# THE WEARY TALK GOES ON

## NO CHANGE IN THE SENATE SITUATION.

DEMOCRATS STILL PREVENTING LEGISLATION —A REPUBLICAN QUORUM AT LAST SECURED —THE PLAN FOR STOPPING DEBATE.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Jan. 23.—The Senate resumed at 11 o'clock this morning the session which was interrupted by the recess of 6 o'clock last evening, the same legislative day continuing still unbroken. The consideration of the closure rule was consequently the only business which could be proceeded with, and the debate—which, of course, is one only in name—on Mr. Aldrich's resolution went on with monotonous regularity. Mr. Cockrell, by beginning as soon as a quorum had appeared, was able to finish his formidable assault on the pages of "The Congressional Record" shortly after 4 o'clock, most of his time on the floor having been spent in reading from official publications almost everything which has ever been said in the Senate on the subject of limiting debate. Mr. Gray, of Delaware, followed in a speech which aimed to show, by quotations from many so-called independent and a few semi-Republican newspapers, that public sentiment throughout the country was not wholly favorable to Federal control of Congressional elections. About 6 o'clock Mr. Stewart, of Nevada, obtained the floor for a speech, but yielded for another recess till to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The situation in the Senate was left practically unchanged, therefore, by to-day's proceedings. An effort made early in the afternoon by Mr. Aldrich to secure unanimous consent for a vote on the closure resolution to-morrow at 5 p. m. showed plainly that the Democratic managers will never voluntarily allow the proposed rule to be acted upon. Mr. Aldrich's request was drawn out by a question from Mr. Teller, who said that it was evident to him that some move to end debate on the rule was already impending, and that he would consequently like to know just how much more time was likely to be left for discussion. After expressing his eagerness to arrive at any reasonable agreement by which the hour for taking a vote might be fixed, Mr. Aldrich proposed 5 o'clock to-morrow. But Mr. Gorman, after fencing on the proposition for five or ten minutes, bluntly announced that no agreement to close the debate could be thought of for the present by the opposition. The Maryland Senator then offered a formal objection to Mr. Aldrich's request, and the Rhode Island Senator withdrew it, saying that he never had expected the Democratic side to agree to fix a time for voting, and that he would take other means to secure to the majority its right to pass upon pending legislation. This courageous and sensible declaration of indifference to minority dictation pointed all one way, and there is little doubt that Mr. Aldrich will endeavor to shut off discussion and reach action by next Monday at the latest. He anticipates the desertion of the whole body of Democratic Senators when the crisis comes, and is strengthening, by every means possible, the scanty quorum of Republicans now here. Mr. Chandler, of New-Hampshire, arrived to-day and his appearance reduced the number of Republican absentees to five, making a quorum, with one vote to spare. Mr. Squire, of Washington, is expected to be here on Monday, giving a margin of two. The other four absent Senators—Messrs. Moody, Pettigrew, Pierce and Ingalls—cannot be depended upon with any certainty to return in time for action upon the rule.

The present Republican plan for stopping debate simply requires the presence and vote of forty-five Senators. If the Chair does not cut off debate arbitrarily at a given point some Senator will get up and make the point of order that further debate is dilatory and improper, and ask for a ruling by the Chair. If the Chair decided that debate is permissible an appeal can be taken and sustained by a majority of the Senate. The duty of the Chair will then be to submit the resolution forthwith, and if it is adopted it can be applied at once to whatever business the majority next calls up. Among the Senators who expect to continue the fight against time to-morrow are Messrs. Stewart, Daniel, Morgan and probably Teller.

When the Senate met, Mr. Cockrell resumed the floor. In order to continue his argument against the closure resolution. He yielded, however, to Mr. Hoar, who said that he desired to add one idea to what he had said last evening. He regarded the pending proposition as he should if the case had arisen in the Supreme Court of the United States. There was no one who would not recognize the importance of absolute, free and untrammelled discussion in that tribunal, and that no member of that court should be curtailed in stating his opinion to his brethren, or in suggesting any modification of any judgment expected to be pronounced. But if it could be conceived of that august tribunal that, in the case of some controversy about to pass into judgment, affecting the interests of large portions of the American people, and exciting their feelings, four members of the nine should undertake to read opinions alternately day after day, night after night and week after week—one taking turns with the other, and having read all the decisions which had been made since the foundation of the Government, and in that way to prevent the action of the court altogether, or to postpone it until judgment could cease to be effectual—would anybody doubt that it would be the duty of that great tribunal to interpose and to adopt some rule that would put a limit to the length of opinions or to the number of arguments that should be made by the minority? Would anybody claim that that action would be inconsistent with the fullest respect for untrammelled freedom of discussion or suggestion, when used in good faith? It was almost an affront to the name and character of that illustrious bench even to suppose possible what he had supposed. But that bench was certainly no more important, august or illustrious, and no higher in constitutional functions, than the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Cockrell again took the floor and resumed his argument against the closure rule. The article which he had been reading at the close of his remarks yesterday (Mr. Hoar's, in "The Youth's Companion") was, he said, a specific answer to what Mr. Hoar said yesterday and also to what he had said this morning, and he asked that the Senate should have it printed as a separate document in order that it might be treasured up by Senators with other valuable documents and transmitted to their children. Mr. Cockrell went on to criticise the proposed rule, pointed out particularly that the demand for closing debate required to be seconded by "a majority of the Senators present," instead of by "a majority of the Senate," so that (he said) if there were only three Senators present, two of them could enforce the "gag law."

Mr. Edmunds explained that the same location was to be found in the Constitution, but that it was to be taken with the constitutional provision requiring a majority of either house to transact business.

Mr. Cockrell—Then your understanding is that, if such a demand be seconded by a majority of the senators present, it must be a majority of a quorum?

Mr. Edmunds—Undoubtedly. Just as clear as words can make it, taking in view the Constitution and the rest of the rule.

Mr. Cockrell, in support of his position, read from reports of Congressional proceedings in the past, particularly from the debate on Mr. Clay's previous question rule in 1841, and, commenting on one of his extracts, applied it to the present situation. He yielded to Mr. Teller, who inquired of Mr. Aldrich, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, how long a time was to be given to the debate. Mr. Aldrich said he had been hoping to be able to get the floor to request the Senate to fix some time, to-morrow or Monday, when the vote would be taken on the resolution and amendments.

Mr. Cockrell asked Mr. Teller his reason for asking the question.

Mr. Teller said that there was a rumor, which he supposed had reached every one, that there was to be a stage in the proceeding on the resolution at which debate was to be cut off arbitrarily, and when there would be no opportunity to proceed beyond that. He desired to speak upon the resolution, but was not prepared to do so now, even if he could get the floor. That was the reason why he made the inquiry.

Mr. Gibson asked Mr. Teller what was the necessity for the proposed rule, if the Senator from Rhode Island could arbitrarily, by a majority vote, cut off debate: Could he not as well do so on the Election bill as on the resolution?

Mr. Teller said that he was not able to answer the first question. He was not himself able to understand the distinction. He merely wanted to get some idea as to when the debate would close.

Mr. Aldrich presumed that there was no necessity for him to discuss hypothetical questions. He took it for granted that there could be no closing of debate on the resolution except by the action of the Senate itself. But he now asked unanimous consent that debate shall close on the pending resolution and amendments and the vote be taken to-morrow afternoon at 5 o'clock.

The presiding officer (Mr. Frye) asked if there were any objection to the request.

Mr. Gorman objected. He was glad, however, that unanimous consent had been asked; because that had been the universal custom of the Senate. It was the way in which all public business had been done in the Senate. The Senate had taken a step yesterday which, in his judgment, overturned the whole history of the body. The pending resolution had been brought before the Senate under most peculiar circumstances by a decision of the Chair, and by a majority vote of the Senate, in direct opposition to every specific rule of the Senate and to general parliamentary law. No instance in the history of legislation could be cited where such action had been taken as had been taken yesterday. So vast and important were the results that would follow the adoption of the proposed rule, he submitted to the Senator from Rhode Island, that there had not been sufficient discussion on it; and therefore, for the time being, he objected to fix any time for its consideration.

Mr. Aldrich said that he had made the suggestion in good faith and intended to make every possible suggestion to get early action on the pending resolution.

Mr. Cockrell then resumed his argument against the proposed rule and asked why, if it was such a good rule, it was to end with this session. Why was it not proposed to make it permanent? It was useless to try to disguise its purpose. Its only object was to pass the Lodge bill. But the Lodge virus seemed to have put the Senator from Massachusetts in the condition of the rattlesnake blinded by its own virus. Apostrophizing Mr. Hoar, Mr. Cockrell exclaimed: "Ah, shame upon you, my friend from Massachusetts, who now attempts to force upon the people of Massachusetts and of the country the humiliating confession that they are no longer capable of holding their own elections." He then read from "The St. Louis Republic" a letter addressed to Mr. Edmunds by a former Republican constituent of his, now living in Weatherford, Tex., Francis Granger, appealing against the passage of the Election bill.

Mr. Edmunds said that he had never received such a letter, and believed that it was fabricated in order to promote operations of resistance to the bill. (Applause.)

Mr. Cockrell said that the letter spoke for itself and was a genuine letter. He also read from "The Washington Post," of July 19, 1890, an article giving the "inside history of the Lodge Force bill"; an extract from a letter of Mr. Blaine's adverse to the bill; and extracts from various Republican newspaper articles condemning it; and he wound up his speech by expressing the hope that the bill would be remitted to its tomb where it might rest for all time to come. (Applause.)

Mr. Gray next took the floor. It was, he said, a matter of regret to him that the debate on the Election bill had not been allowed to proceed uninterruptedly, without the interposition of the grasping, rude, violent proposition now before the Senate. Coming to the Election bill, Mr. Gray asked what public opinion did its promoters represent outside of that opinion which came from tight and close party organization? What public demand did they represent? Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Gray what he was referring to, and was told that it was the Election bill. He supposed, he said, that the question before the Senate was whether a majority should assert its power to transact any business, or whether a minority of the Senate should have the power, by the abuse of debate, to prevent the majority from expressing the will of the majority.

Mr. Gray resented the attempt of the Senator from Ohio "to read a lecture" to him as to how he should conduct debate. The Senator's age and long experience in public service gave him a great many privileges which he (Mr. Gray) would be the last to ignore; but still they gave him no right to interrupt him (Mr. Gray) and to administer a reproof as to the manner in which he addressed himself to the question. (Suppressed applause.)

Mr. Gray went on to mention a number of Republican papers opposed to the Election bill. He mentioned as some of the Western Republican papers that opposed the bill, "The Omaha Bee," "The Minneapolis Journal," "The St. Paul Pioneer Press," "The St. Louis Globe-Democrat," and "The Denver Republican."

In reference to the last-mentioned paper, Mr. Teller spoke of it as the leading paper of Denver, and of that section of the country; and Mr. Wolcott added that its proprietor (Mr. Hill) was the gentleman whose name had been sent to the Senate by the President as one of the Monetary Commissioners, and who, he hoped, would be confirmed at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Gray said that he was glad to hear that the paper had the imprimatur of the President. The gentleman (he understood) had formerly been a member of the Senate.

Mr. Wolcott assented, and remarked that the senator from Montana (Mr. Sanders) had asked him, in a very feeble voice, if the proprietor of "The Denver Republican" was a good man. The answer was that he was formerly a member of this body. (Laughter.)

Mr. Gray quoted articles from other papers and from resolutions adopted at the convention of the Farmers' Alliance, protesting against the passage of the Election bill.

Mr. Gray then proceeded to discuss the closure rule of the English House of Commons; when he was interrupted by Mr. Stewart with the suggestion that that rule had been adopted without a violation of the existing rules.

Mr. Aldrich said that the English closure had been adopted by a process which would not be adopted by the United States Senate—by turning members out.

Mr. Gray replied that that was the only way that was open to the English House when it was attempting to put the gag upon free speech, which had lived in England for generations. The gentleman from Rhode Island could never succeed in the United States Senate until he had the power and the authority to turn out the minority which sat on the Democratic side. (Applause in the galleries; which was promptly checked by the presiding officer, Mr. Dolph.)

Mr. Aldrich said that the people were living under the rules of parliamentary and constitutional laws. He thought that no attempt would be made to exclude the Senator or any other Senator.

Mr. Hoar inquired whether the Senator claimed that there was any difference between the constitutional power of the Senate and the constitutional power of the House to establish the previous question. If there were not, would it be justifiable for the minority to resist forcibly the previous question?

Mr. Gray replied that of course it would not. He had seen no proposition that the minority should forcibly resist any measure that it was in the power of the majority to make under the Constitution and the laws. He wanted to preserve at least in one body of this Congress the freedom of speech. The Republicans said that the power of obstruction must be put down and taken from the minority. Let the power of obstruction be destroyed and free parliamentary government would also be destroyed. Obstruction was the very weapon of liberty in every English-speaking country. Closure had been adopted in England in order that Irishmen might be gagged in the House of Commons when they attempted to assert that freedom of speech which belonged to them, as representatives of their nation and of their people. Let gentlemen tell the naturalized citizens tha. that was the example they were following, in order to destroy home rule in this country.

Mr. Hoar inquired whether the closure rule in England had not been adopted under the lead of Mr. Gladstone, the present leader of the Home Rule party to-day, but who had not changed his opinion in that respect.

Mr. Gray replied that he trusted that the conversion that took place in the great English statesman in 1882 would take place in some equally distinguished American statesmen in 1891. (Laughter.)

Mr. Stewart then took the floor; but the hour of 6 having arrived, the Senate took a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

## THE LODGE BILL AND THE WORLD'S FAIR.

SOUTHERN STATES VOTING TO WITHHOLD APPROPRIATIONS BECAUSE OF THE MEASURE.

Springfield, Ill., Jan. 23.—The Senate to-day passed unanimously the House joint resolution thanking other States for making appropriations in behalf of the World's Fair.

A resolution was introduced setting forth that the Legislature of Alabama had laid upon the table the proposed appropriation for a State exhibit at the World's Fair, on the ground that if the Election bill pending in Congress should be passed such an exhibit would be of no value to the State, and calling upon the Illinois delegation in Congress to vote against the passage of the Election bill in the interests of the Fair.

Motions to table and refer to a committee were defeated by the full Democratic vote, aided by the three F. M. B. A. votes and one Republican. In the course of the debate it was pointed out that the two Senators from Illinois hold the balance of power in the Senate and can defeat the passage of the bill. Pending action on the resolution, the hour for the joint session of the House and Senate to ballot for a United States Senator arrived, and the matter went over.

Little Rock, Ark., Jan. 23 (Special).—The House resolution to stop all further action on an appropriation of $100,000 for the Columbian Exposition was taken up by the State Senate this morning, and unanimously adopted without delay. The reason assigned for not desiring to make an appropriation for the World's Fair is because Congress contemplates passing the Election bill. Many of the prominent taxpayers in Little Rock look upon this action of the Legislature with regret. A business man and stanch Democrat remarked that when the World's Fair was held at New-Orleans the Northern States asked no questions about the location of that institution, but contributed most liberally to its success. The action of the Arkansas Legislature in carrying politics into business affairs is severely condemned by all liberal-minded men of Little Rock.

## DIGEST OF THE HOUSE RULES AND PRACTICE.

Washington, Jan. 23.—The thirteenth edition of the digest and manual of the rules and practice of the House of Representatives has just been issued. It was compiled by Henry H. Smith, journal clerk of the House. In addition to the rules, constitution, rulings and tables of representation, population, apportionment and abstracts of Congressional debates, the volume contains a new and timely feature in the shape of "A summary of the proceedure in leading foreign parliaments." This, says the compiler, has been printed at the request of a number of Representatives in view of the greatly increased interest in recent years in general parliamentary law and practice.

## EXPENSES OF CONTESTANTS.

Washington, Jan. 23.—There are now pending before the House Claims Committee a half-dozen bills to pay to Representatives who have been contestants for their seats in this Congress the amount they expended in such contests over the $2,000 allowed by law for this purpose. To-day Representative Langston, of Virginia, who is one of the fortunate contestants, appeared before the committee, and made an argument, not only in support of these bills, but in behalf of a general proposition to reimburse all of the thirty-four contestants and contestees for the amounts spent by them over the lawful allowance. The aggregate amount of money that would be required for this purpose would aggregate, probably, $100,000. No action was taken by the committee.

# MR. LITTLER ON THE STAND

## HOW HE "RIPPED THE RASCALS UP THE BACK."

NOT A BLOOD-CURDLING OPERATION—CONVINCED THAT NO SILVER POOL EVER EXISTED—SAYS HE BOUGHT SILVER FOR SENATOR CAMERON PENDING LEGISLATION—A POOR MEMORY FOR NAMES AND DATES.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

Washington, Jan. 23.—David T. Littler, of Illinois, gave his testimony before the Silver Pool Committee of the House this afternoon. Mr. Littler arrived in Washington last night, and soon after his arrival he is said to have held a long private conference with Representative Taylor, of Illinois, who is one of his clients and also a member of the Coinage Committee. Mr. Littler is a politician of some note, is said to be a man of considerable wealth, and, as he testified to-day, he is "a professional lawyer." In a Chicago dispatch published in The Tribune several days ago Mr. Littler was reported as saying that he was on his way to Washington to tell all he knew about silver pools and "rip the rascals up the back." As far as his testimony to-day was concerned, the "back-ripping" process must be regarded as a comparatively mild and painless operation; and he did not explain, except in a general way, who the "rascals" were, upon whom the operation with the blood-curdling name was performed, although he denounced them as "liars" and their statements as "lies," with as much emphasis as Boythorn himself could have used.

Mr. Littler's statements in regard to the purchase and sale of silver, pending the silver legislation of last year, were tolerably definite, although his memory was at fault in respect to dates. He was certain, however, that the purchases and sales were made before the bill became law. Mr. Littler is a successful business man and he foresaw, as he explained to the committee, that silver bullion would advance, and so he bought "a small matter of $40,000 or $50,000 worth of silver" on his own account, in the form of exchange on Calcutta, India, through a London house. He was so confident that the speculation would be a profitable one that he talked to his friends on the subject and freely expressed his opinion. The only one for whom he bought any silver was Senator Cameron, who ordered "a small amount—about $100,000." Witness thought that this also was in the form of exchange on Calcutta, but was not certain, and his testimony did not make it quite clear whether the "margin" was $100,000 or whether the amount represented by the margin was $100,000. Nor did he explain the process of buying Indian or other bills of exchange by "putting up a margin"—an explanation which might have enlightened some members of the committee.

Chairman Dingley's efforts to ascertain from the witness the names of any of the numerous Senators and Representatives with whom he had conversed on the subject and to whom he had freely expressed the opinion that the silver speculation was a promising one, were almost fruitless. He did remember after awhile that he had talked with Senator Vest on the subject, as well with "divers and sundry" other Senators and Representatives whose names he did not "recall at present." On this particular point his memory was an absolute blank; he fairly revelled in affluence of forgetfulness in regard to these names, although he remembered that he never had solicited any body to engage in the speculation. "I don't recall them at present," was Mr. Littler's reply when pressed for the names.

But on one point he was most clear and emphatic. He did not believe that any silver pool ever existed—in fact, he felt convinced that none existed, and that all assertions to the contrary were "lies." He did not explain the grounds of his belief and conviction, unless his testimony that he knew of no silver transactions by any Senator or Representative, except Senator Cameron, could be called such an explanation. Outside of that and his own "small purchase," Mr. Littler testified that he knew of no silver speculations, that is, by "personal knowledge." Of course it was not incumbent upon Mr. Littler to volunteer any explanation as to how it happened that Senator Cameron—who is an active and experienced business man and financier of large wealth, who is familiar with the manner and opportunities of making investments and who doubtless has business associates and relations in New-York as well as in Philadelphia—how it happened that he selected Mr. Littler, of Springfield, Ill., who was sojourning in Washington "for pleasure and to attend to some professional business," to be his agent in the silver speculation. Probably Mr. Cameron will take occasion to do that when he appears before the committee to testify, as it is understood that he is anxious to do so as soon as practicable. It is presumed that after reading the report of Mr. Littler's testimony, the Senators and Representatives with whom he conversed and to whom he expressed the opinion that a speculation in silver would yield handsome returns, but whose names he unfortunately "did not recall" to-day, will be anxious to appear before the committee and give their testimony. In fact, that would seem to be a wise course for them to pursue.

Mr. Littler was asked several questions by members of the committee, which seemed to be designed to elicit something which would tend to discredit one of the witnesses for whom a subpœna has been issued, but who has not yet been before the committee. He is J. A. Owenby, who asserts that he can prove that a number of Senators and Representatives were engaged in silver speculations, and declares his willingness to do so if he "can have a reasonable assurance that the committee intends in good faith to go to the bottom of the matter." As there can be no reason to doubt the good faith of the committee, Mr. Owenby probably will be willing to appear and tell all he knows; and he declares that he knows a great deal. Perhaps he does, for it is certain that no inconsiderable amount of anxiety appears to be manifested in some quarters to discredit his testimony in advance.

In response to further questions Mr. Littler said he had talked generally with a good many people, Senators and others, about silver; but he could not undertake to say who they were. Never talked with anybody, though, with a view to inducing them to purchase. He said he only did for Cameron what one friend would do for another, and that perhaps he had suggested the purchase. As he remembered it, the purchase for Cameron was also in the form of Calcutta exchange. He had no knowledge as to where silver was held. He did not recall ever talking with any other person who bought silver, and did not know who did buy silver.

Mr. Littler further testified that he had no knowledge of any conferences being held in Washington or elsewhere during the pending of the legislation; and he had never himself met any gentlemen interested in silver legislation.

Mr. Littler's attention was then called to an interview in which he was represented as saying that he would go to Washington and "rip some of the rascals up."

"That's characteristic language, Governor," the witness said rather drily, and added: "I want to say that I have been much provoked at the amount of lying that has been done, so far as I am concerned; and I want to characterize in most unequivocal terms the general statement that I have been connected with a silver pool, looking to the influencing of legislation, as an unqualified lie, in the strongest terms that I can use. I may have said something of the kind reported. I referred to the fellows who have been going around the country lying about me. I mean those people who have been sending out through the papers reports that have not the semblance of truth. That is the character of people I referred to."

Mr. Dingley called the attention of the witness once or twice to the fact that the expression used would convey the intimation that he had some knowledge of legislation on silver; but Mr. Littler reiterated his statement that he did not refer to legislation, and said he had given the committee all the knowledge he had on the subject. When asked about the reputation of Owenby, who has been mentioned in connection with the alleged silver pool, witness said that he did not know Owenby well enough to answer the question. Owenby seemed a clever fellow, but he would think better of him when he got back some money he had lent Owenby, as he supposed he would get it back after a while.

Mr. Oates wanted to know how much both witness and Senator Cameron had made by their investment. Mr. Littler said that as well as he could remember, he made less than $800 and more than $600. He could not recall just how much Mr. Cameron had made; but it was a comparatively small amount. Subsequently the witness put the figure at between $1,000 and $1,500. To Mr. Oates the witness said that no Representative, Senator or other Government officer had ever told him he was interested in silver; and he had no knowledge on the subject.

The attention of the witness was called to the testimony of Senator Vest; and he said he had talked with Cameron, Vest and others about silver speculation. He had talked with Vest exactly as with Cameron and with others.

Being asked again for the names of some of these others, the witness said he could not remember, and, turning toward Mr. Rowell, a member of the committee, who was sitting near, he said: "Perhaps with Captain Rowell, as well as with other Illinois friends." He would not have remembered Cameron but for the actual transaction.

In reply to Mr. Rowell witness said he did not mean to say that he recalled talking with him (Mr. Rowell) and that he only used his name because that was as likely as with any one else. Mr. Littler further said he had never offered any one any inducement whatever, except to express his opinion that there would be an advance in silver.

Adjourned till to-morrow.

## PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE.

MR. COOPER WORRIED ABOUT A RESOLUTION—DEBATE ON THE NAVAL BILL.

Washington, Jan. 24.—The journal having been read in its usual form, Mr. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, objected to its approval until the remaining portion (relative to the reference of bills, etc.) was read.

The Speaker—Does the gentleman request that this be read?

Mr. Breckinridge—I do.

The Speaker—Then the clerk will read.

The journal having been read, a few moments were consumed by Mr. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, in calling attention to what he claimed to be errors and omissions in the journal in respect to the reference of petitions, but this matter being satisfactorily settled, the journal was approved without further question.

Mr. Cooper, of Indiana, rising to a question of privilege, sent to the clerk's desk and had read a resolution offered by him on September 4 last making certain charges against the Commissioner of Pensions and asking for a broadening of the investigation of that official. This resolution had been referred to the select committee examining previous charges, and on September 11 the chairman of that committee (Mr. Morrill, of Kansas) had been directed to report the resolution, but he had never performed that duty. He (Mr. Cooper) therefore offered a resolution directing the investigating committee to report the resolution.

Mr. McKinley, of Ohio, raised the point of order that the question presented was not a privileged one.

Mr. Cooper went on to address himself to the point of order, interspersing his remarks with certain reflections bearing on the merits of the resolution. Several times he was interrupted by Republicans, on the ground that he was not addressing himself to the point of order. The Speaker called Mr. Cooper to order on a few occasions, and finally directed the gentleman to resume his seat.

Mr. Cooper—I have not transgressed the rules of the House.

The Speaker—The Chair calls the gentleman to order and asks him to resume his seat, under the rules of the House.

Mr. Cooper complied with this request, and the speaker recognized Mr. Morrill, of Kansas. But Mr. Bland, of Missouri, was on his feet, demanding the reading of the rule under which the gentleman from Indiana was required to resume his seat. The rule having been read, Mr. Bland (acting under one of the paragraphs of the rule) moved that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to proceed.

Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, suggested that the speaker had the right to stop debate upon any point of order when he so desired.

The Speaker said that he had endeavored in every way to induce the gentleman from Indiana to address the Chair on the point of order. The Chair had not exercised the power of saying that he would hear no further discussion on that point, because the Chair was ready to hear anything said in order. But the gentleman from Indiana had proceeded out of order.

Mr. Bland's motion was lost—yeas 117, nays, 143.

The Speaker then ruled that the resolution offered by Mr. Cooper was a privileged one, and overruled the point of order against it.

Mr. Cooper then proceeded to advocate his resolution and to attack the administration of the Pension Bureau; and he also criticised the action of John Raum, son of the Commissioner.

Mr. Morrill, of Kansas, said that he desired only to reply to the gentleman's reflection upon him as chairman of the investigating committee. The committee had unanimously decided that the resolution had been improperly referred to it; and within one hour he had returned the resolution to the Speaker's desk by a page. Six weeks ago the gentleman from Indiana had asked him what had been done with the resolution. He had informed the gentleman that he had not given the subject a thought since.

Mr. Cooper disclaimed any intention of reflecting upon the gentleman from Kansas. But the resolution had never been put upon "The Record."

Mr. Grosvenor, of Ohio, in defence of the Commissioner of Pensions, said that there had not been the smell of the fire of corruption on the skirts of Green B. Raum. Before the gentleman from Indiana had been old enough to know the difference between the American flag and the Confederate symbol, Green B. Raum had shed his blood in defence of his country. (Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.) The gentlemen might laugh. The time seemed to have come when it was not safe for a man, if he wished to be treated respectfully, to refer to the American flag.

Mr. Henderson, Mr. Smith and Mr. Cannon, of Illinois, briefly defended the Commissioner of Pensions.

The matter was settled amicably by Mr. Morrill obtaining the original resolution from the files of the House, reporting it from his committee and having it referred to the Committee on Rules.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole (Mr. Burrows, of Michigan, in the chair) on the Naval Appropriation bill. General debate on the bill was participated in by Messrs. Herbert, McAdoo, Adams, of Illinois, and Lodge, of Massachusetts. The criticism by Mr. Lodge of the bill was that it did not go nearly far enough in its provisions. If this Congress did not go far enough, the necessity of it would come upon other Congresses. There was no subject of appropriation by Congress of more direct benefit to the people, to their prosperity and comfort and safety, than proper appropriations for the Navy and for harbor and coast defences. A bill with proper appropriations for a navy was an expense more desirable and more justifiable than any expense on which Congress entered. It was a question of well-being, honor and protection to the country.

Speaking of the unsettled questions with England, Mr. Lodge said that no one that observed the matter could doubt for a moment that they hung unsettled by the last and by this Administration because Great Britain knew that the forts and seaport cities of the United States lay at the mercy of her cruisers. To-day, if this country wanted to make negotiations and diplomacy successful and worthy of the American people and honor, it must seg that it had defences to back it up.

The bill was then taken up by paragraphs for amendment; but without making any progress with it, the committee rose, and the House at 5 o'clock adjourned.

## TRYING TO GET MORE PENSION LEGISLATION.

Washington, Jan. 23.—A delegation of Grand Army people was before the House Invalid Pension Committee to-day. It consisted of General Veazey, commander-in-chief of the Grand Army of the Republic; Colonel Blue, of Kansas, the chairman of the Pension Committee of the Grand Army of the Republic, and Colonel Emory, of Washington. Their purpose was to make arguments in behalf of a bill providing for a service pension for the benefit of that large class of soldiers, aggregating possibly 250,000, whose cases are not reached by the act of June last.

There was also before the committee a delegation representing the maimed soldiers of the United States, who presented petitions and statements in favor of the enactment of the bill to increase the pensions of soldiers who have lost eyes, limbs, or the use of them, etc.

## TO OPEN THE CHEROKEE OUTLET.

Washington, Jan. 23.—Mr. Perkins, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to-day reported with an amendment the bill to open to settlement certain portions of Indian Territory known as the Cherokee Outlet. The bill as amended provides that a fair settlement be made with the Cherokee Indians for any interest they may have in or to the lands, and under the provisions of the bill creating the Territory of Oklahoma these lands are to become part thereof, and are to be governed by the laws of Oklahoma when the Indian title is extinguished.

## NEW-YORK'S POSTAL FACILITIES.

Washington, Jan. 23.—The House Committee on Postoffices and Postroads to-day referred to a sub-committee the resolution introduced by Mr. Flower, of New-York, reciting the necessity of greater accommodations for the postal service in New-York, and providing for a commission to examine into the facilities of the postoffice there, and, if deemed expedient, to report a plan looking to an increase of those facilities. The resolution also authorizes the commission to report a plan for a more speedy delivery of mails between the main postoffice and the twenty-four branches in the city.

There was also referred to a sub-committee for report the bill introduced by Mr. Taylor, of Illinois, reducing the rate chargeable for registration of domestic mail matter to five cents a piece, in addition to the regular postage, and also Mr. Taylor's bill to establish a registered parcel-post system.

## THE ASSAY COMMISSION NAMED.

Washington, Jan. 23.—The President has appointed the following commissioners to test the coinage of the mints for the calendar year 1890: Nelson W. Aldrich, Committee on Finance, United States Senate; Thomas H. Carter, Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, House of Representatives; Dr. B. A. Gould, Cambridge, Mass.; Cabell Whitehead, assayer, Virginia; Nelson F. Evans, Philadelphia; Frank A. Leach, Oakland, Cal.; G. R. Metten, Helena, Mont.; Professor

**A Pleasing Sense**

Of health and strength renewed and of ease and comfort follows the use of Syrup of Figs, as it acts in harmony with nature to effectually cleanse the system when costive or bilious. For sale in 50c. and $1.00 bottles by all leading druggists.

TO CURE A COLD IN EASIEST WAY APPLY POND'S EXTRACT TO PART AFFECTED

**A COLD IS INFLAMMATION. POND'S EXTRACT REDUCES INFLAMMATION.**

**Specific Directions.**

IF A COLD IN THE HEAD, apply Pond's Extract (diluted one-half) by a nasal douche, or snuff it, or vaporize it over a lamp and inhale the fumes through the nose.

IF HOARSE, gargle with Pond's Extract severa times daily.

IF THE THROAT IS SORE and NECK STIFF rub the neck thoroughly with Pond's Extract, and, on retiring, wrap the neck in a woollen bandage saturated with Pond's Extract, and protected by an outer wrapping.

IF THE LUNGS ARE SORE, take a teaspoonful of Pond's Extract four or five times daily.

IF THE LIMBS ACHE and are sore, rub them vigorously with Pond's Extract.

FOR CHILBLAINS, bathe with Pond's Extract and bandage with cloth saturated with Pond's Extract. Itching quickly stopped.

BUT do not purchase some cheap substitute and expect it to do what Pond's Extract will. Be sure you have genuine article. Made only by Pond's Extract Co., New-York and London.

John H. Appleton, Providence, R. I.; C. W. Moore, Boise City, Idaho; E. S. Willcox, Peoria, Ill.; Irwin Sheppard, Winona, Minn.; H. W. Cannon, New-York; Charles Parson, St. Louis, Mo.; J. M. Bailey, Jr., Sioux Falls, S. D.; W. D. Ewing, Evansville, Ind.; Charles W. Parvey, Springfield, Ill.

## COLONEL FLAGLER MADE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE.

Washington, Jan. 23 (Special).—The nomination of Colonel D. W. Flagler, of the Army, to be chief of ordnance, will give general satisfaction. He is well known and popular throughout the service. His promotion over the heads of two senior officers, Colonel Wittemore and Colonel Buffington, was not expected, in view of what had come to be regarded as the custom of following the principle of seniority in filling vacancies in the rank of brigadier-general. Colonel Wittemore had little influence, and appeared to rest his arguments for promotion upon the fact of his seniority of rank and service. The next officer in the corps, Colonel Buffington, was regarded by many as the probable successor of General Benet, who favored this appointment, and enlisted his friends in behalf of the officer. The President, in the appointment of Colonel Buffington, would have been confronted with the dissatisfaction of Colonel Whittemore's friends at so obvious a discrimination against the latter officer. This, in a measure, suggested the appointment of Colonel Flagler, who had the support of Senator Allison and Postmaster-General Wanamaker. His is the next retirement in his corps, which fact probably, also influenced the President in to-day's nomination, as Colonel Whittemore and Colonel Buffington may still be chief of ordnance, the former retiring in 1900 (one year after Colonel Flagler), and the latter in November, 1901.

Colonel Flagler was born in New-York on March 24, 1835, and was graduated from West Point in June, 1861, and in July, 1861, he took part in the Manassas campaign and in the defence of Washington. He served as chief of ordnance in Burnside's North Carolina expedition, and took part in the Maryland campaign, and was breveted several times for service in the field. Since the war he has held many important places in the Ordnance Department. He became a lieutenant-colonel of ordnance in 1881. Since the fall of 1889, he has been in command of the Watertown (Mass.) Arsenal.

## AMERICAN PETITIONS FOR RUSSIAN JEWS.

Washington, Jan. 23.—Representatives Cummings, of New-York, and Catchings, of Mississippi, called upon Secretary Blaine to-day and presented to him resolutions adopted by the Hebrews of Greenville, Miss., asking the Secretary to protest against the persecution of the Jews in Russia. The Secretary said that he had received many similar petitions from all parts of the country, and that a digest of them was being made, which would be forwarded to the United States Minister at St. Petersburg and by him transmitted to Mr. De Giers, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs.

## NOMINATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT.

Washington, Jan. 23.—The President to-day sent to the Senate the following nominations: Marcus W. Acheson, United States Circuit Judge, for the Third Judicial Circuit; Colonel Daniel W. Flagler, chief of ordnance, with rank of brigadier-general; William H. Luce, collector of customs at Waldoboro, Me.; First Lieutenant Horatio D. Smith, of Massachusetts, captain in the United States Revenue service.

## BOND REDEMPTION AND SILVER PURCHASES.

Washington, Jan. 23.—The amount of 4 1-2 per cent bonds redeemed to-day was $207,750, making the total to date $9,115,950.

The Treasury Department, having purchased the full amount of silver authorized by law for the current month, will make no further purchases until February 2.

## NAVY INTELLIGENCE.

Washington, Jan. 23.—Commander O. A. Batchellor has been detached from special duty connected with the Concord, February 9, and ordered to command that vessel February 10. Lieutenant-Commander E. P. Wood, Chief Engineer R. B. Hine and Passed Assistant Engineer E. E. Freeman are ordered to duty on the Concord. Lieutenant J. B. Briggs is detached from the Bureau of Equipment, and ordered to the Concord February 10; Lieutenant C. F. Emerich, detached from duty at Pittsburg and ordered to duty under the steel inspection board, Washington; Lieutenant Lucien Young, from duty in the Navy Department and ordered to the Boston, March 4; Paymaster James A. Ring, from present duties, February 9, and ordered to the Concord.

Lieutenant O. W. Lowrey has been ordered to the Hydrographic Office, February 2; Ensign George H. Slocum, to duty at the Naval Rendezvous, San Francisco; Ensign William Truxton, to temporary duty in the Bureau of Equipment and Repair; Paymaster S. R. Calhoun, to prepare for orders to the Monongahela; Naval Cadets S. W. Bostwick, W. C. Neville and John V. Chase, detached from the Kearsarge and ordered to the Newark; Gunner Andrew Harman, from the Chicago and placed on waiting orders; Gunner Charles Morgan, from the Navy Yard, New-York, and ordered to the Chicago.

## BENEFITS TO COUNT AS WELL AS DAMAGES.

Chicago, Jan. 23 (Special).—A decision just rendered by the State Supreme Court means, according to the opinion of the city's legal advisers, a saving to Chicago of millions of dollars in the future and less hesitancy about embarking in certain classes of much needed public improvements. Some time ago, when the Jackson-st. Viaduct across the railroad tracks was built, Warren Springer brought suit for $200,000 damages alleged to have been done to his property on Canal-st. The case has been finally settled by the Supreme Court affirming the decision of the lower tribunal. This was in effect that while the city may be liable for damages believed by the owner to have been inflicted, it is also entitled to credit for any benefits derived by the property from improvements. The jury was allowed carefully to inspect the property and to decide the relative amount of