THE SPEAKERSHIP STAKES.

AN EXPERIENCED TURFMAN DESCRIBES THE WAITING HORSE.

Washington Watching the Fight Between Mills and Crisp—The Result of Col. Jones's Attack Upon the Georgia's Lines—A Flank Movement Developed in Iowa—A Rack of Candidates Rounding the Turn—The Waiting Horse Forging Ahead—Dangers Awaiting the Favorites—A Good Pedigree, Magnificent Bottom, and Speed at the Prick of the Spur.

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The contest for the Speakership still attracts attention. It wazes in intensity. The sky remains overcast. There are flashes of lightning in Missouri and mutterings of thunder in Georgia. The friends of Roger Q. Mills have assumed an offensive attitude. Headed by Col. Jones of St. Louis they are assaulting the record of Charles F. Crisp. The unexpected attack has called Crisp's friends to arms. With Clark Howell of Atlanta in command, they are repelling the assault. Mr. Crisp has been accused of being lukewarm in the cause of tariff reform. The accusation was well timed. It dropped into Georgia like a bolt from a clear sky, and exploded a can of dynamite. The leading Farmers' Alliance Democrat in the Congressional delegation from that State, assuming the charge to be true, promptly shot off his mouth. He struck out right and left, hitting the *Atlanta Constitution* on the nose and the *Augusta Chronicle* under the ear. He wound up by jumping upon Crisp with both Free-Trade feet, and by transferring his support to Mills. Thereupon Crisp unlimbered his tongue. He denied the accusation, and held up his record to corroborate the denial. It was a blow from the shoulder.

To those who had served with him in the House this denial was unnecessary. Mills was the Democratic leader of the Committee on Ways and Means that reported the Tariff bill, and as such led the debate on the floor of the House. Precedent required him to head all assaults upon the enemy and to appear upon the skirmish line morning, noon, and night. The Speaker always recognized him, to the exclusion of others of his party. Crisp was not a member of the Ways and Means. He was on service in an entirely different part of the Congressional field of action. He was the Democratic leader in the Committee on Elections. At that part of the front he headed all assaults and was ever on the skirmish line. Mills never made a speech upon an election case while Crisp was on the committee. Crisp made more than one carefully prepared address upon the tariff, while Mills was a member of the Ways and Means. And they were in the line of tariff reform full as much as the utterances of William C. P. Breckinridge or William M. Springer. To accuse him of being lukewarm is unjust. You might, with much better grace, but with equal injustice, accuse Mr. Mills of being lukewarm to the cause of Democracy in the House because he took an active part in contested election cases. Mr. Crisp's speech upon the McKinley bill was made on the third day of the fight. It was thus described in THE SUN'S Washington letter, under date of May 30, 1890:

"Then the Empire State of the South sounded a bugle blast. It came from the lips of Charles Frederick Crisp of Americus. It was crisp in tone and logic and was delivered with an emphasis that told upon those who heard it. It attracted all the more attention because Mr. Crisp is regarded by many as the heir to the Speakership. Crisp closed with this poetical quotation, which drew great applause:

> "Be these juggling fiends no more believed
> That palter with us in a double sense;
> That keep the word of promise to our ear
> And break it to our hope."

Meantime Col. Jones pays no attention to the protests of Mr. Crisp. The Georgia newspapers are filled with extracts from his great tariff reform speech, but not a line appears in the St. Louis *Republic*. It simply reiterates the charges, utterly ignoring the denial. It advocates Mills's election upon a free trade issue alone, being even unmindful of the claims of the Missouri candidate, William Henry Hatch of Hannibal. Its assaults upon Crisp have hardly been repelled by the Georgia newspapers when a flank movement is developed. It comes from Iowa. Democratic editors there are scoring the Georgian for his vote on the Original Package bill. They charge him with being a Prohibitionist. They say that by the election of Boies the Iowa Democrats had fairly bottled the Republicans. The bottle had been sealed by an unforeseen decision of the United States Supreme Court. It upset the prohibitory law of the State. Congress was asked to break the seal by the passage of the Original Package bill. The Republicans had strength enough to pass it in the House without Democratic aid, yet several Democrats, including Mr. Crisp, voted for it. This, however, is hardly a fair indication of their sentiments on prohibition. The question of State rights was involved and it undoubtedly accounted for more than one Democratic vote. Mr. Crisp can answer for himself. Certainly none of his Congressional associates has ever suspected him of prohibition proclivities. It is asserted, however, that he took an active prohibition part in the local fight in Georgia.

All this while Mr. Crisp remains in Americus, listening to the mutterings of the storm, practising law, and trying to stop the leaks in his roof. His competitor, the genial Mills, is at Bastrop or some other town in Texas, also watching the play of the elements. A few of Crisp's friends evidently looked for him to disclaim any sympathy with the assaults upon the Georgian's tariff-reform record. He may have hallooed "haw" or "gee" to Col. Jones; but if so the Colonel has not heard it. Indeed, the strongest sman of the whip sometimes fails to bring him to. Meantime there are interesting newspaper reports concerning Mills. They come from the Southwest, and they give color to the assertion that the great Texan wants the Speakership simply as a stepping stone to the United States Senate. A telegram from Texas credits him with saying that unless he succeeds Reagan in the Senate his career in Congress is ended. This means that he will refuse a renomination in 1892. Reagan's term expires March 4, 1893.

II.—THE WAITING HORSE.

It is a horse race. The Texas nag and the Georgia stallion are away in the lead, with a ruck of candidates in the rear. The blooded horses in front are going at a terrific rate of speed, with a prospect of breaking each other down. They are throwing up a cloud of dust in their efforts to reach the goal. But they are as yet far from the homestretch, and the ruck is worth watching. It is not always safe to bet on the favorites, and especially when the odds are long. Many a turfman is living who has seen many a horse dash from the ruck, overhaul the favorites, and win the prize. The battle is not always to the strong, nor is the race always to the swift. The horse that goes the fastest at the start soonest loses his wind.

There are good horses in the ruck in the race for the Speakership. Most of them are steady goers, and can respond to either the whip or the spur at critical moments. One of them is already striding slowly away from his fellows. His speed and bottom have been tested in many a political heat. He is of good blood and of excellent Democratic lineage. He is Benton McMillin. He comes from the old Baillie Peyton district in Tennessee. Grass cannot grow under his feet. As active as a cricket, he is ever in motion. Since the adjournment of Congress, the click of his hoofs has been heard in New England, New York, and elsewhere. There is no false modesty about him. He is a pronounced candidate for Speaker. No one doubts that he is thoroughly qualified for the office. He has served twelve years in the House. Although only 45 years old, he has held eleven commissions from the State of Tennessee. When a boy he was red-headed and freckled. Some of the hair and a few of the freckles remain untouched by time. It may interest carping Republican critics to learn that he was never in the Confederate army. He was too young to enter the service when the war broke out.

Mr. McMillin was born in Monroe county, Ky., Sept. 11, 1845. He is of Scotch-Irish ancestry, and preserves all the characteristics of that race. His parents were God-fearing people, members of the Campbellite Church. Receiving a collegiate education, Benton studied law, and began to practise his profession in Celina, Tenn., in 1871. Three years afterward he became a member of the Legislature. He has been a State Commissioner, a Presidential elector on the Tilden ticket, and a Judge of the Circuit Court.

Benton McMillin is tall and brawny. He has keen gray eyes, and the seamed forehead of a thinker. His features are regular. He wears an auburn moustache, but no whiskers. He tries to hide his baldness from himself by dragging the auburn hair fringing his ears over his bump of benevolence. A brilliant conversationalist, he is extremely social. In manner he is open and hearty. He has not a particle of affectation. Upon the floor of the House he is a power. His voice is sonorous, but at times turgid. It can be heard above all other voices when the House is in the most extreme confusion. His short speeches are his best. He can say as much in a few words as any man in the House. A close student, he is well equipped for discussion upon almost any topic. He is as quick and as keen at repartee as was the late Sunset Cox. In the parliamentary field he has no superior. Never does he lose his head. Even if stung to the quick, he remains cool and collected. His excessive modesty kept him in the background during his first term in Congress. Like Roscoe Conkling, he sat with folded arms, and listened to the great men claiming all the time allowed for debate by virtue of their terms of service. Their greatness impressed him with its smallness; yet he failed to open his head. It was evident that he was regarded as a Yahoo from the backwoods of Tennessee, sent to Congress because he was a good jumper and an excellent marksman. For four years he served at the tail end of tail committees, wondering where he would stand in the succeeding Congress. In the fourth year he asserted himself. Meeting Phil Thompson of Kentucky in the cloak room one day he said:

"Look here, Phil. You and I came here together. We have held our mouths long enough. We are altogether too modest. If the fool-killer doesn't do his duty by this Congress, that is no reason why we should remain silent. We know enough to tell what we know, and we must be heard."

Representative Thompson reminded him of the advice given by Proctor Knott when they first entered Congress. "Don't be brash with your mouth," the great Corneracker observed. "Remember that little boys should be seen—not heard."

"Yes," broke in McMillin, "but we are so excessively modest, Phil, that we are neither seen nor heard. Proctor Knott and the other fellows seize the time belonging to us, and have put the House into a state of coma. We must wake them up, Phil, we must wake them up. If we don't do it, our constituents will wake us up this fall. The nominating Convention in my district might be held six weeks from now, and I don't want to waste four years of my life if I can help it. I never thought that I had much ability, Phil, but I know that I can overlap some of these statesmen, and I'm going to jump in on the first opportunity."

He jumped in that very afternoon. The water was not too deep for him. Mr. Keifer was Speaker. The Tennesseean got the floor for half an hour by swapping time with Jim McKenzie of Kentucky. A dreary debate upon the tariff question was in progress. A few members were asleep, many more were yawning, and the others were bent over their desks answering letters. As the resonance of the young Benton's voice filled the chamber, the letter writers turned their heads and regarded him with querulous interest. They sat with pens poised above paper listening to his opening. One by one the pens were laid upon the desks. The sleepers awoke, and there was no more yawning. Heads were stretched forward in the galleries. The young man had caught the ear of the House and was charming it. There was no fustian in the woof of his argument and no straining for effect. He was talking the plainest common sense in the purest Anglo-Saxon. In five minutes every seat near him was filled. Every head was raised in attention, and every ear was drinking in what he said. The speech was clear-cut, symmetrical, logical, compact, and convincing. Phil Thompson was delighted. Proctor Knott surprised, and the whole House enlightened. The speaker retired to his hall, and from that day to this has commanded the attention of the House when rising to speak.

His versatility is remarkable. He not only elucidates points under discussion, but he draws out information from others. He is equally at home upon any part of the field. If the battle waxes hot, he sends the thousand and one similar subjects brought to the attention of Congress, he has definite ideas based upon study and observation. He keeps them upon tap for all who desire information. But he delights in parliamentary lore. Many a dance he has led there with Tom Reed and other renowned Republican leaders. In the last Congress he was ever at the outposts. There were daily skirmishes, in which he distinguished himself. In the preceding Congress he was one of the assailed and not an assailant. Mr. Carlisle called him to the chair as often as he called any other man, and at one time he was elected Speaker *pro tem.* by the House itself. It was at such times that Tom Reed took delight in twanging arrows at him. And they were always returned with the vim of a hickory bow.

His power of endurance, accuracy of memory, and quick perception of comprehension were never better shown than in Gen. Oates's remarkable fight against the Direct Tax bill. It was in the Fiftieth Congress, when filibustering was in its heyday. Tom Reed championed the effort to take over $17,000,000 from the Treasury, backed by the entire Republican phalanx, and some of the Democrats whose States were to be benefited by the spoliation. Through the efforts of Oates, McMillin, and others, and the veto of Grover Cleveland, the project was reserved for the Billion Congress and Benjamin Harrison. Without this the Republican prodigality would have fallen a little short of a billion. No one who participated in Oates's great fight against the bill can ever forget it. It lasted ten days and ten nights, the session being almost continuous. It was a genuine parliamentary struggle. Every device known to parliamentary law was used to obstruct the passage of the bill. Tom Reed was the Republican leader upon the floor. Backed by his own party and by far more than a corporal's guard of Democrats, he accepted the issue, and determined to make it a question of physical endurance. The fight was hot from the beginning. At the end of eight nights Speaker Carlisle's strength gave out. Along in the afternoon Clifton R. Breckinridge had moved to excuse Mr. McMillin from voting upon a subsidiary motion. It was done on behalf of the minority, to waste time. Tom Reed instantly raised a point of order. A terrific war of words followed, and it lasted until long after dark. Reed was at his best in denunciation of the proposition, and Oates held his own without flinching. About 8 o'clock, as nearly everybody was hoarse, Mr. Carlisle announced his decision. He decided the motion in order, and, as was his custom, cited the authorities for the decision. He then called Mr. McMillin to the chair and retired to his room.

Tom Reed was in ecstacy when he saw the Tennesseean take the gavel. With Carlisle out of the way he saw, as he supposed, an opportunity either to shame the Speaker or to make the filibusters ridiculous. He promptly got the yeas and nays on the motion to excuse Mr. McMillin from voting, and moved to excuse Mr. Cannon from voting on the motion to excuse the gentleman from Tennessee. This opened a new and a vast parliamentary vista. The next motion would be to move that Mr. Mills or some other member be excused from voting on the motion to excuse Mr. Cannon, and so on, until each one of the 330 members of the House was resting under a similar motion.

Tom Reed was chuckling and shaking his head in glee. His followers were smiling in admiration of his adroitness. It seemed plain to them that if a motion to excuse McMillin from voting was in order, a motion to excuse Cannon must be equally in order. McMillin must either overrule Carlisle's decision or deadlock the House until the end of the Fiftieth Congress.

The Tennesseean was equal to the emergency. He did neither. He decided the motion out of order, saying that he knew there was a precedent for his action, but that he was not able then to lay his hand upon it. There was derisive laughter upon the Republican side of the chamber. Reed's friends evidently took no stock in the alleged precedent. McMillin was confident that his memory was correct. He sent for Mr. Carlisle, but that gentlemen had gone home for the night. He appealed to Mr. Randall's recollection in vain. Sam said that his ruling was incorrect. Mr. McMillin then sent Clerk Rives for the journals of the House. The Clerk returned in a few moments and reported that the doors were locked, and he could not get at the journals.

"Break open the door, then," McMillin undaunted by replied, "I know I'm right. I must have the journals."

Neither Tom Reed and Joe Cannon were showering him with sarcasm. His own associates were regarding him with critical eyes. An appeal had been taken, when Towles returned with the journals. There was no nervousness about the Speaker protem. He selected a volume and opened it as calmly as if he was searching for a passage from the Scriptures. He found what he sought without trouble. It was a decision from Speaker Colfax by which sustained the ruling of Mr. McMillin. The reasons for the apparently diverse rulings were clearly and compactly stated. They were, that while under the Constitution every parliamentary latitude should be allowed the minority, no motion was in order that paralyzed the House and made it utterly unable to do business.

Tom Reed's jaw fell as he took his seat. Joe Cannon looked as if he had heard of the death of a near friend. The yeas and nays on the appeal were not pressed, and the appeal itself was withdrawn. McMillin's victory was complete, and Sam Randall was the first man to congratulate him. When McMillin left the chair the next day he had not lain down nor slept for forty-nine hours.

This is the only bout that Tom Reed ever had with McMillin while the latter was in the chair. In later days, when Reed became Speaker, McMillin returned the compliment with interest. While Mr. Crisp led the opening fight against Reed's arbitrary methods in counting a quorum under general parliamentary law, McMillin proved an able lieutenant. After the adoption of the rules he made them his study. He was probably as well versed in them as their authors. While they bound the minority hand and foot, they were equally binding upon the Speaker. Mr. Reed did not always recognize this. The instant he overstepped the bounds he found McMillin upon his back. With fair play from the Chair, the Tennesseean always drove him back, but he was never assured of fair play. The Speaker would take the floor from under his feet by transferring his recognitions, or would ignore him entirely. Many a fight did McMillin make with his right hand tied behind him. He knew the game to the time, and utilized every second allowed him.

A case in point was the Judiciary bill as moulded by Senator Evarts. It provided for the appointment of nine additional United States Circuit Judges. The Committee on Rules forced it through the House under a special order. It was made late after the fall elections. The Reed rules gave the Democrats twenty minutes after the previous question was demanded, provided no discussion had preceded the demand. To cut off this twenty minutes' allowance Tom Reed recognized Joseph G. Cannon, who made a few remarks before demanding the previous question. He acknowledged that he did so to rob the Democrats of the time allowed them. Reed ruled that his remarks amounted to discussion, and was about to put the previous question when McMillin indignantly protested. He said that it was a question of increasing expenditures and a proposition to carry for the deed ducks in the House. "It is the forerunner of divers other bills," he shouted, "intended to bleed the Treasury, now that you linger superfluous on the stage after having been defeated."

There was tremendous applause from the Democratic side. McMillin protested so strenuously against being gagged that Cannon derisively said: "I will yield the gentleman three minutes, so that he may get all the bile off his stomach."

McMillin promptly accepted the time, although neither just nor sufficient. Never was time more wisely used. He showed that under the special order no opportunity for amendment was allowed. Mistakes were sure to follow. The House was told by the Committee on Rules that it was not fit to govern either the country or itself, and that the committee itself intended to govern both.

Mark the sequel. McMillin proved a prophet. The bill was crowded through the House, under the special order, without amendment. After it was signed by the President, and Congress adjourned, it was found that, by no loosely drawn as to be utterly inoperative. It upset the calendar of the Supreme Court and raised Ned generally. It provided that the Judges should be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. As Congress had adjourned, the advice and consent of the Senate could not be found. Hence the President could not make the appointments. The Constitution empowers him to fill only vacancies, and in this case there really were no vacancies to fill.

Whether this Tennessee horse wins the Speakership a akes or not, he will always maintain a high position upon the racing calendar of politics. He has served for years upon the Ways and Means Committee, and in the last Congress was a member of the important Committee on Rules. His associates in Congress know his worth. The people themselves appreciate it, for he is as well known personally throughout the country as either Crisp or Mr. Mills. He has spoken in nearly every State east of the Rocky Mountains, and has never refused to answer a question or explain a proposition.

AMOS J. CUMMINGS.

THE BILLION CONGRESS.

TO AVOID A LIKE RECORD IS THE SUPREME DUTY OF DEMOCRATS.

How the Historic Forty-fourth Congress, Under the Leadership of Samuel J. Randall, Turned Back the Tide of Extravagance and Carried On the Great Work of Retrenchment and Reform Together.

WASHINGTON, April 25.—According to the official "Statement of Appropriations, New Offices, &c.," prepared by the clerks of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and just issued from the Government Printing Office as a public document, the total amount of regular and permanent appropriations authorized by the late Congress is set down at $983,417,183.34. The Hon. J. D. Sayers, a prominent Democratic member of the House committee, puts the total, in his revised statement, at $1,038,000,000. The Hon. A. M. Dockery, another member of the Democratic minority, puts it at $1,009,000,000, while the Hon. F. M. Cockrell of the Senate committee says it is $1,032,884,826.27. Their divergences from the official statement arise merely from differences of bookkeeping, and the salient fact of the Republican Billion Congress stands out ineffaceably still. How a record similar to that will be avoided by the incoming Democratic Congress is recognized in Washington to be, as THE SUN has pointed out, the one supreme duty of the Democratic leaders, both from a political and from a patriotic standpoint, for nothing done at the capital of the Government so intimately enters into the daily life of the people and of the nation as the disposition of the public money. Gen. Garfield, away back in 1872, said:

"The expenditure of revenue forms the grand level from which all heights and depths of legislative action are measured, and is the best test of the health, the wisdom, and the virtue of a Government. There is scarcely a conceivable form of corruption or public wrong that does not at last present itself at the cashier's desk and demand payment. The Legislature, therefore, that stands at the cashier's desk and watches with its Argus eyes the demands for payment over the counter is most certain to see all the forms of public rascality. At that place, too, we may feel the nation's pulse; we may determine whether it is in the delirium of fever or whether the currents of its life are flowing with the steady throbbings of health."

With this truth in mind, and keeping in view the scandalous record of the late Congress and the urgent necessity for a radical reform by the next, it is edifying as well as entertaining to trace the steps by which the historic Democratic Forty-fourth Congress overthrew the long precedents of extravagance established by the Republican Congresses before it and demonstrated what a sweeping degree of retrenchment in Government expenditures could be achieved by heroic Democratic honesty and adherence to Democratic principles.

At the first session of the preceding Forty-third Congress, it should be remembered, the Republican House Committee on Appropriations, of which Garfield was Chairman, made an attempt at "retrenchment," and at the second session continued that attempt, and succeeded in reducing the regular appropriations still further by four and a half millions of dollars, in anticipation of the reforms which the ensuing Democratic Congress was pledged and expected to effect.

The grand total of appropriations, regular and permanent, granted by that first session for the fiscal year 1875 was $325,666,791.89, and of those by the second session, for the fiscal year 1876, was $328,128,199.32, the increase being occasioned by the addition of seven millions in permanent appropriations for interest on the public debt and sinking fund, which were not affected by the legislation of the session. Garfield, therefore, congratulated his party colleagues on the result, and it was supposed that no further reduction could be made without crippling the public service.

Samuel J. Randall and others, however, believed otherwise, and proved in the next Congress, the Forty-fourth, that their belief was well founded. It was the first Democratic Congress since the beginning of the war. The Hon. Michael C. Kerr of Indiana was Speaker of the House, and Mr. Randall was made Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He naturally had to begin his work under disadvantageous conditions, since the preceding Congress had shrewdly lopped off the most conspicuous excrescences in appropriations, and had put down at least the thousands as much as could be done without interfering with the luxury of the Administration. The bureaus and departments of the Government, moreover, taking warning from the experience of the past two sessions, had thoroughly organized their opposition to any further pruning of their allowances on the part of Congress.

At the very outset, accordingly, Mr. Randall was confronted with systematic obstruction from the outside, and with difficulties equally grave from the inside of Congress. These latter difficulties arose from a rule of the House which prevented a repeal or even modification of any law as a rider to an appropriation bill unless two-thirds of the members assented thereto, which number the Democratic majority did not have. The construction which had been given to that rule allowed amendments to increase compensation to officers, clerks, and employes, but adroitly prevented, in the case of officers, any reduction whatever. To overcome this impediment a proposition was submitted to so change the rule as to allow the incorporation into appropriation bills of such legislation as, being germane, would retrench expenditures, thus making a complete revolution in the operation of the rule, and turning legislative action in the House from extravagance into the better and safer direction of economy. That change was resisted vigorously by the Republican side of the House, for the reason that, composing as they did more than one-third of its members, no amendments changing existing law could be made or put upon an appropriation bill except when they increased salaries or expenses, and this requisite vote of two-thirds could at any time be refused by the minority. Without such a change all efforts on the part of the Democratic majority in the House to reduce expenditures would have been, as Mr. Randall himself expressed it, "as the idle wind." The Republican minority stood ready to prevent any reduction, while the Senate was even more determined in the same purpose. Finally, through the Committee on Rules, a report was secured making the alteration desired, and the House adopted it by a strict party vote.

The way for action being thus opened, the Committee on Appropriations, with Mr. Randall at its head, proceeded to execute the work of retrenchment and reform which the Democratic party had promised to do in behalf of the great body of the people borne down by a heavy and unnecessary load of taxation. In that work every item of public expense, whether large or small, was subjected to the severest scrutiny, and an unparalleled inspection of every bureau and department of the Government was undertaken and carried out. The words of Mr. Randall on the floor of the House, in explanation of this work and its results, embodied in the memorable speech which was distributed by the million in the following Presidential campaign of 1876, and which largely contributed to the popular success of the Democratic ticket, graphically describe the methods and means that were used. Said he:

"The work required incessant labor and much patience. Arrayed against us were all those who as favorite selfish schemes were to be frustrated for the public good, eager and greedy corporations who sought to plunder from the public purse, place-hunters and place holders, and the friends and partisans of all, high or low, who were in any way to be affected by reduction, and especially by the marked unwillingness on all hands by chiefs of bureaus and heads of departments to agree to any withdrawal of their official patronage. But we had the comforting assurance that we had behind us the people, who demanded that their burdens should be lightened by practical and necessary reductions, and this consoled us oftentimes in the discharge of an imperative public duty when we found ourselves compelled to deny appropriations to the extent desired for objects dearly cherished by our constituents.

"Our duty in such a condition of affairs was too plain to be mistaken. It was to lop off at once and resolutely every extravagant and unnecessary expense. This we have partially accomplished, and in a manner which will in no degree cripple the Administration in its legitimate functions. But to secure even this partial result without producing friction has required long and patient examination, investigation, and study. A further plan of procedure adopted was to reduce ten per cent all salaries over $1,200, and provide a reduction in the force of clerks and employees of twenty per cent. These two provisions, if full adopted, would have secured a much larger reduction of appropriations and the discharge of all superfluous clerks and employees, of which there are still a large number.

"When it came to the passage of the appropriation bills through the Senate, however, this plan failed of execution in many instances, owing to the resistance of the Senate. Nevertheless, wherever practicable, the House Committee and the House pursued this plan, with astonishing and beneficial results. In the prosecution of this gigantic task Mr. Randall illustrated his wonderful capacity for labor and his marvellous faculty for details and fertility of resource. Probably no man ever served in Congress who possessed greater power for work. During all that time, as he afterward related to friends, he toiled sixteen hours out of every twenty-four. He worked continuously and rapidly, almost without limit. And he seemed to thrive.

As he and his colleagues went on, the field and scope of their investigations broadened and lengthened. Divers called to their assistance all the little committees on expenditures in the various departments, together with other committees whose jurisdiction gave them familiarity with other branches of the public service, and set them at work to dig out all available facts bearing on the question of Government expenditures. Mr. Randall himself constantly conferred with the respective Chairmen of these independent committees and suggested to them lines of inquiry and investigation touching legislation and administration. In this way his committee secured most valuable information bearing directly on the subject in hand, and afterward used it with tremendous effect in debate and legislative battle. The Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and the Committee on Printing notably lent their aid in correcting gross abuses and instances of extravagance and corruption in the administration of the navy, the Department of Justice, and the Government Printing Office. There is no question but that all these committees, which in recent years have been simply sinecures, sought after merely because each committee room and a clerk each, with no duties to perform, rendered incalculable service in the intelligent work and action of the Appropriations Committee at that time.

The greatest reductions were made on the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill, $24,000,000; the Deficiency bill, $8,800,000; the Naval bill, $4,200,000, and the Sundry Civil bill, $10,287,000, the latter being the bill on which it had been customary previously to engraft all doubtful schemes and unnecessary expenses, which to any other general appropriation bill would be ruled out of order as not germane.

The estimates of the appropriations to be provided that year were to the amount of $203,099,025.48. The House Committee recommended an expenditure of only $137,233,155.71. The amounts of the bills as they passed the House, however, were slightly increased, the total being $138,752,342. The Senate Committee on Appropriations made considerable additions, so that the aggregate, as recommended by that committee to the Senate, was $158,626,722.88. In the Senate reduction was made to $153,260,598.63. In conferences between the two Houses the aggregate of all the money bills for regular appropriations, as they became laws, was reduced to $147,719,074.85, or $10,495,919.14 more than as recommended by Mr. Randall's committee, but even then a reduction of within a fraction of $30,000,000 of the people's money.

This of itself was a stupendous achievement, considering all the difficulties, obstructions, and insuperable obstacles offered to prevent such a result. It meant, as was pointed out by the Hon. William M. Springer of Illinois when the figures were announced at the close of the session, a saving of $102,555,65 to every Congressional district in the entire country: a saving to the State of New York alone, for example, as the Hon. S. S. Cox suggested, of $3,384,336.45, counting in all its Congressional districts. The significance of these figures, when brought home to the people of a Congressional district, was electrical. None could fail to appreciate the full import of the accomplished fact, with its consequent lightening of the burden of taxation by that amount. And all this was done, it should be noted, without detriment or embarrassment to the public service, but on the contrary, with an actual improvement in the efficiency of the Administration. On this record the Democratic party appealed to the people for judgment, and swept the country at the November election.

At the next session, Speaker Kerr having died, Mr. Randall was chosen Speaker and the Hon. William S. Holman of Indiana was made Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Pursuing the same policy of retrenchment and reform under his leadership, the committee was able to reduce expenditures still further by ten millions, and succeeded, thanks to the robbie administered to the recalcitrant Senate by the people at the ballot box, in keeping in writing that reduction into law, the total amount of the regular appropriations being $144,592,149.65.

Such was the real and actual reform accomplished by the first Democratic Congress since the war, following the extravagance of Republican legislation for over a decade. What will be the record of the Democratic Fifty-second Congress, succeeding to the control of appropriations after the delirium of the Republican Billion Congress?

INDIANS AS SOLDIERS.

A Prospect That the Red Men Will Wear the Army Blue.

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The reluctance of the Indians to enlist in the army as ordinary soldiers has at last been measurably overcome, and at one point and another they are yielding to the blandishments of the recruiting officer. At Rosebud upward of thirty had been gathered in at the latest accounts, while at Cheyenne fifty-five had been secured, or enough to complete Troop L, Sixth Cavalry.

It is true that this is only a beginning; but with the Indians the main difficulty has been to get a start. Tribal influences are strong, and members of the same band are apt to be influenced by the same motives and impressed by the same facts for or against individual acceptance of propositions made to them by the Government.

One of the new organizations is made up of Brulé Sioux, some of whom were conspicuous in the Messiah excitement, and who now by their enlistment show a willingness to take to drills in place of dances. This is a sign, so far as it goes, that the troubles of last winter will not be renewed, and that an outbreak would in any event lack the services of some of the most restless and ambitious of the young warriors, whose energy is hereafter to find an outlet in the army. This consideration is mentioned foremost among the reasons which Gen. Schofield gives for the enlistment of about 2,000 young Indians, organized as troops and companies and each incorporated into some existing regiment as Troop L of the cavalry or Company L of the infantry:

> For the purpose of giving satisfactory employment to a considerable number of young men among the wards of the nation, who are disposed to become the disaffected who are likely to become enemies; for the purpose of educating the Indians in the rules and methods of civilized warfare, which are matters which would be a long stride toward their civilization; for the purpose of adding to the army a valuable contingent possessed of the special military qualifications which characterize the Indian warriors of the country, and to assist in the efforts to transform the Indian character from that of a foe into that of citizen of the United States.

But the army officers are evidently not all of one mind in regard to the results of enlisting Indians. Some do not like the plan at all. Many like it, but do not look with great hope on enlistment as a civilizing agency. Gen. Miles, in a letter to the *Indian Bulletin*, thinks that the plan is wholly feasible, and adds that, in his experience, Indians having taken the oath of enlistment have always kept it in good faith, even when required to fight against their own countrymen. He holds that the Indian soldiers should be allowed to have their families with them, and should cultivate ground to supply themselves with vegetables. There would be fewer desertions among them, he thinks, but their officers should possess special qualifications for controlling them.

Major Guy V. Henry, Ninth Cavalry, in a letter to the same periodical, holds that the scheme is practicable, although the question of the home and the family is a difficult one:

> The army discipline, if properly enforced, would "kill the Indian" in them, but to accomplish this an officer of a peculiar temperament should have the man one interested in the "civilizing part." They are taken now by young officers as a rule, for the glory and prospect of a fight. During the late trouble I could not get my Sioux scouts to go into places of danger, during the Missouri fight many went in the rear, and the treaching generally, so far as the Sioux Indians concerned, he could not be trusted in a fight as at his own people. I enlisted the first Apache scouts in Arizona and they only remained faithful after killing their own people, and were afraid to leave the Union soldiers.

Now, to civilize them, I would not enlist them. That is being done more to lead and keep away any restless element that would be a bad leaven. Once in the army does it, and keeps them under rea raint at the same time. An army in one sense never was a civilizer. I should break up the organizations, keep them together in bands or families, and scatter them among the different states, and surrounded by civilization. In farming districts they would soon learn the value of money, and work or starve.

With many differences of opinion in detail, there is yet a pretty widespread opinion in favor of the practicability of using Indian troops and companies. This largely rests, no doubt, on the experience had for years with companies of Indian scouts; and the new plan makes a difference in degree rather than in kind of employment. Even as scouts, the red men were liable to be called upon to make war not only on their own race, but their own kin. Indian reservation policemen also fight members of their own tribe. Lieut. Casey's experiment showed the practicability of establishing an Indian military village.

But whether enough troops and companies can be recruited to give one to each of nineteen regiments, as is now proposed, is not so clear. It may be easy to enlist for the cavalry service, when the infantry will have far less attraction. Still, the experiment in the mounted service, at least, after a sluggish start, is now moving along with good promise.

Millions of June Bugs on the Wing.

From the Philadelphia Press.

GREEN CASTLE, Ind., April 20.—Last evening a loud, roaring sound was heard, and heavy black clouds were observed passing rapidly over the city. Upon close observation it was found that the clouds were composed of millions of bugs about one inch in size. They passed from the west to the east, and the noise of their combined wings made as much sound as an express train at full speed. Several were captured, and are said to be of the "June bug" variety.

WHEN PLAY WAS HIGH.

Modern Gambling Not Comparable to that of Last Century—Cheating Was Usual and Winked at—Princes Who Played.

LONDON, April 15.—"The great baccarat case," as it has been labelled from the first, will soon be brought into court for trial. Then the stigma of cheating at cards in a friend's house, in the presence of ladies and of "an exalted personage," will be removed from or branded on a brave and hitherto respected soldier, who has served his country faithfully, and deserved better than the fate that has overtaken him. If he is found "not guilty" and absolved by a public judgment, the shame and onus will be shifted from his shoulders to those of his accusers; but whatever be the final sentence on Sir William Gordon Cumming, it is not less a sad and painful fact that the ancient traditions of hospitality which make the person of a guest sacred and place him under the protection of his host, have been violated grossly in the doings of last winter at Tranby Croft.

A great reaction is taking place against gambling since these events and objurgations raised against those who allow themselves the pastime. The objectors forget that gambling, far from being a modern and heinous crime, was essentially the pleasure of sovereigns, and, as a natural sequence, of the aristocracy. The young "bloods" of a former epoch had not to resort exclusively to the "hells," so numerous then in all great capitals: they could stake, win, or lose a patrimony openly, publicly, gracefully, and more or less carelessly at almost any of the noble houses famed for the number and splendor of their entertainments.

All the Queens of England and all the Princes of Wales have invariably played high. Queen Elizabeth lost her temper when fortune deserted her, and her ill luck invariably foreboded evil to her courtiers. Brummell often lost large sums to the Prince of Wales—perhaps not always by accident—but if he expected to have them returned when his royal friend ascended the throne, he was disappointed, for he never received a guinea.

In France, as far back as Philippe le Bel, the monarch made a practice daily of writing down in his account book his losses at play. Louis XII. had his game of *Flux* even in camp and on the eve of a battle. Henri IV. was not above mild cheating at cards, but that was considered then a very venial offence. To this day there is a certain game of *tarocchi* played in Italy where it is allowable to look into one's partner's hand if he gives you a chance of doing so.

Under the last three Louises of France gambling was a passion at court; the games most in vogue were successively *Passe-dix*, *Lansquenet*, *Trente-et-un*, and later, Boston, of which Whist was one of the variations. Louis XIV. was a very capital player, but he refused to take the thirteen golden coins of the Chevalier de Rohan because he would lose on the exchange, and insisted in having his winnings paid in louis d'or. The Chevalier threw his *pistoles* out of the window "for the pages" and counted out the French coins.

It had become then so much the custom to cheat at all sorts of play that the ladies of the court, to distinguish themselves from the more ordinary swindlers, used to return to each other the sums they had dishonestly and unfairly won during the game.

The highest play nowadays, even at the clubs where the Prince of Wales shows himself a perfect player, never letting it be seen by his manner that he wins or loses, appears absolutely insignificant when compared with the sums that changed hands in those days. Mme. de Montespan lost seven hundred thousand crowns one Christmas day, and a few nights later won back five million francs at one sitting. Philippe, Duke of Orléans, was constantly impawn all his jewelry to meet the debts incurred at cards. Even in the royal coaches coming or going to Marly, Versailles, and Fontainebleau gambling went on. Napoleon I., who was not fond of cards, somewhat checked the fashion. He liked chess, at which he thought himself very clever, but he was the especional surprised and vexed when he was beaten by the humble card of Fontainebleau, all the more so, possibly, because his courtiers made it a practice never to win when playing with him. Under the Restoration and Monarchy of July playing was encouraged only in moderation and for small stakes; during the second empire it was the same; only at Biarritz did the court depart from this rule.

In Germany the Dowager Empress Augusta indulged in an occasional game of whist with her intimates; her Consort never. The present Emperor is opposed to gambling, and quite lately has issued very stringent regulations to be enforced by the officers and students at the universities. The Emperor of Austria, if he touches cards at all, plays patience; the Czar finds no pleasure in cards under any form; King Humbert hates them, though his father, Victor Emanuel, thoroughly enjoyed the game, swearing when he lost, when he won laughing boisterously, and not averse to assisting fortune in a perfectly good humored and unsophisticated manner which deceived no one. Alfonso XII. used to play *tresillo* with the Spanish *forei* cards, and *besique*, which he had learned in France, but it is said there has been no playing at all at the court of Spain.

However, if the reigning sovereigns of to-day do not gamble so much as their predecessors, the princes of their families do not hesitate to do so, and several have lost fortunes in that way; among the most notable of these was the noted Prince of Grance, so essentially a *bon joueur* that never was any reproach directed to him on account of this partiality for play.

It is well known now that a great number of fashionable people in the London "smart set" attempt to make an additional income by gambling; the ever-growing increase of luxury, love of display, seems to be responsible for it. There are ladies of rank in England who are inveterate, and one might almost say unscrupulous, gamblers; but although certain derelictions in absolute delicacy and serious honesty are not ignored, they are consistently overlooked as they would not be under other circumstances, and, as a rule, if and then, as an salve to sensitive consciences, an example is made and a scapegoat selected to establish the immaculate reputation of the rest. Formerly when the same thing was done it was done openly; the public accepted the fact, and no excuses apparently were deemed necessary. The Duchess d'Abrantes, in her most delightful memoirs, speaking of the great Parisian salons, says that men and women cheated at cards, that it was well known, and only raised a smile. The Comte de Grammont, "the King of Fashion," che