

INDIANA LEGISLATURE.

On motions and curtailments of this report for want of space in these columns will appear in an appendix to Volume XXII of the Review Legislative Reports.

IN SENATE.

THURSDAY MORNING, March 5, 1885.

Mr. SELLERS moved that the bill [H. R. 222] to abolish the office of Ditch Commissioner be read the first time by sections and the second time by title.

Mr. WEIR: The present law is a system of robbery. Under the present law a man may start a ditch scheme and rob the people of thousands of dollars. We need some legislation upon this question: the people are expecting and demanding it. In one county of this State I am told there are over sixty ditches that have been returned, while the property assessed as benefited is not sufficient to pay the executions. This is an infamous law and ought to be changed.

Mr. YOCHE: I hope that motion will not prevail. There have been bills introduced here and reported by the committee that would do away with the most objectionable parts of the drainage law.

Mr. WEIR: It is evident that no bill that has not gone through the House can originate in the Senate and then go to the House and pass this session. It is the duty of the Senate to take some action upon this matter.

Mr. MAGEE: This is going to make a radical change in the law. The people have become thoroughly familiar with the present law, and the law has worked satisfactory with few exceptions. I am opposed to this bill at this time.

Mr. WEIR: The people in my section have become so familiar with the law that they regard it as an inviolable right. It is from this familiarity that the people demand a change.

Mr. MAGEE: I don't know why the bill should work one way in Cass County and another way in Laporte County. You can't have a public highway law that is not arbitrary. I bill so important as this, coming at this late day, ought not to be considered. It is utterly impossible to give this bill the proper attention.

Mr. HILLGASS: The present law is not satisfactory to the people of Indiana. The present law is eminently satisfactory to one class of people, and that class of people is the attorneys. In my county, where a great deal of ditching has been done, the most satisfactory law is the Commissioners' law. A more arbitrary law has never been placed upon the statute book than the present one.

Mr. WILLARD: It seems to me that this Legislature in this late day of the session is trying to follow out the action of the Legislature of 1881, when several bills were rushed through that were afterwards found to work unjustly. I doubt whether there are three members on the floor of the House who understand anything about this bill. It changes radically the entire drainage law of the State. We ought not to change the present law by passing a bill we know nothing about.

Mr. SHIVELY: I introduced a bill to repeal the present law in regard to drainage; this was referred to the Committee on Drainage and they made a favorable report. I am told by several members of that committee that there would be a bill introduced in the Senate for the purpose of amending the ditch law. Now we have a bill before the Senate proposing to amend that law, and I trust that it will pass. If there is any law that is infamous, odious and oppressing the people it is this Circuit Court ditch law. I trust the rule will be suspended.

Mr. McINTOSH: Nearly one-half of my county have written to me in regard to this law and spoken of its injustice. I understand the intention of the bill is to keep the Ditch Commissioners from confiscating the property of the people.

Mr. YOCHE: This bill proposes to repeal the present Circuit Court drainage law in toto, and to pass a new act upon the subject. It provides that there shall be a jury trial, and if there were five hundred witnesses, as might be the case, it would hardly be possible for a jury to do justice to the parties concerned. The jury would not be able to render an impartial verdict. This bill provides that if a majority of the residents of the county remonstrate against the ditch, it will go down. In the case of a non-resident, or one who has no friends in the county, it would work a very great hardship indeed. This bill comes to the Senate without any recommendation from any committee. I hope so radical a measure will not come up at this late hour of the session.

Mr. SELLERS: It is not too late to do justice. This bill was introduced January 21. It provides that where any two landowners of the county, or a majority of the landowners shall remonstrate, they shall proceed no further. I say that the majority of the people should always have control of this matter. I move the previous question. The demand was seconded, and under its operation—

The motion (Mr. Sellers') was agreed to—yeas, 37; nays, 11. The bill was ordered engrossed, with amendments proposed by several Senators.

Mr. SELLERS: The report signed by the Senator from Wayne and myself proposes to sell these reports at a profit of seventy-five cents a volume, and provides a good salary for the Reporter. The State paid \$14,500 for her share of these reports last year. I desire to be fair to the Reporter of the Supreme Court, but let this law be passed so that hereafter these Reports may be fully understood what the emoluments of the office will be.

Mr. YOCHE: Two members of the committee were in favor of reducing the price of the Reports to \$2.75.

The Senate took a recess for dinner.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The report submitted by Messrs. Sellers and Foulke was read.

The minority (Mr. Magee's) report, recommending indefinite postponement, was rejected by yeas 13, nays 27.

Mr. MAGEE, explaining: There is a demand for some legislation on this subject. I think it had policy to indefinitely postpone this bill, so I vote "no."

Mr. SELLERS: With the view that the bill shall be so amended as not to take effect during the term of the present incumbent, I vote "no."

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: As the terms of the five Commissioners expire this year, which increases the number of reports about one-half, and as it is probably there will be an Appellate Court, which will still further reduce the number of reports, and believing they should not cost more than \$2.75 a volume, I vote "aye."

Mr. SAILEY: In view of the explanation of Senator Sellers, I change my vote to "aye."

So the Senate refused to indefinitely postpone the bill.

Mr. YOCHE moved that the report signed by Mr. Fowler and himself be adopted instead of the other majority report, which leaves the law on this subject as it is, except that it proposes to cut down the price of the Supreme Court reports from \$3.50 to \$2.75. There is a great deal of detail about the other report.

Mr. SELLERS: The amendment which I propose meets the favor of a majority of the House. The volumes will not be cut down to more than six a year. This bill provides that the State shall issue these reports, and have all the profit after paying all costs of publications and officers. I hope the report signed by Mr. Foulke and myself will be adopted. The measure as it stood without the amendment was defeated in the House, but after the bill was engrossed, an amendment similar to the one I have in my hands was intended to be offered, but could not be because the bill was ordered to be engrossed. I am satisfied the amendment will be accepted by the House. This bill gives to the State all the profits arising from the publication of these reports. This new system is intended to be offered, but could not be, don't think there will be any difficulty in the House.

Mr. FOWLER moved to amend the report submitted by Senator Yocche and himself by providing that the provisions of this bill shall apply to the present incumbent.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tippecanoe, moved as a substitute that the provisions of this act shall go into effect from and after the 1st of January, 1886.

The substitute was rejected on a division—yeas, 13; nays, 27.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph, moved as a substitute that the provisions of this act shall not take effect till January 1, 1887.

Mr. WEIR: Inasmuch as we will probably adjourn this session before 1879, I move the substitute lay on the table.

The motion was rejected by yeas 18, nays 26.

Mr. HILLGASS: It is not just to cut down the emoluments of the office during the term of an incumbent, who made the race understanding what the office would be worth. Let the Legislature, if any is made, effect only the man who comes into office after the bill is enacted. Had either of us made a race for any position we would think such a way that they are prompted to leave to this impost a large endowment of real estate. I have no reason why the university should not hold this real estate.

Mr. MAGEE: I undertake to say that these reports can be sold for \$1.50. You can get the Pennsylvania reports for \$1.50 a volume. It is entirely wrong that any one in the State should get the salary that the Reporter of the Supreme Court gets. I can show that he gets nearly \$2,000 a year, and \$20,000—more than the Judge of the Supreme Court get. From every town in the State a petition has come up here asking us to pass such a bill.

Mr. McCULLOUGH: I don't believe in the theory that we can cut down the fees or salary of an officer during the term of an incumbent. I think we have the right to regulate the fees of any officer at any time. The only trouble I find is I don't know what are the emoluments on fees of this office. It has been said that the Supreme Court Reporter gets \$20,000. That is robbery. The great trouble is to get at the facts about this office. These committees are utterly unable to get the ex-Reporters or any one else to give them any facts in regard to the cost of the reports. I believe we ought to make this law take effect in 1887, and if the Supreme Court Reporter sees it, he can come before the next Legislature with facts and ask the Legislature to repeal the law. I am willing to put the price so low as to compel the Reporter to come in and show what the cost is. We are doing no injustice to the Reporter when we require a showing of the cost to be made.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: The amendment which does not meet with my sanction. I have made it as a sort of compromise. Heretofore we have cut down the salaries of various officers of the State, and I think it would be a bad precedent to say we could cut upon the fees or salaries of an officer during the incumbency of an officer. We have stricken \$2 a day from the fees of clerks during the present session, and it would be a dangerous thing to say we shall not legislate upon the fees of incumbent officers.

Mr. SELLERS: This same proposition was voted down in the House. If we pass a law now fixing what will be the compensation of the office of the Supreme Court Reporter, the next applicant will seek this office with his eyes open.

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: Up to 1880 you could not get any reports for anything like the price mentioned by the Senator from Cass (Mr. Magee). A company in New York published United States Reports, four volumes a year, for about a dollar volume. This proposed change will decrease the emoluments of that office about half, and, in addition, the introduction of the Appellate Court will take away a great part of the business of the Supreme Court Reporter.

The substitute was rejected.

Mr. OVERSTREET questioned whether it is competent for this General Assembly to pass a law to take effect after the meeting of the next General Assembly.

Mr. FOWLER: I think the Constitution is sufficiently plain on that subject. Reads: "The amendment (Mr. Fowler's) was agreed to by yeas 26, nays 20.

The question being on substituting the report of Senator Yocche and Fowler for the other report—

It was so ordered.

On motion by Mr. YOCHE the report submitted by Mr. Fowler and himself was concurred in.

The amendments proposed in that report was ordered engrossed.

COUNTY SCHOOL REVENUE.

Mr. HILL: S. 322 is a bill to regulate the county school revenue. This is a matter of great importance, not only to every county in the State but also to the State officers. It is also a matter of great importance to every taxpayer, because it lessens the amount of liability of the State Treasury. If you keep this money in the County Treasury it will be much more safe than otherwise. I have had the combined wisdom of the Auditor of the State, Supervisor of Public Instruction, and the Committee on Finance to assist in formulating this bill. I move to suspend the constitutional rule, and pass the bill the second time by its title, the third time by its sections, and put it upon its passage.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill passed by yeas 39, nays 3.

FREE TURNPIKES.

On motion of Mr. MAGEE the constitutional rule was suspended by a yeas and nays vote, in order that the bill [H. R. 29] authorizing County Commissioners to construct free turnpikes instead of county bridges might be read the second and third time and put upon its passage.

Mr. DAVIS: I move to strike out Section 4.

Mr. MAGEE: I think Section 4 ought to remain. Our city has more bridges than any city in the State. Section 4 puts in an emphatic form what has always been the law.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill passed by yeas 35, nays 10.

On motion of Mr. MAGEE the constitutional rule was suspended and the bill [H. R. 168] authorizing Councils of cities to enforce ordinances and requiring contractors

to accept estimates, etc., was finally passed by yeas 43, nays 0.

Mr. FOUKLE, on behalf of Republicans of the Senate, presented a lengthy protest against the passage of the appropriation bills. (See appendix to the Reports.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

On motion of Mr. BROWN the Weights and Measures bill [H. R. 211] was read the second time under a suspension of the constitutional rule.

Mr. OVERSTREET moved to amend so that fifty pounds of sweet potatoes shall constitute a bushel and fifty pounds of corn a bushel. Mr. BROWN opposed the amendment, believing that it would kill the bill at this late day in the session.

Mr. FOWLER: This is an amendment that strikes directly at the best interest of Indiana. I move to strike out "seventy pounds of corn."

Mr. BENZ: All of the Western States, Kentucky and Illinois have seventy pounds to constitute a bushel. I therefore vote "aye."

Mr. BROWN: I can see no reason for changing the present law. I vote "aye."

Mr. DAVIS: I am informed by a grain-dealer in Elkhart that every State in the West makes seventy pounds to constitute a bushel.

Mr. FOWLER: I am informed that the grain-dealers of this State would be glad to have the law changed so they can get two more pounds on every bushel of corn than they now get.

The motion was agreed to—yeas, 23; nays, 16.

The amendment to make fifty pounds of sweet potatoes a bushel was agreed to.

COLLEGES HOLDING REAL ESTATE.

On motion of Mr. FOUKLE, the constitutional rule was suspended and the bill [H. R. 400] authorizing colleges and universities to hold real estate to the value of \$500,000 was taken up.

Mr. YOCHE moved to amend so that real estate may be received by donation or devise, but it must be disposed of in twenty years from the date of the receipt.

Mr. WEIR: I hope the amendment of the Senator from Lake (Mr. Yocche) will not prevail. I am in favor of fair legislation in regard to the educational institutions of the State. This bill has passed the House. There are those who feel that a restriction is such a way that they are prompted to leave to this impost a large endowment of real estate. I have no reason why the university should not hold this real estate.

Mr. FOUKLE: I move to add after the word "advise" the words "and on foreclosure of mortgage, give to secure any part of the endowment fund."

Mr. YOCHE: The purpose of this amendment is not to prevent them from receiving the real estate, but the purpose is to prevent them from using it in the real estate.

Mr. OVERSTREET: Why not give the institution the right to build up itself by private enterprise? Any educational institution should have the right to hold \$500,000 if they can use it.

Mr. FOUKLE: I don't think any university receiving \$500,000 would cause any real estate crisis. I think we had better not jeopardize the bill by any amendments.

Mr. WEIR: At the time of the incorporation of De Pauw, it was allowed to hold real estate to the amount of \$50,000. Now they are asking that they be allowed to hold real estate to the amount of \$500,000, which some benevolent person desires to give them.

Mr. YOCHE: I believe there are twenty such cases in this State, and under this bill there would be \$10,000,000 wrapped up in these institutions.

Mr. WEIR: I would not object if they held that much.

Mr. WINTER: The object of this bill is to allow the institutions to show each and every one \$500,000 more than they need for the purpose for which it was incorporated. I am ready to allow every educational institution the right to buy or receive by purchase property or anything else for the purpose of education, and I am not sure that such action as that proposed by the bill is against all reason.

Mr. THOMPSON: I am not afraid to allow institutions to receive large donations.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of St. Joseph: If a college has five hundred thousand dollars as an income the presumption is that it is going to be invested in real estate or some other live property to bring an income.

Mr. SMITH, of Jay: This bill is against the policy of our Government. I am opposed to it.

Mr. SMITH, of Jennings: The opposition to this bill is that the institutions would acquire by purchase or gift large amounts of real estate which they would not yield up. It would be the creation of a landed monopoly, with lands and real estate incorporated. Such action as that proposed by the bill is against all reason.

The question being on the amendments (Mr. Foulke's) the vote resulted yeas 13, nays 16.

No quorum voting the Senate adjourned until 9:30 to-morrow morning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 5, 1885—9 a. m.

THE STATE MILITIA.

The unfinished business was consideration of the bill [S. 88] to regulate the State militia.

Mr. BROWNING: I do not see how this bill can pass. The Constitution says that no colored men shall belong to it; and while I have no prejudice against that race, yet I am sworn to support the Constitution, and for that reason I can not support this bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND: Does not the Constitution of the United States declare this State constitutional provision void? And are you not sworn to support the United States Constitution?

Mr. BROWNING: I do not believe that the United States has any right to interfere with this State right.

any attack without cause upon this bill. I do think that a close scrutiny of the bill will develop no reason that will be approved by the people why the bill should pass. The bill, as it stands, should have, on one or two grounds, that either it is an ornament to the State or that it is needed. Will anyone say that because other States have it we should have it as an ornament, to satisfy the whims of a few? We are told that there is to be an appropriation of but \$100,000. Don't delude yourself! Money will be demanded constantly and it is but the beginning of stupendous military organizations of the State. In private arguments the supporters of the bill say, "Give us a start. The cost to the State will not be less than \$25,000 per annum. Even though you have 17,000 petitioners for the bill, don't forget the 500,000 voters who have not been heard from. An organization to secure petitions against it would far out-weigh the petitioners for it. Don't let it be said that on the very day a Democratic administration came into power that the Indiana Assembly organized a standing army; we do not need it. There is no fear of coming on, nor is there an impending riot. No man need charge that the Democrats on this floor are fearing labor riots. Go into the States which have militia, and they are no more peaceful than Indiana. Take Ohio, for instance, with its Cincinnati and Hooking by day riots, and yet that State pays \$60,000 per year for its militia. It is the same in Pennsylvania. The cost of uniforms will be at least \$50,000, then there is the \$100,000 appropriation and the release from poll tax. It will be too good a burden for the taxpayer. Does Marion County want this tax on its property for the sake of a parade through the streets of Indianapolis? I have that confidence in the people which precludes any fear of riots or insurrection of property.

Mr. GORDON: The gentleman from Putnam (Mr. Gordon) has stated this question most thoroughly. What is the necessity of enacting this bill into a law? Don't delude yourselves with the idea that the law can be repealed in two years. The military organizations of the State are here with demands. Henry Clay once warned the people against military power. In time of war I am for soldiers, but in times of peace let us have peace. It is twenty years since the war, and even our Republican friends have discovered that it is not necessary to have a militia for this bill now? It will make Indiana a general encampment for this militia. Some speak of riots in cities, where some corporation of great power is keeping men at starvation's door and want "protection." The Sheriff can call every man in the county to his aid to suppress riot. The Democratic party is for the people, and it can not afford to pass this bill.

Mr. SMITH, of Warrick: Being a member of the Military Committee, and the only member opposing this unjust Military Bill, I will offer some thoughts against it. I represent a county which does not have a standing army. I followed the old flag with my musket. But these are times of peace. We will find a great many men braver in peace than in war. It has been urged that other States pay for military organizations, but as we do not need it I can not see why we should favor it. We should vote down the bill and save the taxpayer thousands of dollars. We want no such State dignity.

Mr. LOYD: I would like to support a reasonable bill for the militia, but I would rather encourage something of benefit to the State. I would rather vote to organize farmers' sons into a company for better stock raising or a company of carpenters or the like. But such a scheme would not meet with my favor. I do not care to "point with pride" to any military organization. I happen to be a member of a post of G. A. R., and it does not favor it. We should not contemplate the organization of military organizations for the workingmen were organized to protect themselves against oppression. Let it not be sent abroad that we oppose any labor organization.

Mr. DITMORE: While I am too old to take part in military parades, yet I favor the idea of the young men. I am not a soldier. I am willing to trust the State officers of whatever political party. When property is destroyed and the lives of innocent ones threatened, then I want the military to quell such troubles. I like to treat this matter fairly. I am not sure that a company would be organized in my county, but my people are not afraid of the bill.

Mr. GARRISON: I am the representative of a county which has an interest in this bill. I believe that this bill is an injury against the principles of the Democratic party. We have provided our children with books instead of swords, and we are capable of self-government. There is a dispute between capital and labor. I believe it would be a wise course to take to put the hands of capital or in the hands of labor.

Mr. MURPHY: I am a member of the G. A. R., but I see no necessity for the bill.

Mr. HARRELL: We are not here to make money of the young men. I am not sure that the people will not favor it. The expense will be heavy and the good nothing. I have studied the bill carefully, but I can not find the need of the law. I believe the bill to be unconstitutional.

Mr. PENNINGTON: I am an advocate of this bill. The opposition has drawn largely upon imagination regarding the bill and the cost. The long list of officers is complimentary—not one cent of tax upon the people. The only argument I have heard against the bill is its constitutionality of admitting colored men; but that may be declared by the Supreme Court and stricken out. We have five companies in Indianapolis, and they are all laboring men, and hard laboring men.

Mr. BARNEY: As the representative of 17,000 old soldiers, I must say that they are almost unanimously in favor of this bill. In the seventy-one counties where petitions come from, every old soldier is in favor of it. Go back before the war, when we were sleeping in peace, and a volcano suddenly bursts under our feet. The militia was the backbone of the war of 1812. We may need a militia suddenly in Indiana. No man regards brass buttons when he is going to be shot at. There is nothing in the ornament argument.

The bill passed—yeas, 56; nays, 35.

Mr. ADAMS, explaining his vote, said: Inasmuch as I hold in my hand a petition in favor of this bill from eighty-six taxpayers of my county, headed by the heaviest tax-payers of the county, I vote "aye."

Mr. BESF: Because I believe that it is demanded, I vote "aye."

Mr. BOOE: Because I am opposed to military powers in times of peace, because this bill is against the principles of our Government to equip and maintain large military forces, because it endangers the future peace of our country, in that it engenders a military spirit; because it will largely increase our burden of taxation; because this is an era of greater peace and such a vast military force is not needed; because, lastly, the people do not demand it, but it is only asked by red-tape military companies, I vote "no."

Mr. BOYD: Because I think it needful, I vote "aye."

Mr. BROWNING: Because I believe it unconstitutional, and because I am opposed to taxing old soldiers to support home guards, I vote "no."

Mr. COPELAND: Being opposed to bowing before the military, because I think a power should be put in the hands of the Governor, I vote "aye."

Mr. FRANKLIN: The bill is not free

from objection, but it is better than no bill. I vote "aye."

Mr. HOBAN: I thought last night that I would vote for this bill, but as I think it anti-Democratic, and as I think that morality is better than firearms, and thinking it unnecessary, I vote "no."

Mr. KELLISON: Because I am not in favor of filling the laboring men with bullets instead of bread, because history has taught me that all other Republics have perished because of military tactics and standing armies, I vote "no."

Mr. MAUK, of Wayne: Because I have a petition signed by 350 people of the great Quaker county which Mr. Gooding spoke of, and because I represent, with my colleagues, those people, and not Mr. Gooding, I vote "aye."

Mr. MCHENRY: Though a large petition was sent to me asking the passage of this bill, yet I believe it was signed under a misapprehension; I vote "no."

Mr. McMICHAEL: I have a petition of 250 names, from all parties of St. Joseph County, asking for the passage of this bill. I vote "aye."

Mr. OSBORN: I voted against the bill before, because I had a misapprehension. I vote for it now, because I understand it, and because the Senate has relieved it of its objectionable features. I believe in a system of protection to life and property. I vote "aye."

Mr. PASSAGE: Because the militia in this State has never been used for improper purposes, and because I don't believe it will be, I vote "aye."

Mr. REEVES: Because my people demand it, and because I have some misgivings about the bill, I vote "aye."

Mr. ROBINSON: Because we should cultivate the acts of peace instead of the theory of war, I vote "no."

Mr. SMITH, of Tippecanoe: Because the Constitution says that citizens may take up arms in their defense; because its spirit was indorsed by Thomas Jefferson, not because I fear riots at home; because I wish our army to be fully equipped and ready, I vote "aye."

Mr. STALEY: I am a man of peace, but in the time of peace prepare for war. The people of Indiana demand the law. I hold a petition signed by 175 men from my county, mostly working men, asking it: therefore, I vote "aye."

Mr. TOWNSEND: Because I do not entertain the misgivings experienced here to-day; because I am not afraid of the soldier; for precautionary reasons; and that I may be allowed a little personality, I think I should vote opposite to Mr. Browning. I vote "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS: Because I believe it contrary to the spirit of our country, I vote "aye."

The vote was then announced as above. So the bill passed.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

CLAIMS.

Mr. CHECELUS, from the Committee on Mileage and Accounts, presented a concurrent resolution [H. R. 31] recommending that the Doorkeeper of the House and T. W. Tomlinson, short-hand reporter, be allowed certain sums on account of the Knightston investigation.

The resolution was adopted.

THE STATE MILITIA.

Mr. McMULLEN moved to reconsider the vote passed upon the bill [S. 88] regarding the militia of the State.

Mr. DITMORE moved to lay the motion on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to by—yeas 51, nays 44.

THE GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PATTEN moved that the House at 3 o'clock take up the bill [H. R. 479] to make general appropriation for the State government.

On motion by Mr. DITMORE the motion was laid on the table—yeas, 56; nays, 39.

CLARK AND FLOYD COURT TERMS.

The Senate amendments to the bill [H. R. 430] changing the time of holding courts in Floyd and Clark Counties were concurred in.

U. S. GRANT.

The Senate concurrent resolution expressing a vote of thanks to Congress for placing Grant on the retired list was adopted.

DISSOLVING AN ASSOCIATION.

The bill [S. 325] authorizing the dissolution of the Eastern Indiana Agricultural Association was read the third time.

Mr. HARRELL said that the bill should not pass, as a majority of the citizens opposed it.

Mr. FISHER favored the bill because it was the wish of his constituents.

The bill passed by yeas 78, nays 10.

Mr. BARNEY explaining his vote said: All over northern Indiana are some old fair grounds which are an eyesore, and will remain so because of some stubborn member. I vote "aye."

BONDS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The bill [S. 7] to authorize County Commissioners to issue bonds for public buildings was read the third time and passed—yeas, 79; nays, 1.

PROTECTION TO STREAMS.

Mr. Hanlon's bill [H. R. 229] concerning the planting of willows on the banks of streams was read the third time and passed—yeas,