FORTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

Objectionable Clause in the Army Bill Reached.

The Iowa and Ohio Election Cases—Mr. Tucker's Amendment—Too Much for the Democrats—Debate on the Use of Troops to Preserve Order on Election Day—A Point of Order Pending.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 28, 1879.

The Senate was not in session to-day.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. SPRINGER presented the memorial of J. J. Wilson, claiming to have been elected Representative from the ninth Congressional district of Iowa upon the 5th of November, 1878. He also offered a resolution for the reference of the petition, together with a certificate of said election in the hands of the Clerk of the House, to the Committee on Elections, when appointed.

Mr. CONGER objected to the offering of the resolution.

The Speaker stated that the resolution was offered as a question of privilege.

Mr. CONGER argued that the memorial should have been placed in the petition box, as it did not present in itself a matter of privilege. It presented such a farce as would not have been tolerated until the days of Belford and Patterson from Colorado.

Mr. PRICE also alluded to the whole matter as a farce.

Mr. SPRINGER called attention to the fact that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Price), who claimed that the November elections were a farce, had seen fit to be a candidate at that election.

Mr. PRICE replied that he had done so because he had discovered that a few Democrats were going to vote on the 5th of November, and in order to prevent their coming to Congress and contesting his seat he had been a candidate. He, however, did not claim his seat under the November election.

After further discussion the Speaker ruled that the resolution involved a question of privilege.

Mr. CONGER moved to so modify the resolution as to refer merely the memorial and papers relating to the October election, and the resolution was so modified and referred to the Committee on Elections when appointed.

Mr. YOUNG (Ohio), rising to a question of privilege, stated that a resolution had been adopted for the investigation of charges made against himself and his colleague (Mr. Butterworth)—charges which, if true, ought to send both of them to the penitentiary. They had felt the sting of that attack, and had brought the matter before the grand jury of Hamilton County, a majority of whom were Democrats. That body had reported that it had examined fifty witnesses, including those persons who had signed the memorial presented to Congress, and from the testimony given had found nothing to warrant its taking any action in the matter.

He had quoted from that report, not in order to prejudice the House or the committee which was to examine the charges, but in order to show his colleagues that in Hamilton County he and his colleague (Mr. Butterworth) were not regarded as bad men, but as men who had some standing there.

The House then, at one o'clock, went into Committee of the Whole (Mr. Springer in the chair) on the army appropriation bill.

Mr. DIBRELL offered an amendment providing that nothing in the act shall prevent the promotion of any captain who has served twenty years in the army. Adopted.

On motion of Mr. CALKINS, an amendment was adopted providing that any officer hereafter retired on account of wounds received in action shall be retired with the highest rank he may have held (exclusive of brevet rank) in the regular or volunteer service.

Mr. CALKINS also offered an amendment providing that the actual time of service in the army and navy shall be allowed all officers in computing their pay. Adopted.

Mr. TUCKER offered an amendment repealing section 1228 of the Revised Statutes.

[This is the section which prohibits the appointment to the army of any person who served in any capacity in the military, naval, or civil service of the so-called Confederate States.]

Mr. CONGER made a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TUCKER argued that the amendment was germane and in order. He trusted that the amendment would meet with universal approbation on both sides, and that the stigma which rested on a very large class of the people of the Southern States would be, as a matter of justice, wiped out from the statute book now and forever. In this era of peace and good feeling (a derisive laugh on the Republican side) there should be no longer a statutory stigma against a large portion of the people of this country. It should no longer be provided by law that, because men took part in the rebellion, they were not unworthy to wear a sword in defense of the country; that they might carry a musket in the ranks, but were unworthy to wear a sword; that they were worthy to make laws in Congress, but were unworthy to hold a commission in the army.

Mr. CONGER argued that the amendment was new legislation; that it was not germane to the bill, and that it was not in the interest of retrenchment by any manner of means. He ridiculed the idea of it being made in the interest of that overburdening idea of peace and good will which overshadowed Congress, like a great cloud just on the eve of a conflict, unlike any conflict that has been seen in these halls for years.

Mr. TUCKER. He calls a signal of peace a cloud.

Mr. CONGER. Overshadowing as like a cloud of peace.

Mr. TUCKER. A piece of a cloud.

Mr. CONGER. A peaceful cloud—that kind of cloud which generally follows a battle and does not precede it.

This cloud of smoke and tumult the gentleman has brought into our peaceful and calm and quiet deliberations to-day, and before we have come to the exciting subject which, by common consent, was to be postponed until we had allowed ourselves to be harmonious for a few moments. [Laughter.] The gentleman has thrown in the gage of battle. He has had the courage to do what no man in this House has dared to do before. He has had the courage to offer, in the presence of the American people, an amendment which his own brethren on that side of the House have repeatedly declared (when it was even suggested) to be premature. When I changed some time ago, that members on the other side were looking forward to the time when, by reduction of the army, they could make places for the brigadier-generals of the South, I was laughed at scornfully by every Democrat, and I was told that nobody intended ever to propose such a thing.

Mr. CONGER finally stated that his party friends desired to meet the issue in a manly way, and therefore he withdrew his point of order.

Mr. SPARKS renewed it.

The Chairman sustained the point of order, on the ground that the amendment was not in the direction of economy, and changed existing law.

Mr. KLOTZ offered an amendment to amend the act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the war of 1812. Ruled out of order.

Mr. MCCOOK moved to strike out the section prohibiting promotions and appointments in the army, beyond the rank of captain, except in the Engineer Corps. In the discussion which followed some sharp remarks were interchanged between Mr. Sparks and Mr. Conger as to the service rendered by them respectively during the late war; Mr. Sparks stating that like the gentleman from Michigan, he had been a little too cowardly to fight on either side.

Mr. CONGER replied that he had served as a member of the State military board of Michigan. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKS. Were you a chaplain or a sutler?

Mr. CONGER replied that his peculiar organization would have naturally inclined him to be a chaplain. [Laughter.] He was proud, however, that he had helped to send out to the war as gallant a set of men as ever had gone there. The Michigan troops had captured the Southern civil leader, Jeff Davis. Probably that accounted for the humanity which the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Sparks) showed toward him as a citizen of Michigan. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLYMER opposed the amendment. It would be unwise to strike out the provision. It was in the direction of reducing the obstacles to a fair and just reorganization of the army.

Mr. MARSH favored the amendment. Ever since the Capitol had been in the hands of the Democrats they had been endeavoring to reduce and organize the army; yet they had been unable to mature a plan which would meet with favor, and it was now mean and contemptible on the part of the American Congress to attempt to cut down the strength of the army by preventing meritorious officers from receiving the promotion which they deserved.

Mr. SPARKS opposed the amendment. The provision limiting promotions would result in a saving of thousands of dollars to the Government, without impairing the efficiency of the army.

Mr. WHITE, while he had been, and still was, in favor of a reorganization of the army, did not think it fair that pending reorganization this provision prohibiting promotions should be adopted.

The amendment to strike out was defeated.

The consideration of the bill having been concluded with the exception of section 6, repealing the statutes allowing the military to preserve the peace at the polls, that section was read.

Mr. CONGER raised the point of order that the section changed existing law and did not retrench expenditures. It could not be held seriously that striking out the words "to keep the peace at the polls" retrenched expenditures.

Mr. SPARKS admitted that the section changed existing law, but argued that it retrenched expenditures. He hoped for the credit of free institutions that such an un-American principle had not been largely acted upon as to allow a sovereign citizen to be watched at the polls by his own servant with a musket in his hand.

Mr. FRYE argued that the section did not retrench expenditures. It did not effect the transportation of the army, because the President was Commander-in-Chief, and could transport troops where he pleased; and there was no power in the House to say he should transport the troop here and not there.

Mr. ROBINSON made an argument in the same line.

Mr. SPARKS asked Mr. Robinson whether, if the uses to which the army could be applied were diminished, that would not necessarily reduce expenditure.

Mr. CASWELL. Does not keeping the peace tend to reduce expenditures?

Mr. ROBINSON. I go deeper than that question goes. You cannot take from the President the power to send the army, even to put down domestic violence at the polls. If you cannot take away that power you cannot save a dollar.

Mr. SPARKS. Can we not repeal this statute and say that the army shall not be used to keep peace at the polls?

Mr. ROBINSON. What I say is this: That if Congress undertakes to do what the Constitution says it shall not do it does not control the power of the President or save a dollar.

Mr. MCLANE expressed his belief that the proposition contended for on the Republican side (that Congress could not economize money by controlling the use of the army) had never been made before in either House of Congress. He contended that the power to make rules and regulations for the government of the army and navy was a fundamental power of Congress, and he had never heard that power questioned.

Mr. HASKELL asked Mr. McLane whether he had read the fourth section of the Constitution, which says that the United States shall guarantee to every State a republican form of government, and shall protect it against invasion and on the application of its Legislature or Governor) against domestic violence; and whether, in spite of this proposed repeal, the President could not, on the application of the Governor of New York, order troops to protect the peace at the polls in the city of New York.

Mr. MCLANE replied that the question was not at all pertinent to the question at issue.

Mr. HASKELL. Under the operation of this law, do you pretend to say that under no circumstances shall any armed body of troops be sent to any poll? I ask you whether, in spite of this proposed repeal, if the Governor of the State of New York should on election day ask the President that troops should be given him, right there at the polls, to put down violence, the troops would not be sent under the Constitution?

Mr. MCLANE. Whenever the Governor of a State certifies to the President that he cannot suppress insurrection that is existing the President is bound by the Constitution to send troops to suppress it.

Mr. HASKELL. And would he, in spite of this law.

Mr. MCLANE. No law of Congress can control that power.

Mr. MCMAHON. The section speaks of armed enemies of the United States. I ask the gentleman from Kansas when persons become the armed enemies of the United States?

Mr. HASKELL. Judging from the remarks on one side of this House, since the Forty-fourth Congress, I declare before my Maker that I do not know what that side of the House would consider to be armed enemies of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KEIFER argued against the proposed section.

Mr. CARLISLE thought that the House and the country would hesitate a long time before accepting the doctrine laid down by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Frye); that the President of the United States as Commander-in-Chief of the army can transport troops wherever he pleases, and use them for whatever purpose he pleases with or without the consent of Congress.

This was the first time he had ever heard such doctrine enunciated by a gentleman of such respectability and intelligence as the gentleman from Maine. Although the King of Great Britain could raise armies without the authority of Parliament, yet for more than two hundred years Parliament, representing the Commons of England, had controlled the King in the use of the army. In this country the President could not raise an army, equip, or use a single soldier without the consent of Congress, and yet there was now claimed for him the power far more extensive and far more dangerous to the liberties of the people than the monarch of Great Britain possessed.

He undertook to affirm that under the Constitution of the United States the President had no right to use the army and the navy, or no part of it, to protect the States against domestic violence, or to enforce the State laws, except he was authorized to do so by act of Congress. Did gentlemen on the other side mean to say that the provision of the Constitution which made it the duty of the United States to guarantee to every State a Republican form of government conferred upon the President, a single officer of the United States, that power? Were gentlemen prepared to go before the country on the proposition that the President was the United States?

Mr. CONGER asked Mr. Carlisle to whom the application to protect a State from domestic violence came, if not to the President.

Mr. CARLISLE replied that the application came to the President. The Constitution made it the duty, not of the President, but of the United States as a government to protect the States against domestic violence on the application of their Governor or Legislature. He repeated the proposition that under that provision of the Constitution the President did not possess, without legislation on the part of Congress, one particle of power to use the army and navy for that purpose.

Mr. BAYNE. Did not this legislation, which it is now proposed to repeal, confer it upon him?

Mr. CARLISLE. Yes; and the same power that conferred the authority on him by legislation can take it away from him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WHITE reminded Mr. Carlisle of the times when marines were sent to an election poll in Washington City, and when fourteen American citizens were shot down, and he remarked that that act had been sustained.

Mr. CARLISLE replied that he remembered the occasion; but he said that the act of the District of Columbia was under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, and that the Republican party had complained loudly and long of that act.

Mr. WHITE asked him whether his predecessor, Mr. Burnett, had not defended the use of troops to keep peace at the polls.

Mr. CARLISLE admitted that he had done so as to the District of Columbia, but not as to any State.

Mr. CARLISLE repeated the assertion that all the authority which the President possessed to-day to use the army and navy in protecting States against domestic violence, or in assisting States in enforcing law, was derived, not from the provision of the Constitution which had been read, but from the act of Congress of the 28th of February, 1795, amended in 1807. It was under that act that the President proceeded in every instance that the army or navy was sent into a State for protection against domestic violence. That act had been passed by the men who framed the Constitution, and who knew what the Constitution meant.

It provided that in case of insurrection in a State against the government thereof it shall be lawful for the President, on the application of the Legislature of such State, or of the Executive when the Legislature cannot be convened, to call for such number of militia from any other State or States as he may deem sufficient, and on like application to employ for the same purpose such part of the land and naval force of the United States as he may deem necessary. That was the foundation and the only foundation on which rested to-day all the authority that the President had to use the army or navy for such purpose, and he submitted to his friends on the other side whether it was not entirely competent for the power which conferred that authority to take it away again, to modify it, or to alter it.

He denied, however, that even under that authority (if left without any modification) the President could send a soldier into a State to stand around the polls on election day for the purpose of keeping the peace. He denied what had been asserted by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. Frye) that the United States deputy-marshals could now call on the army to assist them in keeping the peace.

Mr. FRYE. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky know that Mr. Cushing, when he was Attorney-General of the United States, gave an opinion that the marshals and deputy-marshals can call upon United States soldiers as a *posse comitatus* in the enforcement of law?

Mr. CARLISLE. I believe he did.

Mr. FRYE. The gentleman in commencing his speech stated that it was claimed by me that the President had power to transport troops wherever he pleased, for any purpose whatever. I did not say so. I did not claim it, and I never claimed it. What I claimed was simply this: that if these words, "to keep the peace at the polls," were stricken out, that would not be any restriction whatever on the power of the commander-in-chief of the army to transport the army from barrack to barrack and from State to State as he saw fit. That is all that I claim, and does not the gentleman admit that?

Mr. CARLISLE. I agree to that.

Mr. FRYE. I was simply illustrating it to show that this section does not on its face reduce expenditures.

Mr. CARLISLE. But if the President desires to transport the army, not only from post to post within the States and Territories, but to distribute it among all the polling places, I ask the gentleman if the cost of transportation would not be greatly increased?

Mr. FRYE. Not necessarily. [Ironical laughter on the Democratic side.] The President might desire to transport the whole army to the borders of Texas; that would be much more expensive than placing half a dozen soldiers at a poll in the South to frighten the whole white population of that voting district.

Mr. CARLISLE. While the Constitution provided that it shall be the duty of the United States to guarantee to every State a republican form of government and to protect them against domestic violence, it also conferred upon Congress, by express provision, the power to pass all laws that might be necessary and proper to execute the powers conferred on Congress or on any department or officer of the Government, and in the exercise of that power Congress passed the acts of 1795 and 1807, under which this constitutional provision is to be executed by the President.

Mr. ROBESON asked Mr. Carlisle whether he thought that the proposed section of the bill would repeal the law of 1795 and 1807 and restrict the power of the President as conferred by those laws.

Mr. CARLISLE. I do not, because I do not think that that law authorizes the President to use troops at the polls to keep the peace. I think that the whole effect of it is to authorize the President to send troops into a State to protect the State against domestic violence on the application of its Governor or Legislature, and that it does not authorize him to send troops to stand at the ballot-boxes and arrest citizens who come to vote.

Mr. ROBESON. If the Executive of a State calls on the President to suppress domestic violence, and if the domestic violence is at polls where a general election is taking place, is not the President bound, under his oath of office, to comply with that request?

Mr. CARLISLE. If the application is made in regular form under the act of Congress, I admit that it is the duty of the President to send the troops, but I say that when these troops have gone into a State and have dispersed the mob or the insurrectionists, or whatever they may be called, who are acting in resistance to the State authorities, they have performed their duty and must stop at that. They cannot stay at the polls to protect the peace there.

Mr. ROBESON. Nobody is now disputing that question; but I ask the gentleman whether or not this proposed section would take away the power of the President to do that if he were properly called upon?

Mr. CARLISLE. It certainly will not.

Mr. ROBESON. If that be so, and if it does not take away the President's power, and if that contingency shall happen, as it possibly may, and if officers of the army are sworn to obey the lawful orders of the President, then when becomes of the officer who is ordered by the President to suppress a riot and to quiet domestic violence at a place where a general election has taken place?

Mr. CARLISLE. The gentleman from New Jersey is asking me questions on one subject and I am discussing another subject. Of course an officer is bound to obey the order of the President where the President is acting in strict conformity to the law. But we are discussing the question whether or not soldiers can be sent into a State for the purpose of keeping the peace at the polls—not for the purpose of suppressing domestic insurrection or violence. The two propositions are altogether different in their nature. They stand upon altogether different foundations. The one is essential to the preservation, not only of the peace, but of the very existence of the Union.

Mr. ROBESON. Do you understand that the President of the United States is included in the scope of this section which speaks of "any other person engaged in the civil service of the United States?" If he is and if he be called upon by the Executive of a State properly and in a proper manner, and if he responds to that call, would he be liable to punishment under the provision of the section?

Mr. CARLISLE. My first answer to the question is that the President cannot properly be called upon to do a thing which he has no power to do—in other words, that he cannot be properly called upon to send troops into a State to preserve peace at an election.

Mr. ROBESON. I understood the gentleman to say that he thought the section did not affect that power of the Executive.

Mr. CARLISLE. In further response to the question I desire to say that the words of the section to which the gentleman has called my attention are taken from the act of February 25, 1865, and are an exact copy, so far as they go, of that act. I do not know what construction the Administration, which was then in power put upon it as to its effect upon the President, nor do I know what construction the Administration of which my friend from New Jersey was a distinguished member put upon it. I am not prepared to say exactly what its true construction is, but I do say that this law cannot be so construed or administered as to punish any officer or citizen for doing that which he has a right to do.

Mr. REAGAN contended that the point of order could not be sustained, inasmuch as no rules had been adopted for the government of the present House, and therefore the section under discussion could come in conflict with no rule.

Mr. LAPHAM argued that the section did not upon its face retrench expenditures. Election riots, which were the bloodiest riots in the history of the country, generally followed the violence perpetrated on election day upon the ballot-boxes. To deny the use of the army for the purpose of preventing violence on election day was to deny the utility of preventing violence at the election. In the bloody night that followed the Government would have to furnish the pound of cure.

Mr. HOOKER thought that it was a startling proposition which had been brought forward by some gentleman on the other side, that there was a time in this country superior to the legislative branch of the Government, and who could do more than the law authorized him to do. There was no man in this country, however high in position, who must not bow his lordly head in obedience to the great law of man, as proclaimed by the commons of his country—the representatives of the people. It was the right of the people and the duty of their representatives to say how, when, and under what circumstances the army should be used.

He proceeded to argue that the section was in the interest of economy, inasmuch as it cut off one purpose for which it was necessary to use and transport troops.

Mr. STEPHENS obtained the floor, but stated that he was unable to proceed at present, and at his suggestion the committee rose, and the House at 4:45 o'clock adjourned.

The Clerk read a notice, inviting members who desired to have measures of financial relief acted upon at the present session to meet this evening at 7:30 o'clock in the Judiciary Committee room.

GEORGETOWN NEWS.

Collected by Republican Reporters.

A. B. Slocum, Troy, N. Y.; H. W. Nelson, Delaware, and George M. Pearl, of Jersey City, N. J., are at the West End Hotel.

The several coal companies have commenced to load boats at Cumberland, and on Monday the Central and Consolidated Coal Companies will dispatch several boats to Georgetown.

Mr. William Masters, son of the late Captain J. R. Masters, who was for many years agent of the Borden Mining and Coal Company, has been appointed to the position formerly held by his father. Mr. Masters is a young gentleman of ability, and his appointment gives general satisfaction to coal shippers.

MONETARY AND TRADE REPORT.

FINANCIAL MATTERS.

New York Money Market.

NEW YORK, March 28, 1879.

The imports of dry goods for the past week were $2,267,569, and the amount marketed was $2,290,356.

Money was in very active demand at 6@7, closing at 7.

Foreign exchange was firm at 483¼@486 for long and 487¼@487¾ for demand.

Government bonds were firm.

State bonds were quiet.

Railroad bonds were active, with the large st rise (1¾) in Kansas Pa ific Income No 16. The next largest advance was 1¼ in New Jersey Central firsts consols assented, and the next (1 per cent) in do convertible assented. The other changes were as follows: An advance of ¼ in Kansas Pacific 7's (Denver division trust receipts), ¼ in Morris and Essex 7's of 1891 and Canonda Southern firsts guaranteed, ¼ in Union Pacific firsts, ¼ in Rock Island 6's of 1917, Northwest gold 7's, St Paul sinking funds, and Central Pacific land grants, and ½ in New York Elevated Railroad firsts. There was a decline of 1 per cent in Rome, Watertown and Ogdensburg consolidated firsts and ¼ in Missouri, Kansas and Texas consolidated assented, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy 7's sold at 116, Michigan Southern sinking funds at 111, and Albany and Susquehanna seconds at 107.

The stock market was active and buoyant, a good buying movement having set in, of which the Northwestern shares were the principal feature. The speculation was firm throughout the entire day, and, with an occasional fractional reaction in some cases, prices steadily advanced until an improvement ranging from ¼ to 2 per cent was established. Northwest was common leading the advance. In the bond dealings there was a reaction of ½@¾ per cent in a few instances from the highest figures of the day, but the market generally closed at the highest prices. The transactions aggregated 157,000 shares, of which 11,900 were Erie, 10,000 were Lake Shore, 4,100 were Wabash, 35,000 were Northwest, 15,000 were St. Paul, 22,000 were Delaware, Lackawanna and Western, 5,000 were New Jersey Central, 2,000 were Ohio and Mississippi, 3,000 were Michigan Central, 2,000 were Western Union, 3,000 Kansas Pacific, 2,000 were St. Louis, Kansas City and Northern, and 2,000 were St Louis and San Francisco.

The following were the closing prices:

1881's, coupons	104¾	New 5's	104¾
1867's	102¼	Ten-forties	102
1868's	102¼		

STATE BONDS.

D. C. 3.65's	81	Levee 8's	35
Tenn. 6's, old	25	Ala. 8's	48
Do, new	25	Do 5's	46
Va. 6's, old	35	Mo. 6's	101¼
Do, new	35	Do 7's	110
Do, consolidated	76¼	N. C., 6's	22½
Do, deferred	7½	Do, new	11
La. 6's, old	75	Do, special tax	1½
Do, new	35	S. C., old	23
Levee 6's	35	Do, new	10

STOCKS.

N. Y. Central	114⅞	Chicago and N. W.	29¾
Erie	24½	Do, preferred	87½
Lake Shore	71¾	Rock Island	112
Illinois Central	81	Western Union	104¾
Pittsburg	99½		

SUB-TREASURY BALANCES.

Gold	$118,665,491
Currency	45,970,499

Pacific Mining Stocks.

SAN FRANCISCO, March 28, 1879.

The following are the official closing quotations of mining stocks to-day:

Alpha	18⅞	Hale & Norcross	11½
Alta	5⅝	Jacket consolidated	4½
Belcher	8	Justice	3⅝
Best & Belcher	16	Mexican	31⅞
Bullion	5¾	Northern Belle	9⅝
Caledonia	2⅞	Ophir	24
California	5½	Overman	10½
Chollar	43½	Raymond & Ely	5¼
Consolidated Virginia	5⅞	Savage	8¼
Crown Point	5¼	Sierra Nevada	45
Eureka consolid'd	1⅞	Union consolidated	58
Exchequer	5	Yellow Jacket	14⅞
Gould & Curry	8	Bodie	6¾
Grand Prize	3⅝		

GENERAL MARKETS.

Georgetown Grain Market.

GEORGETOWN, March 28, 1879.

Wheat—Since the opening of navigation the market for wheat has been more active and to-day about 5,000 bushels changed hands. The demand is greater than the supply. There were sales of 3,500 bushels mixed Fultz and Lancaster at $1 13½, 400 bushels Lancaster at $1 15, 50 bushels inferior at 90, 150 bushels good Fultz at $1 12½, 500 bushels do at $1 08@1 10, and 500 bushels fair Fultz at $1 08.

Corn—The demand for corn is greater than the supply, and, in the absence of receipts or any note, we quote the market nominal.

Baltimore General Market.

BALTIMORE, March 28, 1879.

Cotton firm. Middling, 10½c.

Flour dull and heavy. Howard-street and Western superfine, $2 25@2 75; do extra, $2@2 25; do family, $4 75@5 50; City Mills superfine, $4 50@5 75; do extra, $4 25@4 50; do Rio brands, $4 75@6; Patapsco family, $5 75.

Wheat—Southern higher and steady. Western dull and steady. Southern red, $1 12@1 15; do amber, $1 15@1 16; No 2 Pennsylvania red, $1 13@1 13½; No 2 Western winter red, spot and March, $1 13½@1 13¾; April, $1 12½@1 13½; May, $1 13½@1 13¾.

Corn—Southern firm and higher. Western steady. Southern white, 42@46c; do yellow, 44@46c; Western mixed, spot and March, 43⅞@43¾c; April, 43¼@43⅝c; May, 44@44¼c; steamer, 43@43½c.

Oats dull. Southern, 32@32½c; Western white, 32@32½c; do mixed, 31@32c; Pennsylvania, 32@32½c.

Rye quiet at 84@86c.

Hay steady. Maryland and Pennsylvania prime, $11@12.

Provisions steady. Mess pork, $10 50@10 75. Bulk meats—Loose shoulders, 3½@3⅝c; clear-rib sides, 4⅞@5c; packed, 4½c and 5½c. Bacon—Shoulders, 4¾c; clear-rib sides, 5¼@6c. Hams, 9@12c. Lard, refined tierces, 5¾@5¾c. Butter quiet; prime to choice Western, 16@20c; roll, 18@19c. Eggs quiet; fresh, 12@13c.

Petroleum steady. Crude, 7½@8c; refined, 9½c.

Coffee firm. Rio cargoes, ordinary to prime, 11½@14½c.

Sugar quiet. A soft, 8⅝@8¾c.

Whisky dull at $1 07@1 07½.

Freights to Liverpool per steam steady and lower. Cotton, 7-32d. Flour, 2s 3d; grain, 6¼d.

Receipts—Flour, 3,900 bbls; wheat, 55,000 bu; corn, 168,000 bu; oats, 000 bu.

Shipments—Wheat, 67,800 bu; corn, 81,000 bu.

RIVER AND CANAL NEWS.

Washington River Front.

ARRIVED YESTERDAY.

Riley's wharves—Schooner B T, Bratton, Johnson, Chesapeake Bay, with oysters to market.

Carter's wharf—Schooners Potomac, Biggis, Philadelphia, with coal to Walter H Marlow; Agnes Reppard, Hopkins, Philadelphia, with coal to B P Clark; Fair Wind, Lloyd, Philadelphia, with coal to same.

Clark & Oliven's wharf—Schooners Edward Ewing, Walker, Philadelphia, with coal to Clark & Oliven; B Bradley, Bradley, Philadelphia, with coal to same.

CLEARED YESTERDAY.

Biscoe's wharves—Schooner Salisbury, Godfo, bound down, light.

Riley's wharves—Schooners Dove, Shreeves; Maria Laird, Collison; General Hancock, Chesser, and Annie Merrill, Wood, all bound down, light.

Johnson's wharves—Schooner Ida Jackson, Beach, bound down, light.

Georgetown River Front.

PORT.

Cleared yesterday—Steamship E C Knight, Chichester, New York, with a full cargo of merchandise to New York merchants, including a large lot of flour.

Canal.

Cleared yesterday—Boats Loudon, Wheeler & Barron, Seneca, J C Grove, John R Cruzen, and Aggie M Groves.

THE COURTS.

Supreme Court of the United States.

FRIDAY, March 28, 1879.

On motion of Mr. F. Phillips, Sidney Ward, esq., of New York City, was admitted to practice.

No. 97. The people ex rel C. P. Williams, plaintiff in error, vs. William J. Weaver et al. No. 1047. C. P. Williams, plaintiff in error, vs. William J. Weaver et al. Argument continued by Mr. R. W. Peckham for defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. George F. Edmunds for plaintiff in error.

No. 187. Joseph Tounstein, plaintiff in error, vs. John A. Wills. Argued by Mr. J. B. Stallo for plaintiff in error, and by Mr. J. H. Ashton and Mr. C. P. James for defendant in error.

No. 190. The steamship Abbotsford, &c., appellants, vs. Thomas J. Johnson, master &c. Argument commenced by Mr. M. P. Henry for appellants.

Adjourned until Monday, at twelve o'clock.

District Courts.

Equity Court—Justice MacArthur.—Colclazer vs. Cowling; bill dismissed; appeal taken. Matthews vs. Matthews; submitted. Helstern vs. Duvall; sale confirmed provisionally. McPherson vs. Smallwood; same action. Shea vs. Shea; auditor's report confirmed; distribution ordered. Cammack vs. Savage; pro confesso. Green vs. Green; complainant's guardian authorized to sell or mortgage Ward's interest not exceeding $2,000.

Probate Court—Justice Wylie—In re estate of Thomas McCarthy, deceased; letters of administration, will annexed, to F. B. Burke; bond, $900. In re estate Ann Brown; letters of administration issued to Julia Parker; bond, $25. In re estate Catherine Leonard; order directing the proceeds of sale of personal property to be paid into the registry of the court. In re estate Anthony Best; order dismissing exceptions to account of administratrix; account proven and appeal taken. In re estate Mordecai Yarnell; inventory of personal estate returned. The will of J. E. Colburn; returned with commission duly executed and will admitted to probate. In re estate James Monoghan; Peter Monoghan made administrator; bond, $1,200. In re estate F. P. Stuart; order of court revoking appointment of Charles Stuart and appointing B. A. Kidder administrator; bond, $2,000. Last will and testament of Jacob Scheibley filed for probate.

Adjourned until April 1.

BRYAN'S

ELECTRIC BELTS,

A SELF-CURE, WITHOUT MEDICINE,

For all Diseases Arising From a Loss of Vital Force.

Dyspepsia, Paralysis, Rheumatism, Epilepsy, Hysteria, Weak Lungs, Nervous Debility, Weakness, Kidney Complaints, Impotency, and Physical Prostration.

This improvement in electric appliances embraces the effective properties of older inventions without requiring vinegar or other liquid to excite action. The metals in this belt are so nicely adjusted that the heat and moisture of the body is sufficient to evolve the current of Electricity. They encircle the body with Electric and Magnetic influence, restore the Nervous and Debilitated, and impart New Life and Strength to the waning organism.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF NEW YORK has this year awarded A DIPLOMA FOR THIS INVENTION, after having been thoroughly examined and tested by the eminent Physicians and Electricians appointed for the purpose by the directors of that institution. Some of the most eminent physicians of the city have certified to the merits of this Therapeutic agent.

Read the following from Dr. Guernsey, No. 18 West Twenty-third street: "I have used Bryan's Electric Voltaic Belts with very decided benefit. In all cases where continued action is required they give very decided satisfaction." Hundreds testify to their therapeutic excellence, and physicians will find them of great aid in cases that resist every other form of treatment.

"ROBERT GUERNSEY, M. D."

JOSEPH SACHERS says: "My disease, nervous debility, and all its horrors, unfitted me for business, society, or domestic life. Your belt has proved a sovereign balm and effected a perfect cure."

For illustrated pamphlets address

H. M. MALOY,

205 East Fourteenth St., New York City.

dec31-ly

A SPLENDID OPPORTUNITY TO WIN A FORTUNE. FOURTH GRAND DISTRIBUTION. CLASS B, AT NEW ORLEANS, TUESDAY, April 8, 1879—167th Monthly Drawing.

Louisiana State Lottery Company.

This institution was regularly incorporated by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana for 25 years, for educational purposes, in 1868, FOR THE TERM OF TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, to which contract the inviolable faith of the State is pledged, with a capital of $1,000,000, to which it has since added a reserve fund of $150,000. ITS GRAND SINGLE NUMBER DISTRIBUTION will take place monthly on the second Tuesday. *It never scales or postpones.* Look at the following Distribution:

CAPITAL PRIZE, $80,000.

100,000 TICKETS AT TWO DOLLARS EACH.

HALF TICKETS, ONE DOLLAR.

LIST OF PRIZES.

1 CAPITAL PRIZE	$80,000
1 CAPITAL PRIZE	10,000
1 CAPITAL PRIZE	5,000
2 PRIZES OF $2,500	5,000
5 PRIZES OF 1,000	5,000
20 PRIZES OF 500	10,000
100 PRIZES OF 100	10,000
200 PRIZES OF 50	10,000
500 PRIZES OF 20	10,000
1000 PRIZES OF 10	10,000

APPROXIMATION PRIZES.

9 Approximation Prizes of $800	2,700
9 Approximation Prizes of 200	1,800
9 Approximation Prizes of 100	900
1,857 Prizes, amounting to	$210,100

Responsible corresponding agents wanted at all prominent points, to whom a liberal compensation will be paid.

Application for rates to clubs should only be made to the home office in New Orleans.

Write, clearly stating full address, for further information, or send orders to

M. A. DAUPHIN,
P. O. Box 692. New Orleans, Louisiana.
or to H. L. PLUM,
No. 319 Broadway, New York.
JNO. W. CLARK,
1701 New York avenue, Washington.

All our Grand Extraordinary Drawings are under the supervision and management of GENERALS G. T. BEAUREGARD and JUBAL A. EARLY. mar22

$10 to $1,000 invested in Wall St. stocks makes fortunes every month. Book sent free explaining everything. Address BAXTER & CO. Bankers, 17 Wall-st, N. Y. 3:26ody

INTERIOR ADORNMENTS.

1901 PENN. AVE. 1901 PENN AVE.

A. P. M'ELROY

GILDER, MANUFACTURER OF PIER AND MANTEL MIRRORS.

Gold and Walnut Frames of every description. Window Cornices &c. made to order.

OLD FRAMES REPAIRED AND REGILT.

Mirrors and Pictures removed and re-hung. Picture Hooks, Nails, Gold, Silver, and Copper Wires, Matts, Velvet Frames, Passe-Partouts, &c.

Picture Rods—Gilt, Walnut, and Oak—put up at the shortest notice, and at reasonable rates.

As all work is done on the premises, I am prepared to do the same at 15 per cent. less than any establishment this side of New York, and will guarantee satisfaction. Mirrors and Pictures carefully packed, unpacked, and hung by experienced workmen.

Orders by mail promptly attended to.

S. BENSINGER,

Dealer in

RAGS, PAPER STOCK, AND METALS OF ALL KINDS,

mch1-1m 937 and 939 Louisiana avenue.

PROPOSALS.

ARCHITECT'S OFFICE, U. S. CAPITOL,
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 25, 1879.

Proposals will be received at this office, where plans, specifications, &c., can be seen, until TUESDAY, April 8, at 12 o'clock m., for the brick, labor, and materials for laying the same, of the extension of the Government Printing-Office.

EDWARD CLARK,
Architect United States Capitol.

mh26

PROPOSALS FOR DESIGNATION OF AVENUES AND STREETS.

ENGINEER DEPARTMENT,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
WASHINGTON, March 22, 1879.

By direction of the Commissioners, sealed proposals will be received at this office until 12 o'clock, noon, SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1879, for furnishing and placing upon street lamps in the cities of Washington and Georgetown the designations of Avenues and Streets in letters and numbers one and one-half (1½) inches in length and properly proportioned.

Bidders are at liberty to submit any plan whatever for effecting this purpose, transmitting samples of work.

Bids must be indorsed "Proposals for Designations of Avenues and Streets," and addressed to the undersigned.

The right is reserved to reject any or all bids or parts of bids. W. J. TWINING,
Major Engineers, U. S. A.; Engineer Commissioner District of Columbia.

mar24-6d

NAVY PAY OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 15, 1879.

Sealed proposals in duplicate, to be indorsed "Proposals for Coal," will be received at this office until 12 m. the 29th day of MARCH, 1879, for the below-described coal, to be delivered at the Navy-Yard, Washington, D. C., free of any expense to the Government, and subject to the usual inspection, viz:

BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

Five hundred tons (2,240 pounds per ton) White-Ash Egg Coal, best quality, very free from dust, sulphur, or other impurities.

Fifty tons (2,240 pounds per ton) White-Ash Egg Coal, best quality, very free from slate and dust.

All to be delivered by April 10, 1879. The contractor is to place it in carts provided by the Government at the Navy-Yard wharf, and the quantity is to be paid for at the weight of the Navy-Yard scales.

The right is reserved to reject any or all bids not deemed advantageous to the Government.