a case of humanity. I have nothing further to say except that the committee recommend non-concurrence.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. RANDALL. There is no disposition to concur.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I only desire to say that I fully indorse what the gentleman says. I have a case now in my own hands where a young naval officer died abroad while on service at Nagasaki, Japan, and his remains are there without an effort to bring them home.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it would be inhuman to strike this out. It ought to be adhered to.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend non-concurrence in the amendment.

The motion to non-concur was agreed to.

Amendment numbered 5 was read, as follows:

On page 4, line 76, strike out "valubles" and insert "valuables."

Mr. RANDALL. That is the correction of an error of engrossment. The committee recommend concurrence.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 6 was read, as follows:

In lines 112 and 113, page 6, under the heading "Bureau of Navigation," strike out "\$87,500" and insert "\$100,000."

Mr. RANDALL. This amendment relates to the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Navigation. The committee recommend non-concurrence. I have no doubt when it comes into conference a settlement will be quickly reached.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 7 was read, as follows:

After line 113 insert as follows:

"For special ocean surveys and the publication thereof, \$10,000."

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend non-concurrence; but I desire to say that there is an inclination on the part of the committee to favor this proposition. We propose, however, that it shall be non-concurred in in connection with another matter. The two questions may be adjusted together.

Mr. BLOUNT. What is the other matter?

Mr. RANDALL. The next item.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 8 was read, as follows:

After the seventh amendment insert as follows:

"For publication of professional papers, \$10,000."

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend non-concurrence.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 9 was read, as follows:

After line 133 insert the following:

For the purchase or manufacture of steel guns of small caliber for ships now in service, and for testing the same at the naval ordnance proving-ground, \$21,000.

Mr. RANDALL. We recommend non-concurrence.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will give us some reason for non-concurring.

Mr. RANDALL. This is an item which relates to the purchase or manufacture of small steel guns costing from \$2,000 to \$4,000 each. The committee considered this proposition before sending the bill to the Senate and thought it was unnecessary. But the Senate has inserted it and the committee desire non-concurrence with a view to having further light, if there be any, from the Department in connection with the subject. The Committee on Appropriations originally were as a whole opposed to the purchase or manufacture of these guns by the Government.

The question being taken on non-concurring, the Speaker stated that in the judgment of the Chair the "noes" had it.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 25.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 10 was read, as follows:

Page 7, line 138, after the words "completion and," insert the word "public;" so that it will read:

"For the completion and public test of two breech-loading rifle cannon of the larger calibers now in course of construction for the Navy, with carriages and ammunition for both, \$80,000."

Mr. RANDALL. We recommend concurrence.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 11 was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the word "dollars," in line 141 on page 7, down to and including line 153 on page 7, namely, the following:

"Provided, That the test shall be conducted as follows: With battering charges for two hours, and under the most rapid continuous rate of firing, as near as may be like the conditions of a hotly contested battle; then with the service charge not less than five hours. Permission, with ample notice to be present, shall be given to all persons who indicate a desire to examine the preliminary preparation and witness the firing. Expenditures of public money on all other naval cannon of and above said caliber shall cease until this public test has terminated. And all the facts and incidents of the test shall be reported to Congress by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance as soon thereafter as possible."

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend non-concurrence.

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether this amendment does not stop the construction of the guns which are almost completed now for the new cruisers.

Mr. RANDALL. It has no connection whatever with any armament incident to the new cruisers. I will state for the information of the House to what it relates.

There are now in course of construction at the Washington navy-yard two 10-inch guns. We in this bill give sufficient money for their completion, to wit, \$80,000. The House thought it prudent to add the character of test which should be given to these guns prior to their being placed in use on board ship. The Senate has seen fit to strike that out. The House considered that the severest test should be applied to these 10-inch breech-loading steel guns, because probably in the event of their proving a success they will become the type of that sized gun, and because we are admonished by the history of the late civil war that the severest test should be applied to this character of gun. We remember that even guns of smaller caliber than these, the guns, for instance, at Fort Fisher, were more dangerous to us than they were to the confederates in that struggle. There were said to have been eleven of the confederates injured, while forty-odd of the Federals were injured by the bursting of our own cannon.

It is rather surprising that there should be any disinclination on the part of the Department to have a full test as to these guns. It does not indicate to me that confidence in their manufacture which they ought

to have, and that is the reason why the committee insist upon this character of test as necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. RANDALL], that the greatest test should be given to these guns, and I think it ought to be a public test.

Mr. RANDALL. That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not object to non-concurrence. I simply rose for the purpose of asking whether this prevents the completion of the 6-inch and 8-inch guns which are being built at the Washington navy-yard in addition to the 10-inch gun, but I see by reading the amendment that the language is this: "Expenditure of public money on all other naval cannon of and above said caliber shall cease until this public test has terminated." So it will be seen that this does not affect the 6-inch and 8-inch guns which are building, but is intended to apply only to the two 10-inch guns, and I think that is right.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of John F. Severance; and

A bill (H. R. 44) for the completion of a public building at Council Bluffs, Iowa.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference upon the bill (S. 84) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amounts due to citizens of the United States for supplies furnished to the Sioux or Dakota Indians of Minnesota subsequent to August, 1860, and prior to the massacre of August, 1862, and to provide for the payment thereof.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Amendment numbered 12 was read, as follows:

Strike out "three" and insert "four."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, that relates to the amount of the appropriation, and the committee recommend that the House non-concur, with the view of reaching an agreement.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 13 was read, as follows:

After the word "hundred" insert "and twenty-five;" so that it will read, as the total appropriation for the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting, "eight hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars."

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend non-concurrence in that amendment.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 14 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words "car-tickets."

Mr. RANDALL. The Senate desires to cut off the supply of car-tickets to employés of the Department, and the committee recommend concurrence.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 15 was read, as follows:

After the word "hundred" insert "and fifty;" so that it will read "\$250,000," as the total appropriation for the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. RANDALL. That also relates to the amount of the appropriation, and the committee recommend non-concurrence.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 16 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words: "And if the Secretary of the Navy shall not be able to maintain properly the whole number of naval hospitals now kept open on the amounts hereby appropriated for the maintenance of a civil establishment at naval hospitals, he shall close those which are least necessary to the service, and provide for the patients now cared for therein at such other naval hospitals as may be most convenient."

Mr. RANDALL. That clause was originally placed in the bill at the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress. The Committee on Appropriations deem it a wise provision because it prevents a deficiency; and if sufficient money should not be appropriated for the maintenance of all these hospitals, then the provision is that such of them as can be safely closed shall be closed by order of the Surgeon-General.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this provision has been three times recommended by the Secretary of the Navy—

Mr. RANDALL. And it has been inserted in the law.

Mr. THOMAS. I say it has been recommended three times by the Secretary of the Navy, and it meets the unanimous concurrence of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I will not take time to state them, but there are other reasons than those given by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations why this amendment should be non-concurred in.

Mr. RANDALL. I am obliged to the gentleman.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 17 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words "and car-tickets."

Mr. RANDALL. That amendment, like number 14, relates to the use of car-tickets by employés.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in regard to this amendment, as well as in relation to the one numbered 14, under the head of

Bureau of Equipment, that while I am willing that the amendment shall be concurred in, it seems to me that we are simply prohibiting the supply of car-tickets and leaving persons who may have to be transported to various points on the business that they are engaged in to ride in carriages at a much greater cost to the Government.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know where there is any appropriation made in any of these bills for carriage-hire.

Mr. KEIFER. But there is plenty of money to be used for carriage-hire made under the head of "incidental expenditures."

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 18 was read, as follows:

Page 10, line 3, strike out "ten" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the appropriation for necessary repairs of naval laboratory, naval hospitals, &c., \$15,000.

Mr. RANDALL. This amendment relates to the amount of the appropriation. The committee recommend non-concurrence.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 19 was read, as follows:

Page 10, line 13, strike out "eighty-five" and insert "one hundred;" so as to make the appropriation for provisions of seamen and marines, &c., \$100,000.

Mr. RANDALL. This amendment also relates to the amount appropriated. The committee recommend non-concurrence, with a view to reaching an amicable adjustment in conference.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 20 was read, as follows:

Page 10, line 21, strike out "car-tickets."

Mr. RANDALL. I move to concur in this amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 21 was read, as follows:

Page 11, line 16, strike out "30" and insert "20;" so as to make the proviso read:

"Provided, That no part of this sum shall be applied to the repairs of any wooden ship when the estimated cost of such repairs, to be appraised by a competent board of naval officers, shall exceed 20 per cent. of the estimated cost, appraised in like manner, of a new ship of the same size and like material."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, upon the recommendation of the committee in this case, which is to concur in the amendment of the Senate, I am not a proper spokesman for the committee. I will yield to some other member—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER]—and after an explanation on that side of the question I shall take the liberty to give the views of the minority of the committee on this matter.

Mr. LONG. I move that the House concur in this amendment of the Senate.

Mr. RANDALL. That is the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. LONG. That is the recommendation of the majority of the committee. This is the same question which has been discussed and settled two or three times heretofore. For two or three years we have been proceeding under the policy embraced in the amendment of the Senate—that no repairs of wooden ships of war shall exceed 20 per cent. of the estimated cost of a new ship of the same size and like material. The figures show that the great extravagance in our naval establishment has arisen from repairs made upon our wooden ships, which in some cases have amounted to two, three, or four times the original cost of the vessel. Unless we are to go back to the era of wooden ships, we should concur in the Senate amendment.

All the more necessary is this in view of the fact that our Navy consists of old wooden vessels; and unless we continue the present policy of restricting repairs to 20 per cent. we shall be spending all our money in repairs of vessels which when repaired will be of no value.

I move that the House concur.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a minority of the committee would have preferred that this point might go to the committee of conference. The real question involved is how soon we shall get rid of the wooden vessels in the Navy. This naturally depends upon how fast we construct steel vessels to take their places. The minority of the committee thought we should not be too rapid in dispensing with our wooden vessels until we are assured of their substitution by steel vessels; and that until the purpose of Congress in this particular is manifest, the limit of repairs might properly be placed at 30 per cent. For the current year under the two six-month bills and for the prior year the limit has been 20 per cent. This is about what is involved in the amendment. There are some gentlemen so zealous in behalf of steel vessels that I fear they think the taking away of wooden vessels now in the Navy will increase the rapidity with which a new navy may be constructed.

Mr. COX, of New York. Mr. Speaker, when the other day the question came up about finishing the New York, I dropped a remark which I think will apply to this business of wooden ships. As in an army we may need artillery, infantry, and cavalry—all three—so in our Navy we may need wooden ships, iron ships, and steel ships. There is not a very great difference between 20 per cent. and 30 per cent., and we need not take up much time upon it. I would be willing that the House non-concur, and let the question be settled in conference. We must have some wooden vessels. We cannot improvise all at once a steel navy. We have here propositions for steel cruisers which I hope will be concurred in; and, at the same time, I hope we shall non-

concur in the amendment as to the finishing of the wooden vessel, the New York. I think it would be well to give the committee of conference a little leeway that they may adjust or, if you please, "trade" on this business, in order that the bill may provide for these various arms of our service.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox], I desire to say that while it may be possible we ought to have various kinds of vessels in our Navy, yet at the same time we have no vessels that rise to the dignity of war vessels. Our vessels are all wooden vessels now; and we do not wish that all the money Congress sees fit to expend for the building up of a navy shall be spent in repairing old obsolete wooden ships.

I desire to understand exactly what this proposition is, because the same form of amendment will be found further along in this bill. The amendment of the Senate proposes that no part of the sum appropriated shall be applied to the repairs of any wooden ship when the estimated cost of such repairs shall exceed 20 per cent. of the estimated cost of a new ship of the same size and like material. If we agree to the limitation of 20 per cent.—that is, one-fifth of the cost of a new ship of the same size and like material—we shall have enough wooden ships of that kind, I think, to answer all the purposes that the gentleman from New York expects to be served by wooden ships. The limitation of 30 per cent. allows nearly one-third of the original cost to be spent in repairing a wooden vessel which we have no use for when constructed. These vessels are all upon old models—all obsolete. If we keep up such a policy we can spend from year to year on these old vessels more than enough to make a good navy.

Mr. COX, of New York. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. COX, of New York. Suppose we compromise this matter at 25

per cent.

Mr. ELLIS. No.

Mr. KEIFER. If the gentleman chooses to make that amendment it can be submitted to the House. I wish to say there is some present promise that we are going to have finished the best cruisers which we have commenced constructing; we are going to finish the monitors; we are proposing to do something also in the way of building the best ship that floats on the waters according to the best and most approved model. We have now this in prospect, but we shall limit ourselves a little on these old obsolete tubs. That is the position I take, that we will spend money enough, that we will keep enough of this class of vessels, if we are allowed to spend up to 25 per cent. of the value of a new ship of the same size and model.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, rose.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio has not suggested any amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. No; I have not moved any amendment.

Mr. COX, of New York. I move to concur with the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his amendment.

Mr. COX, of New York. I move to insert 25 instead of 20, so it will provide that it shall not exceed 25 per cent. instead of 20 per cent.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on his amendment?

Mr. COX, of New York. For a moment only. All I have to say is this in response to what has fallen from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], that many of these wooden vessels are not obsolete tubs. They are made of good timber. The New York when completed will be built of perfectly good timber, and the new engines to be placed in these vessels will be of the most recent origin. So the remark of the gentleman does not altogether apply to the wooden vessels, and I hope we may have some of these old wooden vessels which may serve admirably in the uses of the Navy. Therefore, I say 20 per cent. will apply to the repair of more vessels than 30, and a fair compromise between the two I think would be 25 per cent., which amendment I have proposed.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I should like to ask my colleague where these new engines are to come from.

Mr. COX, of New York. I suppose they will come from the future.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Out of what fund—how are they going to be paid for?

Mr. COX, of New York. Is there nothing in the bill as to that object?

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. My colleague says they will put improved engines upon these vessels of the Navy.

Mr. COX, of New York. Evidently they would, or they would not be made hereafter.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Why, they have to be made, and out of what fund is it to be done?

Mr. COX, of New York. That will be attended to hereafter; if not this year, why, then, the next.

Mr. RANDALL. It will come out of the fund for steam-engineering, \$950,000.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to reply to a remark made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] a moment or two ago in reference to the models of our ships, he deprecate-

ing the use of the models of the old tubs, as he calls them, which were designed years ago. I say, sir, in the interest of the Navy it is to be regretted that the old models have not been adhered to in building ships, both iron and wooden. I will state this fact, which may be information to the gentleman from Ohio, that the old frigates United States and Constellation, wooden ships, built in this century, have never been surpassed in speed. Those are the models which ought to be adhered to. The frigate United States was the fastest sailing vessel in the United States Navy in her day, and the fastest sailing naval vessel in the world. The Constellation came just after her in speed, and the old Constitution not much behind.

I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the old models, and I assert it here that there never has been any improvement since those days in building naval vessels for speed. I do not deprecate the idea, therefore, that we shall adhere to those old models if we want quick sailing vessels.

Mr. KEIFER. Then had we not better build new ships than repair old ones?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The ships were built with great care; they were built in the navy-yards of the country. Every piece of wood or other material used in their construction was properly inspected before being allowed to go into their construction. The ship-builders of those days produced vessels which could sail away, if necessary, from the greater fleets of England during the war of 1812. I consider the naval architecture since, as a general thing, to be comparatively a failure in regard to speed.

One vessel I will refer to which gentlemen will recall, and that is the Princeton, which was built under the auspices of a Democratic administration. Everything was allowed to be put in here. She was constructed in accordance with the ideas of Commodore Stockton of that day, who supervised the construction of that vessel. She was a failure. So it has been with vessels since then. Hence, I say, do not let us depreciate the older ship-builders of the country, those who produced ships that could sail away from the hostile fleet if that fleet was stronger than one of our naval vessels.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has three minutes of his time left. Does he claim it?

Mr. COX, of New York. Yes; and I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox], I believe it is hardly worth while—it is simply making two bites of a cherry. The Senate have determined on 20 per cent. The question with the House is whether we will amend by making it 30 per cent. This is not permanent legislation. It applies merely to the present year. It is carrying out the policy of the last two years. Our Navy is in a transition state. All our wooden vessels are very old, and most of them if repaired at all would exceed the limit.

Experience has shown that the great expense connected with the Navy arises from the repair of these old wooden vessels. It will reduce that expense and the extravagance which has heretofore applied to their repairs to keep that limit down, as proposed by the Senate amendment. Let us, therefore, during this transition state, keep it down to the lowest point. When we have reached another period, and when our Navy rests upon a basis of iron or steel vessels, we can then afford to change this limit, but not now.

I will yield the remainder of any time that remains to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this House will restrict repairs upon these wooden ships as much as it possibly can. In the first place, sir, they are all of a type that is passing away. Wood in naval construction is a thing of the past. So far as ship-building is concerned its day is over, and the enormous repairs that have been put upon our ships in the past has been the graveyard of our Navy. Year after year we have been repairing these old wooden vessels at a cost which would have given us a modern navy. Let us take the Tennessee, the best vessel of our Navy, and the only one which ranks as a first-class vessel, and I quote with reference to that from a speech of my honorable and distinguished friend from New York [Mr. HEWITT], every word of which is verified by the official reports. His description of the Tennessee is complete and conclusive. He shows that the repairs to the hull of this vessel and other incidental repairs, during the Robeson administration of the Navy Department, was \$1,434,500. That is the Tennessee, our best vessel afloat, which was built in 1844, and the only vessel upon our register which ranks as a first-class ship of war. The reports, as I have said, show that the statement of the gentleman from New York is verified, and that during that administration the expense of the repairs of this ship reached nearly a million and a half of dollars. That would have been ample to have built a modern cruiser—

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. Debate is exhausted upon this amendment.

Mr. ELLIS. I have not exhausted five minutes, certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has exhausted the remainder of the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I move to make the limit twenty-six.

Mr. ELLIS. I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves an amendment which is in order. He moves to amend the amendment by striking out twenty-five and inserting twenty-six.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the question for the House to consider now is not whether we are to have a navy of wooden ships, but whether we are to have any navy at all left after the expiration of two years.

Now, Admiral Porter recommended that this limit should be fixed at 40 per cent.; and for one I prefer to take his judgment as head of the Navy Department to risking my own in a question of this kind. But the Bureau of Construction and Repair recommend that we fix the limit at 33½ or 33, I believe, and the committee after considering the question have decided to fix it at 30, in which form it passed the House and went to the Senate, where it was reduced to 20.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in our Navy Department at the present time thirty-one vessels of war available; that is to say, one of the first class, eleven of the second class, and nineteen of the third class. Under the limit proposed by the committee at the expiration of one year from this time eleven, or more than one-third of the available fleet of to-day, will be stricken from the rolls of the Navy; and if we pass this amendment at 20 or 25 per cent. at the expiration of two, or at most three, years we will not have a ship left. Now, the only proposition is to extend the Navy by improving the modern ships or repairing them, making them available for some time for service, until we have devised some plan for the permanent increase of the Navy. As yet no plan has been devised.

There is no certainty whatever that within a year or two we shall have another steel cruiser, and certainly it does not seem to be the part of wisdom or policy on the part of the legislators of this country to deprive the nation of any navy at all, even if it be a wooden navy, until we have something to take its place. It is like a man burning the house in which he lives before he has completed a new one into which he can move. All that gentlemen say of the expense in connection with the wooden vessels is true, but do not let us discard them, in the face of the recommendation of the Navy and the Bureau of Construction and Repair, until we have something to replace them with.

Let us keep the limit of their repair down to 30 per cent. I hope it will be the will of the House to reject the motion to concur in the Senate amendment, and let the matter at least go to a conference committee, where, after a full consideration of the subject, we can doubtless arrive at some arrangement or conclusion that may be satisfactory both to the Senate and to the House.

Mr. ELLIS. Now, Mr. Speaker, to resume where I left off. I desire again to call the attention of the House to the cost of this only first-class vessel, the Tennessee. This vessel has a speed of fourteen knots per hour.

Mr. HUTCHINS. You speak of the Tennessee?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUTCHINS. She goes off under this amendment in a year.

Mr. ELLIS. Ah! she is rated as a first-class vessel, the best in your Navy and of a type you want to keep up.

Mr. HUTCHINS. She would not come in under this limit.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not yield. I trust the gentleman from New York will possess his soul in patience. As a coal-consumer she consumes now 2.95 pounds per hour of horse-power; while your modern engine consumes one and one-third pounds per hour of horse-power. She is an enormous coal-consumer. She is too slow for any purpose. And yet the gentleman would have this Government enact a law which would permit this vessel to be absolutely built over, when she would be of no use in war or in peace.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I desire to correct the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIS. I decline to yield. I know the views of the gentleman from New York, and so does the House.

Now, what does the Secretary of the Navy tell us? He gives you a long catalogue of vessels that have not been repaired but have been absolutely built over; more having been expended on their repairs under that enormously wasteful system than the vessels originally cost; enough to have made modern vessels in the place of every one of them.

The gentleman from New York knows we have no vessels; this matter of repairs amounts absolutely to the building of the vessel or the rebuilding it over, and thus perpetuating in the Navy of the United States a type and class and character of vessels that are insufficient in war and no credit in peace.

Now, how long is the country to be subjected to this wasteful and extravagant process? How long are you to keep this open grave for our hopes for a navy? For as long as we have a few old rotten, obsolete hulks on the sea, just strong enough to bear the flag and not strong enough to defend it, I am persuaded the views of certain gentlemen will prevail and that we will not embark in the work of building a navy. I say let these old vessels pass away. I would not spend a dollar in repairing them; but when they become totally unfit I would sell them and get rid of them. Let the people know we have not a navy, and then they will fill this Hall with Representatives up to their thought, up to their wealth, up to their ideas of national power and glory, who will compel the building of a modern navy.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I withdraw my amendment and move to amend by making it 27 per cent.

I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana means to treat this question fairly. He has selected the Tennessee, and he founds all his argument on the condition of that ship as a reason why no money, not a dollar, should be expended on the repairs of the present Navy.

If the gentleman from Louisiana had read the report of the Secretary of the Navy he would have seen he was dealing unfairly with this subject. The Secretary says at page 14 of his report:

The available cruising sea vessels of the Navy are the following: One first-rate, the Tennessee, of 4,840 tons displacement.

He means by that first class, not that it is in the best repair; because on the same page he says:

Of the above list it is reported that the following will be condemned when surveyed, as they can not be repaired under the law: Tennessee, Lackawanna, Powhatan, and Wachusett.

Now, the gentleman from Louisiana has been talking here about the Tennessee, which the Secretary of the Navy tells us under the law, as it stands, of the 30 per cent. clause, can not be repaired. He says that we propose to appropriate a sum of money here to rebuild that vessel. My answer is, under that law that vessel can not be repaired. It is only those in good condition which can be repaired; and it is only for a temporary purpose, that the American flag may be seen at some mast-head until we can agree among ourselves to provide for the construction of such navy as this Government ought to have.

I withdraw the amendment, and hope that the 30 per cent. limit will be adopted.

Mr. HISCOCK. I move to amend by striking out "25" and inserting "26."

Mr. Speaker, this is the old contest which we have had before in the House, striving to support the navy-yards; and every one who has a navy-yard in his neighborhood is in favor of the 30 per cent. limit.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Does the gentleman seriously mean to make that statement? I have a navy-yard in my immediate neighborhood and I am not in favor of that limit.

Mr. LONG. And I am not.

Mr. HISCOCK. I will not undertake to say that there are not some exceptions.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Will the gentleman answer me a question?

Mr. HISCOCK. There may be some exceptions, and I will except gentlemen from the State of New York.

Mr. HUTCHINS. That is not the point of my question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] yield?

Mr. HISCOCK. I do not yield further.

I have before me a statement of the expenditures upon these old ships. The investigation of that subject in the past resulted in the establishment of this limitation of 20 per cent. Twenty per cent., I believe, is the law to-day.

Mr. LONG. And has been for two years.

Mr. HISCOCK. And has been for two years, and I am not sure but it has been for three years. Now, as a matter of course, when you carry the limit up to 30 per cent. you increase the employment in the navy-yards.

Now I do not say that my colleague from New York, Mr. HEWITT, or my other colleague from New York, Mr. HUTCHINS, is influenced by that, but it is wooden ships that are to be repaired, and the moment you carry the expenditure up to 30 per cent. you increase the amount of work in these navy-yards, and the interests of locations, the interest perhaps of Brooklyn, the interest of League Island, the interest of all the navy-yards and of the communities in the vicinity of those navy-yards, is in favor of the highest amount.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to say, as representing one of the League Island districts, that I am in favor of the smallest limitation. I want to get rid of these wooden hulks.

Mr. HISCOCK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has always occupied that position, but I believe that his colleague, Mr. O'NEILL, who is always looking after his navy-yard with great industry and great intelligence, always antagonizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] upon that subject. Now, sir, I will call the attention of the House and of my friend from New York [Mr. HUTCHINS] to the remarkable statement which was sent to us at the beginning of this Congress in regard to the ships now borne upon the register. Upon those vessels since they have been borne upon the register we have expended for repairs \$41,200,000, and those vessels cost only \$40,000,000. Therefore it appears that we have expended upon them for repairs since they have been borne on the register more than they originally cost. Are we to continue this policy? I say, sir, that if we are to have a new navy, an iron and steel navy, we can do for a while with a less number of these old ships, and save this money and devote it to the construction of new cruisers, and I believe that will be a much better use to make of it. I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE].

Mr. BAYNE. I have only a word to say. The proposition is made to expend 30 per cent. upon the repairs of these ships. I am informed

by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], who is thoroughly well posted in all naval matters, that these vessels were constructed during the war and soon after the war, when the cost of building ships was very high. Unseasoned timber was used in their construction; they were not enduring; and if this appropriation be made on the basis of 30 per cent. of the original cost, it will amount now to 50 per cent. on the estimated present cost of such vessels. If we appropriate even 20 per cent. now, it will be perhaps equivalent to 50 per cent. of the real value of the vessels, so that in two years the appropriation will reach what would be the full par value of these vessels if constructed in times like these. I can not imagine what business principles enter into a proposition of that kind, and I am surprised that such a proposition should come from this economical Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. I am here, sir, as an advocate of building ships in the navy-yards of the country. I do not hold, however, that there should be no ships built by contract, but *pari passu* with the building of naval vessels in the navy-yards I would like to see contractors build ships in their private ship-yards. I stand here, sir, as I have always stood, as an advocate of the League Island navy-yard, and to assert that for the purposes of building vessels of war it is not equalled by any navy-yard in the country; and in this connection I desire to bring to the recollection of the House the fact that one of the gentlemen who in a former Congress was foremost in advocating the closing of that yard by legislation was my friend from New York [Mr. HISCOCK].

The League Island navy-yard is in the neighborhood of the city a part of which I represent upon this floor. In that city there are mechanics unsurpassed in their skill in ship-building, either iron ships or wooden ships, either building a new vessel from the keel up or repairing an old one; and such vessels as have been built or repaired at the League Island navy-yard, the Quinnebaug and the Ossipee, for instance, have had less money expended upon them in comparison with the amount of work necessary to be done than any vessels which have been repaired at any other navy-yard in the country. I say this in respect of the mechanics and ship-builders in the city of Philadelphia, that they possess the highest skill, developed by long experience, in the construction of ships and in the production of models of naval architecture, and I predict that before long Congress will have to re-establish the League Island navy-yard, for it is the only place in this country where iron naval architecture can be profitably carried on.

Mr. POTTER obtained the floor.

Mr. RANDALL. After the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTER] has spoken I shall move to close debate upon this paragraph.

The SPEAKER. On the Senate amendment and the amendments thereto?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. HISCOCK withdrew his formal amendment.

Mr. POTTER. I renew the amendment. I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, that this nation should have a navy equal to its great wants and its great duties. We should not be behind any of the other nations of the world in this respect. But, sir, there is unanswerable force in the suggestion of the honorable member, my colleague, from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], that it is of higher importance than any question of 5 or 10 or 15 per cent. that the flag of our country be kept afloat until we shall introduce and produce vessels of iron that shall supplement those that we now have to bear our flag. For one, sir, I am willing that the naval authorities who have recommended that this limit shall be kept at 30 per cent., or as near that as possible, shall have their way. I desire that the flag of my country, if it can not float upon iron ships, shall at least, until we have such ships, float wherever possible upon the best ships that we have.

Mr. RANDALL. I now move to close debate on this amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The first question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York, Mr. POTTER, to the amendment of the gentleman from New York, Mr. COX.

Mr. POTTER. I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The question is now upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York, Mr. COX, to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five."

The amendment was not agreed to; there being—ayes 12, noes not counted.

The question being then taken upon the motion of Mr. LONG to concur in the amendment of the Senate, there were—ayes 61, noes 83.

Mr. LONG. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 53 voting in favor thereof.

SURVEY OF NAPA RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER. Before the vote is taken, the Chair, if there be no objection, will lay before the House several executive communications and personal requests.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers of a survey of

Napa River, California; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF CASHIE RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers of a survey of Cashie River, from its mouth to Windsor, N. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF DARIEN HARBOR, GEORGIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers of a survey of Darien Harbor, Georgia; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON AND GEORGETOWN RAILROAD.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the president of the Washington and Georgetown Railroad Company, transmitting the annual report of that company; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

J. R. SANTOS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a dispatch from the consul-general of Guayaquil relative to the citizenship of J. R. Santos; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted in the following cases:

To Mr. YORK, for Tuesday and Wednesday next, on account of sickness.

To Mr. MILLER, of Pennsylvania, until Tuesday next, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. JOHNSON, from attendance in the evenings for the remainder of the session, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, leave to print remarks in the RECORD was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUDD, on the fortification appropriation bill.

To Mr. STOCKSLAGER, on the bill (H. R. 7523) defining the duties of the Supervising Architect, and for other purposes.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. STEELE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of George W. Osborn without leaving copies, there having been no adverse report.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION.

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 577) to donate a cemetery site on the public lands to the city of Kirwin, Kans.;

A bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of Alexander D. Schenck;

A bill (H. R. 2158) for the benefit of John C. Herndon;

A bill (H. R. 3058) to amend section 1889 of chapter 1, title 23 of Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to general incorporation acts of Territories;

A bill (H. R. 4280) to increase the pension of Mrs. Martha C. Breese;

A bill (H. R. 4382) for the relief of William H. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 5713) to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 6940) granting a pension to Sarah M. Bissell;

A bill (H. R. 8030) making an appropriation for the Agricultural Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8120) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 124) authorizing the collector at the port of New York to deliver, free of duty, a silver cup won by Sergt. A. B. Van Heusen as a member of the American Rifle Team, at Wimbledon, in July, 1883.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced the return, in compliance with the request of the House, of concurrent resolution of the House of February 27, 1885, providing for the printing of the first and second volumes of decisions relating to the public lands.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on concurrence in the twenty-first amendment of the Senate, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 115, nays 151, not voting 58; as follows:

YEAS—115.

Adams, G. E.	Dingley,	Kean,	Rockwell,
Adams, J. J.	Dixon,	Kefer,	Rowell,
Aiken,	Dunham,	Kelley,	Russell,
Anderson,	Ellis,	Ketcham,	Ryan,
Arnot,	Ellwood,	Lacey,	Smalls,
Atkinson,	Evans,	Lawrence,	Smith, A. Herr
Barksdale,	Eyerhart,	Libbey,	Smith, H. Y.
Barr,	Findlay,	Long,	Spooner,
Bayne,	Finerty,	Lyman,	Steele,
Bisbee,	George,	McCoid,	Stephenson,
Blanchard,	Guenther,	McComas,	Stewart, J. W.
Boutelle,	Hanback,	McCormick,	Stone,
Bowen,	Hancock,	Millard,	Strait,
Breitung,	Hart,	Money,	Talbot,
Brewer, F. B.	Hatch, H. H.	Morrill,	Taylor, J. D.
Brewer, J. H.	Henderson, D. B.	Nelson,	Thomas,
Brown, W. W.	Hepburn,	Ochiltree,	Valentine,
Browne, T. M.	Hewitt, A. S.	O'Hara,	Wait,
Brumm,	Hewitt, G. W.	Parker,	Wakefield,
Burlingh,	Hiscock,	Payne,	Washburn,
Campbell, J. M.	Hitt,	Payson,	Weaver,
Cannon,	Holmes,	Perkins,	Wemple,
Cassidy,	Holton,	Peters,	White, J. D.
Craig,	Horr,	Pettibone,	Whiting,
Culbertson, W. W.	Houk,	Poland,	Wilson, James
Curtin,	Howey,	Post,	Woodward,
Cutcheon,	Jeffords,	Price,	Worthington,
Davis, G. R.	Johnson,	Ranney,	York.
Davis, R. T.	Jones, B. W.	Riggs,	

NAYS—151.

Alexander,	Dorsheimer,	Jones, J. H.	Rogers, W. F.
Bagley,	Dowd,	Jones, J. K.	Seney,
Ballentine,	Dunn,	Jordan,	Seymour,
Beach,	Eaton,	Lanham,	Shively,
Belmont,	Eldredge,	Le Fevre,	Singleton,
Bennett,	Elliott,	Lewis,	Skinner, T. G.
Bingham,	English,	Lore,	Slocum,
Blair,	Ermentrout,	Lowry,	Spriggs,
Blount,	Ferrell,	McAdoo,	Springer,
Boyle,	Fiedler,	McMillin,	Stevens,
Breckinridge,	Follett,	Matson,	Stewart, Charles
Broadhead,	Foran,	Maybury,	Stockslager,
Buchanan,	Forney,	Miller, J. F.	Storn,
Buckner,	Fyan,	Mills,	Sumner, C. A.
Budd,	Garrison,	Mitchell,	Swope,
Burnes,	Geddes,	Moulton,	Taylor, J. M.
Cabell,	Gibson,	Muldrow,	Thompson,
Caldwell,	Glasecock,	Muller,	Tillman,
Candler,	Graves,	Murphy,	Townsend,
Carleton,	Green,	Mutchler,	Tucker,
Clardy,	Greenleaf,	Nichols,	Tully,
Clay,	Halsell,	Oates,	Turner, H. G.
Clements,	Hammond,	O'Ferrall,	Turner, Oscar
Cobb,	Hardeman,	O'Neill, Charles	Van Alstyne,
Connolly,	Hardy,	Paige,	Vance,
Converse,	Harmer,	Patton,	Van Eaton,
Cook,	Hatch, W. H.	Peel,	Wallace,
Cosgrove,	Hemphill,	Pierce,	Ward,
Covington,	Henley,	Potter,	Warner, A. J.
Cox, S. S.	Herbert,	Pryor,	Warner, Richard
Cox, W. R.	Hill,	Pusey,	Willis,
Crisp,	Hoblitzell,	Randall,	Wilson, W. L.
Culbertson, D. B.	Holman,	Reagan,	Winans, E. B.
Davidson,	Hopkins,	Reid, J. W.	Wolford,
Davis, L. H.	Houseman,	Reese,	Wood,
Deuster,	Hunt,	Robertson,	Yaple,
Dibrell,	Hurd,	Robinson, W. E.	Young.
Dockery,	Hutchins,	Rogers, J. H.	

NOT VOTING—58.

Barbour,	Henderson, T. J.	Murray,	Struble,
Belford,	Hooper,	Neece,	Sumner, D. H.
Blackburn,	James,	Nutting,	Taylor, E. B.
Brainerd,	Jones, J. T.	O'Neill, J. J.	Throckmorton,
Bratton,	Kellogg,	Phepals,	Wadsworth,
Campbell, Felix	Kings,	Rankin,	Wellborn,
Campbell, J. E.	Kleiner,	Ray, G. W.	Weller,
Chalmers,	Laird,	Ray, Ossian	White, Milo
Collins,	Lamb,	Reed, T. B.	Wilkins,
Cullen,	Lovering,	Rice,	Williams,
Dargan,	Miller, S. H.	Robinson, J. S.	Winans, John
Dibble,	Milliken,	Rosecrans,	Wise, G. D.
Funston,	Morgan,	Shaw,	Wise, J. S.
Goff,	Morrison,	Skinner, C. R.	
Haynes,	Morse,	Snyder,	

So the amendment was non-concurred in.

During the roll-call,

Mr. RANDALL moved that the reading of the names be dispensed with by unanimous consent.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

The following pairs were then announced:

On all political questions until further notice:

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. JOHN S. WISE.

Mr. SHAW with Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. THROCKMORTON with Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR.

Mr. RANKIN with Mr. RICE.

Mr. NEECE with Mr. CHALMERS.

For this day:

Mr. KELLOGG with Mr. BLANCHARD.

Mr. JONES, of Alabama, with Mr. STRUBLE.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.

On this vote:

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. HAYNES.

Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. BELFORD.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. GOFF.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was non-concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of John F. Severance; and

A bill (H. R. 441) for the completion of a public building at Council Bluffs, Iowa.

REPORT OF CAPT. M. A. HEALY, UNITED STATES REVENUE MARINE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of Capt. M. A. Healy, U. S. R. M., on the cruise of the revenue-marine steamer Corwin in the Arctic Ocean; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HISCOCK. I move that the question of printing extra copies of that valuable report be referred under the rule to the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. That question will be referred to the Committee on Printing, when it will then become a privileged matter.

Mr. HISCOCK. So I suppose, and that is what I desire.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment of the Senate.

Amendment numbered 22 was read, as follows:

Strike out the following: "For the completion of the New York, \$400,000."

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations recommend non-concurrence; and as this subject was very fully discussed when the bill was under consideration some days ago, I feel justified in demanding the previous question.

Mr. HISCOCK. It seems to me we should have some discussion on this question of concurrence or non-concurrence in the amendments of the Senate in striking out this paragraph.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I think we are entitled to a discussion under the order of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House there will be discussion for five minutes on each side.

Mr. RANDALL. Very well; let each side state the case.

Mr. KEIFER. I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Of course the question will be on concurrence.

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations recommend non-concurrence.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very bright hope that the House will so vote, looking at the provisions of this bill for the support of the Navy, that it shall be something more than a mere nominal navy, and in that view I ask the amendment of the Senate striking out this appropriation of \$400,000 be concurred in. As we all agree, I believe, this money is to be expended upon an old frame of a ship of an obsolete model, and which when finished at this vast cost will be of no possible use or value to the country in time of war.

As has been already said here on this floor in debate on this bill, this is a vessel without speed in comparison with the naval vessels of the world of to-day. It would have a speed of about twelve knots an hour, perhaps not even so much as that, and it would be incapable of catching a vessel on the high seas that it could whip; and what is still worse, it could not run away from anything on the high seas, and everything could whip it that could catch it. It would be of no value in coast-defense. It would be of no value at sea in time of war. It is well known that this is a mere frame-work of a ship called the New York, on the stocks in the Brooklyn navy-yard. It has some wooden ribs, and has some of the skeleton of a great ship; but it has been standing now for a full score of years in that unfinished condition, and no Congress up to this time has deemed it worth while to expend any money toward its completion. All of a sudden, however, it occurs to the House of Representatives of the United States to expend \$400,000 in trying to put the ship in a condition that it can be launched upon the waters.

But nobody pretends that it will be of any value except my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. COX] who, I see before me, and another distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] on this side of the House, both of whom agreed in the course of debate some days ago that it would be valuable, possibly, in case we should need another ship to keep a naval school in, tied up somewhere in some harbor of the United States. This is the best and the sole purpose to which the vessel could be applied in case the vessel was ever finished. We have, as my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RANNEY] suggests to me, sufficient of these old wooden ships well fitted for the business of teaching a naval

school in at some point along the coast, without the necessity of embarking in the construction of others for that purpose. This vessel, therefore, is not needed for that.

It is beyond comprehension that we should be able to find a body of men insisting upon completing it. The amount to be expended upon it if completed would build some sort of a vessel valuable at least for coast defense; but this expenditure, in addition to what has been already expended on this vessel, is an absolutely useless expenditure and waste of the public money, and ought not to receive the sanction of this House. It would be simply money thrown away, and resolves itself into a mere matter of squandering the public funds.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, this provision was recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, and was adopted by the House after a full debate. The Senate has non-concurred, and the Committee on Appropriations again recommend non-concurrence in their amendment. I do not think any further debate is necessary; but I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. COX, and two minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. POTTER.

Mr. COX, of New York. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] has taken occasion, as he did some time ago in the debate on this subject, to indulge in a spirit of ridicule toward the construction of this ship by calling it an old, obsolete type, or tub, or something of that sort. I wish to say to the House, and to the gentleman from Ohio, that it is nothing of the kind. In the Forty-seventh Congress a report was made by a committee on this very subject; and they reported as to the New York that it should be built. They show that the vessel was commenced in 1865; that it is a vessel of twenty-one guns, with 2,490 tonnage and 4,070 displacement; and as to its present condition and location, it is shown by the tabulated statement accompanying the report as a partly completed vessel or frame on the stocks in New York, built of live-oak, and worthy of being finished. That report, the substance of which I have merely alluded to, was made to the Forty-seventh Congress by that very committee, and I call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact, that recommended the construction of the steel cruisers for our navy of the future.

And now to show that this is not a matter brought up in a hurry, without debate and without proper consideration or proper examination, I hold in my hand another report, which was quoted by myself the other day in reference to this New York, a report made from the Bureau of Construction and Repair to the Secretary of the Navy for the year ending June 30, 1884, in which it will be found, and I will have it printed, but will now only say to my friend from Ohio that this report by Naval Constructor Wilson strongly recommends the completion of this ship. He says, to quote his own language:

The bureau strongly recommends the completion of the frigate New York at the Brooklyn navy-yard. This vessel has been on the stocks in one of the ship-houses since 1865; and from the fact that she was in frame before work was suspended on her, and was neither ceiled nor planked, the air has freely circulated through her timbers, and to-day they are as hard as bone and probably in better condition than any frame timbers ever put in a ship. If completed with materials that have been preserved by the Thilmany process for preserving ship timber, she would make a useful and most efficient ship of her class for twenty years. Although designed in 1865, she is an exceedingly fine model, and if finished will give us a first-class flag-ship. She can carry a battery as heavy and equally as well arranged for head and stern fire as the new cruiser Chicago has. Her length on the mean load line is 315 feet, extreme breadth of beam 47 feet, depth from lower edge of rabbet of keel to lower port sill on gun deck 25 feet 11 inches. She is designed to have a ship's rig, having 24,000 square feet of sail surface in her ten principal sails. Her displacement at a draught of 18 feet 9 inches forward, and 21 feet 5 inches aft, would be equal to 4,527 tons, and her lowest port sill on the gun deck would be 8 feet above water. The plans for finishing this vessel are in such a condition that they could be completed in a very short time, and the work on her, if authorized, could be pushed to completion and the vessel put afloat within six months from the time it is resumed. To permit of doing this work without having to draw so heavily upon the regular appropriations for construction and repair, the bureau has estimated for \$400,000, which it is thought will be sufficient to complete her.

All I have to say, then, is that inasmuch as the skeleton of this vessel is in a first-class condition, and as it has been recommended for completion by competent naval authorities, I hope the good work will go on, and we will furnish machinery in the future by which she may be made useful, if not upon the sea as a belligerent in time of war, at least for other purposes in connection with our naval service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have only time to say that in my judgment this ship should be completed. We have won nearly all we have won by our Navy in the past in wooden ships; and to whatever extent the construction of iron ships will be carried there will be always ample room and ample demand for the use of ships like this. She has cost already many hundreds of thousands of dollars, all of which is either to be thrown away or else we must make this appropriation to complete her. She is a new ship and will be one of the best of her kind in the Navy when completed; and, as I have said, there will be always places in the naval service where ships of this character will be needed, both in time of war and in peace.

In war we need transport ships; in war we shall always need ships under circumstances where this ship will serve better than the iron ship. I hope the House will stand by the committee and insist upon the completion of this ship.

Mr. THOMAS. I move to amend by striking out "\$400,000" and inserting "\$200,000."

Mr. RANDALL. I give notice that after the gentleman from Illinois has been heard I shall move to close debate.

Mr. THOMAS. I offer this amendment in order that I may reply to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with reference to the recommendation for the rebuilding of this vessel. I happened to be a member of the Naval Committee at the time this recommendation was made and before it was certainly known we could furnish the materials and build steel vessels in this country. Since then it has been shown we can not only manufacture the steel, but we can manufacture the ships, as the new vessels which will soon be completed demonstrate.

I desire to call the attention of the House to a letter I have received from the Admiral of the Navy. And however little or however much the members of this House may know about naval architecture and ships of war it is safe to say that David D. Porter, Admiral of the Navy, knows something. He has written to me in reference to this vessel, and he says:

An item is introduced appropriating \$400,000 to finish a wooden ship—

The New York—

whose hull was modeled twenty years ago, and which will cost \$1,000,000 before she is finished.

Why, two shells from this little gunboat would set her on fire and completely destroy her.

I have given the experience of fifty-five years to the naval service.

If Congress thinks proper to go to work and build a wooden vessel upon plans that were prepared twenty years ago, and which, when finished, will scarcely have speed enough to get out of her own way, and will be but a duplicate of the Tennessee, with a vulnerability greater than ships had at the time she was planned, owing to the increase in the size of guns and shell, well and good.

It is said the reason for building her is because we must have something to represent us abroad until iron or steel ships are built, but that would be a poor representation of a nation's progressiveness which would offer a ship to the eyes of the European world that was twenty years behind the time and built of a material that no naval power on the earth would think of using for a fighting ship.

Even the Chinese deride the old wooden ships that we send abroad. Of course, Europeans know how useless they are. What we want for immediate use is something to defend our coasts.

These are the words of wisdom which have fallen from the lips and pen of the Admiral of the Navy, and they meet the concurrence of every man who has looked into this question of the construction of the Navy. These wooden ships have passed out of date. They are no longer useful. Take, for instance, the Michigan, to which I referred on another occasion. She was built forty years ago. She cost about \$500,000; and in the forty years she has been afloat she has cost less to keep her in repair than any wooden vessel now afloat has cost for the same purpose in five years; while the Kearsarge, the Powhatan, the Lancaster, and any number of wooden vessels I might mention, and to which the attention of Congress has been called by an executive document frequently read here, have cost for repairs twice, ay, three times as much, as their original cost. To-day if this bill becomes a law they will be stricken from the Navy Register, because even 30 per cent. will not keep them afloat and make them efficient even for surveying vessels.

I hope the amendment of the Senate will be agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the House will sustain the recommendation of the committee. I move to close debate on the amendment of the Senate and the pending amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] to concur in the Senate amendment striking out the lines which have been read.

Mr. KEIFER. I think we may as well have the yeas and nays.

On the question of ordering the yeas and nays there were yeas 48— not one-fifth of the last vote.

Mr. KEIFER. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, 40 members voting therefor.

Mr. RANDALL. I perceive that the demand for yeas and nays can not be beaten, and therefore to save time I am willing that they shall be ordered by consent.

There was no objection.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 100, nays 151, not voting 73; as follows:

YEAS—100.

Adams, G. E.	Craig	Hatch, H. H.	Lacey,
Adams, J. J.	Culbertson, W. W.	Haynes,	Laird,
Aiken,	Cullen,	Henderson, D. B.	Lawrence,
Anderson,	Curtin,	Henderson, T. J.	Libbey,
Arnot,	Cutecheon,	Hewitt, A. S.	Long,
Barr,	Davis, G. R.	Hiscock,	Lyman,
Bayne,	Davis, R. T.	Hitt,	McCoid,
Bisbee,	Dixon,	Holmes,	McCormick,
Boutelle,	Dunham,	Holton,	Millard,
Brainerd,	Ellwood,	Horr,	Morrill,
Breitung,	Evans,	Houk,	Nutting,
Brewer, F. B.	Findlay,	Howey,	Ochiltree,
Brewer, J. H.	Finerty,	James,	O'Hara,
Browne, T. M.	Geunther,	Jeffords,	Parker,
Brumm,	Hanback,	Jones, B. W.	Payne,
Campbell, J. M.	Hancock,	Kean,	Payson,
Cannon,	Harmer,	Keifer,	Perkins,
Cassidy,	Hart,	Kelley,	Peters,

Pettibone,	Skinner, C. R.	Stone,
Poland,	Smalls,	Strait,
Ranney,	Smith, A. Herr	Taylor, J. D.
Reed, T. B.	Spooner,	Thomas,
Rockwell,	Steele,	Valentine,
Rowell,	Stephenson,	Wait,
Russell,	Stewart, J. W.	Washburn,

NAYS—151.

Alexander,	Dorsheimer,	Kleiner,	Singleton,
Bagley,	Dowd,	Lanham,	Skinner, T. G.
Ballentine,	Dunn,	Le Fevre,	Slocum,
Barbour,	Eaton,	Lewis,	Spriggs,
Barksdale,	Eldredge,	Loving,	Springer,
Beach,	Elliott,	Lowry,	Stevens,
Belmont,	English,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Charles
Bennett,	Ermentrout,	McMillin,	Stockslager,
Blount,	Everhart,	Maybury,	Stocks,
Boyle,	Ferrell,	Miller, J. F.	Sumner, D. H.
Bratton,	Fiedler,	Mills,	Swope,
Breckinridge,	Follett,	Mitchell,	Talbot,
Buchanan,	Forney,	Muldrow,	Taylor, J. M.
Buckner,	Fyan,	Murphy,	Tillman,
Burnes,	Garrison,	Mutehler,	Thompson,
Cabell,	Geddes,	Neece,	Tully,
Caldwell,	Glascoek,	Nicholls,	Turner, H. G.
Campbell, Felix	Graves,	Oates,	Turner, Oscar
Campbell, J. E.	Green,	O'Ferrall,	Van Alstyne,
Candler,	Greenleaf,	O'Neill, Charles	Vance,
Carleton,	Halsell,	O'Neill, J. J.	Van Eaton,
Clay,	Hammond,	Paige,	Wallace,
Clements,	Hardeman,	Patton,	Ward,
Collins,	Hardy,	Peel,	Warner, A. J.
Connelly,	Hatch, W. H.	Phelps,	Warner, Richard
Converse,	Herbert,	Pierce,	Wellborn,
Cook,	Hewitt, G. W.	Potter,	Wilkins,
Cosgrove,	Hill,	Pryor,	Willis,
Covington,	Hoblitzell,	Randall,	Wilson, W. L.
Cox, S. S.	Holman,	Reagan,	Winans, E. B.
Cox, W. R.	Hopkins,	Reid, J. W.	Winans, John
Crisp,	Houseman,	Reese,	Wise, G. D.
Culberson, D. B.	Hunt,	Robertson,	Wolford,
Davidson,	Hurl,	Rogess, J. H.	Wood,
Davis, L. H.	Hutchins,	Rogers, W. F.	Woodward,
Deuster,	Jones, J. H.	Seney,	Worthington,
Dibrell,	Jordan,	Secymer,	Yaple.
Dockery,	King,	Shively,	

NOT VOTING—73.

Atkinson,	Funston,	Money,	Ryan,
Belford,	George,	Morgan,	Shaw,
Bingham,	Gibson,	Morrison,	Smith, H. Y.
Blackburn,	Goff,	Morse,	Snyder,
Blanchard,	Hemphill,	Moulton,	Struble,
Bland,	Henley,	Muller,	Sumner, C. A.
Bowen,	Hepburn,	Murray,	Taylor, E. B.
Broadhead,	Hooper,	Nelson,	Throckmorton,
Brown, W. W.	Johnson,	Post,	Townshend,
Budd,	Jones, J. K.	Prie,	Tucker,
Burleigh,	Jones, J. T.	Pusey,	Wadsworth,
Chalmers,	Kellogg,	Rankin,	Wakefield,
Clardy,	Ketcham,	Ray, G. W.	Weller,
Cobb,	Lamb,	Ray, Ossian	Wemple,
Dargan,	Lore,	Rice,	Williams,
Dibble,	McComas,	Riggs,	Young.
Dingley,	Matson,	Robinson, J. S.	
Ellis,	Miller, S. H.	Robinson, W. E.	
Foran,	Milliken,	Rosecrans,	

So the amendment was non-concurred in.

On motion of Mr. RANDALL the reading of the names was dispensed with.

The following additional pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk: Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, with Mr. HOOPER, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. RIGGS with Mr. JOHNSON, on this vote.

Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. MILLER, of Pennsylvania, on this vote.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. GOFF, on this vote.

Mr. BUDD with Mr. GEORGE, on this vote.

Mr. CLARDY with Mr. BELFORD, on this vote.

Mr. FORAN with Mr. CHALMERS, on this vote.

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. BINGHAM, on this vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was non-concurred in; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Amendment numbered 23 was read, as follows:

Strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "twenty;" so that, if amended, the proviso will read:

"That no part of said sum shall be applied to the repair of engines and machinery of wooden ships where the estimated cost of such repair shall exceed 20 per cent. of the estimated cost," &c.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend concurrence, but there has been an indicative vote of the House this morning in the other direction.

Mr. KEIFER. There is no objection to taking the judgment of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. In obedience to the instructions of the committee I make the motion that the House concur, but I express an individual hope that the House will vote that down.

Mr. LONG. I suggest that that amendment and the next one be taken together.

Mr. KEIFER. Make the motion to non-concur in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth amendments.

Mr. RANDALL. That would be in harmony with the action of the House this morning.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the House will non-concur in these two amendments.

There was no objection; so the amendments were non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 25 was read, as follows:

Strike out "warves" and insert "wharves."

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment numbered 26 was read, as follows:

Strike out "car-tickets, \$200."

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a suggestion. I think the Committee on Appropriations were unanimous in agreeing that the remainder of the amendments of the Senate should be non-concurred in. I do not mean that all the members of the committee were in favor of non-concurrence in each of these amendments, but they were agreed that that was the best policy.

Mr. RANDALL. In accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], for which I am indebted to him, I move that the House non-concur in the remaining amendments of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the remainder of the Senate amendments to this bill will be non-concurred in.

Mr. COX, of New York, and Mr. TALBOTT. There is objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. TALBOTT. I make no objection except as to amendment 28.

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations, as stated by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER], reached a unanimous conclusion as to the remainder of the Senate amendments to this bill, that they should be non-concurred in. The subjects all relate to each other; the amendments are interwoven, as it were, one with another, and the committee have also, in some degree, discussed the position to be taken by the conferees. I hope the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] will be assented to.

Mr. KEIFER. I want it understood that we do not necessarily disagree with the substance of all these amendments, but we do agree that it is a wise policy to go into conference upon them.

Mr. RANDALL. We all agree as to the increase of the navy, and as to the propriety of making the Secretary of the Navy and the heads of bureaus the responsible parties in the construction of these vessels.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection—

Mr. COX, of New York. Objection has been made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that objection was made only to non-concurrence in the twenty-eighth amendment.

Mr. COX, of New York. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to say that he proposed to non-concur in all the rest of the Senate amendments.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. COX, of New York. Now I should think that gentlemen on both sides might be willing to take the sentiment of the House in relation to these things. Let them make the motion to non-concur and let the House act upon it.

Mr. RANDALL. We do move to non-concur.

Mr. COX, of New York. The amendments are quite different in character. Here is a motion to strike out what the House has already inserted and insert something else.

Mr. RANDALL. That is the Senate amendment, and we propose to non-concur.

Mr. COX, of New York. Then, further along, in another amendment, come the monitors. Now, some gentlemen here do not want to vote for the monitors.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, you are not voting for them by non-concurrence.

Mr. COX, of New York. I know I am not, but I may want to vote for some of these other propositions.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, if you want to you can vote for the cruisers.

The SPEAKER. The amendments must be acted upon separately unless unanimous consent is given to act upon them all together. Objection is made, and the Clerk will read the next amendment.

Amendment numbered 27 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words "To complete the construction of the steel cruiser of not less than 5,000 nor more than 6,000 tons displacement, and the armament therefor, authorized by act of Congress August 5, 1882, \$1,780,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, The Secretary of the Navy shall approve of the construction of said vessel."

Mr. RANDALL. I move the previous question on the motion to non-concur in that amendment.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 28 was read, as follows:

Insert:

"To enable the President to strengthen the naval establishment of the United States by additional vessels of the best and most modern design, having the highest attainable speed, the sum of \$1,895,000 is hereby appropriated, to be expended as follows and under the following limitations:

"For the construction of two cruisers of not less than 3,000 nor more than 5,000 tons displacement, costing, exclusive of armament, not more than \$1,100,000 each;

one heavily armed gunboat of about 1,600 tons displacement, costing, exclusive of armament, not more than \$520,000; and one light gunboat of about 800 tons displacement, costing, exclusive of armament, not more than \$275,000; and authority is hereby given for the construction of said four vessels, at not exceeding the total cost for each above specified, in accordance with such final plan as may be determined upon, after a revision and reconsideration of all designs which have been heretofore made, and in the manner and conformity to the conditions and limitations provided for the construction of the new cruisers in the acts of August 5, 1882, and of March 3, 1883."

Mr. RANDALL. Under instruction of the Committee on Appropriations—I believe without dissent—I move non-concurrence.

Mr. TALBOTT. I move to concur with an amendment to insert the word "steel" between "two" and "cruisers;" so as to read "two steel cruisers."

Mr. RANDALL. I ask the previous question on my motion and on the amendment.

Mr. COX, of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], I desire to state that the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I am chairman, favor, I believe almost unanimously, some attempt of this kind to increase our navy. We are not wedded to wooden vessels, although I voted for one of them. We are perfectly content with the increase of steel cruisers of the description embraced in this amendment of the Senate. I should think, as I have already said, that my friend from Pennsylvania and the gentlemen who may be on the conference committee would be glad to have an expression of the opinion of the House upon this matter.

Mr. RANDALL. Both sides of the House, as represented upon the Committee on Appropriations, favor an increase of the navy, and have joined in recommending non-concurrence, with a view to reaching a conclusion which will give us an increase of the navy.

Mr. COX, of New York. Is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed to this 20 per cent. amendment?

Mr. RANDALL. I am not opposed to the object of the Senate amendment—the increase of the navy, but I think that the Committee on Appropriations, after a full discussion of this subject, will indicate a way in which it can be better and more expeditiously done and place the responsibility for the construction of the ships upon the Secretary of the Navy and the heads of the respective bureaus.

Mr. COX, of New York. That is not included in this amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, we are going to try to reach it by non-concurrence.

Mr. COX, of New York. By a conference?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir. I think I have stated fairly the position of gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. KEIFER. As I have already stated, while we favor non-concurrence, we are in favor of this proposition to construct new cruisers.

Mr. RANDALL. I think I have stated the position of the other side of the House on this question as fairly and fully as that of gentlemen on this side.

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Speaker, have I any time for debate at all on this question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] moves to close debate.

Mr. RANDALL. I want to test the wish of the House as to ordering the previous question.

Mr. TALBOTT. I think we may reach an agreement here among ourselves in the House without losing time by a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to close debate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. COX, of New York. After the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I trust that my friend from Maryland [Mr. TALBOTT] will withdraw his amendment and let the conference committee do all they can to initiate this movement.

Mr. RANDALL. That is what we are all striving for on both sides of the House.

Mr. TALBOTT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say one word. The Committee on Naval Affairs, who ought properly to have charge of such matters, believe that this is good legislation contained in this amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. Very well; the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs shall have full consideration in the conference.

The SPEAKER. The first question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. TALBOTT. I withdraw it.

Mr. RANDALL. As I understand, objection will now be withdrawn to the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. I renew my proposition to non-concur in all the remaining amendments.

The SPEAKER. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANDALL. There is no objection now.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the remaining amendments of the Senate will be considered as non-concurred in. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. I now move to reconsider the action of the House on these various amendments, and also move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. BELFORD. I rise to a question of order. The disorder is so great that gentlemen in this part of the Hall have been unable to hear a single remark of the gentleman from Pennsylvania or other gentlemen touching these appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order well taken. The Chair has endeavored by all the means in his power to preserve order. There is so much conversation on the floor and in the rear of the seats that it is impossible to transact the public business. The Sergeant-at-Arms will request gentlemen to take their seats and cease conversation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BENNETT. I rise to a question of privilege, and call up the contested-election case of Frederick vs. Wilson, from the State of Iowa.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will yield a moment to allow me to offer a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] calls up for consideration the contested-election case of Frederick vs. Wilson.

Mr. VALENTINE. On that I raise the question of consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I ask the gentleman to allow me a moment to introduce a resolution which will cause no debate.

Mr. TURNER, of Kentucky. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky on the right demands the regular order.

PRIVILEGES OF REPRESENTATIVES IN INAUGURATION CEREMONIES.

Mr. MILLS. I move to suspend the rules and pass this resolution—

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe there is no objection to this matter of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. There is objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. It relates to the inauguration ceremonies.

The SPEAKER. The resolution of the gentleman from Texas will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the committee appointed to arrange the inaugural ceremonies for the 4th instant having declined to give to the Representatives in Congress their proper place, we will decline to take any part in said ceremonies at the Capitol.

Mr. MILLS. I move to suspend the rules and pass this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. KEIFER. Let it be read again.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read again, and the Chair asks gentlemen to preserve order.

The resolution was again read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this resolution?

Mr. HAMMOND. I object.

Mr. MILLS. I move to suspend the rules and pass this resolution. It is a resolution which reflects the wishes of a large number of gentlemen on this floor.

Mr. RANDALL (to Mr. MILLS). Call the previous question.

Mr. MILLS. I move to suspend the rules. No previous question is necessary. The resolution affects the dignity of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moved that the rules be suspended. That can only be done by consent of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] who holds the floor to call up an election case.

Mr. MILLS. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina to yield to me, as this question which I present affects the dignity of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not see the necessity of taking up the time of the House in a matter of this character.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that the motion to suspend the rules can not be submitted without the consent of the gentleman from North Carolina, who has the floor on a contested-election case.

Mr. MILLS. I appeal to the gentleman from North Carolina to yield to me the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MILLS. I will demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from Texas moves to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand the gentleman from Texas moves the adoption of the resolution, and on that motion demands the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made to the introduction of the resolution, and the gentleman from Texas has moved to suspend the rules and adopt it.

Mr. HAMMOND. I demand a second under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman

from Georgia, Mr. HAMMOND, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MILLS.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (S. 84) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amounts due to citizens of the United States for supplies furnished to the Sioux or Dakota Indians of Minnesota subsequent to August, 1860, and prior to the massacre of August, 1862, and providing for the payment thereof; when the Speaker signed the same.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE—INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 133, noes 8.

So the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule of the House thirty minutes are allowed for debate, fifteen minutes on each side.

Mr. MILLS. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution. We do not want debate. It affects the dignity of this House.

The SPEAKER. Then if no debate is desired the question will be on the motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution.

Mr. HAMMOND. What becomes of the fifteen minutes of debate on either side?

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced there were thirty minutes allowed for debate, fifteen minutes in support of the motion and fifteen minutes against it. It was then stated on the floor that no debate was asked by the gentleman from Texas. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to debate it? [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. HAMMOND. I ask to debate it.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman is entitled, under the rules of the House, to fifteen minutes, and will proceed.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I am so hoarse that it will be very difficult for me to be heard. But I feel that we are about to do, under passion, a very unseemly thing. On the 4th of March a President of the United States is to be inaugurated. It is usual that the House of Representatives shall be present with the Senators and other public officials to witness that great event. And now we are about to pass, without debate, and as I understand it, in childish pique, a resolution that we will decline to be present on that important occasion because it is charged that somebody has offered us a slight. I deny it. The Senate had no such intention. If this House believes it had, there is a dignified way of asserting and maintaining the dignity of this body. I say that a resolution that declares that, because we sit behind the other gentlemen in the Senate Chamber, therefore we will not sit there at all, is puerile. I had the pleasure of a like seat when Garfield was inaugurated. The House sat there and no man dreamed that he was insulted by his location.

Whence comes this sudden notion of insult to the House. Why is it wrong that the members of the House of Representatives should sit in the rear? There will be the Supreme Court and the diplomatic corps and the Senate and all the rest in the Senate Chamber. Some must sit behind. I maintain that true dignity consists in taking the seat that is offered; for they are all equally honorable and of equal importance. It is childish to quarrel about location in that small assembly hall.

I speak earnestly because I feel earnestly. Instead of maintaining its dignity at this moment the House is in danger of losing its dignity. If there has been any slight, it has been entirely unintentional. The Senate never intended to insult us or in any way to inflict upon us a slight of any sort.

Will any gentleman tell me wherein this inauguration differs from any other? Will any gentleman tell me it is any more dishonorable on the 4th of March to sit behind them than it was to sit behind them when we attended the Washington Monument ceremonies?

Mr. BELFORD. If the gentleman will allow me I will tell him.

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield for five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BELFORD. You ask questions and then you decline to have them answered.

Mr. YOUNG. I shall hardly require that much time, Mr. Speaker, to enter my earnest protest against this hasty and inconsiderate action. It seems to me that we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the occasion to conduct ourselves with somewhat more of dignity.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask the House be called to order and that members be requested to take their seats. It is impossible to hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. Members can hear much better in their seats than when crowded in the area in front of the reporters' desk.

Mr. YOUNG. It may be true, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate has not been quite so considerate in this matter as it ought to have been. It may be they have shown some discourtesy to the House. Admitting all that to be true, does it furnish any justification to the House to show equal if not greater discourtesy to the President of the United States by refusing to be present when he is inaugurated? Perhaps it would have been better, and I think myself it would have been, if the Senate had conferred with the House before arranging this programme for the inauguration. Possibly it was an oversight. I can not think

any discourtesy or indignity was intended on the part of the Senate toward the House of Representatives. Whether that is so or not, we owe it to ourselves, it seems to me, to take the usual part the House of Representatives has always taken on occasions of this sort.

It would present a most unseemly spectacle to the country if one branch of the legislative department of this Government, and the largest branch, too, should absent itself altogether, and under a resolution favorably adopted, when the President recently elected by the people is about to be inaugurated. I hope, sir, the House will calmly and dispassionately consider this matter before they adopt the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. HAMMOND. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX, of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual resolution which is proposed at this time for our adoption in connection with the inauguration ceremonies about to take place. If I am correctly informed, the method now proposed by the committee on arrangements is the method that has been uniformly followed in similar ceremonies heretofore, and if I am mistaken in that respect I shall be glad to stand corrected by any gentleman on the floor.

I am perfectly satisfied that no discourtesy is intended to the House on the part of the Senate, and that the gentlemen who made the arrangements, providing the order of proceeding on that day, intended no discourtesy. We are acting to-day in the eyes of this country and of the world; and what a spectacle would we present, not only to our own people but to foreign nations, if one body of the great national Legislature of America should stand upon a mere matter of courtesy or form, and absent itself from this great inaugural ceremony to which the people of the whole country are invited? It seems to me, therefore, before any action is taken such as this resolution contemplates, that it would be at least courtesy to the Senate to signify our disapproval in another manner. I think myself we are making a great deal about a matter which does not justify any such course; and before this body commits itself to the action suggested by this resolution I trust it will deliberate upon the question, and deliberate gravely and dispassionately and not hastily and inconsiderately.

This is too grave a question to be disposed of in this hasty manner; and I trust we will consider the spectacle presented, as I have said, to our own people as well as to the civilized world—that the more numerous branch of the national Legislature by resolution propose to absent themselves altogether, taking no part in the inauguration ceremonies of the President because of an imaginary slight or discourtesy. It will not add to the dignity of this House to adopt such a resolution. It is our right as the Representatives of the people who send us here to be present, and they expect us to be present, and in my judgment nothing but a very grave and momentous occasion should prevent our attendance.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LORE].

Mr. LORE. Mr. Speaker, my first impression was in favor of adopting the resolution which has been read, but a moment's reflection convinces me that it is unwise. If the Senate or the committee on arrangements had deliberately intended this as a discourtesy, or as a slight upon us, then, sir, I feel it would be unworthy of this House to notice it. If on the contrary it did not so intend it, and I am persuaded and advised that such is the fact, it is equally beneath the dignity of this House to give it further consideration. My own judgment is clear that it would be but child's play for the House of Representatives of the United States to take such notice of the action of this committee, whether it is intentional or unintentional, as would place us in an unfavorable and ridiculous attitude before the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAMMOND. I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think one minute will suffice for me to say that this programme is no departure from precedents. It can have nothing offensive as a purpose. It will be the sixth inaugural ceremony that I have attended consecutively; and I have never seen one in which, under a programme identical with the one now submitted, the members of the House could all or any great part of the House get into the Hall of the Senate. I think it would be better if the Senate and the House should take the rear and leave the distinguished guests to the body of the Hall; but such has not been the case, and precedents are all in harmony with the programme now submitted to the House. I think it would dishonor this House in refusing to attend the ceremonies upon such an apparent slight.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAMMOND. I think the House has now had time to think, and if so, I know it is ready to vote. I have no intention myself of allowing a Republican Senate, if it wishes to keep me away from seeing Grover Cleveland inaugurated, to perform that act. It is the first chance I have ever had to see a Democrat inaugurated, and I intend to see it. [Applause.] I do not intend that any supposed insult upon the dig-

nity of this body shall keep me from my proper place as one of the Representatives of the people to witness the inauguration of that man in whose hands they have committed administration for the next four years. [Applause.] And I trust that when the House comes to vote it will change its front as solidly as under quick excitement it voted the other way ten minutes ago.

Mr. MILLS. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. REAGAN].

Mr. HAMMOND. I submit after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] had stated there would be no debate in favor of the proposition that there can be none.

Mr. MILLS. That proposition is absolutely ridiculous.

The SPEAKER. The Chair of course can not prevent under the rules of the House fifteen minutes being occupied in support of the proposition.

Mr. HAMMOND. I am glad, then, the gentleman thinks it will take fifteen minutes to make the House do wrong.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman will sit down and contain himself for the balance of the day. I yield five minutes to my colleague [Mr. REAGAN].

Mr. REAGAN. The President of the United States is to be inaugurated and the two Houses of Congress are to adopt the usual courtesies and regulations for the witnessing of that inauguration. The two Houses make up the Congress of the United States. It is not composed of a Senate alone. Each House is entitled to be respected and to have its voice in making the appropriate arrangements and to occupy its proper position in the ceremonies connected with the inauguration. The Representatives of the American people should not permit the Senatorial branch to take absolute, unqualified control of the inauguration of the President, ignoring the people's Representatives, and after they have accommodated themselves on the right of the President who is to be inaugurated and placed diplomats, judges, heads of Departments, bureau officers, military officers, and everybody else in the second place of honor, condescending to place the three hundred and twenty-five Representatives of the American people in the last place of honor instead of consulting them and permitting them to occupy the place that common right and common decency and courtesy demand for them.

Mr. GLASCOCK. Will the gentleman from Texas allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. REAGAN. I have not time; but I will hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. GLASCOCK. I want to ask the gentleman this question: At the time the ceremonies will take place what Congress will be in existence?

Mr. REAGAN. Until 12 o'clock of that day this House is in existence, and a number of Senators will have no longer tenure than the whole of the House; and it is the Congress of the United States that ought to make arrangements for the inauguration of the President according to custom and precedent. It is not for a single body of this Congress to dictate to the other co-ordinate branch of Congress and to assign it a subordinate and inferior position. If that is done it can not be otherwise than an intentional and deliberate discourtesy on the part of the Senate. I feel that the Representatives of the people will degrade and dishonor themselves if they do not resent that discourtesy, and that we could not answer to our constituents any more than we could answer to future Houses of Representatives if we permit this degradation.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that any such question should have arisen. But common courtesy and the rules of propriety demanded that there should have been a joint committee of the two Houses of Congress to have made these regulations, and not that one House should set itself above everything else. I ask by what authority, by what law, by what custom does it assume this new prerogative of absolutely controlling the inauguration of the President?

They go further, and provide that if it is an inclement day the President shall be inaugurated in the Senate Chamber instead of in the Representatives' Hall, before the Representatives of the people, and where a larger number of the people of the country at large can be witnesses of that ceremony. It seems to be a close corporation, arranging everything to suit itself and manifesting deliberate discourtesy to the House, a discourtesy which if not resented ought to degrade and dishonor the men who submit to it.

Mr. MILLS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JOHN S. WISE].

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I rise in support of this motion because I look upon this as simply one of the many slight outcroppings of a growing evidence of an assumed superiority supposed to exist in the Senate of the United States. I believe that the theory of this Government is that it consists of three departments—legislative, executive, and judicial. I see in the programme which is announced here an arrangement whereby the executive department is represented, where the judicial department follows, where the Senate assumes to represent the legislative department of this Government, and allows us, the poor House of Representatives, to follow along as the little dog under the wagon of the entertainment. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, I am not willing to accept that back seat and be quiet. I

do not approach this subject from any personal standpoint, because my own time here is too short to fight for any particular precedence. But I do feel that it involves a question of representative dignity in the House of Representatives that we have no right to ignore or to pass over.

This is not an isolated example of the assumed superiority of the Senate of the United States, a superiority which they are inclined to make grow and grow, which exhibits itself in the little social courtesies of the Capitol, which year by year expands so that we, the Representatives of the people, coming directly from the people, and having more right to represent the people than its intermediaries, come to ask ourselves, "On what rich meat have these our Cæsars fed?"

I say I would like to know by what process of reasoning not only Senators but Senators-elect are given five tickets apiece to this entertainment when Representatives have two, and Representatives-elect, who were elected at the same time that Grover Cleveland was made President of the United States, are ordered to stand out in the cold while the Senate takes the first place. I had rather be a doorkeeper in the House of Representatives than a prince in such a palace of Senators. I care not what may be the result of this resolution, but I am glad of an opportunity here and now to enter an emphatic protest on behalf of the Representatives of the people against these gradual encroachments of this would-be aristocratic body, the Senate of the United States.

It is our right to be there as a co-ordinate body. It is our right to be there as their equals in all respects. I believe that the principle announced by this resolution is right, and that if we can not be there as co-ordinates and equals, the most proper thing for us is not to go at all.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Go as individuals.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. Yes; go as individuals. I, too, like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND], desire to see this inauguration. He wants to see it because it is the first inauguration of a Democratic President he has seen for a long time. I want to see it because I think it entirely likely that this is the last one I shall have an opportunity of seeing for a long time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENLEY. I am sorry to hear that the gentleman is not coming to Washington again.

Mr. YOUNG. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YOUNG. I desire to be informed if it is in order at this time to offer a substitute for the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER. Of course not. This is a proposition to suspend the rules.

Mr. MILLS. Is my time exhausted, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has six minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in the outset of the remarks which I shall submit for the consideration of the House, I feel that I ought to make a very low bow to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] for the magisterial manner in which he came down and paraded himself in the arena and lectured this great body, the Representatives of fifty millions, ay, sixty millions of people, for their puerility and childishness in proposing to maintain the dignity and the equal rank of the Representatives of the people in the great and solemn transaction of the inauguration of a republican-democratic President of the United States. I use those terms in their large sense, not in their partisan sense.

I use the expression by way of contrast with the idea of a "scepter," which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] spoke of a while ago. Sir, it has always been an object of the chiefest concern among the people of England to maintain the dignity of the House of Commons, which they in their affection have characterized as "the breath of the English people." They have never been willing to accept any affront either from kings or lords, and they have maintained that great representative body in all its power and prestige by resisting every attempt to humble it or to make it inferior, either in the law-making power of Great Britain or in anything else pertaining to its character and history. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] stated a moment ago that all the precedents were in accord with the idea of the House of Representatives marching at the rear as is proposed in this instance. I have been able to find but one such precedent, and that was in 1877 when the Senate took one side and the House of Representatives the other.

We are told, sir, and it is an old story which we all understand, that the Senate and the House of Representatives are co-ordinate branches of the legislative department of this Government, equal in dignity, equal in authority, equal in importance; but now apologists rise upon this floor and tell us that we ought not to offend against propriety by taking this proposed action when we are assigned to a place in the rear, while the Senate and the heads of Departments and the diplomatic corps are given a superior position. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] and other gentlemen here, that we are going to see the inauguration of the President, but we are not going at the tail end of the procession with the boot-blacks; we are not going there as Representatives of the people to take a place in the rear.

Let us go there, but let us occupy the exalted position that all the American people occupy. Let us take our places with our constituents and look on with them at the inauguration of our President. [Ap-

plause.] He is our President; he is the President of all parties; he is the President of the people of the United States. He takes the oath of office, not in the Senate, not in the House of Representatives, but before the eyes of the assembled multitude of his fellow-citizens, and there we as individuals, as his fellow-citizens, will go to see him inaugurated as our Chief Magistrate. But, sir, we owe it to the dignity of this House, we owe it to the people whom we represent, not to accept for this great representative body the inferior station which the Senate has assigned to us, and I trust that we will so declare by this vote to-day.

Mr. HUTCHINS. While agreeing with much that has been said on both sides of the House, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. MILLS. That can not be done.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have a minute and a half remaining.

The SPEAKER. That is the fact.

Mr. HAMMOND. I yield that time to my colleague [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. MILLS. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. One minute.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] I am apprehensive that in this matter we are acting under the impulse of temper and under a misunderstanding of the facts. The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] rises in his place and tells this House that he has witnessed the inauguration of six Presidents of the United States, and that the position assigned to the members of the House of Representatives under this programme is in accord with what he has witnessed on those several occasions.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. BLOUNT. I will not allow the gentleman to interrupt me. I trust that I may use this minute and a half as I see fit.

Mr. REAGAN. The gentleman ought not to flinch at a fact.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not "flinch at a fact." The gentleman from Texas has misstated the facts.

Mr. REAGAN. I have not.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will refer to the printed order of arrangements, which every gentleman has at his desk. It distinctly states in the first place that the diplomatic corps "will occupy seats on the right of the Chair," that is, of the President of the Senate; and then after giving the position of ex-Presidents, ex-Vice-Presidents, and Justices of the Supreme Court on the right of the Chair, and heads of executive departments, the retired General of the Army, &c., on the left of the Chair, governors and ex-governors of States, commissioners of the District of Columbia, &c., east of the main entrance, the programme states that "members and members-elect of the House of Representatives will occupy seats on the right of the Chair, next to the diplomatic corps."

This is the arrangement in the Senate Chamber; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania tells us that it has been uniformly the arrangement heretofore. I trust, sir, that as the people of this country, and especially the democratic people of this country, are gathering here to witness this inauguration, we shall not do what my friend and colleague has characterized as a puerile thing.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] refers to the arrangement in the Senate Chamber. When the Senate gets into its position, and when the invited guests who come in before the House of Representatives all get their places, the members of this House can stand in the corridors, as they have done heretofore. I was speaking of the position on the platform; and in relation to this I will read from the order of arrangements that the gentleman may understand it:

The Senators take their position on the right. Why? Because it is the first post of honor. Why, then, should not the House of Representatives take the place immediately on the left? But that is given to the diplomatic corps.

The diplomatic corps will occupy the seats on the left of the President. Heads of Departments, the retired General of the Army, the Lieutenant-General of the Army, the Admiral of the Navy, and the officers of the Army and Navy who, by name, have received the thanks of Congress, governors and ex-governors of States, and ex-members of the Senate, will take seats west of the President.

The Members and Member-elect of the House will occupy seats reserved for them in the rear of the above.

That is the position of the House of Representatives; and it means to place the military in advance of the civil branch of this Government, which has never been done before.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FINDLAY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion made by the gentleman from Texas to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, on which the yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Would not a substitute be in order by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. FINDLAY. I object. Let us have the yeas and nays. I hope we shall vote down this frivolous and foolish resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an inquiry. I am aware that this resolution is not amendable; but I desire to appeal to the good sense of the members all over the House—

Mr. BLOUNT. Debate is not in order.

Mr. EATON. Can we not lay this motion on the table and let a committee be appointed by the Chair to confer with the Senate on this subject?

The SPEAKER. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. EATON. I hope there will be unanimous consent.

Many MEMBERS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. YOUNG. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again read. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded on all sides of the House; but if there be no objection the resolution will be again read; and the Chair asks gentlemen to stop conversation while this is being done.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

The SPEAKER. On the motion to suspend the rules and adopt this resolution the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 732) granting a pension to William Weddingfield;
 An act (H. R. 256) granting a pension to Mary A. Land;
 An act (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Reuben J. Ebberman;
 An act (H. R. 2550) to prohibit the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia;
 An act (H. R. 1759) granting a pension to Robert Patterson;
 An act (H. R. 2063) granting a pension to James H. Reid;
 An act (H. R. 1046) granting a pension to Mary A. Griffin;
 An act (H. R. 2284) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fowler;
 An act (H. R. 2537) granting a pension to Hugh Ryan;
 An act (H. R. 2539) granting a pension to George W. Kiser;
 An act (H. R. 2894) granting a pension to Henry Rodenback;
 An act (H. R. 3605) granting a pension to Eliza Sluss;
 An act (H. R. 3728) granting a pension to Charles P. Mahan;
 An act (H. R. 3749) granting a pension to William Bolwork;
 An act (H. R. 4833) granting a pension to Louisa Earle;
 An act (H. R. 5069) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary J. Stotts;
 An act (H. R. 5124) granting a pension to Samuel Z. Cooper;
 An act (H. R. 5555) granting a pension to James Frazier;
 An act (H. R. 6235) granting a pension to Eliza J. Norris;
 An act (H. R. 6044) granting a pension to Eliza Pigeon;
 An act (H. R. 6310) granting a pension to Benjamin P. Lowell;
 An act (H. R. 7094) granting a pension to Samuel M. Bartlett;
 An act (H. R. 7175) granting a pension to James O. McKenna;
 An act (H. R. 7256) granting a pension to John A. Vanderhoff;
 An act (H. R. 7336) granting a pension to T. A. Morton;
 An act (H. R. 7338) granting a pension to Chloe A. Whipple;
 An act (H. R. 7709) granting a pension to Louisa A. Ester;
 An act (H. R. 7722) granting a pension to Almira K. Parker;
 An act (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Lois B. Smith;
 An act (H. R. 7822) granting a pension to Spencer Van Loan;
 An act (H. R. 4079) granting a pension to James D. Kirk;
 An act (H. R. 7724) granting a pension to Lydia Wetherbee;
 An act (H. R. 7952) granting a pension to Julia Hartley;
 An act (H. R. 7773) granting a pension to William E. Ayers;
 An act (H. R. 8133) granting a pension to Thomas McGill;
 An act (H. R. 8038) granting a pension to Harriet A. B. Corts;
 An act (H. R. 6205) granting a pension to Catharine S. Edmondson;
 An act (H. R. 4189) granting a pension to Caroline Van Norton;
 An act (H. R. 4098) granting a pension to William Gibbons;
 An act (H. R. 3901) granting a pension to Mrs. Olive W. Parker;
 An act (H. R. 3701) granting a pension to James Bradford;
 An act (H. R. 3681) granting a pension to William L. Sloan;
 An act (H. R. 2325) granting a pension to Helen M. Harrison;
 An act (H. R. 2282) granting a pension to Adolph Weach;
 An act (H. R. 2138) granting a pension to Martha Angell;
 An act (H. R. 1984) granting a pension to Robert M. McKirley;
 An act (H. R. 1502) granting a pension to William Robinson;
 An act (H. R. 5813) granting a pension to Rachel Smith;
 An act (H. R. 5082) granting a pension to Jane Hilton;
 An act (H. R. 4837) granting a pension to Charles H. Phillips;
 An act (H. R. 4548) granting a pension to Cordelia Gale;
 An act (H. R. 4266) granting a pension to Margaret A. Ringwalt;
 An act (H. R. 6826) granting a pension to Rebecca Kupp;
 An act (H. R. 6835) granting a pension to Bernard Donohue;
 An act (H. R. 6653) granting a pension to Mary C. Axline;
 An act (H. R. 6196) granting a pension to R. D. Lawrence;
 An act (H. R. 5508) granting a pension to Isaac P. H. Caldwell;
 An act (H. R. 5207) granting a pension to Adalbert Stickney;
 An act (H. R. 7315) granting a pension to Frederick P. Dearth;
 An act (H. R. 7313) granting a pension to Charles W. Baldwin;
 An act (H. R. 6965) granting a pension to David T. Dudley;
 An act (H. R. 6966) granting a pension to Wealthy H. Seavey;
 An act (H. R. 7571) granting a pension to Cornelia V. Blackburn;

An act (H. R. 7673) granting a pension to Adeline E. Chadbourne;
 An act (H. R. 7386) granting a pension to Eliza M. Byers;
 An act (H. R. 7302) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith;
 An act (H. R. 3402) for the relief of Jacob J. Morningstar;
 An act (H. R. 7092) for the relief of Anthony Beyer;
 An act (H. R. 5989) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Springstead;
 An act (H. R. 5929) for the relief of Abigail Honey;
 An act (H. R. 7308) for the relief of David Fried;
 An act (H. R. 7524) for the relief of Lavisa Heth;
 An act (H. R. 5762) for the relief of Ann Lumphrey;
 An act (H. R. 4061) for the relief of William C. H. Bowman;
 An act (H. R. 3000) for the relief of William R. Miller;
 An act (H. R. 8033) granting an increase of pension to George W. Clark;
 An act (H. R. 8104) granting an increase of pension to George S. Hawley;
 An act (H. R. 7732) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Quinn;
 An act (H. R. 7672) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Hewitt;
 An act (H. R. 2136) granting an increase of pension to Merlin C. Harris;
 An act (H. R. 7602) to grant a pension to Harriet M. Baily;
 An act (H. R. 6018) increasing the pension of George Tapp;
 An act (H. R. 7561) to allow a pension to George F. West;
 An act (H. R. 4317) increasing the pension of Julia A. Chambers;
 An act (H. R. 7262) increasing the pension of Elmina P. Spencer;
 An act (H. R. 5969) increasing the pension of Frederic S. Rich;
 An act (H. R. 3352) to restore the name of Warren Sams to the pension-roll;
 An act (H. R. 7500) to restore the name of Lewis J. Blair to the pension-roll;
 An act (H. R. 1164) to restore to the pension-roll the name of Elenor Stough;
 An act (H. R. 6663) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Caroline Lewis;
 An act (H. R. 7707) to pension Holden Cook;
 An act (H. R. 1711) granting a pension to Frederick Nelson, T. Caine, and Henry C. Sanders;
 An act (H. R. 2670) granting a pension to Sarah A. Scott, widow of John D. Scott, deceased, late first lieutenant of Company H, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry;
 An act (H. R. 3074) to grant a pension to Jasper J. Henry on account of wounds received while acting as guide for the First Arkansas Cavalry Volunteers in the war of the rebellion;
 An act (H. R. 8273) authorizing the printing of 2,500 extra copies of the annual report of the health officer of the District of Columbia;
 Joint resolution (H. Res. 335) to print 2,000 additional copies of Lieut. P. H. Ray's report of the international polar expedition to Point Barrow, Alaska;
 An act (H. R. 2799) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.;
 An act (H. R. 3933) to declare a forfeiture of lands granted to the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, and for other purposes;
 An act (H. R. 4247) granting a pension to Anna Maria Ressler;
 An act (H. R. 2344) for the relief of Melissa G. Polar;
 An act (H. R. 6287) for the relief of John H. Johnson;
 An act (H. R. 7373) for the relief of Sarah A. Burchfield;
 An act (H. R. 3336) for the relief of Sherman C. Perry;
 An act (H. R. 3355) for the relief of Mary Mulholland;
 An act (H. R. 7002) for the relief of Harriet L. Stevens;
 An act (H. R. 5123) granting a pension to Frederick Braunwald;
 An act (H. R. 5925) granting a pension to Margaret A. Berry;
 An act (H. R. 5374) granting a pension to Phillip Wiggins;
 An act (H. R. 6596) granting a pension to John Hazlewood;
 An act (H. R. 6928) granting a pension to Leonard King;
 An act (H. R. 2627) granting a pension to Noah Caton;
 An act (H. R. 7696) granting a pension to Thomas D. Fitch;
 An act (H. R. 4263) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hood;
 An act (H. R. 7869) granting a pension to Emeline L. Fitch;
 An act (H. R. 2540) granting a pension to Priscilla J. Small;
 An act (H. R. 2538) granting a pension to Christiana Almier;
 An act (H. R. 3994) granting a pension to William Strickland;
 An act (H. R. 3751) granting a pension to Francis Curran;
 An act (H. R. 6948) granting a pension to George W. Eagles;
 An act (H. R. 7026) granting a pension to Jeremiah P. Swatzell;
 An act (H. R. 1219) granting a pension to Charles Hendrix;
 An act (H. R. 1653) granting a pension to John R. Hurlburt;
 An act (H. R. 1898) granting a pension to Harriet Armstrong;
 An act (H. R. 6798) to grant a pension to Lloyd W. Hixon;
 An act (H. R. 7769) to grant a pension to Joseph R. Dodds;
 An act (H. R. 2398) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Ann W. Mulvey; and
 An act (H. R. 7292) to increase the pension of Jacob Wiener.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman

from Texas to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 55, nays 185, not voting 84; as follows:

YEAS—55.

Aiken,	Culbertson, W. W.	Hatch, W. H.	Pryor,
Anderson,	Curtin,	Henderson, D. B.	Randall,
Barksdale,	Davis, G. R.	Henley,	Reagan,
Belford,	Deuster,	McAdoo,	Shively,
Bisbee,	Dorshelmer,	McMillin,	Smalls,
Bland,	Dunham,	Miller, J. F.	Stewart, Charles
Breckinridge,	Dunn,	Mills,	Tillman,
Brumm,	Eldredge,	Nelson,	Weaver,
Caldwell,	Ellwood,	Nicholls,	Weller,
Campbell, Felix	Follett,	Ochiltree,	Willis,
Cobb,	Fyan,	O'Ferrall,	Wise, J. S.
Collins,	Green,	O'Hara,	Worthington,
Cook,	Hancock,	Payson,	Yaple.
Craig,	Hardy,	Pettibone,	

NAYS—185.

Adams, G. E.	Ferrell,	Le Fevre,	Skinner, T. G.
Adams, J. J.	Findlay,	Long,	Slocum,
Alexander,	Finerty,	Lore,	Smith, A. Herr
Atkinson,	Foran,	Lovering,	Smith, H. Y.
Bagley,	Forney,	Lowry,	Spooner,
Ballentine,	Funston,	Lyman,	Spriggs,
Barbour,	Garrison,	McComas,	Springer,
Barr,	Geddes,	McCormick,	Stephenson,
Beach,	Glasecock,	Matson,	Stevens,
Belmont,	Goff,	Maybury,	Stewart, J. W.
Bennett,	Graves,	Mitchell,	Stockslager,
Bingham,	Greenleaf,	Money,	Storm,
Blount,	Guenther,	Morgan,	Sumner, C. A.
Boutelle,	Halsell,	Morrill,	Sumner, D. H.
Boyle,	Hammond,	Moulton,	Swope,
Bratton,	Hardeman,	Muldrow,	Talbot,
Brewer, F. B.	Harmer,	Muller,	Taylor, J. D.
Brewer, J. H.	Hart,	Murphy,	Taylor, J. M.
Broadhead,	Hatch, H. H.	Nece,	Thomas,
Browne, T. M.	Hemphill,	Nutting,	Thompson,
Buchanan,	Herbert,	Oates,	Townshend,
Buckner,	Hewitt, A. S.	O'Neill, J. J.	Tucker,
Burleigh,	Hewitt, G. W.	Paige,	Turner, H. G.
Cabell,	Hill,	Parker,	Turner, Oscar
Campbell, J. E.	Hitt,	Patton,	Valentine,
Campbell, J. M.	Hoblitzell,	Payne,	Van Alstyne,
Candler,	Holman,	Peel,	Vance,
Carleton,	Holmes,	Perkins,	Van Eaton,
Cassidy,	Hopkins,	Peters,	Wadsworth,
Clay,	Horr,	Phelps,	Wait,
Clements,	Houseman,	Pierce,	Wallace,
Converse,	Howey,	Poland,	Ward,
Covington,	Hurd,	Post,	Warner, Richard
Cox, W. E.	Hutchins,	Pusey,	Wemple,
Crisp,	James,	Ray, Ossian	Whiting,
Davidson,	Jeffords,	Reed, T. B.	Wilkins,
Dibble,	Johnson,	Reid, J. W.	Wilson, W. L.
Dibrell,	Jones, B. W.	Reese,	Winans, E. B.
Dingley,	Jones, J. H.	Robertson,	Winans, John
Dixon,	Jordan,	Rockwell,	Woodford,
Dockery,	Kean,	Rogers, W. F.	Wood,
Dowd,	Kelley,	Rowell,	Woodward,
Elliott,	Ketcham,	Russell,	York,
English,	Lacey,	Ryan,	Young.
Ermentrout,	Lamo,	Seney,	
Evans,	Lanham,	Seymour,	
Everhart,	Lawrence,	Skinner, C. R.	

NOT VOTING—84.

Arnot,	Davis, R. T.	Laird,	Rogers, J. H.
Bayne,	Easton,	Lewis,	Rosecrans,
Blackburn,	Ellis,	Libbey,	Shaw,
Blanchard,	Fiedler,	McCoid,	Singleton,
Bowen,	George,	Millard,	Snyder,
Brainerd,	Gibson,	Miller, S. H.	Steele,
Breitung,	Hanback,	Milliken,	Stone,
Brown, W. W.	Haynes,	Morrison,	Strait,
Budd,	Henderson, T. J.	Morse,	Struble,
Burnes,	Hepburn,	Murray,	Taylor, E. B.
Cannon,	Hiscock,	Mutchler,	Throckmorton,
Chalmers,	Holton,	O'Neill, Charles	Tully,
Clardy,	Hooper,	Potter,	Wakefield,
Connolly,	Houk,	Price,	Warner, A. J.
Cosgrove,	Hunt,	Rankin,	Washburn,
Cox, S. S.	Jones, J. K.	Ranney,	Wellborn,
Culbertson, D. B.	Jones, J. T.	Ray, G. W.	White, J. D.
Cullen,	Keifer,	Rice,	White, Milo
Cutcheon,	Kellogg,	Riggs,	Williams,
Dargan,	King,	Robinson, J. S.	Wilson, James
Davis, L. H.	Kleiner,	Robinson, W. E.	Wise, G. D.

So (two-thirds not voting in favor thereof) the rules were not suspended.

Mr. STORM. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. PETERS. I object.

The Clerk then recapitulated the names of those voting.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. KLEINER with Mr. CUTCHEON, for the rest of the day.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate requested the House to return the bill (H. R. 5800) for the relief of Sarah B. Jackson.

Also, that the Senate insisted upon its amendments, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, to the bill (H. R. 8239) making appropriation for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and

for other purposes, and asked a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon; and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. PLUMB, and Mr. BECK as managers at said conference on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the House accede to the request of the Senate for a further conference on the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as the managers on the part of the House at said conference Mr. HUTCHINS, Mr. RANDALL, and Mr. LONG.

RETURN OF A BILL TO THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, in pursuance of the request of the Senate, the bill (H. R. 5800) for the relief of Sarah B. Jackson will be returned to the Senate.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina calls up the contested-election case of Frederick against Wilson, from the fifth district of Iowa; against which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] raises the question of consideration.

SALE OF SAC AND FOX RESERVATION.

Mr. PERKINS. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a conference report.

The SPEAKER. That is privileged, and the gentleman will send it to the desk.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6558) to provide for the sale of the Sac and Fox Indian reservation in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate insist on and adhere to all its amendments made to the said bill.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the same.

OLIN WELLBORN,
T. G. SKINNER,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

H. L. DAWES,
BENJ. HARRISON,
RICHARD COKE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement accompanying the report is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6558) "to provide for the sale of the Sac and Fox Indian reservation in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes," submit the following in explanation of the action of the conference committee as submitted in the accompanying report:

The amendments made by the Senate do not change any of the provisions of the bill (H. R. 6558) except to reduce the amount authorized to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior from thirty thousand to ten thousand dollars, and extends the provisions of the bill to the Iowa tribe of Indians and reservation, which has already been recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. These Indians live together and ask for this legislation.

OLIN WELLBORN,
B. W. PERKINS,
T. G. SKINNER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the House concur in the report of the committee of conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter matter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House now proceed to the consideration of the contested-election case of Frederick vs. Wilson, from the State of Iowa?

Mr. VALENTINE. I would like to ask unanimous consent to see if it is not possible that an arrangement can be made for taking up these election cases without any delay, and considering them in the regular order in which they were reported. In the first place I wish to state that there is no disposition on the part of the minority of the Elections Committee to stand out or make any fight against the consideration of the cases in their order. There are four cases reported from the Elections Committee. Some have been here for ten months and some not more than ten days. We are ready to proceed with the consideration of these cases in the order in which they were reported by the committee to the House, provided that fair consideration and fair debate be given to them, and that we proceed at once in that manner. If the chairman of the committee then will inform the minority of the committee that he will call up the cases in their order as they are now before the House, there will be no objection on this side.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to say that it is my intention to call up for consideration the report on the Post-Office bill.

Mr. HERR. Why don't you call it up now?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I am not prepared to call it up just now, but

give notice that even if this election case is gone into I shall call it up as soon as it is ready.

The SPEAKER. The notice is unnecessary, since the conference report is a privileged matter and can be called up at any time.

Mr. BENNETT. In answer to the question put by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] I wish to say—

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Let me give notice to the House—

Mr. BENNETT. I can not yield now.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not propose to interfere with you, but wish to make a suggestion—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized on a subject before the House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Allow me a single word. I will not interfere with the gentleman's motion.

Mr. BENNETT. Not a word now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to be interrupted.

Mr. WASHBURN. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota demands the regular order, which is equivalent to an objection.

The question is, Will the House now proceed to the consideration of the election case?

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 106, noes 0.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. BENNETT were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 134, noes 0.

Mr. SPRINGER. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York, addressed the Chair. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I desire to know if it will be in order after this contested-election case is over to bring up for consideration and disposal the bankruptcy bill.

The SPEAKER. That can only be done by unanimous consent or by a motion to suspend the rules; and that is not in order when any other matter of higher privilege is before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. If in order, I would like to answer the question put by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE].

The SPEAKER. That may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I object.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 4, not voting 156; as follows:

Alexander,	Dorsheimer,	Le Fevre,	Skinner, T. G.
Bagley,	Dowd,	Lovering,	Slocum,
Ballentine,	Dunn,	Lowry,	Snyder,
Barbour,	Eaton,	McAdoo,	Spriggs,
Barksdale,	Elliott,	McMillin,	Springer,
Beach,	Ellis,	Miller, J. F.	Stewart, Charles
Belmont,	English,	Mills,	Stocksager,
Bennett,	Ermentrout,	Mitchell,	Storm,
Blackburn,	Finerty,	Money,	Sumner, C. A.
Bland,	Follett,	Morgan,	Sumner, D. H.
Blount,	Foran,	McMillon,	Swope,
Boyle,	Forney,	Muldrow,	Talbot,
Bratton,	Fyan,	Muller,	Taylor, J. M.
Breckinridge,	Garrison,	Murphy,	Thompson,
Broadhead,	Geddes,	Mutcher,	Tillman,
Buchanan,	Glascock,	Neece,	Townshend,
Buckner,	Green,	Nicholls,	Tucker,
Budd,	Greenleaf,	Oates,	Tully,
Cabell,	Halsell,	O'Ferrall,	Turner, H. G.
Caldwell,	Hammond,	O'Neill, J. J.	Turner, Oscar
Campbell, Felix	Hancock,	Paige,	Van Alstyne,
Campbell, J. E.	Hardeman,	Patton,	Vance,
Candler,	Hardy,	Peel,	Van Eaton,
Cassidy,	Hatch, W. H.	Pierce,	Wallace,
Clay,	Hemphill,	Post,	Ward,
Clements,	Henley,	Potter,	Warner, Richard
Cobb,	Hewitt, A. S.	Pryor,	Wellborn,
Connolly,	Hewitt, G. W.	Pusey,	Weller,
Converse,	Hill,	Randall,	Wemple,
Cook,	Hoblitzell,	Reagan,	Wilkins,
Cosgrove,	Holman,	Reid, J. W.	Willis,
Covington,	Hopkins,	Reese,	Wilson, W. L.
Cox, W. R.	Houseman,	Riggs,	Winans, E. B.
Crisp,	Hunt,	Robertson,	Winans, John
Culbertson, D. B.	Hutchins,	Robinson, W. E.	Wise, G. D.
Curtin,	Jones, B. W.	Rogers, J. H.	Wolford,
Davidson,	Jones, J. H.	Rogers, W. F.	Wood,
Davis, L. H.	Jordan,	Seney,	Woodward,
Deuster,	King,	Seymour,	Worthington,
Dibble,	Lamb,	Shively,	Yaple,
Dibrell,	Lanham,	Singleton,	Young.

Adams, J. J.	Brewer, F. B.	Everhart,	Morse.
NOT VOTING—156.			
Adams, G. E.	Atkinson,	Bingham,	Bowen,
Aiken,	Barr,	Bisbee,	Brainerd,
Anderson,	Bayne,	Blanchard,	Breitung,
Arnot,	Belford,	Boutelle,	Brewer, J. H.

Brown, W. W.	Hanback,	Lore,	Rosecrans,
Browne, T. M.	Harmer,	Lyman,	Rowell,
Brumm,	Hart,	McCold,	Russell,
Burleigh,	Hatch, H. H.	McComas,	Ryan,
Burnes,	Haynes,	McCormick,	Shaw,
Campbell, J. M.	Henderson, D. B.	Matson,	Skinner, C. R.
Cannon,	Henderson, T. J.	Maybury,	Smalls,
Carleton,	Hepburn,	Millard,	Smith, A. Herr
Chalmers,	Herbert,	Miller, S. H.	Smith, H. Y.
Clardy,	Hiscock,	Milliken,	Spooner,
Collins,	Hitt,	Morrill,	Steele,
Cox, S. S.	Holmes,	Morrison,	Stephenson,
Craig,	Holton,	Murray,	Stevens,
Culbertson, W. W.	Hooper,	Nelson,	Stewart, J. W.
Cullen,	Horr,	Nutting,	Stone,
Cutcheon,	Houk,	Ochiltree,	Strait,
Dargan,	Howey,	O'Hara,	Struble,
Davis, G. R.	Hurd,	O'Neill, Charles	Taylor, E. B.
Davis, R. T.	James,	Parker,	Taylor, J. D.
Dingley,	Jeffords,	Payne,	Thomas,
Dixon,	Johnson,	Payson,	Throckmorton,
Dockery,	Jones, J. K.	Pelkins,	Valentine,
Dunham,	Jones, J. T.	Peters,	Vadsworth,
Eldredge,	Kean,	Petibone,	Wait,
Ellwood,	Kelfer,	Phelps,	Wakefield,
Evans,	Kelley,	Poland,	Warner, A. J.
Ferrell,	Kellogg,	Price,	Washburn,
Fiedler,	Ketcham,	Rankin,	Weaver,
Findlay,	Kleiner,	Ranney,	White, J. D.
Funston,	Lacey,	Ray, G. W.	White, Milo
George,	Laird,	Ray, Ossian	Whiting,
Gibson,	Lawrence,	Reed, T. B.	Williams,
Goff,	Lewis,	Rice,	Wilson, James
Graves,	Libbey,	Robinson, J. S.	Wise, J. S.
Guenther,	Long,	Rockwell,	York.

So the House agreed to consider the contested-election case of Frederick vs. Wilson.

Mr. HENLEY. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names of members voting.

Mr. ANDERSON. I object.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. GIBSON with Mr. MCCORMICK, for the rest of the day.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. KELLEY, for the rest of the day.

Mr. DOCKERY with Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR, on the Frederick-Wilson election case.

Mr. MUTCHLER with Mr. BRUMM, on the Frederick-Wilson election case.

Mr. MILLER, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. DAVIS, of Missouri, on the Frederick-Wilson election case.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BRUMM, but have voted as I understand Mr. BRUMM is present.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I voted to make a quorum although paired. Understanding that more than a quorum has voted, I withdraw my vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] has the floor.

Mr. REED, of Maine. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ADAMS] stood ready to move as soon as the vote should be announced that the House do now adjourn, and made that motion.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from North Carolina having the election case in charge, which the House has just agreed to consider, addressed the Chair and was recognized.

Mr. REED, of Maine. A motion to adjourn after a vote of that kind is always in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the gentleman from New York make the motion before the gentleman from North Carolina was recognized. The gentleman from North Carolina, in fact, addressed the Chair before the result was announced.

Mr. REED, of Maine. The gentleman from New York stood there in front of the Chair and sought recognition.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from North Carolina was on the floor and addressed the Chair.

Mr. REED, of Maine. After such a vote as has just been taken a motion to adjourn is always in order when a gentleman takes the floor and makes that motion immediately on the announcement of the vote.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York states that he made the motion before the Chair recognized the gentleman from North Carolina, the Chair, as he always does, will accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I do not make that statement.

Mr. REED, of Maine. The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. ANDERSON, also made the motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I made that motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine now claims that another gentleman made the motion to adjourn.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I do. The gentleman from Kansas moved to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear either of the gentlemen make the motion to adjourn till after the gentleman from North Carolina had been recognized. But if the gentleman from Kansas states

he made the motion to adjourn before the gentleman from North Carolina took the floor and was recognized, the Chair will entertain his motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not state that. I made the motion as quickly as I could; but in the confusion I can not say whether I made it before the gentleman from North Carolina was recognized or not. Gentlemen standing around me say I did.

The SPEAKER. There is so much confusion on the floor that it is impossible to transact business. If gentlemen will resume their seats the Chair will endeavor to see that the public business is transacted in an orderly manner. The House will be in order.

The Chair will state that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] rose in his place and addressed the Chair before the result was announced, but the Chair did not then recognize the gentleman. Immediately upon the announcement of the result the gentleman from North Carolina again addressed the Chair, and the Chair recognized him, not having heard any motion made before that time.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] make his motion to adjourn before the gentleman from North Carolina was recognized.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Kansas himself declines to state that he made that motion before the gentleman from North Carolina was recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, all that I desire to state is this: I did make the motion as promptly as I could make it, but in the confusion I could not hear whether the gentleman from North Carolina was recognized at that time or not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understands the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Gentlemen standing around me say my motion was in time.

The SPEAKER. But other gentlemen say it was not, and the Chair, having recognized the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT], can not decide that question.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine is recognized to make a statement.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I presume that the rule of parliamentary law is very plain and simple. It is not a race on the part of the Speaker or on the part of a member as to recognition. It is not for the Speaker to turn toward a member and recognize him and thereby prevent a motion to adjourn. I am sure that would not be the view of the present occupant of the chair. The motion to adjourn is a privileged motion which takes precedence of recognition, and if a gentleman was standing on the floor and making every effort to be recognized to make that motion, and the Chair turned to another gentleman and recognized him, and then the gentleman who was first trying to get recognition for the purpose of making a motion to adjourn should make that motion, the Chair would be bound to recognize him and to put the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, would not endeavor to give one gentleman an advantage over another on the floor. When the Chair announced the result he had already turned toward the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT], because that gentleman was in charge of this matter and had addressed the Chair. The Chair thereupon recognized him. Afterward it was claimed that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANDERSON] had made a motion to adjourn before the recognition of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. REED, of Maine. But if another gentleman had previously moved to adjourn before the gentleman from North Carolina— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT], under the statements made by the two gentlemen who claim to have made motions, is entitled to the floor. [Renewed cries of "Regular order!"]

CONTESTED ELECTION—FREDERICK VS. WILSON.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the returning board of the State of Iowa—

Mr. RANNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANNEY. The resolution in this case has not been read.

A MEMBER. Are we not entitled to have the report read?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] has the floor, and desires to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware that the gentleman from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. RANNEY. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that the resolution has not been read.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was read on Saturday.

Mr. RANNEY. The report of the minority was read, but not the report of the majority.

The SPEAKER. Both the resolution reported by the minority and the one reported by the majority were read on Saturday.

Mr. REED. But that is not to-day. We voted not to consider the case then.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of any rule which would

authorize gentlemen to demand the reading of the resolution in the time of a gentleman already on the floor, but of course every gentleman has a right to have the resolution read before it is voted upon.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Chair had no right to recognize a gentleman to debate the resolution until it had been read or stated to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the rule. [After a pause.] The Clerk will read the rule.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

RULE XVI.

2. When a motion has been made the Speaker shall state it, or, if it be in writing, cause it to be read aloud by the Clerk, before being debated, and it shall then be in possession of the House, but may be withdrawn at any time before a decision or amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if this rule is insisted upon the resolution must be read or stated before it can be debated.

Mr. VALENTINE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I insist that the resolution be read, and that opportunity be given to all members alike for recognition to debate it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That James Wilson—

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HISCOCK. Is it in order to move that the House now adjourn?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not while the Clerk is reading the resolution.

Mr. HISCOCK. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] has asked for the reading of the resolution.

Mr. HISCOCK. Yes; but we are transacting business, and any business can not be interrupted by a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks the gentleman can not stop the reading of a paper which has been demanded as a matter of right. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued and concluded the reading of the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That James Wilson was not elected as a Representative in Congress from the fifth district of Iowa, and is not entitled to a seat on the floor of this House.

Mr. HISCOCK and Mr. ANDERSON. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ANDERSON. Pending that, I move that the House take a recess until 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. HISCOCK. Pending that, I move that when the House adjourn it adjourns to meet to-morrow at 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That would be to change the order of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] is now entitled to the floor to debate the proposition before the House. When this matter was called up it was stated that it was the contested-election case of Frederick against Wilson. The question of consideration was then raised and the question was submitted, Will the House now proceed to consider this question?—the question then stated to the House and then before the House. I see the Speaker shakes his head.

The SPEAKER. The question then before the House was merely the question of consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER. But what were we to consider? The resolution which has been read; and the House voted to consider it. If gentlemen had desired to have that resolution read, it was their province to ask it when the question of consideration was raised. The question of consideration being raised, it could only be upon the resolution and upon nothing else; and the House has decided now to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, notwithstanding gentlemen absented themselves and broke a quorum.

The gentleman from North Carolina was then recognized, and proceeded to debate—began his speech; and he is now entitled to occupy the floor for one hour on that question.

The SPEAKER. The question which was pending before the House when the resolution was read was not the question whether the report should be adopted or not; the question then was whether the House would consider it or not.

Mr. SPRINGER. But after the House determined that it would consider it then the question was upon the resolution.

The SPEAKER. But the attention of the Chair having been called since that controversy arose to the fact that the resolution had not been read, and the question had not been stated, the Chair was bound, in accordance with the rules, to hold that it was not yet before the House, and that therefore the gentleman from North Carolina could not debate it.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Chair did not get my point. The point I make is this: If gentlemen had desired the resolution read it was their

duty to call for its reading when the question was put to the House upon consideration. The question then before the House was, Will the House now consider this resolution? That question having been submitted, the House voted to consider it; and consideration means debate. The gentleman from North Carolina had the floor and began to debate the question, and he is entitled to speak an hour before he can be taken from the floor without his consent.

The SPEAKER. But the point made by gentlemen on the other side, after the gentleman from North Carolina had been recognized by the Chair, was that under the rules of the House there was then no question before the House which the gentleman from North Carolina could debate, because the resolution had not been read nor had the Chair stated the question to the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. What have we voted on then?

The SPEAKER. The Chair under the rules was obliged to sustain that point of order, and holds that at the time the gentleman from North Carolina took the floor there was in fact no question before the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. What, then, did the House vote on by yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER. That was the question whether the House would consider the matter at all.

Mr. SPRINGER. Whether it would consider this resolution; there is nothing else before it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the distinction is very plain—

Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. There is a question of order pending. The Chair thinks the distinction is very plain and obvious between the question whether the House will consider the report at all and the question whether the House will adopt the report.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now I make this further point—that the gentleman from North Carolina, having this report and resolution in charge, was first entitled to recognition when the House voted to take it up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided that he was entitled to the floor as soon as the question was before the House for debate, and that he could be prevented from taking the floor only by a privileged motion under the rules.

Mr. ANDERSON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Pending that, is a motion to take a recess until 7 o'clock in order?

The SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn has precedence over a motion to take a recess.

Mr. ANDERSON. But still the motion to take a recess may be pending?

Mr. VALENTINE. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Wednesday next, at 10 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is out of order.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order, because it changes a standing order of the House. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 37, noes 78.

Mr. ANDERSON. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not necessary on this question.

Mr. VALENTINE and others called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 48 voting in favor thereof.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 11, nays 194, not voting 119; as follows:

YEAS—11.

Adams, J. J.	Brewer, F. B.	Culbertson, W. W.	James,
Atkinson,	Brewer, J. H.	Cullen,	Johnson.
Bingham,	Browne, T. M.	Hatch, H. H.	

NAYS—194.

Alexander,	Cook,	Graves,	Matson,
Bagley,	Cosgrove,	Green,	Maybury,
Ballentine,	Covington,	Greenleaf,	Miller, J. F.
Barbour,	Cox, S. S.	Halsell,	Mills,
Bayne,	Cox, W. R.	Hammond,	Mitchell,
Beach,	Crisp,	Hardeman,	Morgan,
Belford,	Culbertson, D. B.	Harmer,	Morse,
Belmont,	Curtin,	Hatch, W. H.	Moulton,
Bennett,	Davidson,	Hemphill,	Muller,
Blaekburn,	Davis, G. R.	Henderson, T. J.	Murphy,
Bland,	Davis, L. H.	Hewitt, A. S.	Mutchler,
Blount,	Davis, R. T.	Hewitt, G. W.	Neece,
Boyle,	Deuster,	Hill,	Oates,
Brainerd,	Dibble,	Hoblitzell,	O'Ferrall,
Bratton,	Dibrell,	Holman,	O'Hara,
Breckinridge,	Doekery,	Hopkins,	O'Neill, J. J.
Broadhead,	Dorsheimer,	Houk,	Paige,
Brown, W. W.	Dowd,	Houseman,	Patton,
Brunum,	Dunn,	Howey,	Pierce,
Buchanan,	Eaton,	Hunt,	Peel,
Buckner,	Eldredge,	Hutchins,	Perkins,
Budd,	Elliott,	Jeffords,	Peters,
Burnes,	Ellis,	Jones, B. W.	Post,
Cabell,	English,	Jones, J. H.	Potter,
Caldwell,	Ermentrout,	Kelfer,	Pryor,
Campbell, Felix	Everhart,	Ketcham,	Pusey,
Campbell, J. E.	Ferrell,	King,	Randall,
Campbell, J. M.	Fiedler,	Lamb,	Reid, J. W.
Candler,	Findlay,	Langham,	Reese,
Clardy,	Follett,	Le Fevre,	Riggs,
Clay,	Foran,	Long,	Roekwell,
Clements,	Forney,	Lore,	Rogers, J. H.
Cobb,	Funston,	Lovering,	Rogers, W. F.
Connolly,	Garrison,	Lowry,	Ryan,
Converse,	Glasecock,	McMillin,	Seney,

Seymour,	Storm,	Turner, Oscar	Weller,
Shively,	Sumner, C. A.	Valentine,	Wemple,
Singleton,	Sumner, D. H.	Van Alstyne,	Whiting,
Skinner, T. G.	Swope,	Vance,	Wilkins,
Slocum,	Talbott,	Van Eaton,	Willis,
Smith, A. Herr	Taylor, J. D.	Wadsworth,	Wilson, W. L.
Snyder,	Taylor, J. M.	Walt,	Winans, John
Spooner,	Thomas,	Wallace,	Wolford,
Spriggs,	Thompson,	Ward,	Wood,
Springer,	Tillman,	Warner, A. J.	Worthington,
Stevens,	Townshend,	Warner, Richard	Yaple,
Stewart, Charles	Tucker,	Washburn,	York.
Stockslager,	Tully,	Weaver,	
Stone,	Turner, H. G.	Wellborn,	

NOT VOTING—119.

Adams, G. E.	Goff,	Lyman,	Reed, T. B.
Aiken,	McAdoo,	McAldoo,	Rice,
Anderson,	Hanback,	McCoid,	Robertson,
Arnot,	Hancock,	McComas,	Robinson, J. S.
Barksdale,	Hardy,	McCormick,	Robinson, W. E.
Barr,	Hart,	Millard,	Rosecrans,
Bisbee,	Haynes,	Miller, S. H.	Rowell,
Blanchard,	Henderson, D. B.	Milliken,	Russell,
Boutelle,	Henley,	Money,	Shaw,
Bowen,	Hepburn,	Morrill,	Skinner, C. R.
Breitung,	Herbert,	Morrison,	Smalls,
Burleigh,	Hiscock,	Muldrow,	Smith, H. Y.
Cannon,	Hitt,	Murray,	Steele,
Carleton,	Holmes,	Nelson,	Stephenson,
Cassidy,	Holton,	Nicholls,	Stewart, J. W.
Chalmers,	Hooper,	Nutting,	Strait,
Collins,	Horr,	Ochiltree,	Struble,
Craig,	Hurd,	O'Neill, Charles	Taylor, E. B.
Cutcheon,	Jones, J. K.	Parker,	Throckmorton,
Dargan,	Jones, J. T.	Payne,	Wakefield,
Dingley,	Jordan,	Payson,	White, J. D.
Dixon,	Kean,	Petibone,	White, Milo
Dunham,	Kelley,	Poland,	Williams,
Ellwood,	Kellogg,	Poland,	Wilson, James
Evans,	Kleiner,	Price,	Winan, E. B.
Finerty,	Lacey,	Rankin,	Wise, G. D.
Fyan,	Laird,	Ranney,	Wise, J. S.
Geddes,	Lawrence,	Ray, G. W.	Woodward,
George,	Lewis,	Ray, Ossian	Young.
Gibson,	Libbey,	Reagan,	

So the House refused to adjourn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5800) for the relief of Sarah B. Jackson, and stated that it had appointed Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. VAN WYCK, and Mr. JACKSON as conferees on its part.

IOWA ELECTION CASE.

During the roll-call the following additional pairs were announced: For the rest of the day—

Mr. GEDDES with Mr. HOLMES.
 Mr. BALLENTINE with Mr. LAIRD.
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. HOLTON.
 Mr. MURRAY with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. NICHOLLS with Mr. WAKEFIELD.
 Mr. GEORGE D. WISE with Mr. LIBBEY. If present, Mr. WISE would vote in the negative.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.
 Mr. HEPBURN. I move that the House take a recess until 9 o'clock this evening.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move the House take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will submit their motions one at a time. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from Nebraska moves the House take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move that the House take a recess until 9 o'clock.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I did not make a motion that the House take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, but I will move now that the House take a recess until 10 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER. Several gentlemen made motions at the same time, and the Chair may have been mistaken.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask by unanimous consent to take up from the Speaker's table the message from the Senate asking for a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5808) for the relief of Sarah B. Jackson, and to move that the conference asked for be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. That is not in order just now. It is a privileged matter, but it does not stand on the same footing with a conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the question before the House?
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] moves that the House take a recess until 10 o'clock this evening.

Mr. HEPBURN. And I move to amend that motion so the House shall take a recess until 9 o'clock this evening.

Mr. PETTIBONE. And I move to still further amend by making it 8 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to amend by saying 9 o'clock, and the gentleman from Tennessee moves still further to amend by inserting 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. ANDERSON. And now I move the House adjourn.

Mr. SPRINGER. These are all dilatory motions, and I ask notice be taken of that fact. I have been informed that the contestee in this case has said time and again he would not make any objection to the consideration of this case. [Cries of "Order!" I ask [cries of "Order!"] that the assurances of the gentleman from Iowa [cries of "Order!"] that there should be no contest and no filibustering in this case— [Cries of "Order!"]

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that all these motions be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain no motion whatever until gentlemen resume their seats and order is restored.

The question is first on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. RANDALL. If taken at all it should be until 8.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us have a division on that vote.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 44.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. VALENTINE, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SPRINGER.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 0, noes 103.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum has voted.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move that there be a call of the House.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 43, noes 54.

Mr. HEPBURN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 50, nays 168, not voting 106; as follows:

YEAS—50.

Adams, G. E.	Dunham,	Nutting,	Spooner,
Adams, J. J.	Greenleaf,	O'Hara,	Stockslager,
Anderson,	Guenther,	Parker,	Strait,
Atkinson,	Hanback,	Fayne,	Swope,
Barr,	Hatch, H. H.	Peters,	Taylor, J. D.
Bisbee,	Henderson, D. B.	Ray, G. W.	Valentine,
Collins,	Horr,	Ray, Ossian	Washington,
Culbertson, W. W.	James,	Rockwell,	Washington,
Cullen,	Jeffords,	Roswell,	Weaver,
Davis, G. R.	Lacey,	Russell,	White, J. D.
Davis, R. T.	Libbey,	Skinner, C. R.	Wilson, James
Dingley,	McComas,	Smith, H. Y.	Wise, J. S.
Dixon,	Millard,		

NAYS—168.

Alexander,	Davidson,	Jones, J. K.	Rogers, J. H.
Arnot,	Davis, L. H.	King,	Rogers, W. F.
Bagley,	Dibrell,	Lamb,	Seney,
Ballentine,	Doekery,	Lanham,	Seymour,
Barbour,	Dorshelmer,	LeFevre,	Shively,
Barksdale,	Dowd,	Lewis,	Skinner, T. G.
Bayne,	Dunn,	Long,	Slocum,
Beach,	Eaton,	Lore,	Smith, A. Herr
Belford,	Eldredge,	Lovering,	Spriggs,
Belmont,	Elliott,	Lowry,	Springer,
Bennett,	Ellis,	McMillin,	Stevens,
Bland,	English,	Matson,	Stewart, Charles
Blount,	Everhart,	Maybury,	Sumner, C. A.
Boutelle,	Ferrell,	Miller, J. F.	Sumner, D. H.
Boyle,	Findlay,	Mills,	Talbot,
Brainerd,	Follett,	Money,	Taylor, J. M.
Bratton,	Foran,	Morgan,	Thomas,
Breckinridge,	Forney,	Muller,	Townshend,
Brewer, F. B.	Graves,	Murphy,	Tucker,
Brewer, J. H.	Green,	Mutchler,	Tully,
Broadhead,	Halsell,	Neece,	Turner, H. G.
Browne, T. M.	Hammond,	Oates,	Turner, Oscar
Brumm,	Hardeman,	Ochiltree,	Van Eaton,
Buchanan,	Hardy,	O'Ferrall,	Wallace,
Buckner,	Hatch, W. H.	O'Neill, Charles	Ward,
Budd,	Hemphill,	O'Neill, J. J.	Warner, Richard
Cabell,	Henderson, T. J.	Paige,	Welborn,
Caldwell,	Henley,	Patton,	Weller,
Campbell, Felix	Hepburn,	Peel,	Wemple,
Campbell, J. E.	Hewitt, A. S.	Pettibone,	White, Milo
Campbell, J. M.	Hewitt, G. W.	Pierce,	Whiting,
Candler,	Hill,	Poland,	Wilkins,
Carleton,	Hoblitzell,	Post,	Willis,
Clay,	Holman,	Potter,	Wilson, W. L.
Clements,	Holmes,	Pryor,	Winans, E. B.
Cobb,	Hopkins,	Randall,	Winans, John
Converse,	Houseman,	Reagan,	Wise, G. D.
Cook,	Howey,	Reed, T. B.	Woodward,
Cosgrove,	Hutchins,	Reese,	Woodworth,
Cox, W. R.	Johnson,	Riggs,	Yaple,
Crisp,	Jones, B. W.	Robertson,	York,
Culbertson, D. B.	Jones, J. H.	Robinson, W. E.	Young.

NOT VOTING—106.

Aiken,	Covington,	Fyan,	Holton,
Bingham,	Cox, S. S.	Garrison,	Hooper,
Blackburn,	Craig,	Geddes,	Houk,
Blanchard,	Curtin,	George,	Hunt,
Bowen,	Cutcheon,	Gibson,	Hurd,
Breitung,	Dargan,	Glascocock,	Jones, J. T.
Brown, W. W.	Deuster,	Goff,	Jordan,
Burleigh,	Dibble,	Hancock,	Kean,
Burnes,	Elwood,	Harmer,	Kafer,
Cannon,	Ermentrout,	Hart,	Kelley,
Cassidy,	Evans,	Haynes,	Kellogg,
Chalmers,	Fiedler,	Herbert,	Ketcham,
Clardy,	Finerty,	Hiscock,	Kleiner,
Connolly,	Funston,	Hitt,	Laird,

Lawrence,	Murray,	Rosecrans,	Throckmorton,
Lyman,	Nelson,	Ryan,	Tillman,
McAdoo,	Nicholls,	Shaw,	Van Alstyne,
McCoid,	Payson,	Singleton,	Vance,
McCormick,	Perkins,	Snyder,	Wadsworth,
Miller, S. H.	Phelps,	Steele,	Wait,
Milliken,	Price,	Stephenson,	Wakefield,
Mitchell,	Pusey,	Stewart, J. W.	Warner, A. J.
Morrill,	Rankin,	Stone,	Williams,
Morrison,	Ranney,	Storm,	Wolford,
Morse,	Reid, J. W.	Struble,	Wood.
Moulton,	Rice,	Taylor, E. B.	
Muldrow,	Robinson, J. S.	Thompson,	

So a call of the House was not ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. ERMENTROUT with Mr. HARMER, on all political questions, until further notice.

Mr. DARGAN with Mr. FINERTY, for the rest of the day.

Mr. BUCKNER with Mr. WAIT, for this day.

Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. GEORGE, for to-day.

Mr. VANCE with Mr. SMITH, of Pennsylvania, for this day.

Mr. JORDAN with Mr. DINGLEY, until 7 p. m.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio, with Mr. HOUK, until 8 o'clock p. m.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to order a call of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON. And I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to make a brief statement, and with the consent of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman will proceed. [Cries of "All right!"]

Mr. RANDALL. It is probable that we shall be compelled to stay late to-night, perhaps until to-morrow morning, and I think it will be for the comfort of both sides that we now take a recess until 8 o'clock, so as to allow members of the House an opportunity to get their dinner.

The SPEAKER. That is the question now pending before the House. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee is that the House shall now take a recess until 8 o'clock.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Chair state the question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] moved that the House take a recess until 10 o'clock to-night. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] moved to amend that motion by taking a recess until 9 o'clock; and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] moved to amend the amendment by making the hour 8 o'clock, which is now the pending question.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest to the House that we adopt that with unanimity, and we can commence anew at 8 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa withdraw the motion to reconsider?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. I withdraw the motion to lay on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The motion as amended was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) resumed its session.

CONTESTED ELECTION—FREDERICK VS. WILSON.

Mr. VALENTINE. I move that the House do now take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to amend by making it 9 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the motion, after which the Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to know, in the first place, what is the pending question.

The SPEAKER. The pending question is on the adoption of the report of the majority of the Committee on Elections in the contested-election case.

Mr. SPRINGER. Upon that I wish to be recognized.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Nebraska has made a motion that the House take a recess, which is a privileged motion.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to ask if it is not in order to proceed to the discussion of the election case.

The SPEAKER. Not pending a motion for a recess.

The gentleman from Iowa moves to amend the motion so as to make the recess until 9 o'clock.

Mr. PETTIBONE. I move a further amendment to the amendment, that the recess be taken until 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. SPRINGER. If gentlemen have got through with their motions, I would like to state that the contestee in this case agreed that there should be no filibustering in connection with it [cries of "Regular order!"], and in view of that agreement I ask that gentlemen now cease their filibustering and let us go on with the case.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. There never was any such arrangement made.

Mr. SPRINGER. I say that an agreement was made on the part of the contestee [loud cries of "Regular order!"], and I want to inform members on that side of the House [resumed cries of "Regular order!"] that this case will be before the House, notwithstanding their efforts. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I make a point of order upon that last amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I understand that the gentleman moves that the House take a recess until 10 o'clock, another until 8, and another until 9. That is an amendment in the third degree, and if I am correct in the statement it is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken. There was a motion to take a recess until 10 o'clock, to which an amendment was offered making it 9 o'clock, and the amendment to the amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee, which is now the pending question, until 8 o'clock. The question is on the latter motion.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 2, noes 27.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. SPRINGER were appointed tellers.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that there be a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The House is now taking a vote.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 3, noes 42.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. A quorum has not voted.

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

The question being taken, the Speaker stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 31.

Mr. HEPBURN. I call for tellers.

Tellers were not ordered, only 22 members voting therefor—not one-fifth of a quorum.

So the motion for a call of the House was not agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I have a resolution to offer which bears directly on the question before this House, namely, the contested-election case of Frederick vs. Wilson.

The SPEAKER. A quorum has not appeared and no business is in order except a call of the House or a motion to adjourn.

Mr. SPRINGER. A quorum not being present would it be in order now to proceed to discuss the question before the House?

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is on the motion for a recess and the amendments thereto.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is a mere dilatory motion which gentlemen are urging for revolutionary purposes. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. VALENTINE. The gentleman from Illinois is out of order!

Mr. SPRINGER. I have a right to be out of order when revolution is afoot.

Mr. GEORGE D. WISE. I move that the House do now adjourn. The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, the Speaker stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 56.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. BENNETT rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BENNETT. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the next question before the House?

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is on the motion for a recess. The first question is on the amendment to the amendment, which is now pending.

Mr. VALENTINE. On which no quorum appeared.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does not a motion to adjourn supersede all those motions for a recess?

The SPEAKER. It does not supersede them; it has priority over them.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] and the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] have leave of absence until to-morrow?

Mr. SPRINGER. What was the question of my colleague? That chunk of wisdom has been lost, I am afraid, not only to this generation but to posterity. That cannon exploded in mid-air; nothing was heard of it. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The question being taken, the Speaker stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. VALENTINE. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 36.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum.

Mr. SPRINGER. I move that there be a call of the House, a quorum not having voted.

The question being taken on Mr. SPRINGER's motion, the Speaker stated that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 25.

Mr. VALENTINE. Upon this question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 43 members voting therefor.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 61, not voting 134; as follows:

YEAS—129.

Alexander,	Dunn,	Lowry,	Stevens,
Bagley,	Eaton,	McComas,	Stewart, Charles
Bayne,	Eldredge,	Matson,	Storm,
Belmont,	Elliot,	Maybury,	Sumner, C. A.
Bennett,	Ellis,	Miller, J. F.	Swope,
Blackburn,	English,	Mills,	Talbot,
Blount,	Ermentrout,	Mitchell,	Taylor, J. D.
Breckinridge,	Fiedler,	Money,	Taylor, J. M.
Broadhead,	Findlay,	Murphy,	Thomas,
Brown, W. W.	Follett,	Mutchler,	Thompson,
Browne, T. M.	Forney,	O'Ferrall,	Tully,
Brumm,	Garrison,	Patton,	Turner, H. G.
Buchanan,	Gibson,	Payson,	Van Alstyne,
Burnes,	Graves,	Payson,	Vance,
Cabell,	Greenleaf,	Pettibone,	Van Eaton,
Caldwell,	Halsell,	Pierce,	Wallace,
Campbell, J. E.	Hammond,	Post,	Ward,
Candler,	Hancock,	Potter,	Warner, A. J.
Carleton,	Hardeman,	Pryor,	Warner, Richard
Clay,	Hatch, W. H.	Pusey,	Wellborn,
Clements,	Hewitt, G. W.	Randall,	Weller,
Cobb,	Hill,	Reese,	Wemple,
Connolly,	Hopkins,	Riggs,	Willis,
Cook,	Houseman,	Robertson,	Wilson, W. L.
Cosgrove,	Hutchins,	Rogers, J. H.	Winans, E. B.
Cox, W. R.	Jones, B. W.	Rosecrans,	Wise, G. D.
Crisp,	Jones, J. H.	Seymour,	Woodward,
Culbertson, D. B.	Jordan,	Shively,	Worthington,
Davidson,	Kleiner,	Skinner, T. G.	Yaple.
Davis, L. H.	Lamb,	Slocum,	
Deuster,	Lanham,	Snyder,	
Dockery,	Lewis,	Springer,	
Dowd,	Lore,		

NAYS—61.

Adams, G. E.	Evans,	James,	Peters,
Adams, J. J.	Everhart,	Jeffords,	Price,
Anderson,	Funston,	Johnson,	Rowell,
Barr,	Goff,	Kean,	Ryan,
Bisbee,	Guenther,	Keifer,	Smalls,
Boutelle,	Harmer,	Libbey,	Smith, H. Y.
Bretting,	Hart,	McCoid,	Stewart, J. W.
Cannon,	Hatch, H. H.	McCormick,	Stockslager,
Craig,	Haynes,	Millard,	Strait,
Culbertson, W. W.	Henderson, D. B.	Morrill,	Townsend,
Cullen,	Hepburn,	Nelson,	Valentine,
Davis, G. R.	Hitt,	Ochiltree,	Washburn,
Dingley,	Holman,	O'Hara,	Weaver.
Dixon,	Holmes,	Parker,	
Dunham,	Houk,	Payne,	
Ellwood,	Howey,	Perkins,	

NOT VOTING—134.

Aiken,	Curtin,	Jones, J. K.	Paige,
Arnot,	Cutcheon,	Jones, J. T.	Phelps,
Atkinson,	Dargan,	Kelley,	Poland,
Ballentine,	Davis, R. T.	Kellogg,	Rankin,
Barbour,	Dibble,	Ketcham,	Ranney,
Barksdale,	Dibrell,	King,	Ray, G. W.
Beach,	Dorshheimer,	Lacey,	Ray, Ossian
Belford,	Ferrell,	Laird,	Reagan,
Bingham,	Finerty,	Lawrence,	Reed, T. B.
Blanchard,	Foran,	Le Fevre,	Reid, J. W.
Bland,	Fyan,	Long,	Rice,
Bowen,	Geddes,	Lovering,	Robinson, J. S.
Boyle,	George,	Lyman,	Robinson, W. H.
Brainerd,	Glascocok,	McAdoo,	Rockwell,
Bratton,	Green,	McMillin,	Rogers, W. F.
Brewer, F. B.	Hanback,	Miller, S. H.	Russell,
Brewer, J. H.	Hardy,	Milliken,	Seney,
Buckner,	Hemphill,	Morgan,	Shaw,
Budd,	Henderson, T. J.	Morrison,	Singleton,
Burleigh,	Henley,	Morse,	Skinner, C. R.
Campbell, Felix	Herbert,	Moulton,	Smith, A. Herr
Campbell, J. M.	Hewitt, A. S.	Muldrow,	Spooner,
Cassidy,	Hiscock,	Muller,	Spriggs,
Chalmers,	Hoblitzell,	Murray,	Steele,
Clardy,	Holton,	Nicholls,	Stephenson,
Collins,	Hooper,	Nutting,	Struble,
Converse,	Hort,	Oates,	Sumner, D. H.
Covington,	Hunt,	O'Neill, Charles	Taylor, E. B.
Cox, S. S.	Hurd,	O'Neill, J. J.	Throckmorton,

Tillman, Wakefield, Williams, Wood,
Tucker, White, J. D. Wilson, James York,
Turner, Oscar White, Milo Winans, John Young,
Wadsworth, Whiting, Wise, J. S.
Wait, Wilkins, Wolford.

So the motion was agreed to.
Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ADAMS, of Illinois, and Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, objected.

The Clerk read the names of members voting.
The following additional pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk:

Mr. JOHN S. WISE with Mr. TURNER, of Kentucky, on this vote.
Mr. TUCKER with Mr. LONG, on this vote.

Mr. HEMPHILL with Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. WINANS, of Wisconsin, with Mr. YORK, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. WHITE, of Minnesota, with Mr. DIBRELL, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. SUMNER, of California, with Mr. ROCKWELL, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. GLASCOCK with Mr. NELSON, for the remainder of the day.
Mr. CONVERSE with Mr. STORM, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. HISCOCK with Mr. DORSHEIMER, for the remainder of the day. The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which a call of the House has been ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HEPBURN moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I desire to ask how the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] voted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Indiana voted "ay."

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana (to Mr. SPRINGER). I voted "yea" on purpose, my friend.

The SPEAKER. The question is on laying the motion to reconsider on the table. [After a pause.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better have the yeas and nays on this.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken on laying the motion to reconsider on the table; and there were—yeas 138, nays 70, not voting 116; as follows:

YEAS—138.

Alexander,	Deuster,	Lanham,	Slocum,
Bagley,	Dockery,	Le Fevre,	Snyder,
Barbour,	Dowd,	Lewis,	Spriggs,
Bayne,	Dunn,	Lore,	Springer,
Belford,	Eaton,	Lowry,	Stevens,
Belmont,	Eldredge,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Charles
Bennett,	Ellis,	Maybury,	Stockslager,
Blackburn,	English,	Miller, J. F.	Storm,
Bland,	Ermentrout,	Mills,	Swope,
Boyle,	Ferrell,	Mitchell,	Talbot,
Breckinridge,	Fiedler,	Morgan,	Taylor, J. M.
Broadhead,	Findlay,	Murphy,	Thompson,
Browne, T. M.	Finerty,	Mutchler,	Townshend,
Buchanan,	Follett,	Neece,	Tully,
Budd,	Garrison,	Oates,	Turner, H. G.
Burnes,	Gibson,	O'Ferrall,	Van Alstyne,
Cabell,	Greenleaf,	O'Neill, J. J.	Vance,
Caldwell,	Halsell,	Patton,	Van Eaton,
Campbell, Felix	Hammond,	Peel,	Wallace,
Campbell, J. E.	Hancock,	Pettibone,	Ward,
Candler,	Hardeman,	Pierce,	Warner, A. J.
Carleton,	Hatch, W. H.	Post,	Warner, Richard
Clardy,	Henderson, T. J.	Potter,	Weller,
Clay,	Hewitt, G. W.	Pryor,	Wemple,
Clements,	Hill,	Pusey,	Wilkins,
Cobb,	Holman,	Randall,	Willis,
Connolly,	Hopkins,	Reese,	Wilson, W. L.
Cook,	Houseman,	Riggs,	Winans, E. B.
Cosgrove,	Hunt,	Rogers, J. H.	Wise, G. D.
Cox, S. S.	Hutchins,	Rogers, W. F.	Wolford,
Cox, W. R.	Jones, B. W.	Rosecrans,	Woodward,
Crisp,	Jones, J. H.	Seney,	Worthington,
Culbertson, D. B.	Jordan,	Seymour,	Yaple.
Davidson,	Kleiner,	Shively,	
Davis, L. H.	Lamb,	Skinner, T. G.	

NAYS—70.

Adams, G. E.	Ellwood,	Kean,	Rowell,
Anderson,	Evans,	Keifer,	Ryan,
Atkinson,	Everhart,	Lacey,	Skinner, C. R.
Barr,	Forney,	Libbey,	Smalls,
Bisbee,	Funston,	McCormas,	Smith, H. Y.
Boutelle,	Glascoek,	McCormick,	Spooner,
Breitung,	Goff,	Millard,	Stephenson,
Brown, W. W.	Harmer,	Morrill,	Stewart, J. W.
Brumm,	Hatch, H. H.	Nelson,	Strait,
Cannon,	Henderson, D. B.	Nutting,	Struble,
Craig,	Hepburn,	O'Neill, Charles	Taylor, J. D.
Culbertson, W. W.	Hitt,	Payne,	Thomas,
Cullen,	Holmes,	Payson,	Valentine,
Davis, G. R.	Horr,	Perkins,	Wadsworth,
Davis, R. T.	Houk,	Peters,	Washburn,
Dingley,	Howey,	Ranney,	Weaver.
Dixon,	Jeffords,	Ray, Ossian	
Dunham,	Johnson,	Reed, T. B.	

NOT VOTING—116.

Adams, J. J.	Foran,	Long,	Robinson, J. S.
Aiken,	Fyan,	Loving,	Robinson, W. E.
Arnot,	Geddes,	Lyman,	Rockwell,
Ballentine,	George,	McCoid,	Russell,
Barksdale,	Graves,	McMillin,	Shaw,
Beach,	Green,	Matson,	Singleton,
Bingham,	Guenther,	Miller, S. H.	Smith, A. Herr
Blanchard,	Hanback,	Milliken,	Steele,
Blount,	Hardy,	Money,	Stone,
Bowen,	Hart,	Morrison,	Sumner, C. A.
Brainerd,	Haynes,	Morse,	Sumner, D. H.
Bratton,	Hemphill,	Moulton,	Taylor, E. B.
Brewer, F. B.	Henley,	Muldrow,	Throckmorton,
Brewer, J. H.	Herbert,	Muller,	Tillman,
Buckner,	Hewitt, A. S.	Murray,	Tucker,
Burleigh,	Hiscock,	Nicholls,	Turner, Oscar
Campbell, J. M.	Hoblitzell,	Ochiltree,	Wait,
Cassidy,	Holton,	O'Hara,	Wakefield,
Chalmers,	Hooper,	Paige,	Wellborn,
Collins,	Hurd,	Parker,	White, J. D.
Converse,	James,	Phelps,	White, Milo
Covington,	Jones, J. K.	Poland,	Whiting,
Curtin,	Jones, J. T.	Price,	Williams,
Cutcheon,	Kelley,	Rankin,	Wilson, James
Dargan,	Kellogg,	Ray, G. W.	Winans, John
Dibble,	Ketcham,	Reagan,	Wise, J. S.
Dibrell,	King,	Reid, J. W.	Wood,
Dorsheimer,	Laird,	Rice,	York,
Elliott,	Lawrence,	Robertson,	Young.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the reading of the names.

Several members objected.
The following additional pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk:

Mr. JONES, of Alabama, with Mr. MILLIKEN, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE with Mr. TURNER, of Kentucky, on this vote.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 138 and the noes are 69. The yeas have it; the motion to reconsider is laid on the table; a call of the House is ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate further insisted upon its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 to the bill (H. R. 8135) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House, asked a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PLUMB, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. BECK as conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

A call of the House having been ordered, the Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following members failed to answer to their names:

Aiken,	Fyan,	King,	Rankin,
Ballentine,	Geddes,	Laird,	Reagan,
Barksdale,	Glascoek,	Lawrence,	Rice,
Beach,	Hardy,	Loving,	Robinson, J. S.
Bingham,	Haynes,	Lyman,	Robinson, W. E.
Bowen,	Hemphill,	McCoid,	Shaw,
Campbell, J. M.	Henley,	Miller, S. H.	Singleton,
Chalmers,	Herbert,	Milliken,	Steele,
Collins,	Hewitt, A. S.	Morrison,	Sumner, D. H.
Converse,	Hoblitzell,	Moulton,	Taylor, E. B.
Covington,	Holton,	Murray,	Throckmorton,
Curtin,	Hooper,	Nicholls,	Tillman,
Cutcheon,	Jones, J. K.	Paige,	Wait,
Dargan,	Jones, J. T.	Peters,	Williams,
Dibble,	Kelley,	Poland,	Winans, John
Dibrell,	Kellogg,	Price,	Young.

The SPEAKER. Before the names of the absentees are called, the Chair desires to lay before the House some requests of members to be excused from attendance on account of sickness.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted in the following cases:

To Mr. DIBRELL, for the remainder of this day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. CUTCHEON, for the remainder of the day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. GLASCOCK, for the remainder of the day, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. STEELE, for the remainder of the day, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BALLENTINE, for the remainder of the day, on account of sickness.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence for the remainder of the day because I am suffering from a cold, accompanied with neuralgia.

There being no objection, Mr. HAMMOND was excused.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that my colleague, Mr. PETERS, be excused from attendance this evening. He has been here, but is now absent upon duty as a member of the Committee on Enrolled Bills, having gone to the Executive Mansion.

There being no objection, Mr. PETERS was excused.
Mr. PARKER. I ask leave of absence for the gentleman from Con-

necticut, Mr. WAIT, who desired to be excused as he was not feeling well this evening.

There being no objection, Mr. WAIT was excused.

Mr. JORDAN. I ask that my colleague, Mr. GEDDES, be excused from attendance this evening. He has gone home sick.

There being no objection, Mr. GEDDES was excused.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I ask leave of absence for my colleague [Mr. CURTIN] on account of indisposition.

There being no objection, Mr. CURTIN was excused.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I ask that my colleague, Mr. HERBERT, be excused from attendance this evening on account of sickness in his family.

There being no objection, Mr. HERBERT was excused.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I ask also that my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS, be excused from attendance on account of sickness.

There being no objection, Mr. WILLIAMS was excused.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I ask that my colleague, Judge KELLEY, be excused from attendance this evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has leave of absence from all evening sessions.

Mr. MILLS. I ask that my colleague, Mr. THROCKMORTON, be excused on account of sickness.

There being no objection, Mr. THROCKMORTON was excused.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask that all members be excused until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the names of the absentees, after which the doors will be closed.

Mr. RAY, of New Hampshire. I am requested to ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. LAWRENCE, be excused from attendance this evening on account of sickness.

Mr. HEPBURN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the gentleman from New Hampshire moves that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be excused on account of sickness.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 96, noes 13.

Several MEMBERS. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not necessary upon this question.

Mr. HEPBURN and others called for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. RAY, of New Hampshire, and Mr. HEPBURN were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 12.

Mr. HEPBURN. On this question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 54 voting in favor thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced agreement to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 8179) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes.

It further announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 1 and 29 to the bill (H. R. 8179) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes.

IOWA CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion to excuse the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LAWRENCE], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 203, nays 10, not voting 111; as follows:

YEAS—203.

Adams, G. E.
Adams, J. J.
Alexander,
Anderson,
Arnot,
Atkinson,
Bagley,
Barbour,
Bayne,
Belmont,
Bennett,
Blanchard,
Bland,
Blount,
Boutelle,
Boyle,
Brainerd,
Breckinridge,
Breitung,
Brewer, F. B.
Brewer, J. H.
Broadhead,
Brown, W. W.
Buchanan,
Budd,
Burleigh,
Burnes,
Cabell,
Campbell, Felix
Campbell, J. E.
Candler,
Cannon,
Carleton,
Cassidy,
Clay,
Clements,
Cobb,
Collins,
Connolly,
Cook,
Cosgrove,
Cox, S. S.
Craig,
Crisp,
Culbertson, W. W.
Cullen,
Davidson,
Davis, L. H.
Davis, R. T.
Deuster,
Dixon,
Dockery,
Dorshemer,
Dowd,
Dunham,
Dunn,
Elliott,
Ellwood,
English,
Ermentrout,
Evans,
Everhart,
Farrall,
Forney,
Funston,
Garrison,
Goff,
Graves,
Green,
Greenleaf,
Guenther,
Halsell,
Hanback,
Hardeman,
Harmer,
Hart,
Hatch, H. H.
Hatch, W. H.
Haynes,
Henderson, D. B.
Henderson, T. J.
Hepburn,
Hewitt, G. W.
Hiscock,
Hitt,
Holman,
Holmes,
Hopkins,
Houk,
Houseman,
Howe,
James,
Jeffords,
Johnson,
Jones, B. W.
Jones, J. H.
Jones, J. K.
Kean,
Kellogg,
Kleiner,
Lanham,
Libbey,
Lore,
Lowry,
McAdoo,
McComas,
McCormick,
McMillin,
Matson,
Millard,
Miller, J. F.
Mills,
Mitchell,
Money,
Muldrow,
Muller,
Murphy,
Mutchler,
Necce,
Nelson,
Nutting,
Ochiltree,
O'Hara,
O'Neill, Charles
O'Neill, J. J.
Paige,
Parker,
Patton,
Payne,
Payson,
Peel,
Pettibone,

Phelps,
Post,
Potter,
Pryor,
Pusey,
Randall,
Ranney,
Ray, G. W.
Reed, T. B.
Reid, J. W.
Reese,
Riggs,
Robertson,
Rockwell,
Rogers, J. H.
Rogers, W. F.
Roscreans,
Rowell,
Russell,
Seney,
Seymour,
Shively,
Skinner, C. R.
Slocum, T. G.
Slocum,
Smalls,
Smith, A. Herr
Smith, H. Y.
Snyder,
Spooner,
Spriggs,
Springer,
Stephenson,
Stevens,
Stewart, Charles

NAYS—10.

Barr,
Bisbee,
Caldwell,
Clardy,
Hill,
Cox, W. R.
Follett,
Horr,
Pierce,

NOT VOTING—111.

Aiken,
Ballentine,
Barksdale,
Beach,
Belford,
Bingham,
Blackburn,
Bowen,
Bratton,
Browne, T. M.
Brumm,
Buckner,
Campbell, J. M.
Chalmers,
Converse,
Covington,
Culbertson, D. B.
Curtin,
Cutcheon,
Dargan,
Davis, G. R.
Dibble,
Dibrell,
Dingley,
Eaton,
Eldredge,
Ellis,
Fiedler,
Findlay,
Finerty,
Foran,
Fyan,
Geddes,
George,
Gibson,
Glascock,
Hammond,
Hancock,
Hardy,
Hemphill,
Henley,
Herbert,
Hewitt, A. S.
Hoblitzell,
Holton,
Hooper,
Hunt,
Hurd,
Hutchins,
Jones, J. T.
Jordan,
Keifer,
Kelley,
Ketcham,
King,
Lacey,
Laird,
Lamb,
Lawrence,
Le Fevre,
Lewis,
Long,
Lovering,
Lyman,
McCoid,
Maybury,
Miller, S. H.
Milliken,
Morgan,
Morrill,
Morrison,
Morse,
Moulton,
Murray,
Nichols,
Oates,
O'Ferrall,
Perkins,
Peters,
Poland,
Rankin,
Reagan,
Rice,
Robinson, J. S.

Vance,
Van Eaton,
Wallace,
Warner, A. J.
Warner, Richard
Washburn,
Weaver,
Wellborn,
White, J. D.
Whiting,
Willis,
Wilson, W. L.
Winans, E. B.
Wise, G. D.
Wood,
Woodward,
Yaple.

Price.

Robinson, W. E.
Ryan,
Shaw,
Singleton,
Steele,
Storm,
Sumner, D. H.
Taylor, E. B.
Throckmorton,
Tillman,
Tucker,
Wadsworth,
Wait,
Wakefield,
Ward,
Weller,
Wemple,
White, Milo
Wilkins,
Williams,
Wilson, James
Winans, John
Wise, J. S.
Wolford,
Worthington,
York,
Young.

So the motion that Mr. LAWRENCE be excused was agreed to.

During the roll-call,

The following additional pairs were announced.

Mr. WARD with Mr. LAWRENCE, for the rest of the day.

Mr. HARDEMAN with Mr. JOHNSON, for the rest of the day.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. VALENTINE moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. I ask now, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague, Mr. POLAND, be excused.

The SPEAKER. The noes seem to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 24.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to make a suggestion to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RANDALL. The report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 8179) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, has come over from the Senate, and if proceedings are dispensed with under the call of the House that report can be taken from the Speaker's table and acted upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can not that be done by unanimous consent, the present business before the House standing just as it is?

The SPEAKER. If further proceedings under the call are dispensed with the pending motion can be resumed. These proceedings grow out of the fact of no quorum having voted on the motion before the House.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask by unanimous consent to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I object.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a privileged question. I submit the report of the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and also the statement, under the rules, of the conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry; is this privileged over the pending motion?

The SPEAKER. It is. The Chair will state that a conference report has priority over everything except the reading of the Journal, the call of the roll, or a division of the House.

Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky. I rise to a question of order. I desire to know whether this bill is not subject to debate under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. It is subject to debate under the hour rule, unless the previous question is ordered on the report. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8179) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 38, 42, 43, 44, 47, 63, 64, 65, 66, 75, 79, 81, 82, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 102, 106, 107, 108, 113, 114, 121, 122, 125, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 173, and 174.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 40, 41, 45, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 80, 83, 81, 85, 86, 87, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 132, 136, 150, 151, 153, 155, 157, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, and 171, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$62,418.19;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "twenty-seven;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted insert the following: "One fireman, \$1,080;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$147,901.80;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, in line 5, after the word "labor," insert the words "including \$5,000 for rent of Senate committee-rooms;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$330,849.10;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,161.65;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted insert the following: "For postage-stamps for the officers of the House of Representatives: for the Sergeant-at-Arms, \$50; the Clerk, \$50; the Doorkeeper, \$50; and the Postmaster, \$100; in all, \$250;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted insert "\$1,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$130,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the number proposed to be stricken out by said amendment, and on page 31 in line 11 of the bill, after the word "each," insert "six assorters of money-orders at \$840 each;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$506,030;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 69, on line 42 of the bill, after the word "four," insert the following: "One of whom shall be employed on the general index;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,700;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 124, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$18,120;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "That a committee consisting of five members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Forty-eighth Congress, shall prior to the first Monday of December next inquire into and investigate the expenditures of appropriations for Indians under treaty for their support, for their education, or otherwise, and whether any changes should be made in such appropriations or their expenditure. Said committee shall also inquire into the expenditure of public money for the Yellowstone Park and the administration of the laws applicable to said park, whether any change should be made in said laws or the boundary of the park, and what steps, if any, can be taken to make of practical benefit and utility that portion of the public domain. That said committee shall have power to appoint subcommittees to visit the places where appropriations mentioned

herein are expended, and in doing so they are authorized to use Government conveyances and means of transportation. Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to send for persons and papers and to appoint a clerk, and the committee may report by bill or otherwise to the Forty-ninth Congress. A sum sufficient to pay the expenses of said committee hereby authorized, and all witnesses that may be summoned before it, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which shall be immediately available and payable on the draft of the chairman of said committee in sums not exceeding \$1,000 at any one time;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted insert "one skilled laborer, \$540;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$45,420;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all that follows the word "dollars," on page 85, in line 20 of the bill, down to and including line 22, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "And the Secretary of the Interior shall, in submitting the estimates annually for the expenses of this bureau, give in detail the number and salaries of officers and employés therein;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$72,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 92 of the bill, in line 2, after the word "dollars," where it first occurs, insert the following: "One female messenger, \$840;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$31,900;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert "six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$118,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 95 of the bill, after line 10, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"For the following, for the additional buildings for the money-order and Sixth Auditor's offices, namely: For heating apparatus and fuel, \$1,300; gas, \$400; furniture for the money-order office, \$500; miscellaneous items, \$300; four watchmen, three laborers, and three charwomen, at \$180 each; in all, \$8,100."

And the Senate agree to the same.

On the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 29 the committee of conference are unable to agree.

WM. S. HOLMAN,
JOHN HANCOCK,
J. G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. B. ALLISON,
H. L. DAWES,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the conferees on the part of the House accompanying the report was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 8179, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1886, submit the following, in explanation of the accompanying conference report:

The conference committee have agreed upon all of the one hundred and seventy-four Senate amendments except those numbered 1 and 29, which involve the appropriation of \$39,432 for clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees.

The bill as it is agreed upon, and including the amount involved in said amendments 1 and 29, appropriates in all \$21,390,298.70, being \$153,488 more than as it passed the House, \$50,671.93 less than as it passed the Senate, \$2,843.15 less than the law for the current year, and \$976,201.35 less than the estimates which were submitted.

WM. S. HOLMAN,
JOHN HANCOCK,
J. G. CANNON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit only a few facts in regard to the substance of that report and to call the attention of the House to the one proposition which is still in difference between the two Houses. It will be a very brief statement that I shall make.

There were one hundred and seventy-four amendments made to this bill by the Senate, adding \$153,480 to the amount. The bill as it would be amended by the report of the conference committee appropriates \$80,671.93 less than the amount added to the bill by the Senate. The bill as amended would appropriate a trifle less than the law of the present year—\$4,843.15.

The amendment of the Senate which is the subject of disagreement is amendment numbered 29. I ask that that amendment may be reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at \$6 per day, \$39,432.

Mr. HOLMAN. The amendment numbered 1 is simply a matter of footing. If this amendment should be either adopted or rejected it changes the footing; so that amendment numbered 1 is a mere matter of form. But the amendment which has now been read, that numbered 29, involving \$39,432 for clerks of Senators, gives the subject-

matter of dispute. It is upon that that the committee have not been able to agree.

There are two matters to which I wish to call the attention of the House before asking a vote upon the proposition I have just referred to. The first is as to the act of the Senate touching the employés of the House; and I feel the more in duty bound to call attention to this particular amendment from the fact that it concerns the House Committee on Appropriations. The Senate of its own motion increased the salary of the clerk of the Senate Committee on Appropriations from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and also the salary of the chief clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

These two amendments, one affecting the House and the other the Senate, are Senate amendments and have both been concurred in by the conferees. I shall not suppose the House will deem it important to inquire how this conclusion was arrived at. As I have stated this report concurs in these two amendments of the Senate, the one affecting their own body and the other affecting the House. So much for that. I was the more desirous of calling the attention of the House to it because it is a matter affecting the Committee on Appropriations.

There is another amendment to which I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment. It is amendment numbered 135. I ask that it may be reported to the House, being a change in the provision as it passed the House by the act of the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 135: Strike out all after line 11, on page 79, down to and including line 9, on page 80, and insert the following:

"That a committee consisting of five members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Forty-ninth Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Forty-eighth Congress, shall, prior to the first Monday of December next, inquire into and investigate the expenditure of appropriations for Indians under treaty for their support, for their education, or otherwise, and whether any changes should be made in such appropriations or their expenditure. Said committee shall also inquire into the expenditure of public money for the Yellowstone Park, and the administration of the laws applicable to said park, whether any change should be made in said laws or the boundary of the park, and what steps, if any, can be taken to make of practical benefit and utility that portion of the public domain. That said committee shall have power to appoint subcommittees and visit the places where appropriations mentioned herein are expended, and in doing so they are authorized to use Government conveyances and means of transportation. Said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to send for persons and papers and to appoint a clerk, and the committee may report by bill or otherwise to the Forty-ninth Congress. A sum sufficient to pay the expenses of said committee hereby authorized, and of witnesses that may be summoned before it, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which shall be immediately available and payable on the draft of the chairman of said committee in sums not exceeding \$1,000 at any one time."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] whether this amendment was put in the bill by the Senate or by the conference committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. The original proposition was put in the bill by the House.

Mr. MILLS. Was it not stricken out in the House on the point of order?

Mr. HOLMAN. No. It went to the Senate; the Senate struck it out, and then the conferees restored it with some change in the phraseology.

Mr. MILLS. It ought to be stricken out.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one additional fact I wish to mention, and it is a subject to which I wish to call the attention of the Post-Office Committee. The conferees have restored the office of superintendent of foreign mails, and have provided for the same body of employés in that branch of the postal service with the same salaries as in the existing law.

I believe that those are all the changes which have been made in the bill since it left the House, and I now call the previous question—

Mr. CANNON. I ask my colleague on the committee from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much time does my friend from Illinois wish?

Mr. CANNON. Very little.

Mr. HOLMAN. Five minutes?

Mr. CANNON. I think that will be enough.

Mr. HOLMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the committee [Mr. HOLMAN] has called attention to an amendment made by the Senate increasing the salary of the clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate \$500, and also increasing the salary of the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations \$500. The House conferees concurred in both those amendments, and I wish to state very frankly that I, as one of the conferees, not only concurred in the amendments but did so heartily, because I believe they are right. I am not so familiar with the clerk of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (although quite familiar with his work) as I am with the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Most members of the House are familiar with him and his work, and I say to the House that, from the fact of these appropriation bills involving an examination of the whole civil service of the Government from beginning to end, and requiring a technical and correct knowledge of the whole of that service, it must be apparent to every member that the duties of the clerks of these committees are very onerous. Especially

is this true under the peculiar rules of the House, by which, to a great degree, appropriation bills are made to carry through the chief part of the legislation that each and almost every member of the House desires carried through. I do not propose to discuss that matter now, except to say that I hope that in the future our rules may be so amended that the committees of this House can have measures which they recommend considered under the rules. As I was saying, gentlemen can readily see that the clerks of these two great appropriations committees require to have a close and technical knowledge of the matters covered by these bills, and that such knowledge on their part can be and is of immense advantage in the preparation of the appropriation bills. I think the two clerks in question have that knowledge. More than that, when it is considered that the appropriations made by these bills aggregate over a hundred million dollars every year and that they are massed together at the close of the session of Congress, gentlemen can see at once that these officers require not merely knowledge but rapidity and integrity. I think that these qualities are to be found in these two clerks, and while I have no doubt that there are many other gentlemen throughout the country who could be educated to do this work I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe there are two others in the United States who without that education and training would be one-half as competent as these gentlemen are, and I believe that \$3,000 is a small salary rather than a large one to pay them. Therefore I, for one, heartily concur in the amendment of the Senate increasing their salaries.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. How many clerks does the increase apply to in each committee?

Mr. CANNON. One.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my special purpose in calling attention to this action of the Senate in increasing the salaries of these two clerks was to bring to the notice of the House the fact that the Senate, while resisting any interference by the House with Senate employés or their salaries, thought proper to increase the salary of an employé of the House. That was the point to which I wished especially to call the attention of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the first question is upon the adoption of this report.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I call the previous question on adopting the report.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the report was adopted.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now move that the House further insist on its disagreement as to the twenty-ninth amendment of the Senate, and ask a further conference.

Mr. CANNON. Pending that motion, I move that the House recede.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede takes precedence.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to occupy the floor a minute or two on this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the twenty-ninth amendment of the Senate and ask a further conference. Pending that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same.

Mr. HOLMAN. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. CANNON. I believe I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules the question is first upon the motion to recede.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly; but I had a right to insist on the previous question upon my motion. I was only giving way so that the gentleman's motion might come before the House before the previous question had been called.

The SPEAKER. Still the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is of higher privilege than that of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HOLMAN. But the gentleman could not take me off the floor.

The SPEAKER. There must be an opportunity under the rules to make this motion of higher privilege.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then I will call the previous question after the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is as follows:

For clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, at \$6 per day during the session, \$39,432.

The amendment provides for thirty-one Senators' clerks, at \$180 a month in round numbers, for a session of seven months. I have moved that the House recede from its disagreement and agree to this amendment, and I will state very briefly why.

Prior to the last session of this Congress the Senate by resolution provided these clerks for Senators who were not chairmen of committees, and provided for their pay from the contingent fund of the Senate; and we had to concur in increasing the contingent fund. At the last session

the Senate, when it came to consider the legislative appropriation bill for the current year, placed upon that bill an amendment substantially the same as this.

The matter was fought at great length, there having been conference after conference between the two Houses, the Senate insisting that it had the right to regulate its own affairs so far as the conduct of the business of the Senate was concerned. Let that be as it may, it is certainly the fact that on a fair, square vote, upon a motion to recede, just such a motion as I now make, this House did recede; and there was put in the bill for the current year an appropriation similar to this.

This year when this bill was considered in the House we omitted this appropriation. The Senate put this amendment upon the bill; it came back to the House; we non-concurred, and the question went to a conference.

Now, I would be very willing, ordinarily, to have another conference upon this question—a third and a fourth, for that matter, though I do not know exactly what good it would do unless to call the attention of the country to this subject. Ordinarily, I say, I would be willing for further conference, but when I recollect that to-morrow is the last legislative day of this Congress, I realize there is not much time for that kind of thing; so I think I am authorized to say that in the end the House will do just what we did last session, and what I propose to do now.

One word upon the merits of this amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] offered to-day a resolution that this House should not participate in the inaugural ceremonies because he thought members of the House had been given a back seat. Well, to be frank about it, I did think that the Senate had not treated the outgoing and the incoming members of this House with any very great courtesy; yet I did not mind that much, because the matter was all "dress parade." Neither the House nor the Senate is required under the Constitution or the laws to be present at those ceremonies. Feeling, therefore, that the matter was not of much importance, I contented myself with not voting at all. But here is a proposition to which in substance the House has already assented. This appropriation has run for two years.

This is the second year that this amendment has come to us upon this bill, to give to Senators who are not chairmen of committees clerks at \$180 a month. I have thought that if Senators had these clerks the members of the House ought to have the same assistance for themselves. We are a co-ordinate branch of the Government, representing the people, coming near to them—coming more directly in contact with them day by day, week by week, and year by year, with our elections every other year, than the Senators do. We hold positions of equal dignity, positions which, in the years immediately succeeding the adoption of the Constitution, were considered if anything of superior dignity, men of great ability preferring to come here rather than go to the Senate.

I have thought, I say, the House ought to take the same things conceded to the Senate by the House. What prevents them from doing it? I think members of the House are afraid—that they have not the courage to do it.

A MEMBER. Try us.

Mr. CANNON. Everybody understands, of course, they are willing to do it; but they have not done it.

I must confess two years ago when the Senate passed the resolution in reference to these clerks I thought it might attract some attention in the country; that they might be blamed for so doing; but strange to say I do not suppose there are 1,000 people in the United States outside of the District of Columbia who know Senators have these clerks. If they do, I apprehend most of them approve of it, for I have not seen any condemnation in the public prints, nor have I heard a single word of denunciation hurled against them from the stump.

A MEMBER. Most of them think it is right.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says most of them think it is right. I did not move an amendment for members of the House because of my remembrance of the fate of a precisely similar motion, and because I was satisfied there was no use in doing so. I venture, however, to say and to hope that at the next session of Congress, early in the session, one of two things will be done, namely, either that this appropriation under the law as it is now provided shall be refused to Senators to pay for personal clerks, or the House shall insist it shall be regulated by law and their salaries somewhat decreased, and the members of this House, a co-ordinate of the National Legislature, shall demand for themselves that while they assume the responsibility of granting this to the co-ordinate branch of the Legislature they shall assume for themselves the same right. [Applause.]

Mr. BELFORD. Is it not a fact that I introduced a resolution giving to each member a clerk, and is it not a further fact that you voted against it?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect how I voted; I do not think the yeas and nays were taken or any record of that vote. I recollect, however, that the gentleman did offer that resolution. I think I do. He has offered a great many resolutions and has made a great many demands, as I remember pleasantly, to empty, as he says, the Treasury of the United States. Now, I do not care about emptying the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BELFORD. You will remember about emptying the Treasury before you are two years older.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield for five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, at the organization of our Government the House of Representatives was considered to be the important branch of the National Legislature. The Senate was adopted as a body that represented the States, and this House was the great, important representative body of the American people. But the bicameral system was adopted when we had two Houses. Nobody dreamed for years that the House of Representatives was not equal in power, equal in importance, equal in dignity, equal in prerogative, equal in privilege, equal in deed and in fact in all respects with the House at the other end of the Capitol. But, sir, within a few years that House has encroached upon the rights of this House, little by little, as abuses always grow and arbitrary power always gains upon the right, until to-day they boldly avow superior prerogative and privilege, and we bow down on our knees and grant it unto them.

The gentleman talks about the rights of the House after having voted with the vast majority of this House to take in one of the most important transactions of the people of the United States a secondary position, not by the side of the Senate of the United States where our fathers placed this body. They have placed the diplomatic corps, blazoning with the tinsel of foreign decorations, on the right, where this House of Representatives ought to be. Instead of occupying our rightful position we have been located to the rear. Heads of Departments were placed next in importance to the diplomatic corps, and behind them came the Army, with the clanking of sabers, while far to the rear were located the representatives of the American people. And the gentleman from Illinois voted that the representatives of the people by being so placed were rightfully located.

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me—

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], your colleague, voted with you, although he first voted through the tellers and voted on the Representatives' side of the question. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CANNON. If my friend will allow me—

Mr. MILLS. I will.

Mr. CANNON. I was not present when that vote was taken, and therefore did not vote at all.

Mr. MILLS. I take it all back then. I thought you did. [Laughter.] There are so many here who did as I have accused my friend from Indiana of doing that I must be pardoned for my mistake in his case. One hundred and twenty-six went through the tellers and voted to maintain the dignity and the rights of the House of Representatives, but when the yeas and nays came to be taken that vote dwindled down to 55 for and 185 against. [Laughter and applause.] I came to this House twelve years ago, and by the grace of God two years after I came here the Democratic party came into power in this House and at once commenced to cut down the salaries of officers. It commenced to reduce the expenditures of the Government. We began upon the line of economy, but at the other end of the Capitol that body which represents nothing, is responsible to nobody, refused to accede to the reductions we then made, but on the contrary established a distinction between their officials and the employés of this House by insisting that their employés should receive higher pay than ours. The House then agreed to it and still continues to agree to it. Two years ago they came in with a provision to allow each Senator to have a clerk at \$6 a day or \$180 a month. How did this House of Representatives, representing the horny-handed Democracy of the country, behave? We said we would not agree to give them these clerks, but the Senate insisted and we kneeled down in submission and gave it to them out of the public Treasury of the United States. They claimed it as their right and they have ever since received it. To-day they propose to put you away to the rear during the ceremonies of inaugurating the Chief Magistrate of the country, and yet one hundred and eighty-five representatives of the people of the United States said that was the proper position for us to occupy. It is against all this I enter my solemn protest.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield now for five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. I am also permitted to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. My amendment is in the form of a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out amendment numbered 29 and insert "for clerks to Senators and Representatives who are not chairmen of committees, at the rate of \$100 per month during the session, \$200,300."

Mr. HOLMAN. Is that amendment germane?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so. It is offered as a substitute for the Senate amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. It is to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. But it is subject to the point of order as any other

question coming before the House, that is to say, it involves an expenditure of money, and is subject to consideration in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the point of order, and will be glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio upon it.

The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that under the rules of the House the proposed amendment must have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union because it proposes to increase expenditures.

Mr. KEIFER. I would like to be heard on that.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make the further point of order that it changes existing law and does not retrench expenditures.

Mr. KEIFER. That has nothing to do with it now, for we are considering the proposition of the Senate, which is subject to amendment in the House.

I submit the other point is made too late for the purpose of having this amendment of the Senate go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and for the reason that we have entered upon the consideration of it in the House. It has been debated and we are proceeding with its consideration in the House; and, therefore, it is too late now to make the point of order as against that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is not made against the Senate amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. But my amendment comes in in consequence of the fact that we are considering the Senate amendment in the House against which no point of order was made. Having this Senate amendment before us in the House by failing to make the point of order against it, we are considering it in the House subject to be amended in such way as our rules prescribe; and when an amendment to a Senate amendment is offered it is too late then, of course, to make the point of order that the Senate amendment must go to the Committee of the Whole.

Under Rule XX Senate amendments which would be liable to the point of order if originating in the House may be sent to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the point of order, but it must be the original proposition as it came from the Senate.

I am not able to give exactly the language of Rule XX; but that rule, the language of it, applies to the Senate amendment, and the point of order was not made against the Senate amendment. I submit, then, that it is proper under our rules to offer to a Senate amendment another amendment which is proper to be offered or which is germane to the subject-matter of such an amendment when acting on it in the House as we are here.

The SPEAKER. The question was presented at the last session of Congress and the Chair made a ruling upon it then, but has never been entirely satisfied that it was altogether correct. The Chair will cause the Journal entry to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The House then proceeded as the regular order of business (as a privileged question) to the consideration of the bill of the House (H. R. 5459) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885, and for other purposes, and amendments of the Senate thereto, pending when the House took a recess on yesterday; the pending question being on the following amendment of the Senate, namely: "Page 74, after line 27, insert: 'For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines, one hundred and eighty-five.'" Pending which Mr. HORN moved that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment, and agree to the same with the following amendment:

"Strike out the words 'one hundred and eighty-five' and insert in lieu thereof 'two hundred and fifty.'"

Pending which Mr. HOLMAN made the point of order that the said amendment under clause 3 of Rule XXI was not in order, for the reason that said appropriation was for a purpose not authorized or specified by law or for work already in progress.

The Speaker overruled the said point of order on the ground that the proposition to which the amendment was offered was properly before the House and was amendable, without regard to the rule applicable to an original amendment proposed in the House.

The SPEAKER. It will be observed that the question presented in that case was on an amendment which proposed simply to increase the amount appropriated by the Senate amendment for the same purpose provided for in the Senate amendment. The gentleman from Ohio now submits a proposition which is to make an appropriation for a different purpose from that provided for in the Senate amendment.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But it is a legitimate amendment to the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. It is germane. But that is not the question. The question is whether it is competent under the rule of the House, which the Chair will cause to be read, to propose an amendment in the House to a Senate amendment which provides for an appropriation for a different purpose from that provided for by the Senate amendment unless it shall have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED, of Maine. I would like after the rule is read to be permitted to say something on this point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will then hear the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I suggest to the Chair that this comes within clause 3 of Rule XXI. It changes existing law.

Mr. KEIFER. That has nothing to do with it now.

The Clerk read clause 3 of Rule XXIII, as follows:

3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriation to be made, or author-

ing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Let me suggest to the Chair that the gist of that rule, so far as it applies to the present question, is to be found in the last two lines:

And a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

This evidently refers to a bill which is before the House; and any proposition in such a bill subject to the points of order would carry the bill with it.

We found before the adoption of the twentieth rule that when the Senate made such an amendment it did not become subject to the point of order. We therefore made a further amendment in Rule XX, which declared that any proposition originating in the Senate in the form of an amendment to a House bill should go to the Committee of the Whole upon a point of order, provided it would have been subject to that point had it first come up in the House. Now, then, the House had the option of sending this matter to the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Not this matter, because this comes up now on a conference report.

Mr. KEIFER. I suggest to the Chair that this is not on a conference report. It is an amendment disagreed to by the House and on which the conferees have not agreed.

The SPEAKER. It comes before the House by reason of the presentation of a conference report; otherwise it would not be before the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But the point of order was never made and that amendment was never sent to the Committee of the Whole.

Now, it must be certainly in order for the House to amend the proposition of the Senate. We can not be cut off from a due consideration and amendment of a proposition originating in the Senate by a rule which refers only to the consideration of a bill of the House originating in the House.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman from Maine allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. REED, of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask him whether the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] does not change existing law?

Mr. KEIFER. That does not affect it.

Mr. REED, of Maine. That does not affect it in any way. That is in another section of another rule.

Mr. RANDALL. That is the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. REED, of Maine. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to is the third clause of Rule XXI. We are talking now about the third clause of Rule XXIII. That clause refers to a bill originating in the House and can not be made to apply to an amendment which originates in the Senate. That would clog the free action of the House which ought to have the power to amend any proposition of the Senate before agreeing to it. And the proposition as to the free right of the House to agree to an amendment of the Senate with an amendment, I submit to the Chair, becomes much stronger at this last stage than ever before; and unless there be some positive rule requiring it we should not be hampered by the suggestion that we should go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEIFER. Will the Chair allow me to make a suggestion which I think has not yet been made? This clause of the bill has been considered in the House, and the point of order was not made against it that it had first to be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; and it is probable it could never be made against it after we had passed upon it once in the House. When these amendments came up first after the return of the bill from the Senate, this amendment, like all other Senate amendments to this bill, was considered in the House and was disagreed to. Then was the time, I maintain, if ever, for the point to be made that the amendment should have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so, too, but this proposition was not then before the House at all. This proposition now comes before the House for the first time.

Mr. KEIFER. Then if the original Senate amendment, to which my motion relates, could not be sent to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union either under Rule XX or under paragraph 3 of the rule which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] has just read, it would be impossible to consider it anywhere else. My proposition is one that must go with the Senate amendment, and can not be considered anywhere else. If it is germane to that amendment (and that is conceded), then it can only be considered because we are considering the Senate amendment, and under our rule we may concur in a Senate amendment with an amendment.

My proposition could not be sent to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union unless the original Senate amendment could be sent there. I agree that if we were considering Senate amendments on a bill when they first come here, and we reached one of this character, any gentleman might make the point of order that that amendment must go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union

and the Chair would hold, as it has held, and as it did hold on the Mexican war pension bill, that certain amendments should go for consideration to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; but we have passed that stage with this Senate amendment and are now in the House considering it, and while it is true that we are considering it because a conference report is brought in here, that report does not include this at all, but simply disagrees to it and leaves the House to consider whether or not it will agree to the amendment or concur in the disagreement of the conferees. My amendment is here because the original proposition is here, and that is all there is of it.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word as to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. It is not denied that the proposition which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] has introduced changes existing law. I maintain that, this being a general appropriation bill, the gentleman's proposition is subject to the point of order provided for in the twenty-first rule, whether in Committee of the Whole or in the House. And further, I submit, to strengthen that position, that this is an original proposition, upon which that rule could not be made to operate at all except when it is introduced and known to the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Then why did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] cause to be enacted Rule XX? Because if his argument amounts to anything it must cover amendments that came from the Senate.

Mr. RANDALL. That rule relates to a case where the Senate provides for an object different from that contained in the bill as it passed from the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am surprised to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] contend that the third section of Rule XXI has anything to do with this matter.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is, in my judgment, a valid point of order and ought to be ruled upon.

The SPEAKER. The question of order is made against this amendment upon two grounds: first, that being an original proposition here in the House to appropriate a certain sum of money for a certain purpose, it must have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; and secondly, that it changes existing law and does not retrench expenditures. The Chair has caused to be read a decision made at the last session, in which it was held that a proposition made upon the floor of the House, when a Senate amendment was under consideration, to increase the amount proposed to be appropriated by the Senate for the same purpose for which the appropriation was proposed by the Senate need not necessarily have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; but this, as the Chair has remarked before, is a different proposition from that.

This amendment proposes not simply to increase—not at all to increase, so far as the Chair sees—the amount which the Senate proposes to appropriate as compensation for its own clerks, but to add the clerks of the House, and thereby make an appropriation of something over \$200,000 for another purpose than that provided for in the Senate amendment. Now the rule of the House is that every proposition involving a tax or charge upon the people, all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Of a bill?

The SPEAKER. Of a bill.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Has actually commenced?

The SPEAKER. But the rule includes all propositions or proceedings touching the appropriation of money. Of course the amount involved does not affect the principle or the construction of the rule, but the Chair may be permitted to allude to that for the purpose of illustrating the importance of the rule. If it is in order to add to a Senate amendment, for a different purpose than that to which the amendment relates, the sum of \$100, without first considering the proposition in Committee of the Whole, it is equally in order to add \$10,000,000, and if the Chair were to hold that such an amendment as that could be considered in the House without having its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole, clearly the spirit of the rule would be violated. The Chair thinks that, this being an original proposition in the House and for a purpose not provided for in the Senate amendment, it must have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Upon the other question, the Chair held during the last session that when a Senate amendment providing for an appropriation not authorized by existing law came to the House, it was in order for the House to amend it by adding other appropriations relevant to it, although not authorized by existing law, because otherwise the House would have no power to amend a Senate amendment which proposed to appropriate money for purposes not previously authorized by law. But upon the first ground the Chair thinks this amendment is not in order.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Is it in order to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers to hear gentlemen on that question.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Does the Chair decide it not in order because it must first be considered in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. Not in order to be offered in the House and considered in the House. If the Chair entertains it as pending in the House he supposes he must put the question upon it.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But the Chair will see that his ruling requires foresight on the part of members as to what amendments are going to be offered; and the amendment of the Senate must be sent to the Committee of the Whole upon the strength of amendments which it is proposed subsequently to offer. The Chair can not desire to come to that conclusion. This rule must be construed all together; and the concluding language is:

And a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has been commenced.

Now we have commenced the consideration; and I submit that the point of order is not good under the rule. True, the first clauses of the rule are general—

All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people, &c., shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole.

But that is limited by the subsequent language of the rule:

And a point of order made under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

If it is good before that time the implication of the rule must be that it is not good after that time; and we have entered upon the consideration of this matter.

The Chair will see at once by the condition to which his construction would reduce the House that such can not possibly be the intention of the rule, for the Chair has to rule out this amendment as not being in order because offered in the House.

The SPEAKER. Certainly, because, as the Chair has already said, if the point of order had been made against the Senate amendment when it was presented to the House it would necessarily have had its first consideration in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and then this amendment could have been offered and considered. But that point of order was not made. The House determined not to consider this Senate amendment in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, but to consider it in the House; and this is an amendment which the Chair thinks can not be considered in the House without being first considered in the committee.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Then how would the Chair construe this last part of the rule—because our sole purpose is to arrive at some reasonable construction—

The SPEAKER. Certainly; that is the only purpose of the Chair.

Mr. REED, of Maine. How would the Chair construe this last part of the rule:

And a point of order made under this rule shall be good at any time before consideration of a bill has commenced.

Does not that imply that the point of order shall not be good after consideration has commenced?

The SPEAKER. But there was a time when a mere point of order would have taken this amendment to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; and gentlemen who desired to offer amendments increasing the appropriation or making appropriations for other purposes had a right to take it there for that purpose and offer their amendments. But that was not done; that point of order was not made; and the Senate amendment is now before the House for consideration in the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But not for amendment.

The SPEAKER. For proper amendments—for amendments which are in order.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Is there anything in the rule which says we shall not offer an amendment of this sort?

The SPEAKER. There is a rule which says that a proposition of this kind shall have its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But that rule also says:

And a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

Meaning it shall not be good afterward.

The SPEAKER. But the House is not considering a bill; it is considering a Senate amendment. That is the original proposition.

Mr. REED, of Maine. If the House is not considering a bill, then the third clause of Rule XXIII is not applicable.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that clause of the rule relates to any resolution, proposition, or proceeding.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But the language of the rule refers entirely to a bill, and the Chair must see that—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read it again:

All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money—

Mr. REED, of Maine. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER (reading)—

or bills making appropriations of money or property—

Mr. REED, of Maine. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER—

or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payment out of appropriations already made.

Now, "all proceedings touching appropriations of money" are as much embraced by the rule as what is technically called a bill.

Mr. REED, of Maine. But then comes the rest of the rule:

And a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

Now, I submit to the Chair that this rule never contemplated the present situation; that this was an omitted case, just as that which was remedied by Rule XX was an omitted case; and the Senate having made an amendment, and no point of order having been made upon it in the House, which would have carried it to the Committee of the Whole, it became open for amendment. Now, the amendment of an appropriation bill naturally involves either the increase of an appropriation or the decrease of it or a change of its character; and the House can not have free way on such a matter unless it has the right to amend it not only by increasing the amount which the Chair has already decided is proper, but by varying the object for which the appropriation was made.

The Chair makes a distinction which I think on reflection he will see is not sound. That is, that there is a difference between changing the amount and changing the nature of the object for which the amount is appropriated. Provided it is germane it is just as proper to change the object as it is to change the amount, and the Chair already having ruled on a previous occasion, and properly I think, the amount can be changed, surely it follows logically the object also may be changed. And I think the difficulty which has arisen in this case has arisen from laying too much stress on the earlier words of the rule and not bearing in mind the fact that the rule must be construed all together.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman's construction of the rule in this particular is correct, then the Chair made a great mistake in deciding the amendments to what is known as the Mexican pension bill must have their first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, because the point of order was not made before the consideration of the bill was commenced, but was made on each amendment as it was reached.

Mr. REED, of Maine. That came under Rule XX, which provides any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order.

Mr. KEIFER. The Chair was exactly right as to the amendments to the Mexican pension bill, because they came under another rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has great difficulty in determining whether—

Mr. REED, of Maine. That is an important point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has great difficulty in determining whether it is his duty to decide an amendment out of order and exclude it from the consideration of the House because it ought first to be considered in committee, or whether it is the duty of the Chair to rule simply that it must have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and allow it to be offered, with the right to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering it. That is a question, so far as the Chair knows, which has never been presented or discussed in the House.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Perhaps we might go on with the other amendments.

Mr. KEIFER. That is all there is of it.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know when it will be in order to move that this House adjourn. [Cries of "No!"]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has only one object in view, and that is to give a construction to this rule that will be in accordance with its spirit and not establish a precedent which the House may desire to escape from hereafter. It is an entirely new question, so far as the Chair knows, whether the fact that the proposition must have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union absolutely excludes its presentation in the House, or whether the simple effect of it is to allow it to be presented, if germane and unobjectionable in other respects, and then have its consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. If the gentleman from Indiana knows of any ruling the Chair will be glad to have his attention called to it?

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that in reference to the particular letter of Rule XX it is clear, considering the purpose of the rule and its spirit, that it would be impossible with any safety to the deliberations of the House to adopt any other construction than that adopted by the Chair. I submit that after this discussion we should dispose of this amendment to the Senate amendment. I trust my friend from Illinois will allow me to call the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. I have promised to yield to the gentleman from Kansas. I will then allow the gentleman to take the floor for the pur-

pose of demanding the previous question. All I wish to do is to dispose of the amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I move the House adjourn.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman does not have the floor to submit that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think, after as careful examination of this rule as he is able to make under the circumstances, that to hold that the amendment could not be entertained might result in preventing the House from making very necessary amendments to Senate amendments, and that the Chair ought therefore to allow an amendment to the amendment to be entertained and have its consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The Chair makes that ruling because great inconvenience and injustice might result to the House itself from any other construction of the rule.

Mr. KEIFER. I hope the gentleman will not make any objection to granting unanimous consent to consider it in committee.

A. MEMBER. Consider it in the House as in committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is still in order to make the point that the amendment is not germane to the amendment of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. That has been substantially decided.

Mr. SPRINGER. This has not been made as yet, however; it may have been referred to casually in the statement of the Chair. I desire to call attention to the fact that it is not germane to the pending proposition, for the reason that it is a distinct, additional, substantive proposition. The fact that if a proposition before us which allows clerks to Senators is not to be amended as matter germane to it by giving clerks to the House of Representatives, no more than it would be germane to give additional clerks to the President or to the legation at Paris or to any department here. Simply because clerks are provided here for Senators that does not make it germane to give clerks to any other department of the Government.

Mr. KEIFER. We can not hear the gentleman from Illinois here, but I supposed I was entitled to the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is germane. It relates to the subject of clerks for members of Congress. The fact that the Senate amendment provides simply for clerks to members of the Senate does not preclude the right of the House to so amend as to pay clerks of members of the House. Suppose, for instance, the question was as to the compensation of the clerks of the Senate committees or the officers of the Senate, might it not be amended by adding the clerks or officers of the House? The Chair thinks it could. If you take it in the narrowest sense of course it relates only to the subject of clerks to the individual Senators; but the Chair thinks that would be an exceedingly narrow construction to put upon it and one not warranted by the rule.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that this is now being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana objected.

Mr. KEIFER. I understood he withdrew the objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; I think the House does not intend to increase our own salaries; that is practically the effect of this proposition, if adopted. It amounts substantially to that.

Mr. BLAND. How, then, can we consider it?

The SPEAKER. By going into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEIFER. If we have a little order in the House I think we can get through this without any difficulty. I want to avoid making the motion if I can that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. I am willing, if unanimous consent can be given to consider this in the House as in Committee of the Whole, to limit the time for debate as much as the gentleman desires.

Mr. HATCH, of Missouri. One minute, then.

Mr. SPRINGER. I make the point of order that it is not in order to move at this time that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. That can only be done under a suspension of the rules, and the House is not now in a condition where that motion to suspend the rules can be made. We can not go into the committee without a suspension of the rules, and that motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. On what ground?

Mr. SPRINGER. Because another proposition is pending.

The SPEAKER. Another proposition was pending when this conference report came in; but this is a privileged report and has suspended the consideration of this subject.

Mr. SPRINGER. The conference report did that; but here is another proposition that was not embraced in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. But the House is actually considering it.

Mr. SPRINGER. But not in Committee of the Whole. It would not, of course, be in order to refer the conference report to the Committee of the Whole or to lay it on the table. Mr. Blaine held that to be the construction of the rule. He held that the House must act upon it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is aware of the fact that the House has disposed of the report of the conference committee by

adopting it, and the matter before us now is not the report of the conference committee, but a particular Senate amendment which the gentleman moves to concur in with an amendment. The subject, however, was brought before the House by the conference report.

Mr. RANDALL. But if the question goes to the conference committee it takes the whole subject.

The SPEAKER. It takes the proposition before the House of course.

Mr. SPRINGER. But this bill came from the conference committee. It is the report of that committee, and we are now considering a part of the conference report; and if you can refer this portion of the conference report to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, you can dispose of all conference reports by referring them to the committees of the House, which would be a means of defeating all legislation.

The SPEAKER. It does not refer the conference report which has been disposed of by the House. It only refers a particular amendment on which the point of order is made.

Mr. SPRINGER. But the conference report is this bill.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, or rather on the amendments of the Senate to the House bill. The conference report does not relate to any part of the bill to which the two Houses agree; and hence no part of the bill would go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union excepting such amendment as the point of order may lie against. It has all been disposed of but the one single question which is now before the House for consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER. But if we go into Committee of the Whole, then where would it be?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole. He states that he will agree to such limitation upon debate as the gentleman from Indiana will suggest.

Mr. RANDALL. That is objected to.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to reserve the point of order that this changes existing law and does not retrench expenditures.

The SPEAKER. That point of order has been disposed of. The Senate amendment changes existing law also.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to seem to stand in opposition to the general sentiment of the House, but gentlemen will see exactly the position in which the conference committee would be placed if they themselves consented voluntarily that this amendment should be submitted.

Mr. KEIFER. But the conference committee would not be responsible for what we may decide.

Mr. HOLMAN. I trust the gentleman will not misapprehend what interpretation would be fixed upon our action in that respect if the members of the conference committee consent that such proposition shall go before the House.

Mr. KEIFER. Then we can go into Committee of the Whole House, and I shall have to make that motion.

Mr. HOLMAN. I greatly prefer voting for an increase of our salaries directly than to vote for the increase in this indirect way, for that is simply what it amounts to, and for one I can not consent to that.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman will see the time in the remaining part of this session, short as it is, as he did in the last, when we will agree to pay certain clerks \$180 a month, at the same time refusing to pay them \$100 a month in connection with paying clerks for members of the House \$100 a month.

Mr. HOLMAN. The conferees on the part of the House recommend to the House to insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate. What more could they do? They have done that. And if now they voluntarily consent by their own act that that provision shall be enlarged from \$39,000 to over \$200,000 in what position does that place them? It is a position which I for one can not consent to occupy.

Mr. KEIFER. Is the gentleman from Indiana not in error when he says the conferees on the part of the House recommend the House to insist on its disagreement? Do not they say only they disagreed with the conference on the part of the Senate as to that amendment? They do not say anything on the subject of what the House should do.

Mr. HOLMAN. What more could we do than disagree?

Mr. KEIFER. One of the conferees on the part of the House has already moved that the House shall recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I speak of the act of the majority of the conferees.

Mr. McMILLIN. I beg the gentleman to remember that one man does not constitute a majority of the conferees. A majority favor non-concurrence, and they should be sustained by the House.

Mr. KEIFER. In order to have this proposition considered I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Chair to rule that that required unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has made no ruling upon that subject.

Mr. MORSE. Then I object; and we will have a ruling.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will rule when the point is made. Under the rules of the House it is not in order to move to go into Committee

of the Whole House on the state of the Union till after the morning hour has been occupied or dispensed with, and neither has been done to-day.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Then we will have to stop with the bill.

Mr. KEIFER. I think paragraph 9 of Rule XVI applies to this motion.

The SPEAKER. Clause 9 of Rule XVI provides that—

At any time after the expiration of the morning hour it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue or general appropriation bills.

Mr. KEIFER. Under the circumstances and with very great regret I shall be obliged to withdraw this proposition.

Several MEMBERS. Why withdraw it?

Mr. KEIFER. There is a variety of opinion as to whether this should be insisted upon. We cannot finish this bill to-night perhaps if we insist upon this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can insist upon it in the conference.

Mr. KEIFER. I will be entirely candid and will say I am afraid of the conferees on the part of the House, although I know the Speaker will appoint very excellent men. I wish it were possible to instruct the conferees to agree to such a proposition as this before agreeing to provide for the payment of Senators' clerks at \$180 per month.

Now, as I have a few minutes of time yielded to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I will at least state what will be the effect of such an amendment. The proposition if it were adopted would cut down the pay that is proposed to be given to Senate clerks from \$6 a day, or \$180 a month, to \$100 a month, and it would give to each Representative not a chairman of a committee a clerk during the session, paying him at the rate of \$100 a month. There would be some economy in the matter of paying the Senate clerks, and we would not pay a large price to the clerks of the members of the House.

In a long session, the average of which is seven months, it would be \$700 for the clerk; in the short session about \$300; in an entire Congress \$1,000 would be paid to the clerk of each Representative and each Senator, except the clerk that was appointed by the chairman of a committee either of the Senate or of the House; and that clerk would be left to receive the same pay as he now receives, \$6 a day, and he ought to have the difference. He, as the clerk to the committee, has the committee work to do, and presumably a good deal of work for the chairman of the committee.

Allow me to say, as I am about to take my leave of the Congress of the United States, that the people of this country would gladly give clerks to members, and be willing they should be paid out of the United States Treasury if they knew how much better a Representative a member would be if he had a clerk. I venture to state here in this presence that there is no member of this House who does not occupy more than four-fifths of all his valuable time in looking after matters that are entirely and wholly disconnected with his legislative duties, and while he is doing that he is cut off from the necessary work that he should do in following legislation; in studying the subjects of legislation, in good reading, in close investigation; he is cut off from that and he is tired and wearied out writing letters and going for this thing and for that for his constituents. All that may be proper enough in itself, but it results in this, that he is so weary and tired that he is unable to discharge his duties here upon the floor or in committee.

I know that members of this House of Representatives who do much work on the floor and in committee are men who fail in a large sense to please their constituents at home. And why? They do not write enough letters; they do not run enough errands; they do not devote their time sufficiently to attend to little things for their constituents, but are devoting their time to the things they came here to attend to.

I take it that no person will be offended when I say that practically nineteen Representatives on the floor of this House out of every twenty are utterly disqualified by reason of this for properly discharging their legislative duties. Now, it is a very proper thing to attend to the correspondence connected with the Pension Office. It is a matter of sentiment with us, and we all do it, or try to do it. It is a very proper thing to do, and so are a multitude of other things that we have to do in connection with the Land Office and the Indian Office and the other public offices. All these things we could do if each member had a clerk recognized as the clerk of a particular member. The clerk could attend to the correspondence; he would be received by the heads of Departments and the heads of the different bureaus; he would have the *entrée* anywhere he chose to go on this business, and he could attend to these matters as well as the member, and the member might be devoting himself to study, to investigation, to the duties that belong to him as a Representative here.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. Do not the members know the duties that they assume when they seek the votes of their constituents?

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, yes.

Mr. McMILLIN. And do they not accept the office with that knowledge?

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, yes; they know the burdens, and when they get here—I say it without intending to give offense to anybody—they fail to do the things they ought to do, and do first those other things which their constituents, as individuals, require them to do, but which are no proper part of the duties of a Representative in Congress. I know this. I am perfectly well aware of it. We are all guilty of that. A man will tramp about this city from Department to Department all the morning and he will hasten away from his seat during the sessions of the House; he will grow tired and weary, and the day will pass by, and he will give no sort of attention to the legislation of Congress. He does this because he feels that if he does not write to "John Smith" promptly and get his little matter through some Department he will make an enemy at home.

We ought to be above it. But if we are to do these things, if we are required to do them, let us have this aid. I say "us," although I am not included for the future. If this amendment should be agreed to in the conference committee it would not affect me; it would go into effect in the Forty-ninth Congress. I am speaking, therefore, as one having no sort of interest in this proposition except the great interest which we all have that Representatives in the Congress of the United States shall be placed in that position with relation to their constituents that they can discharge their proper duties here.

If this provision were adopted legislation would go on more rapidly and it would be better done, for each member each day could know that he was free to set about his legislative duties and not to have his time taken up in answering letters and running errands. Mr. Speaker, this is no new trouble, nor did it originate in America. Edmund Burke, when taken to task on a certain occasion for not coming to visit his constituents for a long period of time, responded and said, "While I have not been among you, I have run my very legs off in London doing your errands." We are running our legs off doing errands, and while we are doing that we are not doing the duties we are sent here to do.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. CANNON, to concur in the Senate amendment; and there were—ayes 34, noes 59.

So the amendment was non-concurred in.

Mr. HOLMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and ask a further conference.

Mr. HISCOCK. May I inquire of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] if he expects the Senate will yield?

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not able to tell.

Mr. HISCOCK. Have you the slightest idea that the Senate will yield?

Mr. HOLMAN. I have no other information than the gentleman from New York has himself, but I trust that the Senate will see the propriety of yielding this point.

Mr. HISCOCK. You have been in conference with the Senate and must have formed an opinion.

Mr. HOLMAN. As far as I am concerned as one member of the House I do not propose that this amendment of the Senate shall be adopted. I propose to do all I can to prevent it.

Mr. HISCOCK. I simply want to know what we have before us, even if it goes to the extent of an extra session.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I will stand up for an extra session rather than agree to this amendment.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to call attention to the fact that last session at 10 o'clock in the evening we voted against giving the Senate an extra \$30,000, because, although nothing was said about it, it was understood that the money was for clerks, and at 4 o'clock next morning the House voted for the Senate proposition pure and simple. I mention this merely as an interesting historical fact.

Mr. CANNON. And Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, in my opinion, this House, inside of twenty-four hours, will do exactly what it has now refused to do.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. But we must save our money now for public buildings.

Mr. REED, of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I want to add that I voted steadily against the proposition, both at 10 o'clock and at 4 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is time enough to cross that stream when we come to it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to say a single word before submitting the motion for the previous question. If the House proposes to have a further conference on this proposition, I must protest that gentlemen here, especially my colleague on the committee [Mr. CANNON], who it is to be presumed will be one of the managers on the part of the House in the further conference, should not notify the Senate that within twenty-four hours the House will recede from its disagreement. I do not think my friend is justified in indulging in that prediction. Such a result may take place; but I do not propose for one to advertise the other House that the present action upon our part is not a *bona fide* and honest expression of the conviction of the House that the Senate ought not to increase the salaries of Senators, especially in this indirect way.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is no mere opposed to Senators having these clerks than I am.

Mr. HOLMAN. So I understand.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to add that if, perchance, I am to be one of the managers on the part of the House in the further conference upon this bill, it may be that I was guilty of an indiscretion in making the remark that I did. But I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana, who is an older member than I am, to the fact that I did but follow in his wake when he, who will also probably be one of the conferees, announced that he never had assented and never would assent to this proposition, and would do all he could to defeat it.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. Is it true that under this provision thirty-one Senators who are not chairmen of committees will be entitled to clerks?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. And that the salary of each clerk at \$180 a month for a long session of seven months will be \$1,260?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. Now I would like to know what difference there is between passing an amendment in this guise and voting to each of these United States Senators \$1,260 extra compensation from the United States Treasury. As a rule Senators are able to hire clerks from their own private means; while Members of the House of Representatives, who spend their time and money in the service of their constituents, working night and day, depriving themselves of social comfort with their families, are asked to vote Senators this extra compensation.

I hope that the conferees on the part of the House will hold out until 12 o'clock on the 4th of March in their resistance to this demand, and if necessary will allow an extra session to come rather than agree to this amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the motion of Mr. HOLMAN that the House further insist on its disagreement to the twenty-ninth amendment of the Senate and ask a further conference was agreed to; and the Speaker announced the appointment of Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. CANNON as conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. What motion does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] make as to the other amendment—the amendment numbered 1?

Mr. HOLMAN. As to that amendment, which is formal, I make the same motion—that the House further insist on its disagreement and ask a further conference.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that order will be made. There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. NEECE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 6658) to provide for the sale of the Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian reservations in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes.

CATTLE TRAFFIC IN THE WEST.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in response of the resolution of the House calling for information in regard to the ranch and range cattle traffic in the Western States and Territories; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to inquire whether it is now in order to proceed with the consideration of the election case? If so, I hope we shall go on with it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to take a recess.

Mr. SPRINGER. That was certainly superseded by all these intervening matters.

The SPEAKER. Under what rule?

Mr. SPRINGER. Unanimous consent was given—

The SPEAKER. It required no unanimous consent. The conference report was a privileged matter, and simply suspended the proceedings which were going on—did not terminate them.

Mr. VALENTINE. The first question is upon the motion for a recess till 8 o'clock.

A MEMBER. Make it 9.

The SPEAKER. The first question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee proposes a recess till 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. VALENTINE. I understand there is a desire on the part of members on both sides that we now take a recess until 9 o'clock. If

that be the general desire, I suggest that the amendment fixing 8 o'clock be withdrawn, so that we may vote at once on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] proposing 9 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. I propose to stay here till the House settles this question of the right of a member to his seat; and I ask every man who desires the question shall be settled to stay here until it has been settled. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

A MEMBER. What is the question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] moved that the House take a recess until 10 o'clock—

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that will not prevail.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] moved to amend by fixing 9 o'clock, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] moved a further amendment to fix 8 o'clock. The question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is desirable that we should sit here until we receive from the Senate the sundry civil appropriation bill, so we may take action upon the amendments of the Senate, and if the action of the House requires it, that the disagreements of the two Houses may be sent to a conference committee, and the managers of said conference appointed on the part of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right; and while we are waiting I insist we shall proceed with the discussion of the question of the right of a member to his seat upon this floor.

Mr. VALENTINE. Would it not be in order, Mr. Speaker, for the House now to designate the conferees who shall act on the sundry civil bill when it comes over from the Senate?

Mr. RANDALL. The House must concur or non-concur in the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. VALENTINE. It seems to me by unanimous consent we can non-concur and order the appointment of the conferees on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The House can not act on a matter that is not before it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will give to the House such information as he may possess as to the probability of the sundry civil bill being reported during the night.

Mr. RANDALL. It may be 2 o'clock or it may be 3.

Mr. VALENTINE. It may be daylight or 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning; and what is the use of our staying here during all these long hours and tiring ourselves out when we have so much work to do to-morrow and to-morrow night?

Mr. HERR. The Senate are debating the question yet.

Mr. RANDALL. It ought to come here to-night, and the conferees ought to be able to sit as early as 7 o'clock in the morning.

The SPEAKER. If the Chair may be allowed to state, he was informed that the Senate will pass the bill before it takes a recess or adjourns.

Mr. RANDALL. My information comes from what I believe is an authentic source that the Senate will probably finish the bill by 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] that the House shall take a recess until 8 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BLAND. I ask by unanimous consent that we take a recess until half past 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That is objected to by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. We must keep the members of the House here if we are to have any business done before 2 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. BLAND. There is no quorum here now, and by taking the recess I suggest it will save the clerks, who are now nearly worn out. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I move that after 2 o'clock nothing shall be done except the consideration of the sundry civil bill when it comes from the Senate, and that then we shall take a further recess until 9 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. WELLER. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order being demanded, the question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, to take a recess until 8 o'clock in the morning.

The House divided; and there were—ay 1, noes 44.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. WELLER.

Mr. VALENTINE. By way of compromise, I ask the House to agree to take a recess until half past 1 o'clock for the purpose of considering the sundry civil bill as it comes from the Senate; that a motion may be considered as made and agreed to to non-concur in the Senate amendments; and that then the Speaker shall have power to appoint the conferees on the part of the House, after which the House will take a recess until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HATCH, of Missouri, in the chair). Is there objection to that?

Mr. VAN EATON. Yes, I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. Then let us have the result announced of the vote by tellers.

The House again divided on Mr. PETTIBONE'S motion to take a recess until 8 o'clock; and the tellers reported—ayes 6, noes 24.

Mr. VALENTINE. Still no quorum has voted.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move the House do now adjourn (12 o'clock and 15 minutes a. m., March 3).

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. We either ought to adjourn or take a recess.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 60.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. LAMB. I ask by unanimous consent the House take up the Mexican pension bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question again recurs on the motion to take a recess until 8 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The tellers will resume their places, as a quorum has not yet voted.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the House take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. VALENTINE. I object, unless some understanding can be reached.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. With the understanding that nothing shall be done except to receive the amendments of the Senate to the sundry civil bill and send them to conference.

Mr. LORE. I object.

Mr. RANDALL. I move the House take a recess until 3 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is not in order, unless the previous motions to take a recess are withdrawn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. VALENTINE. I object.

Mr. HOUK. I ask unanimous consent of the House that I may be heard for one minute in regard to a matter of great importance to a very large number of people.

Mr. BENNETT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. HOUK. I ask unanimous consent— [Cries of "Regular order!"] If the House will listen to me but for one minute—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. HOUK. I would be glad if the House would give me unanimous consent for one minute—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. HOUK. I appeal to gentlemen to give unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement. Here is a bill— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair, without objection, will recognize the gentleman from Tennessee for one minute.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object.

Mr. BLAND. Regular order.

Mr. HOUK. Here is a list of the names of persons whose accounts have been audited by the Departments of the Government—

Mr. BLAND. I have objected to this all the while.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair recognized the gentleman for one minute.

Mr. BLAND. Well, he can have one minute, if that is all, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HOUK. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been passed every session of Congress heretofore as a matter of course.

Mr. HOLMAN. For sixteen years.

Mr. HOUK. It contains the claims which have been audited by the various Departments of the Government after the most careful scrutiny and investigation.

There are a very large number of these claims contained in this bill, and, as I have said, it has been invariably passed heretofore, generally under a suspension of the rules. Here we are now within twenty-four hours of adjournment. If this bill does not pass these people will be compelled to wait more than twelve months for honest debts which have been thoroughly investigated, considered, allowed, recommended, and audited by the authorized auditing officers of the Government. I appeal, then, to members to let this bill be taken up and passed. It has always passed heretofore almost unchallenged.

Mr. KEIFER. Has that been reported by a committee of this House at this session?

Mr. HOUK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEIFER. What committee?

Mr. HOUK. The Committee on War Claims. I say this, Mr. Speaker: that committee has gone into the most careful scrutiny of this matter; has looked into every case, with very few exceptions, covered by this bill, and in the view of that committee it is absolute justice to these claimants that this bill should become a law. It is one of the appropriation bills of Congress, and ought to be passed. I ask gentlemen, therefore, to let us take it up and pass it. I refer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] in support of what I have said as to this bill heretofore.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Does this bill contain anything but audited accounts?

Mr. HOUK. No, sir; not a thing, as I understand it; and I ask my colleague on the committee [Mr. ROWELL] to state what course the committee has taken in the examination of the accounts?

Mr. COX, of North Carolina. Has not the minute expired?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for a moment or two.

Mr. ROWELL. Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill permit me to say that the committee examined into every claim allowed by the auditing officers of the Government, taking up claim after claim and looking carefully through them as has never been done before. They took up the cases in their order and threw out on amendments and motions some five or six claims that they thought ought not to have been audited, and reported the bill by the unanimous vote of the committee after a close scrutiny and careful examination of nearly every one of the claims that came in.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be indulged to make a very brief statement in reference to this bill. I wish to say that the request of my colleague from Tennessee is one that ought to prevail. As has been stated by him, this bill pertains to claims all of which have been audited by the accounting officers of the Government, and all of which have been in the first place examined by quartermaster's agents of the United States and approved by the Quartermaster-General.

Mr. LAMB. What sort of claims does this bill contain?

Mr. McMILLIN. Audited war claims; and I may be permitted to say to my friend from Indiana that if it does not contain claims of citizens of his State it is the first bill bearing the claims so reported from the Quartermaster-General in the course of my experience in Congress that they were not interested in, for they suffered losses of this kind.

They are what is known as the 4th of July claims, under the act passed on the 4th of July, 1864, which provided for the payment of claims of citizens for property taken for the use of the Army of the United States. These claims are examined by quartermaster's agents throughout the country in States to which the act applies, and reported to the accounting officers of the Department, and are transmitted to Congress after thorough examination.

Mr. THOMPSON. And it has been uniformly passed.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. What States are interested in this matter?

Mr. McMILLIN. It pertains to a great many of the States; to all of the border States, I believe.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Yes; Kentucky and Tennessee.

Mr. McMILLIN. All the border States. In response to the gentleman from Alabama who asks what States it applies to I will say that I do not remember how many are represented in this bill, but heretofore bills which have been passed embraced the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, Maryland, and probably others.

Mr. PETTIBONE. Missouri.

Mr. McMILLIN. Yes; Missouri and Pennsylvania. I do not know what other States have been embraced in it.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I must object to this proceeding.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do hope the gentleman from Alabama will not interpose an objection to this. The Government has owed these claims for more than twenty years, and to fail to pay them now is an outrage against every citizen and an unjustifiable postponement of justice. These unfortunate claimants do not get a cent of interest during this long delay. What justice is there in postponing payment?

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I have a claim here for a citizen of my own district in Alabama, which is just as meritorious and honest a claim as any of these, and I can not pass that claim through this House.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us take it up then and pass it. I hope I have fairness enough to do at least justice to any citizen of this Republic.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Unless we can pass that claim I shall object to this.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will aid the gentleman in his efforts to get a meritorious claim through.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas, rose.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to say to both the gentleman from Tennessee and—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have consumed during the present session of Congress but very little of the time of this House, and I appeal now to members on the ground of humanity that they may hear me for two or three minutes upon a subject foreign to this one we have under consideration, but of importance to the people of my State.

Mr. VALENTINE. If we are to go into any new subject I must object.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I would feel that I was neglecting a public duty if I failed to call the attention of this House to this matter if an opportunity is offered me to do so.

On the Speaker's table is a Senate bill authorizing the construction of a Federal jail at Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I rise to a question of order. Under what rule is this debate now going on?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. By unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not too late to make objection after the gentleman from Arkansas commenced speaking?

Mr. TUCKER. It seems we are all giving our experiences. I would like to give mine. One gentleman has spoken of claims that the Government has owed for twenty years. I have a bill on the Speaker's table that has passed the Senate, to restore to a constituent of mine \$400 that were taken from him by unjust taxation seventeen years ago. I want to have that bill pass the House so that this man may have his money returned to him. I appeal to the House to let that bill be taken up and passed.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I would like to tell my experience also.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask unanimous consent that the election case be withdrawn so as to allow all these matters to be brought up.

Mr. TUCKER. I appeal to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE], my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, to allow this bill to be taken up.

The SPEAKER. All this is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Objection was made.

Mr. WELLER. I hope the Chair will not be partial, so as to fail to recognize me.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the gentleman from Georgia making a statement?

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Unless I be permitted to go on, I object.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no objection to the gentleman from Arkansas being heard.

Mr. WELLER addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. WELLER. I rise for the express purpose of being recognized by the Chair. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that he can not recognize him unless he discloses for what purpose he desires to be recognized.

Mr. WELLER. I will state what I propose. I desire to secure unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 252). I send it to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. VAN EATON. I object, unless the gentleman provides for the payment being made in standard silver dollars.

Mr. WELLER. I do.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRATTON] has a privileged report from the Committee on Printing in reference to the eulogies on the late Senator Anthony. It is a privileged report, although not as against the election case. Is there objection to the gentleman from South Carolina making the report?

There was no objection.

EULOGIES UPON THE LATE SENATOR ANTHONY.

Mr. BRATTON, from the Committee on Printing, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 2577) to authorize the printing of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the late Henry B. Anthony.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the late Henry B. Anthony, a Senator from Rhode Island, with an account of his funeral, prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on Public Printing, 12,000 copies; of which 4,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 8,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have printed a portrait of said Henry B. Anthony to accompany said eulogies; and for engraving and printing said portrait the sum of \$500, or so much as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the bill to be read a third time.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. Would it be proper to amend so as to give the Senate 8,000 copies and take 4,000 copies for the House?

The SPEAKER. That amendment is in order, if the gentleman desires to offer it.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the amendment?

The SPEAKER. None has been offered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRATTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF REPORT—WASHINGTON MONUMENT CEREMONIES.

Mr. DORSHEIMER. I ask unanimous consent to call up the Senate bill providing for the printing of the proceedings had here on the occasion of the dedication of the Washington Monument. The House passed a resolution and sent it to the Senate, which has not been acted

upon by the Senate. The Senate passed a bill covering the same subject, differing somewhat from the House resolution. The bill is now on the Speaker's table.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take up the Senate bill indicated. The title will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. While that bill is being looked for I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. There is one request for unanimous consent now pending. There can not be two pending at the same time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2666) to provide for the printing of the report and proceedings of the commission to provide suitable ceremonies for the dedication of the Washington Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the report and proceedings of the commission to provide suitable ceremonies for the dedication of the Washington Monument, together with the engraved card attached thereto, be printed under the direction of the Committee on Printing; and that 26,500 additional copies be printed, 8,000 copies of the same for the use of the Senate; 16,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 500 copies for distribution by Lieut. General P. H. Sheridan, United States Army, to the civil and military organizations which participated in the proceedings; 500 copies for the Washington National Monument Association for distribution among its members; 500 copies for distribution by Col. Thomas L. Casey, engineer, among the mechanics and workmen employed in the erection of the monument; 500 copies to the Hon. R. C. Winthrop; and 500 copies to the Hon. John W. Daniel; and for the purpose of defraying the expense of printing the attached card the sum of \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. DORSHEIMER. I will state to the House that the only respect in which this bill differs from the resolution already passed by the House is that the bill provides for the printing of the engraved card, which was not provided for by the resolution, and this bill also provides for giving five hundred copies to each of the two orators. Those are the only respects in which the bill differs from the resolution already passed.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the bill is open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. WELLER. I move that the bill be amended so as to make the number of copies 35,000, the distribution to be in the same ratio as provided in the bill.

The SPEAKER was proceeding to put the question when Mr. WELLER withdrew the amendment.

Mr. DORSHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask my colleague [Mr. DORSHEIMER] how many copies this bill would give to each Senator and how many to each Member of the House.

Mr. DORSHEIMER. I have not figured it up—it provides for 8,000 copies for the Senate, and 16,000 for the House.

Mr. SKINNER, of New York. It gives every Senator 105 copies and every Member 49 copies.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DORSHEIMER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REPORT ON FISH AND FISHERIES.

Mr. ROGERS, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make two privileged reports from the Committee on Printing, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, are these reports subject to objection when they are read?

The SPEAKER. They are subject to the question of consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this a conference report?

The SPEAKER. It is not. It is a privileged report from the Committee on Printing, as the Chair understands.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it can come in only by unanimous consent. I do not know what matters they relate to, and I may desire to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know with certainty that this is a privileged report; but certain reports from the Committee on Printing are privileged.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not as against the present order, which is the question of the highest privilege, the right of a member to his seat.

The SPEAKER. The pending question is on a motion for a recess.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is a contested-election case pending.

The SPEAKER. There is no question pending on the report of the Committee on Elections.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let this report from the Committee on Printing be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, February 25, 1885.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for the year 1885 be printed, and that

there be printed 11,000 extra copies, of which 3,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 6,000 for the use of the House, 1,500 for the use of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, and 500 for sale by the Public Printer under such regulations as the Joint Committee on Printing may prescribe, at a price equal to the additional cost of publication, and 10 per cent. thereto added; illustrations to be obtained by the Public Printer under the joint direction of the Committee on Printing.

The resolution was concurred in.

Mr. ROGERS, of New York, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was concurred in; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. ROGERS, of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, February 25, 1885.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the annual volume of Astronomical and Meteorological Observations of the Naval Observatory for the years 1881 and 1882 be printed, and that 2,000 additional copies of each volume be printed, of which 400 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 800 copies for the use of the House, and 800 copies for the use of the Navy Department, or for sale at the cost of paper and printing, in accordance with section 422 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The resolution was concurred in.

Mr. ROGERS, of New York, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was concurred in; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, a while ago I asked unanimous consent to make a statement in reference to Executive Document 119. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] objected, but he withdraws his objection.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] asks unanimous consent to make a statement. Is there objection?

Mr. VALENTINE. Regular order.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] demands the regular order, which cuts off all requests for unanimous consent.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. This is a matter of a good deal of interest.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must make his appeal to the gentleman from Nebraska. The Chair has no discretion in the matter.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the gentleman from Georgia making his statement.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, Executive Document 119 is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of claims which have arisen under the act of July 4, 1864. By virtue of that act the Quartermaster-General, the Commissary-General, and the Third Auditor of the Treasury are required to examine and consider certain claims, and it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to report them to Congress at each session. In the Forty-fourth Congress this document, covering claims amounting to about \$500,000, was reported by Mr. Edey, of Illinois, then chairman of the Committee on War Claims. It passed the House at both sessions of that Congress by unanimous consent, and it has always passed without objection until, I think, the last session of the last Congress, when some objection was made, but I believe it finally passed the House. This time the claims amount to only \$228,000. Now, the law did not contemplate that these claims should be examined by the House. The act provided that they should be examined by the Quartermaster-General, the Commissary-General, and the Third Auditor. They have always passed in the way I have stated, and I think it will be a great injustice to these claimants if this bill does not now pass. This is not the case of ordinary claims on the Calendar which we reserve to ourselves the right to examine. These are cases the examination of which has been delegated to the officers I have designated, and I trust that the House will see the justice of doing what has been done heretofore in reference to these cases and allow them to pass without objection. The committee have reported these claims unanimously.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that the House may get at the bill to which he refers by simply disposing of this contested-election case.

Mr. KEAN. You want to take \$11,000 out of the Treasury on that.

Mr. WELLER. Well, if he is entitled to it give it to him.

Mr. KEAN. But he is not.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend understands very well the difficulty there is in getting an election case out of the way.

We have been in a minority ourselves, and have had some difficulty of this sort. I trust that neither this election case nor any other reason will prevent the House from doing what it has always done, and rightly done, with reference to these audited claims.

Mr. McMILLIN. This claim ought to be passed, and I hope the gentleman from Alabama will make no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPRINGER. I object. I would be delighted to have this bill passed; and I ask gentlemen on the other side to cease their opposition to this election case, and let us fix a time to consider and dispose of it, and then we can take up these other matters. I think the right of a member to his seat on the floor is a question of the highest importance. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee being for a recess till 8 o'clock to-morrow.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 28, noes 45.

Several MEMBERS. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. HEPBURN were appointed.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I desire to know whether it requires a quorum to vote down a motion for a recess.

The SPEAKER. It requires a quorum to decide it either way.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Another tribute to our rules.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported 1 in the affirmative, 36 in the negative—no quorum voting.

During the count by tellers the following proceedings took place:

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of joint resolution 252?

The SPEAKER. The House is taking a vote.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent that the House take up the joint resolution to print the annual report of the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER. A vote of the House is being taken.

Mr. GIBSON. I am led to believe there will be no objection to putting upon its passage the bill which I hold in my hand. I am assured by some gentlemen who have been objecting to general business that they think this bill ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. But the House is taking a vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate further insisted on its amendments numbered 1 and 29 to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN FRANCISCO.

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Senate bill 147. I do not think any one will object.

A MEMBER. What is it about?

Mr. BUDD. It is for the erection of a post-office building in San Francisco.

Several members objected.

Mr. BUDD. We never have had a post-office building there. Our postal business is done away down on the old water-front, in a little cubby-hole. San Francisco has 300,000 inhabitants.

Mr. WELLER. I rise to a point of order. Is it proper for the gentleman to proceed after objection has been made?

The SPEAKER. Not without unanimous consent.

A MEMBER. There was no objection to the gentleman proceeding with his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Objection was made to considering the bill, but no objection was made to the gentleman proceeding with his statement.

Mr. BUDD. As the time is not being occupied with anything else, I hope I may be allowed to conclude my statement.

In 1860 the tonnage of San Francisco was 235,000; in 1882 it had a tonnage of more than 1,000,000 tons. In 1860 its imports amounted to more than \$9,000,000; in 1882 to over \$51,600,000. In 1860 the exports were more than \$2,900,000; in 1882 over \$52,400,000. The postal revenue for 1860 was \$154,872; in 1882 it amounted to \$558,133; and to-day San Francisco, one of the largest and most important cities in the United States, yields a net revenue of some \$400,000.

Mr. KEAN. How much has been spent there on public buildings?

Mr. BUDD. Not a single dollar has been spent on a post-office building.

Mr. KEAN. What other public buildings are there?

Mr. BUDD. The Government has built a mint there, of which the Democracy will have control in a few days.

The building in which our post-office business is now transacted is down on the old water-front and is very inconvenient, not sufficient to afford proper facilities to our people. We are using for a post-office the lower floor and basement of the old custom-house. This bill is a Senate bill, and should become a law; hence I ask that it be now taken up and passed.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I suggest that the gentleman have this measure attached to the sundry civil bill in the Senate.

Mr. BUDD. This bill has already passed the Senate; it passed there more than a year ago, and has since been on the Speaker's table. It should pass here. I know this requires unanimous consent on account of the state of present proceedings. Let it pass. [Cry of "Regular order!"]

Mr. WELLER. I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to permit my resolution to be read to the House. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

The SPEAKER. That is not the regular order, and the regular order has been demanded on both sides of the House.

Mr. WELLER. I was trying to get rid of that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will get rid of it only by having it withdrawn. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to take a recess until 8 o'clock in the morning. [Putting the question. After a pause.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 31.

Mr. WELLER. No quorum.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. As the House has refused to take a recess I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The regular order is insisted upon. The point of no quorum has been made, and the Chair will appoint as tellers Mr. PETTIBONE and Mr. WELLER.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 4, noes 12.

Mr. BUDD. I move to take up Senate bill 147. The objection made by the gentleman from Alabama will be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SKINNER] objected.

Mr. SKINNER, of North Carolina. I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought the gentleman did object.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move there be a call of the House.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 18, noes 37.

So the motion was disagreed to.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes a. m., March 3) moved that the House adjourn.

The motion was disagreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask this bill be read from the Clerk's desk. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. PERKINS. I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. LEWIS. Would it be in order to make a statement in which I am interested?

The SPEAKER. It would be if the demand for the regular order is withdrawn. Is the demand for the regular order withdrawn?

Mr. SHIVELY and others objected.

Mr. CALDWELL. I ask to have read for information a resolution for the payment of the employes for the month of March. It is the usual resolution. These boys can not get away unless it is passed.

[Cries of "Regular order!"] I hope objection will be withdrawn. [Cries of "Regular order!"] This is simply to make available the pay of the employes for the month of March. [Cries of "Regular order!"] It was done at the last session, and ought to be done now.

The SPEAKER. Is the regular order insisted upon?

Mr. COOK. I demand the regular order of business.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to take a recess.

The SPEAKER. All the motions to take a recess that can be made have been made.

Mr. CALDWELL. My motion is to make available the pay of the employes for the month of March.

Mr. ENGLISH. Otherwise they will have to remain here.

Mr. CALDWELL. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa withdraw his demand for the regular order?

Mr. COOK. The regular is called for by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana insist upon it?

Mr. SHIVELY. I do.

Mr. WELLER. I feel I have not been fairly treated. Other matters of less importance than mine have been considered. [Cries of "Regular order!"] The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] says he has no objection to it.

Mr. ROGERS, of New York. I ask to submit a report from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. It is not now in order; the division of the House discloses the want of a quorum.

Mr. CALDWELL. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the resolution for our worthy and courteous employes. [Cries of "Regular order!"] I understand there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. There are demands for the regular order on both sides of the House, and they are in the nature of objections.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I have a bill here that I know nobody will object to [cries of "Oh, no; of course not!"], and I send it up with

the report, and ask that the report and the bill may be read for the information of the House. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The demand for the regular order of course stands until it is withdrawn by gentlemen who make it.

Mr. BURNES. I think I can make a statement that will interest the House—a patriotic suggestion— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BURNES. I believe unanimous consent is given me to make a brief statement of one minute and a half.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Regular order.

Mr. WELLER. I now ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution of the House No. 252 may be read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. WELLER. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to importune gentlemen to permit me to have this read because I know it will be agreed to. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. If gentlemen will withdraw their demands for the regular order, of course the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. Regular order.

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

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 29, noes 36.

So the call of the House was not ordered.

Mr. WELLER. No quorum. I think we ought to have members present to transact the public business.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not necessary on this motion.

Mr. WELLER. Can I now ask unanimous consent to call up this resolution? I ask to have it read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain the request pending the demand for the regular order.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken; there were on a division—ayes 28, noes 42. So the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 636, providing for the erection of a public building at Oshkosh, Wis., and put it upon its passage. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The demand for the regular order cuts off such requests.

Mr. GUENTHER. I sincerely hope that no gentleman will insist upon the demand for the regular order as against this bill, which is a very meritorious and important measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must recognize the demand for the regular order.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I move that the House take a recess for thirty minutes.

The SPEAKER. That, of course, could only be done by unanimous consent, for the reason that all motions in reference to a recess that are permissible under the rule are already pending.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, and ask the unanimous consent of the House to that effect. I understand that the sundry civil bill will be here within that time, and I am serious in making the motion, because we are merely exhausting the Speaker and doing nothing.

Mr. WELLER. If the gentleman would not submit so many motions he would not exhaust the Speaker so much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair repeats that the motion could only be entertained by unanimous consent. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. We ought to take a recess to give the reporters and other officers of the House some opportunity to rest.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to take a recess.

Mr. McADOO. I move a call of the House. I wish to preserve the order and dignity of the House and the decorum of our proceedings, and therefore submit that motion.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I demand the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. MILLS and others. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. I think it is only proper that we should give the reporters some rest; and I hope that we will at least put a stop to unnecessary talking if we can not proceed with the public business.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 25, noes 29.

So the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LACEY. I rise to a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LACEY. If this vote discloses the absence of a quorum can we proceed to the consideration of any business whatever until a quorum shall appear?

Mr. REED, of Maine. I move to reconsider the vote by which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUTCHINS. How did you vote?

Mr. REED, of Maine. It does not make any difference how I voted. I voted the right way, of course.

Mr. MILLS. I called for the yeas and nays on the motion so as to give the reporters a little rest.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Has the gentleman the right to make the motion to reconsider?

The SPEAKER. Any gentleman has the right to move a reconsideration when there is no record of the vote, the presumption being that all voted on the prevailing side.

Mr. REED, of Maine. We do not want to wear out our clerks in this way. It is not right, and there is no necessity for calling the roll on this motion.

The question being taken on the motion to reconsider the vote ordering the yeas and nays, it was agreed to—ayes 45, noes 21.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Now, Mr. Speaker, out of consideration for the Speaker himself, for the reporters, and the clerks, while we are waiting for the sundry civil bill to come from the Senate, I suggest that by unanimous consent we take a recess for thirty minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. I can state, if the House will permit me, that I have information of the passage of the sundry civil bill by the Senate, and I think it will be here within half an hour.

Mr. HOLMAN. It is very proper that we should take a recess for half an hour while waiting for that bill.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I ask by unanimous consent that the House may now take a recess for thirty minutes.

Mr. MILLS. That is right; give all a rest for that length of time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Suppose we should have a yea-and-nay vote and it should disclose the fact that no quorum is present, would not the Chair be compelled to take official notice of that fact, and would we not be placed in the position of being unable to transact any other business whatever until a quorum had appeared?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks when the record shows on a call of the yeas and nays there is not a quorum present business must cease until a quorum appears.

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. I ask that by unanimous consent a recess be taken for thirty minutes.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I hope not. If the House will allow me I should like to entertain it for a few moments with the consideration of a bill for the erection of a public building at Williamsport, Pa.

The SPEAKER. There is a matter pending. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WARNER] that the House take a recess for thirty minutes?

Mr. SPRINGER. All other motions for a recess being withdrawn?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. Nothing is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois can object if he desires to do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire, if this request for a recess be agreed to, that all other motions be withdrawn.

Mr. HEPBURN. You know we will not do that.

Mr. MILLS. Let us take a recess and rest the clerks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 3) the House took a recess for thirty minutes.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m. Tuesday, March 3.

PAYMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYÉS FOR MARCH.

Mr. CALDWELL. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for the immediate payment of the officers and employés of the Senate and of the House for the month of March.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I believe I had the floor at the time the House took the recess.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am satisfied if this joint resolution be understood there will be no objection to it. It is simply to pay in advance the employés of the Senate and of the House for the month of March. It is not extra pay. They are on the annual roll. It is simply a matter of accommodation to gentlemen who have constantly accommodated us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the resolution be reported.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

A joint resolution authorizing the immediate payment of the officers and employés of the Senate and of the House for the month of March.

Resolved, *etc.*, That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and of the House borne upon the annual roll their respective compensation, including the Capitol police, for the month of March, 1885, as soon as practicable after the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would suggest that that is hardly broad enough. It applies only to the employés on the annual roll. There is a very considerable class who are not on the annual roll, but who are paid for

the long session for eight months and for the short session for four months. This would not apply to them. I suggest this course: that the joint resolution shall be passed when, after consultation with the Clerk, it is ascertained exactly what class of persons are entitled to receive the compensation for the month of March. I am satisfied that they are a much larger class than those named in the joint resolution. Quite a large number of persons are employed for the session, which means four months, and yet they would not get the pay for that additional month under this resolution. I suggest that after consultation has been had with the Clerk as to what the terms of the joint resolution exactly should be, it should then be submitted to the House and passed.

Mr. RANDALL. I am inclined to think the session clerks will get their salaries independent of this resolution.

Mr. CALDWELL. They will.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] is certain that this is right I have no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. This is in the exact terms of the resolution which has been passed heretofore session after session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 346) was read three times, and passed.

Mr. CALDWELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed; and also moved to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill H. R. 8102. I wish to state this bill makes no appropriation. The facts are these—

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I understand that I am entitled to the floor; but I will yield for a few moments to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] a fact that I think will be sufficient to justify the indulgence he has kindly yielded me. A railroad is organized to be built to some coal mines in my State. A fellow-citizen of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is interested therein. It is an immense enterprise, and they can not proceed without the right to cross the Cumberland River. It is a bill for the purpose of giving the assent of Congress to the construction of a bridge. I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN and Mr. VALENTINE. Let the bill be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8102) to give the assent of Congress to the construction of a railroad bridge by the East and Middle Tennessee Railroad Company over the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers was read at length.

Mr. VALENTINE. The House seems now to be in a state of good feeling. I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. One matter is now pending.

Mr. VALENTINE. Unanimous consent was not given for its consideration. I said, "Read the bill first." I ask this of the House. We have to wait until the sundry civil bill comes from the Senate. I ask that while we are waiting its arrival the Speaker proceed to recognize gentleman to call up bills for consideration under the morning-hour rule, which allows ten minutes for debate—five minutes in favor of the bill and five minutes against it.

Mr. COOK. I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. Then I give notice that nothing shall be passed here to-night with my consent.

Mr. WILKINS. Did not the objection to the consideration of the bill called up by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] come too late? The Speaker asked if there were objections, and there were none.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] said, "Let the bill be read."

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman withdraws his objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. I do, if the objection is withdrawn to my request for the consideration of bills under the ten-minute rule. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COOK] withdraw his objection?

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I understand the objection is withdrawn on both sides.

The SPEAKER. It is not withdrawn.

Mr. COOK. I want to say that, believing the Constitution imposes on the House the duty of judging of the election of one of its members whose case is now before the House, nothing shall be transacted until this case is disposed of.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BENNETT] seems to have withdrawn, probably to take a nap or for some such purpose, I suggest that we lay aside the election case. [Laughter.]

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by a number of members that I repeat the proposition I made a while ago asking unanimous consent that until the sundry civil bill reaches the House the Speaker now entertain motions under the special rule for the consideration of such bills as members may call up, leaving the general status exactly as it is at present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE] asks unanimous consent to proceed under the special rule of the House recently adopted until the sundry civil appropriation bill is received from the Senate.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order!

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be in order for me to state one thing: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] yielded the floor to me a while ago, and as an act of courtesy and as an act of justice to him I ask that he be permitted to resume it now.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I understand there has been a ruling on that point.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded. Is the demand for the regular order withdrawn?

Mr. CALDWELL. As I understand it, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] had the floor without objection.

The SPEAKER. Before the recess the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] rose and stated, according to the recollection of the Chair, that he had a matter with which he proposed to "entertain" the House, but somebody objected, and immediately the recess was taken. The gentleman did not submit any motion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] now asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of a bill in relation to a public building at Williamsport, Pa.

Mr. VALENTINE. Regular order.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the objection to my bill is insisted upon, and I hope it will not be.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand that the objection has been withdrawn.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, we may just as well understand this matter. This stream to which that bill relates is a navigable one, which is being improved by this Government at great expense, and I object to building any bridge across it unless after a thorough investigation.

Mr. McMILLIN. It has been investigated. The report of the Secretary of War is here. He submitted the question to the local engineers and the matter was delayed until their reports came, and they are embodied in the report of the Secretary.

Mr. GIBSON. I just want to go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that no drawbridge across a running stream—

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House. The regular order is insisted upon on both sides of the House.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, we shall need a quorum here in a few minutes, and I think we had better send for one. There will be nothing further done here to-night without a quorum. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] wants a quorum, and I think we had better have a call of the House. I make that motion.

The question was taken on ordering a call of the House; and there were—ayes 26, noes 41.

So the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now take a recess.

Mr. BISBEE. Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask unanimous consent to move to suspend the rules to pass the bill for the relief of General Grant?

The SPEAKER. Not while the regular order is insisted upon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BROWN] states that the objection to the request made by him to take up a public-building bill is withdrawn.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. There is no quorum here, so we can not do any business. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] wants a quorum.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table—

The SPEAKER. Objection is made and the regular order is demanded by gentlemen on both sides of the House, so that the Chair can not entertain a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. TUCKER. I will ask the House, if I can get attention for a moment—

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. TUCKER. Who makes the objection?

The SPEAKER. Several gentlemen are demanding the regular order and insisting that no business shall be done except the regular business before the House.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess.

The SPEAKER. That motion can be entertained only by unanimous consent, because, as the Chair has stated several times, all the motions that can be made with reference to a recess, under the rules of the House, are now pending.

Mr. TUCKER. The objection is withdrawn.
 The SPEAKER. Is the demand for the regular order withdrawn?
 Several MEMBERS. Regular order.
 The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand that it is withdrawn. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PETTIBONE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to the motion made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. VALENTINE].
 The House divided; and there were—ayes 24, noes 32.
 Mr. HOUK. No quorum.
 Tellers were ordered; and Mr. COOK and Mr. HOUK were appointed.
 The House proceeded to divide; but before the tellers announced the result of the count the following proceedings took place:
 Mr. VALENTINE. I move that the House adjourn.
 The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. HATCH, of Missouri). That motion is not in order. The House is dividing.
 Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to move to suspend the rules in order to take up and put on its passage Senate bill 1372, to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is dividing, and the motion is not in order.
 Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman who has just returned from the other end of the Capitol states that the Senate has taken a recess until 9 o'clock to-morrow morning. If that be true, I do not see any necessity of our remaining here longer.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, will this House hear the story of two men who entered the Army at the beginning of the war as private soldiers and after serving bravely for four years under the flag that hangs so gracefully over your head, sir, met with a misfortune which a bill now pending in this House is designed to remedy? For four years as private soldiers they marched to "the music of the Union."

A MEMBER. Do they want an appropriation?
 Mr. BURNES. They ask no appropriation; they ask a simple act of justice. Entering the Army as poor boys, and serving through the war, they earned the rank respectively of colonel and lieutenant-colonel. Commissions were sent to them from the War Department, but unfortunately these commissions arrived a day or two after these soldiers were mustered out.

They ask no pay, no emoluments. They simply ask at the hands of the country the honor of these titles of colonel and lieutenant-colonel, which they won. The bill has passed the Senate of the United States, and has been reported favorably by a committee of this House, the report being made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE]. The bill asks no appropriation of money; it proposes nothing but to do an act of simple justice to these plain men who fairly earned this distinction.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] asks unanimous consent to call up for immediate consideration the Senate bill to which he has referred. Is there objection?

Mr. VALENTINE. I object.
 Mr. DAVIS, of Illinois. Let the bill be read subject to objection.
 Mr. VALENTINE. I object.
 Mr. MCCOMAS. Let the report be read.
 Mr. VALENTINE. There must be a quorum here before any further business is done.

Mr. BURNES. I believe it is the right of a member desiring to call up a bill to have it read before objections are made.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is dividing. The proposition of the gentleman from Missouri requires unanimous consent, and objection has been made.

Mr. HATCH, of Michigan. I move that the House adjourn.
 The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The tellers have not reported the result of their count, and the motion of the gentleman from Michigan is not in order.

Mr. HATCH, of Michigan. Are the tellers going to stand there all night?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hopes gentlemen will vote. No quorum has voted.

Mr. BELFORD. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for present consideration Senate bill 1504. Let it be read, subject to objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent—

Mr. HATCH, of Michigan. How can that motion be entertained if the motion to adjourn is not in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELFORD] asked for unanimous consent.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:
 A bill (S. 1504) for the erection of a public building at Pueblo, Colo.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. WARNER, of Ohio. That is provided for in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. BELFORD. It is not.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?
 Mr. VALENTINE. I object to any business proceeding until there is a quorum.

Mr. BELFORD. Is it possible for me to say that a man from a Western State objects to a Western measure?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Colorado is not in order.

Mr. VALENTINE. I am very sorry—
 Mr. BELFORD. You are the only one in this House that objects, and I want the RECORD to show it.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I ask unanimous consent to offer the following resolution—

Mr. WELLER. I object.
 Mr. ADAMS, of New York. Let it be read for information.

Mr. WELLER. No, sir. I have been trying to get my joint resolution read for information. I will withdraw my objection if I can have my joint resolution read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa is not in order.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask the House to allow me to have considered a bill to pay a postmaster in my State \$171 on account of vouchers which were burned. The claim is duly authenticated by the Post-Office Department. It is a small matter and I ask that it be considered. It is a Senate bill, which has the recommendation of the Department and has been unanimously reported by the committee that have examined it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?
 Mr. VALENTINE. I object.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I understand that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WELLER] withdrew his objection to my resolution and there was no other objection that I heard.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Nebraska has objected to the consideration of any measure.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. The gentleman from Nebraska states to me that he did not make any objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. I did not object to the reading of that resolution. If I understand its purport I think it is in the line of our duty to-night. I have heard of it but have not heard it read.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I call for the reading of my resolution.
 Mr. WELLER. I have not withdrawn my objection.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Shortly after the close of the late war— [Laughter and applause and cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The tellers will announce the result.
 Mr. COOK. Eleven ayes and 25 noes.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama, rose. [Cries of "Regular order!"]
 Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I ask to take up the Blair educational bill.

I believe we are agreed on that. I hope there will be no objection. It is an important measure.

Mr. KEAN. I object.
 Mr. JORDAN. I ask to take up a bill. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been called and gentlemen say they will object to any measure.

Mr. WELLER. I withdraw my objection to the reading of the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADAMS]. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. It is entirely useless to ask unanimous consent so long as there are calls for the regular order. It makes a great deal of labor for the Official Reporters of the House, and amounts to nothing. Whenever the demand for the regular order is withdrawn the Chair will take pleasure in recognizing gentlemen.

Mr. ADAMS, of New York. I understood the gentleman from Iowa withdrew his objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. I understand the gentleman's resolution is in reference to the subject we are acting on. If so, I should like to hear it read.

Mr. HATCH, of Missouri. I demand the regular order of business.
 Mr. KEAN. Would it be in order to take a recess for fifteen minutes?

The SPEAKER. It will not, as all the motions for a recess that can be entertained have been made. The tellers report 11 ayes and 27 noes.

Mr. VALENTINE. No quorum (3 o'clock and 40 minutes a. m. March 3). I move that the House do now adjourn.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 26, noes 34.

Mr. VALENTINE. I demand the yeas and nays.
 The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 34, nays 52, not voting 238; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Adams, J. J.	Dixon,	Kean,	Smalls,
Barr,	Everhart,	Lacey,	Stephenson,
Bisbee,	God,	Lewis,	Thomas,
Boutelle,	Hanback,	McComas,	Tillman,
Breitung,	Hart,	O'Hara,	Valentine,
Brown, W. W.	Hatch, H. H.	Parker,	Weaver,
Brumm,	Haynes,	Perkins,	Wise, J. S.
Cannon,	Hepburn,	Peters,	
Cassidy,	Houk,	Rowell,	

NAYS—52.

Arnott,
Bagley,
Belford,
Bjount,
Bratton,
Budd,
Burnes,
Cabell,
Caldwell,
Carleton,
Clay,
Cook,
Davis, G. R.

Dibble,
English,
Ferrell,
Funston,
Gibson,
Halsell,
Hatch, W. H.
Hewitt, G. W.
Hill,
Hutchins,
Jordan,
Kleiner,
Long,

Lore,
Lowry,
Mills,
Murphy,
Mutchler,
O'Ferrall,
O'Neill, J. J.
Patton,
Post,
Randall,
Ranney,
Reece,
Rockwell,

Rogers, W. F.
Shiveley,
Snyder,
Springer,
Swope,
Taylor, J. M.
Van Eaton,
Wallace,
Warner, A. J.
Warner, Richard
Weller,
Wolford,
Woodward.

NOT VOTING—238.

Adams, G. E.
Aiken,
Alexander,
Anderson,
Atkinson,
Ballentine,
Barbour,
Barksdale,
Bayne,
Beach,
Belmont,
Bennett,
Bingham,
Blackburn,
Blanchard,
Bland,
Bowen,
Boyle,
Brainerd,
Breckinridge,
Brewer, F. B.
Brewer, J. H.
Broadhead,
Browne, T. M.
Buchanan,
Buckner,
Burlingame,
Campbell, Felix
Campbell, J. E.
Campbell, J. M.
Candler,
Chalmers,
Clardy,
Clements,
Cobb,
Collins,
Connolly,
Converse,
Cosgrove,
Covington,
Cox, S. S.
Cox, W. R.
Craig,
Crisp,
Culbertson, D. B.
Culbertson, W. W.
Cullen,
Curtin,
Cutcheon,
Dargan,
Davidson,
Davis, L. H.
Davis, R. T.
Deuster,
Dibrell,
Dingley,
Dockery,
Dorshimer,
Dowd,
Dunham,

Dunn,
Eaton,
Eldredge,
Elliott,
Ellis,
Ellwood,
Ermentrout,
Evans,
Fiedler,
Findlay,
Finerty,
Follett,
Foran,
Forney,
Fyan,
Garrison,
Geddes,
George,
Glascok,
Graves,
Green,
Greenleaf,
Guenther,
Hammond,
Hancock,
Hardeman,
Hardy,
Harmer,
Hemphill,
Henderson, D. B.
Henderson, T. J.
Henley,
Herbert,
Hewitt, A. S.
Hiscock,
Hitt,
Hoblitzell,
Holman,
Holmes,
Holton,
Hooper,
Hopkins,
Horr,
Houseman,
Howey,
Hunt,
Hurd,
James,
Jeffords,
Johnson,
Jones, B. W.
Jones, J. H.
Jones, J. K.
Jones, J. T.
Keifer,
Kelley,
Kellogg,
Ketcham,
King,
Laird,

Lamb,
Lanham,
Lawrence,
Le Fevre,
Libbey,
Lovering,
Lyman,
McAdoo,
McCoid,
McCormick,
McMillin,
Maybury,
Millard,
Miller, J. F.
Miller, S. H.
Milliken,
Mitchell,
Money,
Morgan,
Morrill,
Morrison,
Morse,
Moulton,
Muldrow,
Muller,
Murray,
Neece,
Nelson,
Nicholls,
Nutting,
Oates,
Ochiltree,
O'Neill, Charles
Paige,
Payne,
Payson,
Peel,
Petibone,
Phelps,
Pierce,
Poland,
Potter,
Price,
Pryor,
Pusey,
Rankin,
Ray, G. W.
Ray, Ossian
Reagan,
Reed, T. B.
Reid, J. W.
Rice,
Riggs,
Robertson,
Robinson, J. S.
Robinson, W. E.
Rogers, J. H.
Rosecrans,
Russell,

Ryan,
Seney,
Seymour,
Shaw,
Singleton,
Skinner, C. R.
Skinner, T. G.
Slocum,
Smith, A. Herr
Smith, H. Y.
Spooner,
Spriggs,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart, Charles
Stewart, J. W.
Stockslager,
Stone,
Storm,
Strait,
Struble,
Sumner, C. A.
Sumner, D. H.
Talbott,
Taylor, E. B.
Taylor, J. D.
Thompson,
Throckmorton,
Tucker,
Tully,
Turner, H. G.
Turner, Oscar
Van Alstyne,
Vance,
Wadsworth,
Wait,
Wakefield,
Ward,
Washburn,
Wellborn,
Wemple,
White, J. D.
White, Milo
Whiting,
Wilkins,
Williams,
Willis,
Wilson, James
Wilson, W. L.
Winans, E. B.
Winans, John
Wise, G. D.
Wood,
Worthington,
Yapic,
York,
Young.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to say that my information from the Senate is that the sundry civil bill can not be here until 5 o'clock, and I make the motion that the House take a recess until 9 o'clock.

Mr. JOHN S. WISE. I move that the House do now adjourn. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HUNT. I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. I make the point of order that there are amendments pending now in the second degree.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess until 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. MCOMAS. Say 10 o'clock.

Mr. RANDALL. No; 9 o'clock. That is as late as we ought to make it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

And accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m. Tuesday) the House took a recess until 9 o'clock a. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired the House (at 9 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 3, 1885) resumed its session.

Mr. VALENTINE. I move that the House take a further recess until 10.55 o'clock to-day.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to a recess, and hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. PETTIBONE. I move to amend the motion by taking a recess until 10.50 o'clock.

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to state to gentlemen that the sundry civil bill will be here in a few moments.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to amend the amendment by taking a recess until 10.45 o'clock.

Mr. SPRINGER. Gentlemen on the other side are making a sad mistake in filibustering this way.

Mr. VALENTINE. Gentlemen will judge for themselves on that point.

BRIDGE OVER THE CUMBERLAND AND CANEY FORK RIVERS.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to take up the bill (H. R. 8102) to give the assent of Congress to the construction of a railroad bridge by the East and Middle Tennessee Railroad Company over the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, and put it upon its passage. I think there can be no objection to this bill, which has been already read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the East and Middle Tennessee Railroad Company be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Cumberland River at the most accessible point in or near the corporate limits of Carthage, county of Smith, and State of Tennessee. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railroad trains and wagons and travelers across said river.

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post-route; and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States: *Provided*, That the United States may construct a postal telegraph over said bridge without charge therefor.

SEC. 3. That if said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans, the spans thereof shall not be less than one hundred and sixty-four feet in length in the clear, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river. The lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge shall be at least thirty-four feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, and the bridge shall be at right angles to and its piers parallel with the current of the river: *Provided*, That if the same shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, the draw or pivot shall be over the main channel at an accessible point, and the spans shall not be less than one hundred and sixty feet in the clear, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with and the bridge itself at right angles to the current of the river, and the spans shall not be less than ten feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge: *Provided also*, That the said draw shall be opened promptly by said corporation, upon reasonable signal, for the passage of boats; and said corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset till sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe, and shall also place and maintain such sheer-booms and other guides necessary for the safe passage of vessels and other water-craft as may be required by the Secretary of War. No bridge shall be erected or maintained under the authority of this act which shall at any time substantially or materially obstruct the free navigation of said river; and if any bridge erected under such authority shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, obstruct such navigation, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction; and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of said corporation; and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the circuit court of the United States of the middle district of Tennessee in which any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located, or in the circuit court of the State of Tennessee for that circuit: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to repeal or modify any of the provisions of law now existing in reference to the protection of the navigation of rivers, or to exempt this bridge from the operations of the same: *And provided further*, That the right is reserved to regulate tolls and freights over said bridge.

SEC. 4. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his exami-

So the House refused to adjourn.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. PRYOR with Mr. BAYNE, till morning.

Mr. VANCE with Mr. ANDERSON, for the day.

Mr. LE FEVRE with Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, until morning.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. PIERCE with Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. DUNHAM with Mr. COX, of North Carolina, until 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. PUSEY with Mr. HOLMES, until 9 o'clock March 3.

Mr. MORGAN with Mr. MORRILL.

Mr. DEUSTER with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.

Mr. JONES, of Wisconsin, with Mr. MCCORMICK, for the day.

Mr. ERMENTROUT with Mr. BRAINERD, for the rest of the day.

Mr. ROSECRANS with Mr. WADSWORTH, for the rest of the day.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. RANNEY, for the rest of the day.

Mr. DOWD with Mr. WHITE, of Kentucky, for the rest of the day.

Mr. MILLARD with Mr. AENOT.

Mr. BISBEE with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. MILLS with Mr. PAYSON.

Mr. STOCKSLAGER with Mr. LIBBEY, for the rest of the day.

Mr. WOOD with Mr. RAY, of New Hampshire.

Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. BREWER, of New York.

Mr. PEEL with Mr. NELSON.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee for a recess.

nation and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of one mile above and one mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be built; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved, and the right to require any changes in said structure, or its entire removal, at the expense of the owners thereof, whenever Congress shall decide that the public interest requires it, is also expressly reserved.

SEC. 6. That the East and Middle Tennessee Railroad Company is hereby also authorized to construct a railroad bridge over the Caney Fork River at such point between the mouth of said river and the Buffalo Valley as may be necessary in the building of their road, subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the preceding sections.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. VALENTINE. I ask unanimous consent to take up the following Senate bill—

Mr. SPRINGER. I object.

Mr. VALENTINE. That is the usual magnanimity of the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object to any unanimous consent for gentlemen who obstruct the public business.

Mr. McMILLIN. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not insist on his objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Gentlemen have seen fit to filibuster away the time of the House. Now I do not propose that they shall pass bills through by consent. One thing certain, they can not filibuster away the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland, which will take place to-morrow in spite of them.

Mr. VALENTINE. I supposed the gentleman would object. It is not unexpected. It is his usual courtesy to this side.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2686) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a building for the use of the United States circuit and district courts of the United States, the post-office, and other Government offices at Williamsport, Pa.," and making an additional appropriation therefor.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. Very well.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table for present consideration a Senate bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Is that the jail bill?

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, namely:

A bill (H. R. 4089) to empower the commissioners of the District of Columbia to examine the claim of and provide for the payment of Outerbridge Horsey, assignee;

A bill (H. R. 612) for the relief of Brannin, Summers & Co.;

A bill (H. R. 449) to provide for the appraisal and sale of lands in the town of Peru, Dubuque County, Iowa; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 341) to authorize the printing of 50,000 copies of the second annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the year 1885.

It further announced that the Senate had passed a resolution providing for the printing of the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of precious metals in the United States for the year 1885; and further that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 8256) making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. In compliance with the unanimous wish of the members of the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill, and to move that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments, that they be printed, and that a conference be asked with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill with Senate amendments, for the purpose of non-concurring in the Senate amendments and asking a committee of conference.

Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. ROGERS, of Arkansas. I believe there is no objection to the bill which I desire to call up. I should like very much to make a statement in explanation of it.

Mr. RANDALL. I shall object to anything of that kind until the public business can be attended to.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I would suggest that we should proceed to pass the Senate pension bills which have not yet been acted on.

Mr. RANDALL. I shall object to everything until the public business is attended to. I move to suspend the rules and that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments to the sundry civil appropriation and ask for a committee of conference.

The question being taken on Mr. RANDALL's motion, the Speaker stated that in the judgment of the Chair the "ayes" had it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 4.

Mr. HEPBURN. No quorum.

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

The question being taken on Mr. RANDALL's motion, the Speaker stated that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRUMM. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 14, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following members failed to answer:

Adams, J. J.	Dixon	Lacey	Rockwell
Aiken	Dorsheimer	Laird	Rogers, W. F.
Alexander	Dowd	Lamb	Rosecrans
Anderson	Dunn	Lanham	Rowell
Arnot	Eaton	Lawrence	Russell
Atkinson	Elliott	Le Fevre	Seney
Bagley	Ellis	Libbey	Seymour
Ballentine	Ellwood	Long	Shaw
Barbour	English	Lovering	Shively
Barksdale	Ermentrout	Lowry	Singleton
Barr	Evans	Lyman	Skinner, T. G.
Bayne	Everhart	McAdoo	Stocum
Beach	Ferrell	McCoid	Smith
Belford	Fiedler	McComas	Smith, A. Herr
Belmont	Findlay	McCormick	Smith, H. Y.
Bennett	Finerty	Maybury	Snyder
Bingham	Foran	Miller, J. F.	Spooner
Bisbee	Forney	Miller, S. H.	Spriggs
Blanchard	Funston	Milliken	Steele
Bland	Fyan	Mills	Stephenson
Blount	Garrison	Mitchell	Stevens
Boutelle	Geddes	Money	Stewart, Charles
Boyle	George	Morgan	Stewart, J. W.
Brainerd	Gibson	Morrill	Stockslager
Bratton	Glascocock	Morrison	Stone
Breitung	Graves	Morse	Storm
Brewer, F. B.	Green	Moulton	Struble
Brewer, J. H.	Greenleaf	Muldrow	Sumner, C. A.
Browne, T. M.	Guenther	Muller	Sumner, D. H.
Buchanan	Halsell	Murphy	Talbot
Buckner	Hammond	Murray	Taylor, E. B.
Burleigh	Hancock	Mutchler	Taylor, J. D.
Burnes	Hardeman	Neece	Taylor, J. M.
Cabell	Harmer	Nelson	Thomas
Caldwell	Hatch, H. H.	Nicholls	Thompson
Campbell, Felix	Hatch, W. H.	Nutting	Throckmorton
Campbell, J. E.	Hemphill	Oates	Tucker
Campbell, J. M.	Henley	Ochiltree	Tully
Candler	Herbert	O'Ferrall	Turner, H. G.
Cannon	Hewitt, A. S.	O'Hara	Turner, Oscar
Carleton	Hill	O'Neill, J. J.	Van Alstyne
Cassidy	Hitt	Paige	Van Eaton
Chalmers	Hoblitzell	Parker	Wadsworth
Clardy	Holman	Payne	Wait
Clay	Holmes	Peel	Wakefield
Clements	Holton	Perkins	Warner, A. G.
Cobb	Hooper	Peters	Warner, Richard
Collins	Hopkins	Petels	Weaver
Connolly	Houk	Pierce	Wellborn
Converse	Houseman	Poland	Weller
Cosgrove	Hovey	Post	Wemple
Covington	Hunt	Potter	White, J. D.
Cox, S. S.	Hurd	Prie	Whiting
Cox, W. R.	Hutchins	Pusey	Wilkins
Craig	James	Rankin	Williams
Crisp	Jeffords	Ranney	Willis
Culbertson, D. B.	Johnson	Ray, G. W.	Winans, John
Culbertson, W. W.	Jones, B. W.	Ray, Ossian	Wise, G. D.
Cullen	Jones, J. H.	Reagan	Wise, J. S.
Curtin	Jones, J. K.	Reed, T. B.	Wolford
Cutcheon	Jones, J. T.	Reid, J. W.	Wood
Dargan	Jordan	Reese	Woodward
Davis, G. R.	Keifer	Rice	Worthington
Davis, R. T.	Kelley	Riggs	York
Deuster	Kellogg	Robertson	Young
Dibble	Ketcham	Robinson, J. S.	
Dingley	Kleiner	Robinson, W. E.	

Mr. KING. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House.

The question being taken on Mr. KING's motion, it was agreed to—ayes 24, noes 0.

So further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. RANDALL. I now ask action on the pending motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. BLACKBURN). The pending motion is that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the sundry civil appropriation bill for the purpose of non-concurring in the Senate amendments and asking a committee of conference.

Mr. RANDALL. And printing the Senate amendments. The question being taken on Mr. RANDALL's motion, the Speaker pro tempore stated that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HANBACK. I call for a division. The House divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 3. So (further count not being called for and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. RANDALL, Mr. FORNEY, and Mr. RYAN.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HISCOCK (at 9.30 a. m., Tuesday, March 3). I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, there were—ayes 25, noes 23.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. I call for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, 19 members voting therefor.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 25, nays 63, not voting 236; as follows:

Table with 4 columns: YEAS-25. Adams, G. E., Bisbee, Bowen, Brewer, F. B., Cox, S. S., Goff, Hanback, Hart, Henderson, D. B., Henderson, T. J., Hepburn, Hiscock, Horr, Howey, Millard, Morrill, O'Hara, Parker, Peters, Pettibone, Price, Rowell, Skinner, C. R., Thomas, Valentine.

Table with 4 columns: NAYS-63. Blackburn, Breckinridge, Brewer, J. H., Broadhead, Brown, W. W., Budd, Caldwell, Candler, Cook, Cox, W. R., Davidson, Davis, L. H., Dibrell, Dunham, Eldredge, Ermentrout, Everhart, Ferrell, Follet, Forney, Halsell, Hammond, Hardy, Harmer, Haynes, Hewitt, G. W., Jones, B. W., Kean, King, Lanham, Lewis, Long, Lore, McMillin, Matson, Moulton, Murphy, Mutchler, Neece, O'Neill, Charles, Patton, Payson, Pryor, Randall, Rogers, J. H., Rosecrans, Springer, Strait, Swope, Taylor, J. M., Tillman, Townsend, Vance, Wallace, Ward, Warner, A. J., Washburn, Weller, White, Milo, Wilson, James, Wilson, W. L., Winans, E. B., Yapple.

Table with 4 columns: NOT VOTING-236. Adams, J. J., Aiken, Alexander, Anderson, Arnot, Atkinson, Bagley, Ballentine, Barbour, Barksdale, Barr, Bayne, Beach, Belford, Belmont, Bennett, Bingham, Blanchard, Bland, Blount, Boutelle, Boyle, Brainerd, Bratton, Breitung, Browne, T. M., Brumm, Buchanan, Buckner, Burleigh, Burnes, Cabell, Campbell, Felix, Campbell, J. E., Campbell, J. M., Cannon, Carleton, Cassidy, Chalmers, Clardy, Clay, Clements, Cobb, Collins, Connoily, Converse, Cosgrove, Covington, Craig, Crisp, Culbertson, D. B., Culbertson, W. W., Cullen, Curtin, Cutcherson, Dargan, Davis, G. R., Davis, R. T., Deuster, Dibble, Dingley, Dixon, Dockery, Dorsheimer, Dowd, Dunn, Eaton, Elliott, Ellis, Ellwood, English, Evans, Fiedler, Findlay, Finerty, Foran, Funston, Fyan, Garrison, Geddes, George, Gibson, Glascock, Graves, Green, Greenleaf, Guenther, Hancock, Hardeman, Hatch, H. H., Hatch, W. H., Hemphill, Henley, Herbert, Hewitt, A. S., Hill, Hitt, Hoblitzell, Holman, Holmes, Holton, Hooper, Hopkins, Houk, Houseman, Hunt, Hurd, Hutchesin, James, Jeffords, Johnson, Jones, J. H., Jones, J. K., Jones, J. T., Jordan, Keifer, Kelley, Kellogg, Ketcham, Kleiner, Lacey, Laird, Lamb, Lawrence, Le Fevre, Libbey, Lovering, Lowry, Lyman, McAdoo, McCoid, McComas, McCormick, Maybury, Miller, J. F., Miller, S. H., Milliken, Mills, Mitchell, Money, Morgan, Morrison, Morse, Muldrow, Muller, Murray, Nelson, Nicholls, Nutting, Oates, Ochiltree, O'Ferrall, O'Neill, J. J., Paige, Payne, Peel, Perkins, Phelps, Pierce, Poland, Post, Potter, Pusey, Rankin, Ranney, Ray, G. W., Ray, Ossian, Reagan, Reed, T. B., Reid, J. W., Reese, Rice, Riggs, Robertson, Robinson, J. S., Robinson, W. E., Rockwell, Rogers, W. F., Russell, Ryan, Seney, Seymour, Shaw, Shively, Singleton, Skinner, T. G., Slocum, Smalls, Smith, A. Herr, Smith, H. Y., Snyder, Spooner, Spriggs, Steele, Stephenson, Stevens, Stewart, Charles, Stewart, J. W., Stockslager, Stone, Storm, Struble, Sumner, C. A., Sumner, D. H., Talbot, Taylor, E. B., Taylor, J. D., Thompson, Throckmorton, Tucker, Turner, H. G., Turner, Oscar, Van Alstyne, Van Eaton, Wadsworth, Wait, Wakefield, Warner, Richard, Weaver, Wellborn, Wemple, White, J. D., Whiting, Wilkins, Williams, Willis, Winans, John, Wise, G. D., Wise, J. S., Wolford, Wood, Woodward, Worthington, York, Young.

So the motion was not agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HARDY, the reading of the names of members voting was dispensed with.

Mr. STOCKSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1040) to provide for the erection of a public building at New Albany, Ind., and move to suspend the rules and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. STOCKSLAGER. I ask unanimous consent. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STOCKSLAGER] asks unanimous consent to take up the bill the title of which he has indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. VALENTINE. Oh, there is no use in talking about it. Mr. ROWELL. I object.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and pass Senate bill 2449—

Mr. VALENTINE. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] asks unanimous consent to call up the bill which he has indicated, but objection is made.

Mr. WELLER. I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection has already been made.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up for present consideration joint resolution (H. R. 252) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use all the unappropriated money in the Treasury for the redemption of United States bonds, and for other purposes. [Laughter.] Several members objected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence until 11 o'clock to-day, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that members on the right and on the left of the Chair be recognized alternately to call up bills by unanimous consent. I think an arrangement of that kind can be made which will be satisfactory to gentlemen on both sides.

Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed for one hour under the special rule of the House for the consideration of bills which are not objected to by as many as ten members; leaving the election case and all other pending matters in statu quo.

Mr. STRAIT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has a request for unanimous consent pending.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 21. Mr. BUDD. I call for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays, and 12 members only voted in the affirmative—not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were not ordered. The motion to adjourn was agreed to; and accordingly (at 10 o'clock a. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Resolution of the Legislature of Kansas, asking that unpensioned ex-soldiers of the Union be pensioned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Washington, Kans., for early action on the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ARNOT: Petition of citizens of New York, asking for the repeal of the revenue tax on tobacco, &c.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAGLEY: Memorial of Charles Stoughton, a citizen of the United States, relative to the Harlem River and other public improvements—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BEACH: Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York, in reference to a national board of health—to the Select Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of Mrs. E. E. Riley, of Henry County, Kentucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEUSTER: Joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, against the importation of foreign labor under contract—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. EVANS: Joint resolution of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, requesting members of that State to oppose any effort by Congress to abolish the National Board of Health—to the Select Committee on the Public Health.

Also, resolution of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of the bill to put General U. S. Grant on the retired-list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVERHART: Resolution of the Legislature of Pennsylvania,

opposing the abolition of the National Board of Health—to the Select Committee on the Public Health.

Also, resolution of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of the bill to relieve General Grant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORAN: Petition of John A. Seymour and 30 others, citizens of Parma, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, praying for the immediate enactment of suitable legislation to prevent the evils of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of 148 citizens of Iola, Kans., asking for action on the Mormon question—to the same committee.

Mr. GUENTHER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, asking for an appropriation of \$50,000 for experiments relating to the making of sorghum sugar—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, asking for the passage of the bill relating to the prohibition of foreign contract labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of S. S. Bacon and others, of Putnam County, Ohio, asking for an increase of widows' pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSEMAN: Resolution of the Legislature of Michigan, for the passage of Government telegraph bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. B. W. JONES: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, on imported contract labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PARKER: Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York, in relation to the National Board of Health—to the Select Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. OSSIAN RAY: Papers relating to the claim of John Reeves—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of Richard T. Yeatman, first lieutenant Fourteenth United States Infantry, to amend military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Capt. James B. Sinclair, United States Army, retired, to have construed the act approved July 15, 1870, to ascertain amount of arrears due him under said act—to the same committee.

By Mr. VAN ALSTYNE: Joint resolution of the Legislature of New York, recommending the passage of an act to authorize the construction of bridges, &c., for public improvement—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also joint resolutions of the Legislature of New York, recommending an appropriation for the National Board of Health—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. A. J. WARNER: Petition of C. H. Grosvenor and others, citizens of Athens County, Ohio, asking legislation on the Mormon question—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILO WHITE: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the enlargement of the Sault Saint Mary's Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHITING: Petition of citizens of Worcester County, Massachusetts, for an increase of widows' pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHN WINANS: Joint resolution of Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, to prevent importation of foreign labor under contract—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. YAPLE: Concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, relative to the Summer postal telegraph bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The following petitions for the passage of the Mexican war pension bill with Senate amendments were presented and severally referred to the Committee on Pensions:

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of citizens of Luther, Mich.
By Mr. EVANS: Resolutions of the Legislature of Pennsylvania.
By Mr. KEIFER: Of W. M. Abbott and 63 others, of Belle Centre; of James A. Mayer and 61 others, of Cardington; of Lewis W. Hebenthal and 122 others, of Dunkirk; and of Erastus Wilcox and 16 others, of Pharisburg, Ohio.

By Mr. MORRILL: Memorial of the Legislature of Kansas.
By Mr. STEVENS: Of Mrs. Maria Turner, of Lockport, N. Y.
By Mr. WHITING: Of citizens of Orange, Amherst, Northfield, &c., Mass.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 3, 1885.

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. D. HUNTLEY, D. D.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday will be read.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings be for the present dispensed with.

Mr. INGALLS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The regular order is called for. The reading of the Journal will be proceeded with.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 2.

Mr. MITCHELL (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.). I move to dispense with the further reading of the Journal, with a view to ask the Senate to take up House pension bills favorably reported from the Committee on Pensions, and put them on their passage at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRISON in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. INGALLS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made. The reading of the Journal will proceed.

Mr. DAWES (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.). I ask unanimous consent to call up the fortifications appropriation bill for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the objection of the Senator from Kansas to the request that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with still stands, and that the request of the Senator from Massachusetts is not in order. The reading of the Journal will proceed.

Mr. PLUMB. It is always in order to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. DAWES. I did not hear any objection.

Mr. HARRIS. It is certainly in order for the Senator from Massachusetts to ask unanimous consent of the Senate to dispense with the further reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not the request that the Senator from Massachusetts made. Pending the reading of the Journal the Senator from Massachusetts asked that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the fortifications bill.

Mr. DAWES. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the fortifications bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with?

Mr. DAWES. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit the question to the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. INGALLS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas objects. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

The Secretary proceeded with the reading of the Journal.

Mr. DAWES (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.). May I renew my request for unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the Journal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the objection made by the Senator from Kansas must be considered as still operating.

Mr. DAWES. There is always a *locus penitentiæ*.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has not withdrawn his objection. The Chair thinks it must be treated as pending.

Mr. DAWES. I have no doubt the Senator from Kansas has already repented.

Mr. HALE. It is a very interesting article that is being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading will proceed.

The Secretary continued and concluded the reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Journal will be approved unless there is objection.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. MILLER, of California, presented the credentials of Leland Stanford, chosen by the Legislature of California a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1885; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of February 20, 1885, a report of the Commissioner of Railroads upon the subject of the transmission of telegraphic messages by corporations affected by the act of July 1, 1862; which was referred to the Committee on Railroads, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting as a partial reply to Senate resolution of June 24, 1884, sundry statements showing tax collections, receipts, and disbursements on account of the water department and expenditures for streets and roads from 1875 to 1884, &c., and asking to be relieved from further action under the resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in which it is stated that the information called for by Senate resolution of the 26th ultimo regarding illegal timberland entries, &c., in the Humboldt land district, California, can not be furnished during the present session of Congress; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.