FINAL SCENES IN THE HOUSE.

THE LAST TYRANNICAL RULINGS OF THE SPEAKER ANALYZED.

The Struggle Over the Appropriation Bills—Representatives Without Sleep for More than Thirty Hours—Acrimonious Personalities—The Fight for the Copyright Bill and for the French Spoliation Claims—The Death Rattle in the Throat of the Fifty-first Congress—Extraordinary Scenes after Its Death—A Confederate Leading the Song of Requiem.

I.—EXTRAORDINARY RULINGS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1.—With the Indian Appropriation bill out of the way, on Feb. 18 the House took up the Post Office Appropriation bill. Behind this lay the Agricultural Appropriation bill and the General Deficiency bill. The other appropriation bills had been turned over to the Senate. Several had passed that body and were in committee of conference. Others had passed the Senate with amendments, and these amendments were awaiting the action of the House. Everything indicated a gorge in legislation in the last days of the Fifty-first Congress.

As long as the appropriation bills were under consideration there was an era of peace in the House. The Speaker made no further tyrannical rulings. There was nothing to be gained by them. With the Force bill dead, and no further prospect of partisan legislation, the Democrats offered no factious opposition to the appropriation bills. They demanded full explanations as to all the items of expenditure, and their action was governed entirely by economic considerations.

Everything was moving smoothly and everybody was apparently in the best of spirits when the triumvirate controlling the Committee on Rules again throttled the House. It looked as if they were spurred to this action by the Administration. It evidently desired to have the appointment of seventeen Republican United States Circuit Judges for life. A bill providing for the appointment of these seventeen Judges was passed on April 15 under a special order from the Committee on Rules. It was rushed through the House in less than three hours, despite the protests of Messrs. Carlisle, Mills, Breckinridge, and other Democratic leaders. These were the Judges who were to have the appointment of the Chief Supervisors of Election and Canvassing Boards under the provisions of the Force bill. With the House Judiciary bill a law, there would be twenty-five Republican Circuit Judges and only two Democratic Judges. The Democrats in the House had vainly endeavored to make the appointments non-partisan.

With the Force bill out of the way, the Senate had amended the House Judiciary bill so as to make it unsatisfactory to the Republican leaders in the House. The Senate amendments reduced the number of Judges to be appointed and made other changes. The Republican leaders were evidently afraid to let these amendments take their regular course in the House. The appropriation bills had the right of way. They might drag along so close to the end of the session that the Democrats would be able to compel the majority either to make the Judges non-partisan or lose their bill. This would never do. Joseph G. Cannon, who had driven the bill through in April in three hours, under a special order from the Committee on Rules, repeated his tactics. While the Post Office Appropriation bill was under consideration, without a word of warning, he sprang a special order upon the House from the Committee on Rules. It provided for the immediate consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill, and for similar action on a bill relating to the salaries of the United States Judges. The vote upon the first was to be taken before 2½ o'clock of the same day, the previous question being considered as ordered upon a motion to nonconcur in gross and agree to a conference with the Senate. After that the second bill was to be considered for an hour. The bill was then to be forced to its passage.

This action was strenuously opposed by the Democrats. They insisted that the House should proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bills. Cannon was more driving than usual. The Democrats resorted to the parliamentary tactics allowed by the Reed rules to stop the switching of the appropriation bills. They were spurred to this action by other considerations. There were two election cases upon the calendar. The Committee on Elections were determined to oust two more Democratic members in order to make room for Republicans. Such action would add four to the Republican majority and place $24,000 in the pockets of the new members.

But the Democrats were not allowed fair play. The Speaker came to the aid of the Committee on Rules, and by unprecedented tyrannical rulings forced the special order to a vote. The excitement was intense. The resolution from the Committee on Rules had been read amid considerable confusion. Mr. Springer asked that it be read again, so that members might understand it. This was refused. Thereupon Mr. Springer moved that the House adjourn, so that members might have an opportunity to ascertain what the resolution was. The Speaker refused to entertain the motion. Mr. Breckinridge then raised the question of consideration. The House determined to consider the resolution by a vote of 115 to 80. Mr. Blount of Georgia moved to table the resolution from the Committee on Rules. This was lost by a vote of 93 to 128.

The resolution then came before the House. Under the rules, forty minutes are allowed for discussion after the previous question is demanded unless discussion has preceded the demand. To cut off these forty minutes of debate Joseph G. Cannon made some remarks before demanding the previous question. He frankly admitted that he did it for the purpose of cutting off the forty minutes allowed for discussion. As soon as he had made this acknowledgment he demanded the previous question. Major McKinley, who had adopted the same tactics the two weeks before, when he knew it was knowledged to be incorrect was to be approved, suggested that Mr. Cannon allow the Democrats twenty minutes for debate, provided that the previous question should be considered as ordered at the end of that time. This was indignantly refused by Mr. McMillin, who was leading the Democrats. The *Record* shows this:

Mr. McMillin—The gentleman from Illinois has announced his course. He has attacked my motives and the motives and motives of this side of the House, and has said that we shall not be heard to reply. If that is to be the method of procedure, let him proceed. We will meet you at every point. This is a question of increasing expenditures, and in making appropriations the interests of your dead grandfather's widow, who is the forerunner of divers other bills that are intended to bleed the Treasury, now that you linger superfluous on the stage, after you have been shamefully defeated. (Tremendous applause on the Democratic side.)

Mr. Cannon—I will yield the gentleman three minutes, so that he may get all the bile oil his stomach.

Mr. McMillin—I do not need to take it, although not yet sufficient. The gentleman has yielded me three minutes, I understand.

Mr. Cannon—Yes. I want the gentleman to get all the bile of his stomach.

In his three minutes Mr. McMillin claimed that under the special order no chance for amendments was allowed. The House was told by the Committee on Rules that the House of Representatives was not fit to govern itself or the country, and the Committee itself was proposing to govern it.

After some further remarks, Mr. Cannon again demanded the previous question. Pending that demand, Mr. Blount offered a resolution to recommit the special order to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the bills for the Post Office Appropriation bill, the Agricultural Appropriation bill, and the General Deficiency bill had been passed, and to allow five hours for the consideration of each bill. Upon a division this was declared lost by ayes, 57; noes, 107. Mr. McMillin called for the yeas and nays, and demanded tellers on the ordering of the yeas and nays. The *Record* shows what followed:

Mr. McMillin—I demand tellers on the yeas nay nays.

The Speaker—The Chair declines to order tellers.

Mr. McMillin—Does the Chair decline to let the House determine the question by tellers? This was never refused before since Congress was organized.

The Speaker—The Chair declines to entertain the demand for tellers on the ordering of the yeas and nays in view of the fact that more than one-half of the House has risen in support of the call for the yeas and nays, and the request is evidently dilatory.

Mr. McMillin—The Chair has no right to refuse to entertain the demand in any case.

The Speaker—The Clerk will call the roll.

At this point most of the Democrats left the hall. The vote stood yeas 12, nays 150. Thereupon the Clerk read the names of enough Democrats whom he claimed were present, and not voting to make a quorum, and declared Blount's motion rejected. The *Record* shows this:

Mr. McMillin—I notice that the name of Mr. Oates of Alabama is recorded among the names of those present and not voting. He is not here, and has not been in the hall this morning.

The Speaker—Has he not been in the cloak room?

Mr. McMillin—He may have been there. He has not been in the hall.

The Speaker—The Chair thinks that the cloak room is a part of the floor of the House.

The question then came upon the demand for the previous question. Nearly every Democrat had left the hall. On the division there were ayes, 154; noes, 2. Mr. McMillin called

No quorum.

The Speaker announced 169 members present. It was evident that no quorum was present. Mr. McMillin looked at him in evident astonishment, and called for the yeas and nays. The Tennessean waved his hand toward the cloak room, where a few Democrats were gathered, preparatory to leaving the House. He wanted them to come forward so as to secure the demand for the yeas and nays. It takes one-fifth of those present to order the yeas and nays. The *Record* shows what happened:

The Speaker—The Chair will count only those gentlemen standing in front of the railing.

Mr. Rogers—I thought the Chair wanted to count those in the cloak room a little while ago.

The Speaker paid no attention to what Mr. Rogers said, but announced that the number rising in support of the yeas and nays was 31, not a sufficient number. Thereupon Mr. McMillin demanded tellers. Although the Speaker had refused tellers on the yeas and nays not half an hour before, he allowed them this time. The reason for this was afterward made manifest. There was no quorum present. Enough Democrats to make a quorum entered the hall and passed between the tellers in order to secure the yeas and nays, and then left the Capitol. They were counted as present on another vote after they had left the House so as to make a quorum. Not only this, but men were counted who had not entered the Capitol at all that day.

The question was then taken on agreeing to the demand for the previous question. The vote was announced—yeas, 150; nays, 8. Thereupon the Clerk counted enough Democrats, including those who had passed between the tellers on the the yeas and nays and had left the building, to make a quorum.

Mr. McMillin demanded a recapitulation of the vote, and the Speaker refused it. Mr. Blount and Mr. McMillin protested against the counting of members who were not in the hall; but the Speaker, without paying the slightest attention to the protest, announced that the previous question had been carried. He then put the question on the adoption of the resolution and announced that it was carried—yeas, 128; nays, 3. Mr. McMillin raised the point of no quorum, and the Speaker again counted the House. He announced that there were 153 members present, including two in the cloak room. The *Record* shows what followed:

Mr. Blount—Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The Speaker—That is not the usual course, or can move for the yeas and nays as another method of ascertaining a quorum.

Mr. Cannon—I expect that it is better to call the yeas and nays.

Mr. Blount—I prefer to take the course that the rule points out.

Mr. Cannon—I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker—As many as are in favor of taking this question by yeas and nays—

Mr. McMillin—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from Georgia moved a call of the House before the other motion was made, and that is to be decided before the other is disposed of.

The Speaker—One moment. There need be no confusion about this.

Mr. McMillin—I am not making any confusion, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker—But the House is dividing, and the prior right is to go on with the division.

Mr. McMillin—But, Mr. Speaker, if the House finds out that a quorum is not present and a member moves a call of the House, that cannot be set aside till it is disposed of. This is a well-settled rule.

The Speaker—But the House can go on with the division.

Here it will be seen that the Speaker acknowledged that Mr. Blount's motion was in order. Nevertheless, he failed to put it. On the contrary, he suggested another method to his side of the House. Mr. Cannon caught the suggestion, and moved for the yeas and nays. The Speaker put Mr. Cannon's motion, and paid no further attention to Mr. Blount. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The readiness of the Speaker is shown in a little colloquy that followed:

Mr. McMillin—Does the Chair hold that it was not in order for the gentleman from Georgia to move a call of the House?

The Speaker—No, the Chair held that it was in order, at the time when that was made, to demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. McMillin—The motion for a call of the House being made, Mr. Speaker, is to be disposed of first.

The Speaker—The yeas and nays having been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The vote upon the passage of the special order was yeas 156, nays 4. This was seven votes less than a quorum. While the vote was being taken the Speaker called Judge Payson of Illinois to the chair. The Clerk began to call the names of Democrats whom he claimed were present and not voting, to make a quorum. He again recorded the names of Democrats who had left the House as present but not voting.

Upon this, the Speaker declared a constitutional quorum present, and announced that the special order was carried. The bill as amended in the Senate was then read. The Clerk had scarcely concluded the reading when the time specified in the special order for taking the vote arrived. This gave no time consideration. The Democrats refused to vote. There were 166 yeas. The Clerk counted enough members to make a quorum and the House disagreed with the Senate amendments and ordered a conference. At this there was great applause on the Republican side.

II.—LAST TYRANNICAL ACTS.

The extraordinary rulings of the Speaker on Feb. 20 were fitly supplemented on Feb. 21. Democratic Representatives whose votes had been recorded while they were absent from the Capitol tried to enter their protests. Some were recognized by the Speaker, not voluntarily, but through the kindness of Major McKinley, to whom the Speaker had given the floor. The Major, however, was partial in his courtesy. Two members, Mr. Geary of California and Mr. Hayes of Iowa, had not appeared at the Capitol at all until after the vote had been taken on the previous day. They were counted as present to make a quorum despite their absence. They vainly sought an opportunity to make a protest.

When the Clerk began to read the journal, Mr. Fithian of Illinois made the point of order that no quorum was present. The Speaker could count only 121 members. Thereupon Major McKinley moved a call of the House. Mr. McMillin, evidently fearful that more Democrats would be unseated by the Committee on Elections, demanded the yeas and nays on the call. The Speaker was disposed to ignore the demand, but Mr. McMillin was persistent. Finally the question was taken on the demand. The Speaker announced that 30 gentlemen arose. "Not a sufficient number," he decided.

It was a singular mistake, for thirty is more than one-fifth of 121. Mr. O'Neill of Boston corrected the Speaker's arithmetic, and the yeas and nays were ordered. The names were called slowly by the Clerk, and a quorum appeared on the record. The call of the House was refused. The Clerk then began to read the journal. As he proceeded, Democratic members with *Congressional Records* before them, followed him. The following is from the *Record*:

Mr. Springer—I ask the Clerk to read the whole of the journal.

Mr. Fithian—I demand the reading of the journal in full.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—Will he proceed to read it in full?

The Speaker—Certainly.

The Clerk resumed the reading.

Mr. Springer—The Clerk is disregarding the instructions of the Chair.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. Springer—I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Clerk is not reading the journal in full.

The Speaker—The journal is being read in full.

Mr. Springer—The journal is not being read in full, sir, and you know it.

The Speaker—The gentleman will sit down.

Mr. Springer—I make the issue of veracity with the Chair. The journal is not being read in full.

The Speaker—The Chair is informed that it is being read in full.

Mr. Springer—I know it is not.

The Speaker—The Chair has instructed the Clerk to read it in full.

Mr. Springer—And the Clerk declines to do it.

The Speaker—The Clerk will read the entire journal. He will continue from where he left off.

Mr. Springer—I asked for the reading of the journal as it appears in his book, and he has not read it. There is a roll call that he has omitted.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Fithian—The Clerk has omitted to read the first roll call. He is reading the second.

The Speaker—The reading of the roll call was not asked for.

Mr. McMillin—It was asked for.

Mr. Springer—I asked for it, and demanded it.

The Clerk continued the reading.

Mr. Fithian—He is reading the second roll call.

The Speaker—This is the second roll call. The first was passed without anybody demanding that it should be read.

Mr. McMillin—The gentleman from Illinois at the beginning of the reading of the journal demanded that it should be read in full.

The Speaker—The Chair thinks that the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. Springer—I am not mistaken.

Thereupon the Speaker gave way, and the Clerk began to read the first roll call.

Mr. Fithian (interrupting the reading)—Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has omitted the reading of a portion of these names. He has skipped from Mr. Dansell down to Mr. Ewart.

The Speaker—The Chair thinks that the proper course with regard to this, if the matter is to be strictly construed, is that the gentleman shall make his complaint after the reading is finished.

The Clerk again resumed the reading. The following occurred (see *Record*):

Mr. Fithian—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the journal.

Mr. Fithian—I desire to make a point of order.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk continued the reading.

Mr. Fithian—I suppose it is out of the rights—

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed with reading of the journal.

Mr. Fithian—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Fithian—New Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed with the reading.

Mr. Fithian—My, Speaker, Mr. Speaker—

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is not reading the journal.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—The Clerk did not read the amendments in which the House non-concurred. They are in the journal, or they ought to be.

The Speaker—The Clerk will read the journal as it stands.

Mr. Springer—Not as it stands, but as it should stand.

Mr. Allen of Michigan—Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman has no right to interrupt the reading. He should wait till after the journal is read.

Mr. Springer—After the journal is read the previous question will be moved and ordered, and I will have no right then.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—I want to know whether these amendments are in the journal.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—The Clerk is not reading these bills at all.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Tracy to the Clerk—Why do you not read the journal correctly?

Mr. Springer—The journal is not being read. I am paying attention and I know what I am talking about.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed.

Mr. Springer—If the Clerk is reading the journal as it stands then he has not made it up correctly.

The Speaker—The Clerk will proceed, reading the journal as it is.

This scene continued for some time. The reading of the journal was finally completed. During the reading Mr. Payson took the chair as Speaker pro tem. The instant the Clerk stopped reading he recognized Major McKinley, who moved that the journal be approved. Then the following occurred (see *Record*):

Mr. Springer—I rise to a question of order—

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman from Ohio moves the approval of the journal of yesterday's proceedings, and on that demands the previous question.

Thereupon Major McKinley yielded five minutes to Judge Turner of Georgia, who, he said, desired to make a statement. Judge Turner acknowledged that he had been in the House and passed through the tellers on the question of taking the yeas and nays on the previous day, but had left the hall through the front door before the yeas and nays were taken. On both occasions he was recorded as present and refusing to vote. Judge Turner therefore asked that a correction be made in the journal. The following occurred (see *Record*):

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman from Ohio moves the approval of the journal, and on that demands the previous question.

Judge Turner—I hope the Chair will allow me a correction. The previous question has not yet been demanded.

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman from Ohio having been recognized yielded to the gentleman from Georgia to make a personal statement, with for that only.

Mr. McKinley—I yielded solely for the purpose of allowing a statement as to the gentleman's own record, and distinctly disclaim yielding for the purpose of making a motion.

The *Record* shows that Mr. Turner asked unanimous consent to have the correction made. The Speaker pro tem. did not put his request to the House, and Major McKinley yielded three minutes to Mr. Clements of Georgia, whose action on the previous day was precisely the same as that of Mr. Turner. He asked unanimous consent that his name might be stricken out from the list of those present and not voting, since he was absent from the Capitol.

"Is there objection," the Speaker pro tem. shouted.

"I object," shouted Mr. Bayne of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Clements got no correction.

At this Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky said: "It is eminently proper that objection should be made to the request by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The manifest purpose being to have a fraudulent record, of course proper correction will be made."

Mr. Blanchard of Louisiana obtained permission to make a statement. He said that he was recorded in the journal and also in the *Record* as being present in the House when the yea and nay vote was taken on the question of ordering the previous question on the day before. He was not in the House when the vote was taken. He had left the Capitol and had gone to a hotel, and yet was counted as present. He continued thus:

Mr. Blanchard—The *Record* and the journal in recording me as present, perpetrate a palpable falsehood.

Mr. McKinley—I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if he was present at any time during the yeas and nays?

Mr. Blanchard—I was present and went through the tellers on the demand for the yeas and nays. (Laughter on the Republican side.)

Mr. Rayne—Is the gentleman admits that he was present.

Mr. Blanchard—I deny it. The fact that that went through the tellers on the vote ordered for the yeas and nays gave no right to the Speaker or the Clerk to count me present on a subsequent vote when, in fact, I was absent from the House.

Mr. McKinley—Do I understand you to say that you were not present during the vote?

Mr. Blanchard—That is what I say. When the vote was taken I was not within the walls of the House, and left the Capitol and repaired to a hotel, and I did not return to the House till the evening session.

Mr. McKinley then yielded to Mr. Crisp of Georgia.

Mr. Crisp made a statement similar to that of Messrs. Blanchard, Clements and Turner. He was absent from the House when the vote was taken. "I merely desire to say this," Mr. Crisp explained, "so that the House and the country may understand the method in which the presiding officer of this House makes up and falsifies the record."

At this Major McKinley shouted: "I will not yield to any one for the purpose of reflecting on the officers of this House." He allowed Mr. Wilson of Missouri, however, to say that he had been treated the same as Mr. Crisp and the others in having his name recorded. Major McKinley then yielded to other gentlemen, three of whom had not passed between the tellers, and had not been in the Capitol until after the yea and nay vote had been taken on the previous day. Yet they were recorded in the journal as present and not voting. They were Mr. Hayes of Iowa, and Mr. Geary of California and Mr. Whiteaw of Missouri. The Major demanded the previous question amid great excitement. The *Record* shows this:

Mr. McMillin—Will the gentleman permit me—

Mr. McKinley—No; I will not permit the gentleman to stand here and assume to prevent the transaction of public business. I will not yield to him.

Mr. McMillin—You dare not. You know you are trying to give a false impression. You are trying to deceive the people.

Mr. McKinley—You know that you have already forfeited all claims to courtesy from this side of the House. (Loud applause on the Republican side.) I demand the previous question.

Mr. McMillin—I say that you are trying to deceive the people, and you cannot publish a fraudulent record on the people. This journal you propose to approve begins with falsehood, continues in falsehood, and ends in falsehood. (Loud applause on the Democratic side, followed by great excitement on the Republican side, and great confusion in the hall.)

Mr. McKinley—I demand the previous question, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were taken, and the journal was approved by a strict party vote. After the announcement of the vote the *Record* shows the following:

Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky—I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman will state it.

Mr. Breckinridge—There was a part of the journal read in skeleton. When we approve it do we approve it as it now is or with a power in the journal clerk to fill it in skeleton?

The Speaker pro tem.—That is hardly a parliamentary question. The gentleman is as capable to judge of the legal effect of the action of the Chair as I am.

Mr. Breckinridge of Kentucky—That is a very high compliment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McMillin—Is there debate under the rule, the previous question having been ordered?

The Speaker pro tem.—There is not.

Mr. McMillin—The Chair holds, then, that the one-sided debate of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McKinley, pre vents debate on this side?

The Speaker pro tem.—The Chair holds under the rule that debate having been entered on before the previous question was ordered, further debate is not in order.

The reader must remember that forty minutes is allowed for debate under the rule unless the House has proceeded to business.

The journal was approved by a party vote. Mr. Springer then rose to a question of privilege. He sent the following to the desk:

Whereas, The Speaker of the House yesterday directed the Clerk to announce and to record as present Mr. Boatner of Louisiana on the statement of the Clerk that he (Boatner) had been present in the House when the yeas and nays on the pending proposition; therefore

Resolved, That the recording of Mr. Boatner as present and not voting was in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. McKinley made the point of order that this was not a privileged resolution. The Speaker sustained the point of order. Mr. Springer appealed from the decision. Without giving him an opportunity to present his case, the Speaker pro tem. recognized Major McKinley, who moved to table the appeal. A motion to lay upon the table is not debatable. The *Record* shows this colloquy:

The Speaker pro tem.—The Chair entertains the motion of the gentleman from Ohio to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. Springer—I hope the Chair will hear a word of argument on the subject.

The Speaker pro tem.—It is not debatable under the rule.

Mr. Springer—But, Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded the floor to the gentleman from Ohio.

The Speaker pro tem.—The motion of the gentleman from Ohio is not debatable.

Mr. Springer—I was on the floor making an appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I have the right, having made that appeal, to retain the floor, to be heard upon it. The Chair cannot take it from me.

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman knows that this is a matter of recognition.

Mr. Springer—Is the right of every gentleman who has the floor for making a motion that is in order under the rules to be heard upon it.

The Speaker pro tem.—But the gentleman was not recognized for debate after his motion was submitted.

Mr. Springer—How can the Chair take me from the floor!

The Speaker pro tem.—The gentleman would have no right to be heard upon a motion till a subsequent recognition. The present motion is not debatable.

Thereupon the decision of the Chair was sustained by a party vote. Speaker Reed stood at the side of the Speaker pro tem. while he was making these decisions.

Under these rulings the reader will see that the journal is not a journal to be corrected until it has been adopted, and then motions to correct it are out of order. This is the legitimate effect of the rulings, because after the journal is read the Speaker, when necessary to carry party measures, recognizes Major McKinley to move the approval of the journal and to demand the previous question. The Speaker then rules that the journal cannot be corrected, because the demand for the previous question cuts off all debate to correct it.

These were the last of the tyrannical rulings in the Fifty-first Congress. They fully account for the refusal of the Democrats afterward to join with the Republicans in thanking the Speaker for his fairness. What would have happened if an effort had been made to carry out the policy of the majority of the Committee on Elections and unseat two more Democrats elected by the people must be conjectured from the rulings already made. Mr. Rowell, Chairman of the Committee on Elections, intended to substitute Republicans for these Democrats. He sought the floor at one time to make this motion. Mr. Crisp, the leader of the Democratic minority of the Committee on Elections, was on the alert. He is a skilful parliamentarian and a magnificent tactician. He could have made a fight that would have knocked out many a bill in which prominent Republicans were interested, and have thrown overboard one or two appropriation bills. Prominent Republicans went to him and assured him that if he would cease his dilatory tactics they would vote against taking up the election cases. Mr. Rowell was informed of their attitude and gave way. Thus Mr. Alderson and Mr. Bullock of Florida were not deprived of their seats.

III.—THE APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The House passed the Indian Appropriation bill on Feb. 18. Three great appropriation bills remained on the calendar. The first was the Post Office Appropriation bill, the second the Agricultural bill, and the third and greatest of all the General Deficiency bill. The Post Office bill was under the charge of Gen. Harry Bingham, Chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He induced the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Feb. 18, by granting four hours and a quarter for general debate, three of which went to the Democrats and an hour and a quarter to the Republicans.

The time allotted to the Democrats was used in the discussion of matters which had no relation to the Post Office Appropriation bill. Mr. Blount and Col. O'Ferrall ventilated their views on the Shipping bill. Mr. Crain of Texas made an exhaustive speech upon his resolutions providing for an amendment to the Constitution. It substitutes the 31st of December for the 4th of March as the termination of the official term of members of the House of Representatives of the United States and Senators, providing that Congress shall hold its annual meeting on the first Monday in January, and substituting the 30th of April for the 4th of March as the day for the commencement and limitation of the term of the President and Vice-President. Mr. Cummings used twenty-five minutes in advocating his resolution of sympathy with the persecuted Jews in Russia. Much of the time on the Republican side was devoted to the discussion of the Shipping bill. Mr. Kerr of Iowa and Mr. Simonds of Connecticut made strong arguments in its favor.

Gen. Bingham and Mr. Evans of Tennessee were the only ones who spoke upon the Appropriation bill. It carries $77,365,000—$180,000 less than the estimate of the Postmaster-General. In this sum there is an appropriation for a deficiency of $34,000,000.

At the close of the general debate the bill was read by paragraphs for amendment. Gen. Bingham is an expert legislative pilot. He had very little trouble and would have put the bill through in quick time if the Committee on Rules had not assumed control of the House and sidetracked it. They brought in a special order under which the bills increasing the number of United States Circuit Judges and increasing the salaries of United States District Judges were passed.

Gen. Bingham did not again get his bill upon the track till the night of Feb. 21. Then it was put through the committee under whip and spur. He got about twenty-five pages.

Behind him stood Joseph G. Cannon with the General Deficiency Appropriation bill. Without rising the committee took up this bill. The Clerk had read twenty-five of the seventy pages when the Democrats made an effort to adjourn. Although it was late at night, the House refused to do so. Cannon forced debate upon his bill. It recommended an appropriation of $36,577,308. Of this sum $28,668,832 was to fill a deficiency for pensions for the current year. Of the remaining sum, $5,000,000 was for the Central Pacific Railroad, for services upon the non-bonded-aided lines of that road. The Central Pacific road, it is said, owes the Government more than $36,000,000. These non-bond-aided roads are now being paid monthly for their services in transporting mails, troops, munitions, and for other services rendered to the United States. The bill, however, found Government, under the Thurman act turned the money into the sinking fund to discharge the indebtedness of the road to the Government. The Central Pacific Company claim that the non-bond-aided roads were independent of the bond-aided roads and that the Government should pay the money due on the latter for other railroad for similar services. The company sued for the money in the Court of Claims and got judgment. The judgment was confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the appropriation was made to satisfy the judgment.

The proposition to appropriate the money led to an acrimonious debate. The Rev. John Anderson of Kansas, recently appointed Consul-General to Egypt, made a ferocious attack upon the Pacific Railroads. He said that the non-bond-aided lines were simply part of the machinery of the bond-aided lines. The Pacific Railroad Company meant to swindle the Government out of the $120,000,000 which it would owe it in six years, and the appropriation to pay the intended swindlers was, in his judgment, a bald-headed outrage.

Gov. Sayres of Texas made an attack upon the appropriation on a different line. He said that it was contended that the non-bond-aided roads were built with the funds of the Central Pacific Railroad—funds which ought to have gone into the Treasury of the United States as a sinking fund in order to meet their liabilities when they matured. The Central Pacific, according to its own statement, is in a bankrupt condition. It acknowledges that when these bonds mature in a few years it will not be able to satisfy its indebtedness to the United States. He thought that Congress ought to take care of the interests of the Government, just as an individual would take care of his own interests.

Gen. Grosvenor suggested that the Central Pacific was willing to execute its bond and mortgage to pay its debt covering the lines in dispute.

Gov. Sayres in reply, illustrated the case thus: "Suppose that A is security upon a note of B to C for $10,000, payable one year from date. B acknowledges to A that it will be impossible for him to pay that indebtedness when it matures, that he is bankrupt. Meantime A owes B $5,000. Would it be the part of wisdom for A to pay B the $5,000, knowing that when B's note to C upon which A is security, matures, he, A, will be obliged to pay the $10,000? That is a parallel case to this of the Government of the United States and the Central Pacific Railroad."

The Governor said that he did not propose to take the money of the people out of the Treasury to pay a bankrupt, defaulting debtor of the Government. "I would hold the money till the bonds matured, and then I would foreclose the securities." He continued: "I would sell the road for what money we could get and then dissolve the connection between the Government and these corporations."

Gen. Bingham did not again get his bill upon the track till the night of Feb. 25. Then the House began to consider the Deficiency bill by sections for amendment. Mr. Cannon had his hands full. He promptly killed off all the amendments that emanated over disputed items. The Wasp of Arkansas stung him at every opportunity, and anon John Anderson of Kansas attacked him with the ferocity of a bulldog. There were votes over the appropriations for the District of Columbia, and for the Soldiers' Home and Asylum, and for the Government hospitals for the insane. Gen. Spinola rushed into the debate and ventilated his views anew upon the Brooklyn monument proposition. The immense appropriations for deficiencies in pensions shook the House to its centre.

On Feb. 21 Mr. Cannon was compelled to sidetrack the bill. The monstrosity known as the Direct Tax bill was switched upon the main track of legislation by another special order from Chairman Springer. It takes almost $16,000,000 from the United States Treasury. It refunds to State and Territorial treasuries a tax collected directly from the people during the prosecution of the war. The excuse for doing it is that certain States did not pay their proportion of the tax levied. These were the States in rebellion. Special taxes upon cotton, a special product of these States, were afterward levied, amounting to nearly $70,000,000. The bill did not propose to refund these taxes.

It was the Direct Tax bill that led to the extraordinary filibustering scenes in the Fifteenth Congress. The bill was finally crowded through the House toward the end of the session, and vetoed by President Cleveland. The dominating force in the present House resolved to put it through the House on the instant. If left till the last days of the session they feared it might be lost in the jam of legislation. They preferred to risk a regular appropriation bill rather than the Direct Tax bill. The Committee on Rules reported a special order providing that immediately after the message of the special order the Direct Tax bill should be taken up, and at 4 P. M. the previous question should be considered as ordered on the bill and pending amendments to its passage. Anxious not to lose any of the time allowed for debate, the Democrats contented themselves with promptly voting against the resolution. Sixteen of them, including the Watchdog of the Treasury, voted with the Republicans. There was a short but telling discussion. Gen. Oates of Alabama headed the assaulting column. He divided his hour of time with his colleagues. A substitute to refund the cotton taxes was lost by 80 yeas to 199 nays. Eleven Northern Democrats voted for the proposition and 25 against it. Some of the Democrats who voted for it thought that if one tax was refunded the other ought to be. Others were governed by the desire to load up the bill so as to prevent its passage. An effort to recommit it failed. The bill was passed by a vote of 172 to 101. Fourteen Northern Democrats and 15 Southern Democrats voted for it. All came from States benefited by the passage of the bill.

Before Mr. Cannon could get his appropriation bills again upon the main track the Committee on Rules sprung another special order upon the House. It was one setting apart two days for the consideration of the Shipping bill. The House adopted the special order, and for two days the bill was considered. There was a desperate struggle over its passage. The fight lasted till long after midnight. The original bill was defeated through the exertions of Mr. Cannon, who secured the passage of a mail subsidy bill in its place.

Mr. Cannon switched his General Deficiency bill out of the Committee of the Whole at late evening session, while the Shipping bill was under consideration. The clause directing the payment of $3,000,000 to the Central Pacific Railroad came up. Mr. Reilly and Mr. Dalzell of Pennsylvania made magnificent speeches in favor of Mr. Sayres's proposition, and Gov. Sayres outdid himself in his efforts to defeat the appropriation. Mr. McComas of Maryland, Judge Turner of Georgia, Watchdog Holman and Mr. Dockery of Missouri spoke against the appropriation. Those who advocated the claims of the railroad were Mr. Crain of Texas, Mr. Payne of New York, Mr. McKenna of California, and Mr. Cannon of Illinois. The discussion wound up with bitter personalities between Mr. Cannon and Mr. Fithian. Both represent Illinois districts. Fithian is a Democrat and Mr. Cannon a Republican. In his speech Mr. Cannon was repeatedly interrupted. Among those who annoyed him were Mr. Rogers of Arkansas and Mr. Cooper of Indiana. Mr. Cannon, in replying to the interruptions, referred to the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Railroad case. He approached the main aisle swinging his hands and faced Mr. Cooper. "As for myself," Mr. Cannon remarked, "I will walk in the light of the Constitution and the law——"

Mr. Cooper of Indiana—Take a walk.

Mr. Cannon (continuing)—and the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the gentleman can do other wise, if he chooses. Oh! yes, the gentleman says, "Take a walk." (Laughter.) Any fool can say that who cannot answer the position that has been taken.

Mr. Fithian (interrupting)—But he is not so much of a fool as to have his mouth photographed for the newspapers.

Mr. Cannon—Go into a hole and pull the hole in after you.

Mr. Fithian—There are plenty of men upon the floor of the House who have as much sense as you have.

Mr. Cannon—I think that is so. I think my colleague from Illinois has as much sense as I have and all the rest of Congress. He thinks so, too. (Laughter.)

Mr. Fithian—I may not have as much as you but I have had no money in my pocket stamped in the newspapers of this country for vulgarity.

The Chairman—The committee will be in order. The time for debate is exhausted.

Mr. Cannon—I would like to see this thing. I think I have enough reputation, good bad, or indifferent, that my colleague may get a notoriety that he does not have by attacking me out of my seat.

Mr. Fithian—You have been tried and found wanting.

Gov. Sayres's motion to strike out the appropriation for the Central Pacific Railroad was carried by a vote of 147 to 63. The bill passed the House an hour before midnight.

While the General Deficiency Appropriation bill was under consideration, Mr. Funston of Kansas flanked Mr. Cannon. Funston is Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. He switched the General Deficiency bill, and ran the Agricultural Appropriation bill upon the main track. Mr. Cannon offered no resistance. It is thought that he would rather have seen the Deficiency bill lost than accept an amendment apparently inevitable. That amendment provided for the payment of the French Spoliation Claims. It took about $500,000 from the Treasury. This sum covers only the claims already allowed by the Court of Claims. Millions upon millions are still left for adjudication. Mr. Cannon was far-seeing. When his Deficiency bill went to a conference committee the Senate conferees insisted upon the payment of the Central Pacific judgment and upon a provision for the payment of the spoliation claims. They afterward compromised by dropping the former and accepting the latter. The House ratified the agreement by a decisive majority. It was done about seven hours before Congress expired.

Mr. Funston thus got his Agricultural Appropriation bill before the House without much trouble. He is a powerful man, six feet in height, with a deep basso profundo voice. He drove his bill to the front with little ceremony, tackling everything that opposed him. Ben Butterworth met him in the fray and for once was unhorsed. Funston gave him no time to breathe, but punished him unmercifully. Everybody expected Ben to retaliate later on, but he did not in the important way.

The bill appropriates $3,028,153.30. This is almost twice the sum appropriated for the present fiscal year. There was an hour or more of general discussion before the bill was taken up by sections. It was then passed before the House could realize what it was doing. Although it was late at night, the House refused to do so. Cannon forced debate upon his bill. It recommended an appropriation of $36,577,308. Of this sum $28,668,832 was to fill a deficiency for pensions for the current year. Of the remaining sum, $5,000,000 was for the Central Pacific Railroad, for services upon the non-bonded-aided lines of that road. The Central Pacific road, it is said, owes the Government more than $36,000,000. These non-bond-aided roads are now being paid monthly for their services in transporting mails, troops, munitions, and for other services rendered to the United States. The bill, however, found Government, under the Thurman act turned the money into the sinking fund to discharge the indebtedness of