# EXCITING DAY IN THE HOUSE.

*STAVING OFF THE VOTE ON THE BILL DEFINING LARD.*

**Members Resort to the Cloak Rooms, Where They Can't be Counted to Make a Quorum—Hats and Umbrellas Taken Along to Make Sure—Mr. Cannon's Resolution Naming Absentees Houses Crain of Texas—Hints of Threats to Lock the Members In—Mason of Chicago Angry—Iowan Turner Talks the Majority Into an Adjournment—What the Lard Bill Is and Who Would be Affected by It.**

WASHINGTON, Aug. 26.—The House had a very lively day of it, thanks to the filibustering of the opponents of the Conger Lard bill, led by Mr. Mason of Chicago. Last Saturday night the Conger bill was put on its passage, and received the support of a large majority of the members voting, but as no quorum was present it went over until Monday.

Yesterday nothing was done in the House on account of the death of Representative Watson and to-day the question to be decided was as to the status of the bill. Its friends contended that the special order of the House was a continuing order, while its opponents contended that to-day and to-morrow being set apart by the special order for consideration of the Butterworth Option bill the latter measure and no other was in order.

After an hour or two of argument on this question of order, Speaker Reed finally ruled that the Lard bill was before the House as unfinished business, and that the first thing in order was a call of the roll on its passage. Mr. Mason promptly appealed from the decision of the Chair, and the House by a large majority voted to sustain the decision of the Chair. But a quorum did not vote, and Mr. Mason and his assistants immediately began a series of filibustering motions, which kept the House in an uproar all the afternoon. Mr. Mason has discovered a new sort of filibustering, which consists of breaking a quorum immediately after a call of the House has disclosed the presence of a quorum. A call of the House was repeatedly ordered to-day, and the Southern members, who are opposed to the Conger bill because of its unfavorable effect upon the market for cotton-seed oil, flocked in and answered to their names so that an order of arrest could not lie against them. Immediately afterward they left the hall by the doors leading through the members' lobby, all the other doors being locked under the rule.

At times there were not more than a dozen members in their seats on the Democratic side, nearly all of these being from the agricultural regions of the North.

The call of the House having disclosed the presence of a quorum, the managers of the Conger bill pushed for a vote on the question of sustaining the decision of the Speaker only to find that a quorum had disappeared.

Nothing was in order, but another call of the House and another quorum was secured for the second time, only to disappear as soon as an effort was made to transact business. This so provoked Mr. Brosius, who is in charge of the bill, and Mr. Cannon, the leader of the Republicans, that the latter brought in a resolution ordering the Sergeant-at-Arms to telegraph for all members who are absent without leave on account of sickness. This resolution was in the usual form, and probably would have been adopted had it not contained a preamble which recited that on the last call of the House one more than a quorum had appeared, but immediately afterward twenty-five or thirty members, who were mentioned by name, had absented themselves from the hall for the purpose of breaking a quorum and defeating legislation.

It was this preamble which plunged the House in disorder almost equalling that of the days when Speaker Reed applied his new rules and new methods of ascertaining quorums. Each of the members who had been named in the preamble was highly indignant at being thus singled out and named, and many exciting colloquies ensued.

WHAT THE BILL IS.

The Compound Lard bill, so-called, is quite similar in its provisions to the law placing an internal revenue tax on oleomargarine, and its advocates are influenced by quite similar motives of doing something to tickle the cockles of the honest farmer's heart. The bill seeks to make manufacturers of lard change their present brands to compound lard, and places on the business burdensome regulations and internal revenue taxation, which, the manufacturers of pure lard say, will drive them from the field. The bill is aimed more particularly at lard-compound which contains cotton-seed oil, which has grown rapidly in public estimation of late years, and has threatened to force packers of lard out of the market. The present bill, called the Conger bill because its author is a Representative Conger of Iowa, is the latest development of the Dawes bill, which began its career in Congress three years ago, when introduced by Senator Dawes of Massachusetts. The originators of the bill were John F. Squire & Co. of Boston, the largest pork packers and lard makers in the East.

A strong lobby has been maintained here during these three years in control of Mr. Rimbell, Squire's brother-in-law, and numberless hearings, both public and private, have been held by the agricultural committees of both the Senate and the House. Several reports have also been made for and against the bill, but it has never before been brought to a vote in either House.

The objects of the proposed legislation, as stated by Representative Brosius, who is in charge of the bill in the House and who reported it from the Committee on Agriculture, are, in addition to obtaining revenue: First, to compel the producers of mixtures composed of ingredients other than lard, but made in the semblance of and sold as lard, so that consumers may be advised of the nature of the article they purchase; second, to relieve the manufacturers of pure lard of the unfair competition of an imitation article made of cheaper ingredients and sold at a lower price; third, to relieve to some extent the existing depression in the farming industry caused in part by the displacement of a large and increasing amount of the pure fat of the hog by a spurious substitute put on the market under the name and brand of the genuine article.

The majority of the committee in reporting the bill also said:

The bill in its main features is similar to the Oleomargarine law, which has given general satisfaction; and the wrongs to be prevented and the benefits to be secured are in their general character the same in both cases, the only difference being that the latter applies to imitations of butter, and the former to imitations of lard. The promoters of the bill are the growers of swine, and the manufacturers and consumers of pure lard. Its opponents are the manufacturers of the imitation compounds, and to some extent the producers of cottonseed oil."

The report also says that "the credit given by a fair name to a false commodity, together with its cheapness, have enabled the imitation compound to outrun honest lard in their race for the tables of consumers, until 200,000,000 pounds of the mixture are annually placed upon the market against 280,000,000 pounds of pure lard."

In closing its report with a somewhat eloquent burst, the committee says:

"Your committee, after full and careful consideration, are of the opinion that the compound lard trade as carried on is a stupendous commercial fraud which it is the duty of Congress to suppress; that if no measures are taken to regulate it and to compel it to employ honest methods, so that consumers can distinguish the pure from the compound article, the latter being cheaper will drive the former from the market or compel it to be sold under the cost of production; that the compound being variable in its constituents to suit the will of the compounder, the production will gradually degenerate into a competition between manufacturers in what has been aptly characterized by a gentleman before the committee as expert adulteration; that is to say, it will become a contest between producers as to which can use the most of the cheaper ingredients and the least lard and not be found out."

The Conger bill provides that all manufacturers of compound lard shall take out an internal revenue license to the amount of $96. Wholesale dealers in compound lard are to be taxed $24, and all persons who offer for sale a greater quantity than fifty pounds shall be deemed a wholesale dealer. Retail dealers are taxed $1.92. A penalty of not less than $250 nor more than $500 is provided for the violation of the provisions of the bill. The bill also provides strict and explicit instructions for the branding, marking, and stamping of the packages before being offered for sale, and goes into the utmost detail in laying down the rules for manufacturers and dealers to follow, and in erecting safeguards for the protection of the Treasury and the revenue.

The opponents of the bill, comprising nearly all the Congressmen who do not represent agricultural districts, including all the New York city members, give numerous reasons for fighting the measure, which they say is unconstitutional and an outrage of even worse character than the Oleomargarine law. Representative McClammy of North Carolina, one of the most earnest advocates of the bill, representing particularly the producers of cotton-seed, states the case in his characteristically picturesque manner by saying that the contest between the friends and enemies of the bill "is a struggle between the Northern hog and the Southern nigger."

Representative Wilson of Kentucky, a member of the Agricultural Committee, who had the temerity to make an elaborate minority report upon the bill, presents a very able argument against its passage. Judge Wilson's report says:

"Our idea is that we might make a mistake and hurt the farmers and the agricultural interests of this country more than we would help them if we should pass this bill. Our idea is that we run a risk thereby of placing farmers and hog raisers more than ever at the mercy of the pork packers and of the stock yards. We do not see clearly how the enactment of this bill is going to raise the grade or purity of 'prime steam' lard. At the same time we are very sure it will put more money in the pockets of the pork packers. The refusal of the majority of the committee to accept such amendments we are unable to reconcile with a sincere desire to protect the public against the adulteration of lard. The greatest opportunity for the contamination of lard is to be found at the slaughter house and at the packing houses; yet the representatives of those interests demand that their small go free of supervision, and the committee have apparently yielded to that demand. We do not think that such kindness to these who systematically watch their own interests as against the farmer is necessary or wise. * * * The gentlemen now advocating this bill as representatives of granges and alliances and other farmer's organizations have come into the field only lately and at the eleventh hour, so to speak. They were not here in 1888 when the bill was championed only by pork packers, as we have described. We fear that gentlemen desiring to represent the farmers and the agricultural interests of this country have been deceived during this session, and are caught in very bad company when advocating a bill like this. We believe it can benefit only the slaughter house combine and the stockyard trust and, as it now stands, we feel justified in refusing it our support. We see no good reason for imposing a specific tax on lard compound, nor for requiring such internal revenue supervision as the bill provides. Living in a State which is largely interested in hog raising, and a State presenting such grand opportunities for the profitable investment of capital and labor, and which in a few years will be teeming with industrious laborers and their families developing our iron, coal, and coke industries, and preparing our timber for market, we decline to indorse a measure like the one proposed, which, as we believe, will either increase the price or restrict the sale of what is admitted to be a healthy food, and which would do the farmer no good, but the laboring man an injury. The laborer wants cheap, healthy food, and the farmer wants protection against the stock yards and slaughter houses."

ALMOST CAME TO BLOWS.

A great amount of earnest and persistent work has been done by both the advocates and opponents of this proposed legislation since it has been before the two houses of Congress during the past three years, and the exciting scenes in the House to-day were a fitting climax to the long struggle.

During the discussion to-day a lively scene took place on the floor of the House, no account of which will appear in the *Congressional Record*, and which nearly resulted in a fist fight between young "Billy" Mason of Chicago, who is taking an active part in opposing the bill, and old Mr. Walker of Massachusetts, one of its foremost advocates.

Mr. Walker's white hair is all that saved him from getting a knock-down. Mr. Walker addressed a remark to Mr. Mason in relation to the latter's attitude on the Lard bill, when Mr. Mason said:

"I am opposing the bill on principle and because I believe I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents in doing so."

Mr. Walker replied that the manufacturers in Chicago had dictated to him (Mason) the course to pursue. Without a moment's hesitation, Mason sprang toward Walker with clenched fist, saying:

"You are a liar."

Friends of the gentlemen immediately separated them, and thus saved the House the disgrace of a personal encounter.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN DETAIL.

Before the reading of the journal Mr. McClammy (Dem., N. C.) made the point of order that there was no quorum present, and a call of the House was ordered. Only 126 members responded to their names, and Mr. Payson (Rep., Ill.) offered a resolution for the arrest of absentees, pending which Mr. Enloe (Dem., Tenn.) moved an adjournment. The motion to adjourn was lost—yeas, 95; nays, 125. The Speaker stated that the Clerk had announced to him that there were 169 members present—more than a quorum. Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with, and the journal was read and approved.

Mr. Brosius (Rep., Pa.) demanded the regular order, and contended that the unfinished business was the Conger Lard bill, the vote upon the passage of which on Saturday was inconclusive, owing to the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Baker (Rep., N. Y.), who was interested in a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, argued that business on the Speaker's table must first be disposed of.

Mr. Blount (Dem., Ga.) read the rule of the House prescribing the order of business, and said that it was clear to him that unfinished business could not be disposed of until after the consideration of the business on the Speaker's table. But the Speaker had intimated that he would rule not only on this question, but also on the question as to whether, under the special order, the Lard bill was the unfinished business. His judgment was that under the terms of that order the House could not consider the Lard bill any further. It was clear from the terms that to-day and to-morrow were devoted to the consideration of the Option bill. The time assigned to the Lard bill had expired yesterday, and its consideration could not be resumed at this time. In support of his position he quoted from the decisions made by Speaker Reed upon the Copyright bill. In that decision the Speaker said: "The Chair is of the opinion that, the day having expired which was allotted to that business, until another day is allotted to that committee (Committee on Judiciary) it will not be competent to act on that motion" (a motion relative to the copyright bill).

Mr. Brosius suggested that in that case the entire special order had expired.

Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.) inquired whether the gentleman from Georgia took the position that, in the pending case, when there was a continuous special order which expired to-morrow, with the previous question and the yeas and nays ordered on a bill, that bill did not come up as "unfinished business." If he so held, was not the decision of the special order, became of the matter in hand? If that construction was right, would not the proposed legislation be lost under the rules of the House? Whereas, if it came up as unfinished business, it was in the power of the House to dispose of it. That construction advanced by the gentleman, was another construction put it out of the power of the House, under its rules, to reach or consider it.

Mr. Blount contended that in the special order there was a distinct time given to each bill mentioned therein, and the time designated for the Lard bill had expired.

Mr. Buchanan (Dem., N. J.) thought that in view of the proceedings on Saturday, when it was intimated by the Speaker that the bill would come up either on Monday or Tuesday on the strength of which intimation an adjournment was taken, it was not in good faith for the opponents of the bill to raise the point that it was not unfinished business.

Mr. Frank (Rep., Mo.) remarked that there was nothing in the proceedings of Saturday that could act as an estoppel.

Mr. Herbert (Dem., Ala.) controverted the position that the Lard bill had now the right of way. It had had its day in court, and had exhausted all the time allotted to it.

Mr. Adams (Rep., Ill.) argued that the rule giving a certain number of days to the Committee on Agriculture was not a continuing order, in the sense in which it was viewed by his colleague (Mr. Cannon). It expressly set apart certain days for the consideration of certain measures. To-day was assigned to the Option bill, and the Lard bill could not interfere with its consideration.

Mr. Hatch (Dem., Mo.) held the view that the Lard bill was unfinished business, the previous question having been ordered, and the yeas and nays having been ordered on its passage. In support of his view he quoted from the decision of Speaker Carlisle on the Oklahoma bill. In this case the special order had expired and the Speaker had ruled that the bill came up, not by reason of the special order, but by virtue of the fact that the previous question had been ordered.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) argued that the bill could not come up before the disposition of bills on the Speaker's table, even if it had been considered in its regular order. If it could come up before the disposition of that business, why not before the reading of the journal, why not before prayer by the chaplain, if his memory served him aright the Speaker had decided that pension bills coming over from Friday night sessions with the previous question ordered could not be considered on Saturday morning.

The Speaker replied that he did not think he had rendered such a decision, but it was so long since the question had been raised that he was not absolutely certain.

Mr. Crisp, continuing, said that even conceding that under the general rules the bill would come up under the operation of the previous question, these general rules had been changed by the special order, and to-day has been dedicated to the consideration of the Option bill.

Mr. Enloe could see no difference between the status of the Lard bill and the status of the Copyright bill.

SPEAKER REED'S DECISION.

The Speaker then rendered this decision: "The House will have seen by the discussion that this and similar questions have had a considerable variety of decision, and it would not be possible to reconcile with each other all the rulings and decisions that have been made. The Chair thinks, however, that the decision which was cited by the gentleman from Missouri governs this case. At the adjournment on Saturday the House had had the previous question ordered in accordance with the rule. The yeas and nays also had been ordered. The taking of the yeas and nays had been interrupted by the absence of a quorum. Thereupon the gentleman in charge of the bill asked if the matter would come up again, and the Chair replied that he thought it would. That was received without dissent on the part of the House. While the Chair does not think that this would be a controlling matter, nevertheless he thinks the House ought to have an opportunity to pass on the question in the light of decisions made in former Congresses and under the intimation of the Chair.

"The Chair thinks it frank to say that, as a result of this discussion, there is very grave doubt in his mind as to whether the decision with regard to the Copyright bill was a correct one. It was in accordance with the decision made in the Forty-eighth Congress that whenever a committee had a day and its work was not done its special power ceased. The attention of the Chair had not been called to the decision cited by the gentleman from Missouri. It may be said that the language of that ruling excepted a case like this where the next day has actually been given to a committee; and it is proper that this statement should be made in connection with the doubt expressed by the Chair. The Chair therefore thinks that the question now before the House is the roll call on the passage of the bill."

Mr. Mason (Rep., Ill.) appealed from the decision. On sustaining the decision the vote stood: Yeas, 125; nays, 28—no quorum—and a call of the House was ordered. One hundred and eighty-two members having responded to their names, the sergeant-at-arms was sent with further proceedings under the call, upon which motion the opponents of the Lard bill, in order to consume time, ordered the yeas and nays. The motion to dispense with further proceedings was agreed to; yeas, 127; nays, 21, the latter being entered on sustaining the decision of the Speaker. But the quorum had vanished, and the vote resulted: Yeas, 120; nays, 14, the clerk being unable to note a quorum. Another call of the House was thereupon ordered. One hundred and fifty-nine members having responded to their names, and nineteen members having reported their presence to the clerk, the Speaker pro tem (Mr. Payson) announced that there was a quorum present.

Mr. Morgan (Dem., Miss.) moved an adjournment, stating that he did so in good faith, believing that gentlemen interested in the state arrangement in regard to the Lard bill. The motion was lost—yeas, 46; nays, 128.

MR. CANNON'S RESOLUTION.

Mr. Cannon then offered a resolution, reciting that twice to-day the legislative proceedings have been interrupted by want of a quorum; that certain members (enumerating them) answered to their names under the calls, but did not respond on the regular roll calls, many of them leaving the hall so that they could not be counted and that there was a large number of members absent without leave and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms immediately to notify by telegraph all members absent, except those absent on account of illness, to return to Washington without delay, and revoking all leaves of absence, except those granted on account of illness. These are the members named in the preamble:

ALMOST ALL THE REPUBLICANS.

Aldrich, Baker, Beckwith, Bootner, Carleton, Catchings, Chipman, Coleman, Covert, Crane, Crisp, Cummings, Enloe, Flower, Grimes, Hayes, Kinsie, Lawler, Lehlbach, Lester (Ga.), Mercer, Moore (Tex.), Morgan, Mutchler, O'Ferrall, Osborne, Pugsley, Rainey, Robertson, Rowland, Seney, Shively, Skinner, Spooner, Tillman, Turner (Ga.), Turner (Tex.), Wilson, Washington, Wheeler (Ala.), Whiting, Wilkinson, Wilson, and Williams (Ill.).

Mr. Blount raised a point of order against the resolution, and entered his protest against the preamble. That preamble was an arraignment of every member mentioned in it, and its adoption would be a precedent for such fight between young "Billy" Mason of Chicago, who is taking an active part in opposing the bill, and old Mr. Walker of Massachusetts, one of its foremost advocates.

Mr. Walker's white hair is all that saved him from getting a knock-down. Mr. Walker addressed a remark to Mr. Mason in relation to the latter's attitude on the Lard bill, when Mr. Mason said:

"I am opposing the bill on principle and because I believe I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents in doing so."

Mr. Walker replied that the manufacturers in Chicago had dictated to him (Mason) the course to pursue. Without a moment's hesitation, Mason sprang toward Walker with clenched fist, saying:

"You are a liar."

Friends of the gentlemen immediately separated them, and thus saved the House the disgrace of a personal encounter.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN DETAIL.

Before the reading of the journal Mr. McClammy (Dem., N. C.) made the point of order that there was no quorum present, and a call of the House was ordered. Only 126 members responded to their names, and Mr. Payson (Rep., Ill.) offered a resolution for the arrest of absentees, pending which Mr. Enloe (Dem., Tenn.) moved an adjournment. The motion to adjourn was lost—yeas, 95; nays, 125. The Speaker stated that the Clerk had announced to him that there were 169 members present—more than a quorum. Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with, and the journal was read and approved.

Mr. Brosius (Rep., Pa.) demanded the regular order, and contended that the unfinished business was the Conger Lard bill, the vote upon the passage of which on Saturday was inconclusive, owing to the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Baker (Rep., N. Y.), who was interested in a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, argued that business on the Speaker's table must first be disposed of.

Mr. Blount (Dem., Ga.) read the rule of the House prescribing the order of business, and said that it was clear to him that unfinished business could not be disposed of until after the consideration of the business on the Speaker's table. But the Speaker had intimated that he would rule not only on this question, but also on the question as to whether, under the special order, the Lard bill was the unfinished business. His judgment was that under the terms of that order the House could not consider the Lard bill any further. It was clear from the terms that to-day and to-morrow were devoted to the consideration of the Option bill. The time assigned to the Lard bill had expired yesterday, and its consideration could not be resumed at this time. In support of his position he quoted from the decisions made by Speaker Reed upon the Copyright bill. In that decision the Speaker said: "The Chair is of the opinion that, the day having expired which was allotted to that business, until another day is allotted to that committee (Committee on Judiciary) it will not be competent to act on that motion" (a motion relative to the copyright bill).

Mr. Brosius suggested that in that case the entire special order had expired.

Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.) inquired whether the gentleman from Georgia took the position that, in the pending case, when there was a continuous special order which expired to-morrow, with the previous question and the yeas and nays ordered on a bill, that bill did not come up as "unfinished business." If he so held, was not the decision of the special order, became of the matter in hand? If that construction was right, would not the proposed legislation be lost under the rules of the House? Whereas, if it came up as unfinished business, it was in the power of the House to dispose of it. That construction advanced by the gentleman, was another construction put it out of the power of the House, under its rules, to reach or consider it.

Mr. Blount contended that in the special order there was a distinct time given to each bill mentioned therein, and the time designated for the Lard bill had expired.

Mr. Buchanan (Dem., N. J.) thought that in view of the proceedings on Saturday, when it was intimated by the Speaker that the bill would come up either on Monday or Tuesday on the strength of which intimation an adjournment was taken, it was not in good faith for the opponents of the bill to raise the point that it was not unfinished business.

Mr. Frank (Rep., Mo.) remarked that there was nothing in the proceedings of Saturday that could act as an estoppel.

Mr. Herbert (Dem., Ala.) controverted the position that the Lard bill had now the right of way. It had had its day in court, and had exhausted all the time allotted to it.

Mr. Adams (Rep., Ill.) argued that the rule giving a certain number of days to the Committee on Agriculture was not a continuing order, in the sense in which it was viewed by his colleague (Mr. Cannon). It expressly set apart certain days for the consideration of certain measures. To-day was assigned to the Option bill, and the Lard bill could not interfere with its consideration.

Mr. Hatch (Dem., Mo.) held the view that the Lard bill was unfinished business, the previous question having been ordered, and the yeas and nays having been ordered on its passage. In support of his view he quoted from the decision of Speaker Carlisle on the Oklahoma bill. In this case the special order had expired and the Speaker had ruled that the bill came up, not by reason of the special order, but by virtue of the fact that the previous question had been ordered.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) argued that the bill could not come up before the disposition of bills on the Speaker's table, even if it had been considered in its regular order. If it could come up before the disposition of that business, why not before the reading of the journal, why not before prayer by the chaplain, if his memory served him aright the Speaker had decided that pension bills coming over from Friday night sessions with the previous question ordered could not be considered on Saturday morning.

The Speaker replied that he did not think he had rendered such a decision, but it was so long since the question had been raised that he was not absolutely certain.

Mr. Crisp, continuing, said that even conceding that under the general rules the bill would come up under the operation of the previous question, these general rules had been changed by the special order, and to-day has been dedicated to the consideration of the Option bill.

Mr. Enloe could see no difference between the status of the Lard bill and the status of the Copyright bill.

SPEAKER REED'S DECISION.

The Speaker then rendered this decision: "The House will have seen by the discussion that this and similar questions have had a considerable variety of decision, and it would not be possible to reconcile with each other all the rulings and decisions that have been made. The Chair thinks, however, that the decision which was cited by the gentleman from Missouri governs this case. At the adjournment on Saturday the House had had the previous question ordered in accordance with the rule. The yeas and nays also had been ordered. The taking of the yeas and nays had been interrupted by the absence of a quorum. Thereupon the gentleman in charge of the bill asked if the matter would come up again, and the Chair replied that he thought it would. That was received without dissent on the part of the House. While the Chair does not think that this would be a controlling matter, nevertheless he thinks the House ought to have an opportunity to pass on the question in the light of decisions made in former Congresses and under the intimation of the Chair.

"The Chair thinks it frank to say that, as a result of this discussion, there is very grave doubt in his mind as to whether the decision with regard to the Copyright bill was a correct one. It was in accordance with the decision made in the Forty-eighth Congress that whenever a committee had a day and its work was not done its special power ceased. The attention of the Chair had not been called to the decision cited by the gentleman from Missouri. It may be said that the language of that ruling excepted a case like this where the next day has actually been given to a committee; and it is proper that this statement should be made in connection with the doubt expressed by the Chair. The Chair therefore thinks that the question now before the House is the roll call on the passage of the bill."

Mr. Mason (Rep., Ill.) appealed from the decision. On sustaining the decision the vote stood: Yeas, 125; nays, 28—no quorum—and a call of the House was ordered. One hundred and eighty-two members having responded to their names, the sergeant-at-arms was sent with further proceedings under the call, upon which motion the opponents of the Lard bill, in order to consume time, ordered the yeas and nays. The motion to dispense with further proceedings was agreed to; yeas, 127; nays, 21, the latter being entered on sustaining the decision of the Speaker. But the quorum had vanished, and the vote resulted: Yeas, 120; nays, 14, the clerk being unable to note a quorum. Another call of the House was thereupon ordered. One hundred and fifty-nine members having responded to their names, and nineteen members having reported their presence to the clerk, the Speaker pro tem (Mr. Payson) announced that there was a quorum present.

Mr. Morgan (Dem., Miss.) moved an adjournment, stating that he did so in good faith, believing that gentlemen interested in the state arrangement in regard to the Lard bill. The motion was lost—yeas, 46; nays, 128.

MR. CANNON'S RESOLUTION.

Mr. Cannon then offered a resolution, reciting that twice to-day the legislative proceedings have been interrupted by want of a quorum; that certain members (enumerating them) answered to their names under the calls, but did not respond on the regular roll calls, many of them leaving the hall so that they could not be counted and that there was a large number of members absent without leave and directing the Sergeant-at-Arms immediately to notify by telegraph all members absent, except those absent on account of illness, to return to Washington without delay, and revoking all leaves of absence, except those granted on account of illness. These are the members named in the preamble:

ALMOST CAME TO BLOWS.

Aldrich, Baker, Beckwith, Bootner, Carleton, Catchings, Chipman, Coleman, Covert, Crane, Crisp, Cummings, Enloe, Flower, Grimes, Hayes, Kinsie, Lawler, Lehlbach, Lester (Ga.), Mercer, Moore (Tex.), Morgan, Mutchler, O'Ferrall, Osborne, Pugsley, Rainey, Robertson, Rowland, Seney, Shively, Skinner, Spooner, Tillman, Turner (Ga.), Turner (Tex.), Wilson, Washington, Wheeler (Ala.), Whiting, Wilkinson, Wilson, and Williams (Ill.).

Mr. Blount raised a point of order against the resolution, and entered his protest against the preamble. That preamble was an arraignment of every member mentioned in it, and its adoption would be a precedent for such fight between young "Billy" Mason of Chicago, who is taking an active part in opposing the bill, and old Mr. Walker of Massachusetts, one of its foremost advocates.

Mr. Walker's white hair is all that saved him from getting a knock-down. Mr. Walker addressed a remark to Mr. Mason in relation to the latter's attitude on the Lard bill, when Mr. Mason said:

"I am opposing the bill on principle and because I believe I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents in doing so."

Mr. Walker replied that the manufacturers in Chicago had dictated to him (Mason) the course to pursue. Without a moment's hesitation, Mason sprang toward Walker with clenched fist, saying:

"You are a liar."

Friends of the gentlemen immediately separated them, and thus saved the House the disgrace of a personal encounter.

THE PROCEEDINGS IN DETAIL.

Before the reading of the journal Mr. McClammy (Dem., N. C.) made the point of order that there was no quorum present, and a call of the House was ordered. Only 126 members responded to their names, and Mr. Payson (Rep., Ill.) offered a resolution for the arrest of absentees, pending which Mr. Enloe (Dem., Tenn.) moved an adjournment. The motion to adjourn was lost—yeas, 95; nays, 125. The Speaker stated that the Clerk had announced to him that there were 169 members present—more than a quorum. Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with, and the journal was read and approved.

Mr. Brosius (Rep., Pa.) demanded the regular order, and contended that the unfinished business was the Conger Lard bill, the vote upon the passage of which on Saturday was inconclusive, owing to the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Baker (Rep., N. Y.), who was interested in a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, argued that business on the Speaker's table must first be disposed of.

Mr. Blount (Dem., Ga.) read the rule of the House prescribing the order of business, and said that it was clear to him that unfinished business could not be disposed of until after the consideration of the business on the Speaker's table. But the Speaker had intimated that he would rule not only on this question, but also on the question as to whether, under the special order, the Lard bill was the unfinished business. His judgment was that under the terms of that order the House could not consider the Lard bill any further. It was clear from the terms that to-day and to-morrow were devoted to the consideration of the Option bill. The time assigned to the Lard bill had expired yesterday, and its consideration could not be resumed at this time. In support of his position he quoted from the decisions made by Speaker Reed upon the Copyright bill. In that decision the Speaker said: "The Chair is of the opinion that, the day having expired which was allotted to that business, until another day is allotted to that committee (Committee on Judiciary) it will not be competent to act on that motion" (a motion relative to the copyright bill).

Mr. Brosius suggested that in that case the entire special order had expired.

Mr. Cannon (Rep., Ill.) inquired whether the gentleman from Georgia took the position that, in the pending case, when there was a continuous special order which expired to-morrow, with the previous question and the yeas and nays ordered on a bill, that bill did not come up as "unfinished business." If he so held, was not the decision of the special order, became of the matter in hand? If that construction was right, would not the proposed legislation be lost under the rules of the House? Whereas, if it came up as unfinished business, it was in the power of the House to dispose of it. That construction advanced by the gentleman, was another construction put it out of the power of the House, under its rules, to reach or consider it.

Mr. Blount contended that in the special order there was a distinct time given to each bill mentioned therein, and the time designated for the Lard bill had expired.

Mr. Buchanan (Dem., N. J.) thought that in view of the proceedings on Saturday, when it was intimated by the Speaker that the bill would come up either on Monday or Tuesday on the strength of which intimation an adjournment was taken, it was not in good faith for the opponents of the bill to raise the point that it was not unfinished business.

Mr. Frank (Rep., Mo.) remarked that there was nothing in the proceedings of Saturday that could act as an estoppel.

Mr. Herbert (Dem., Ala.) controverted the position that the Lard bill had now the right of way. It had had its day in court, and had exhausted all the time allotted to it.

Mr. Adams (Rep., Ill.) argued that the rule giving a certain number of days to the Committee on Agriculture was not a continuing order, in the sense in which it was viewed by his colleague (Mr. Cannon). It expressly set apart certain days for the consideration of certain measures. To-day was assigned to the Option bill, and the Lard bill could not interfere with its consideration.

Mr. Hatch (Dem., Mo.) held the view that the Lard bill was unfinished business, the previous question having been ordered, and the yeas and nays having been ordered on its passage. In support of his view he quoted from the decision of Speaker Carlisle on the Oklahoma bill. In this case the special order had expired and the Speaker had ruled that the bill came up, not by reason of the special order, but by virtue of the fact that the previous question had been ordered.

Mr. Crisp (Dem., Ga.) argued that the bill could not come up before the disposition of bills on the Speaker's table, even if it had been considered in its regular order. If it could come up before the disposition of that business, why not before the reading of the journal, why not before prayer by the chaplain, if his memory served him aright the Speaker had decided that pension bills coming over from Friday night sessions with the previous question ordered could not be considered on Saturday morning.

The Speaker replied that he did not think he had rendered such a decision, but it was so long since the question had been raised that he was not absolutely certain.

Mr. Crisp, continuing, said that even conceding that under the general rules the bill would come up under the operation of the previous question, these general rules had been changed by the special order, and to-day has been dedicated to the consideration of the Option bill.

Mr. Enloe could see no difference between the status of the Lard bill and the status of the Copyright bill.

SPEAKER REED'S DECISION.

The Speaker then rendered this decision: "The House will have seen by the discussion that this and similar questions have had a considerable variety of decision, and it would not be possible to reconcile with each other all the rulings and decisions that have been made.


## "Cleveland's Superior Baking Powder does not contain any adulteration whatever."

*Prof. Morton, President of Stevens Institute of Technology.*


of all the lead produced in Colorado. The Senator from Colorado in his remarks yesterday had not only magnified his office, but had magnified his people. He had said with a little pardonable buncombe that the State of Colorado had made the State of Kansas what it was. In the first place the people of Kansas had given to Colorado practically its entire territorial area, and had also given to it a large portion of its population, who had got their Republicanism and their good citizenship in Kansas. But when the Senator spoke of Colorado's trade of $8,000,000 a year with Kansas he overlooked the fact that the chickens and eggs of Kansas were worth more than that. The entire mineral product of Colorado amounted to only about $27,000,000 a year; a large amount, to be sure, but the wheat industry and the potato industry of Colorado were worth more than its silver and gold industries. The people who went there every year to enjoy the climate, its fishing, and its other delectations in the summer time, spent more money there every year than the entire mineral product of the State. So that the Senator had been, when he made everything hang on the mineral products of Colorado, minimizing the importance of his State.

Mr. Plumb's amendment was rejected—yeas, 18; nays, 28—Mr. Plumb being the only Republican Senator who voted for it.

Mr. Coke's amendment making lead extracted from silver ore free of duty was then voted on and was also rejected—yeas, 19; nays, 30—a strict party vote, Mr. Plumb not voting.

The next paragraph, 197, put a duty of three cents a pound on crude nickel. The Finance Committee had recommended the striking out of the paragraph. It was struck out.

Paragraph 204 was amended on the recommendation of the Finance Committee so as to make the duty on all watches 25 per cent ad valorem.

Paragraph 205, relating to zinc in blocks or pigs, was amended, on the recommendation of the Finance Committee, by reducing the duty from 1¼ to 1¼ cents a pound.

Schedule D, wool and manufacturers of wool, having been reached, Mr. McPherson (Dem., N. J.) wished to offer a substitute for the whole schedule; but he reserved it until the committee amendments should be disposed of.

Paragraph 212, relating to sawed boards, &c., was, on the recommendation of the committee, amended by reducing the duty from 55 per cent. to 10 per cent., and by adding words imposing a duty of 25 per cent. on veneers, not specially provided for.

Paragraph 217, pickets and palings, was amended, on motion of Mr. Aldrich, by reducing the duty from 20 per cent. to 10 per cent.

Mr. Aldrich moved to amend paragraph 221, which puts a duty of 10 per cent. on chair cane manufactured but not made into finished articles by striking out the words "manufactured but not made into finished articles," and inserting in lieu of them the words "or reeds, whether wrought or manufactured from rattans or reeds, and whether round, square, or in any other shape." The amendment, which was agreed to, gave rise to many questions and explanations as to its effect. Mr. Allison expressing doubts about it and reserving the right to have the action reconsidered, and Mr. Blair (Rep., N. H.) suggesting that it was in the interest of a Massachusetts combination and against the interest of the men engaged in making cane-seated chairs.

Schedule E, relating to sugar having been reached, Mr. Aldrich said that the committee proposed to let that schedule be passed over informally for the present so that schedule F, relating to tobacco and its manufactures, would be the first thing to come up to-morrow.

Mr. Call (Dem., Fla.) offered a resolution, which was agreed to, instructing the Judiciary Committee to inquire and report whether any additional legislation is necessary to protect American citizens, formerly Spanish subjects, from persecutions incited by the Spanish Government because of alleged offences committed in the civil war in Cuba.

*LIVE WASHINGTON TOPICS.*

**Things of Interest Happening In and Out of the Halls of Congress.**

WASHINGTON, Aug. 26.—Every mail delivery at the White House reveals astonishing credulity on the part of some of the people of this country. Recently some rogue has been making trouble for the President and people by means of an advertisement. For weeks letters have been coming to the Executive Mansion enclosing three two-cent stamps, and requesting by return mail a promised watch charm or bangle. This was all Greek to the President and those who have charge of the work of assorting his mail matter, but in the big leather pouch to-day there was an explanation of the mystery. A Chicago girl not only wrote to the President and sent the usual number of postage stamps asking for a bangle, but she also enclosed a copy of the advertisement which induced her to write the letter. A small vignette of the President with a big beaver hat is displayed in a small frame, the inscription at the head being, "A national miniature." Under the lower line of the frame are the words "Tiny Ben," followed by a "reading notice," which, it is directed, is to be placed in a column of the newspaper printing it one time next to news matter. The advertisement is as follows:

Neatest thing out! Just the thing for a watch charm or bangle bracelet. Given away in order to introduce it to the public. Enclose three red-headed stamps to pay for packing and postage. Address White House, Washington, D. C.

A correspondent in Wisconsin writes:

Enclosed find three red-headed stamps for the national miniature, which I want to wear on my watch chain.

These are only two samples of a drawer full of letters on the same subject, and they are postmarked from different points all over the United States.

An appeal received from a little girl to-day will probably have the President's serious consideration. She writes:

"MY DEAR PRESIDENT—I have heard that you are buying one-cent postage stamps and paying $6 a hundred for them. Enclosed find 100 stamps which I have collected among my friends and send to you. Won't you please send me $6, too. I am a little girl, 11 years old, and live away down in Arkansas."

This missive was dated from a country town in Arkansas, and postmarked from the same State.

Senator Evarts introduced a bill to-day to provide for the payment of awards made by the Venezuelan Claims Commission now in session in this city. A preamble to the bill recites that the funds received by the Department of State from Venezuela on account of the Caracas awards, under the treaty of 1866, have been invested in United States bonds and increased by interest and by appreciation of the bonds; that the Venezuelan Government is not to be credited with or reimbursed for payments heretofore made upon such of the Caracas awards as have been or may be annulled by the commission now at work; that the present commission allows interest on the awards made by it from the time the cause of action arose to the close of the commission's term of office (Sept. 8, 1890), and by treaty provision they bear interest from that date; therefore the Secretary of State is authorized to apply the funds named, with their accretions, to the payment of the new awards, and to credit the Venezuelan Government, on account of the new awards, with such accretions as well as with the principal of the funds.

Representative Martin of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, presented