rupting influence into the army, which belonged to the whole country and in whose efficiency all were interested. For himself, with his knowledge of the character of the court that convicted this man, of the president who approved its action, and of the facts of the case, if he felt any impulse to vote for this bill to please anybody he would go across the Potomac and kneel among the graves of the boys who fell on the battlefield of Groveton on that twenty-ninth of August, and would there pray to God to forgive him. He would appeal to the spirits of Lincoln, who approved the verdict of the court, and of Garfield, who took part in rendering that verdict and always believed it just, to restrain him from perpetrating such a wrong upon the nation and upon its brave soldiers, living and dead.

Mr. Sewell replied briefly to Mr. Logan. He said that the verdict of the court martial that convicted Gen. Porter was based upon the idea put forth by Gen. Pope that there was no force in Porter's front, that Longstreet had not arrived at the time the order was sent to Porter, and that if that order had been obeyed Porter would have encountered no obstacle until he struck Jackson's right flank. The fact was, however, as shown by evidence not then accessible, that Longstreet arrived before Porter and McDowell, and was there confronting them when they arrived. But Gen. Pope, the commander of the army, did not know this fact, as was evident from his dispatch the evening before, stating that the enemy was moving at a pace which would bring their whole force upon the ground "tomorrow night or next day." Gen. Porter did not know that Gen. Longstreet was present, and that Gen. Pope did not know it, and his action was governed by this knowledge. The evidence in the case showed clearly that Gen. Pope did not understand the situation. His whole campaign was directed against one corps of the confederate force, the one commanded by Jackson, utterly ignoring the fact that Longstreet had passed through Thoroughfare gap, and was in front of Porter and McDowell with 25,000 men. Mr. Sewell read copiously from the testimony and documents in the case in support of his views, and said in conclusion that it was hardly worth while to attempt to add anything to the deliberate statement of the advisory board in relation to the verdict against Gen. Porter: "We believe that not one among all the gallant soldiers on that bloody field was less deserving of such condemnation than he." That was the view that would be accepted by the country.

Mr. McPherson said this subject was not a new one. It was as old as his term in the senate, and was likely to outlive him. Twenty years ago Gen. Porter, a distinguished, capable, and faithful soldier in the army of the United States, who had fought many battles for his country, and not one against her, was condemned as a traitor. From that time to this Gen. Porter had steadily asked, not for money, but for justice, and his demand had been long denied. But, thank heaven, said Mr. McPherson, new light is breaking over that dark and dismal sea which Gen. Porter has been forced to sail. Military boards composed of distinguished officers, not supposed to be his friends, have investigated the case and Gen. Porter stands to-day without stain in the estimation of those who have been his most bitter accusers. Gen. Grant, distinguished alike for ability and courage in war and for the gallantry of his heart and mind in peace, to his everlasting honor be it said, bears testimony to the justice of Gen. Porter's cause. I will not undertake, because I have not the physical strength, neither, indeed, have I the inclination to-day to follow the senator from Illinois (Mr. Logan) in all his wanderings after testimony by which, with his construction of it, he might justify his vote against the passage of this bill. I leave the conclusions of that senator side by side with the conclusions of the advisory board—a board made up of distinguished military officers, some of whom declared in advance that they were believers in Porter's guilt, and that it would require the strongest evidence to remove that belief. They reported unanimously to the president in favor of his innocence, and it has become the opinion of the people of the country that Porter is an innocent man. Now, Mr. President, this is enough. The records of this country, unless corrected, will send down to his children's children, and to their children for all time, the deep damnation of their father's shame. It was his country struck the cruel blow, and congress alone can heal the wound. Therefore, I believe it is the duty of the senate, by passing this bill, to go as far as they can toward correcting the wrong done to Gen. Porter.

Mr. Hawley said he intended to vote in accordance with the views presented by the senator from Illinois (Mr. Logan). He had never had a doubt as to the right way to vote in this case, except for a time after the report of the Schofield board. He was acquainted with the members of that board. He had known Gen. Terry for twenty-five years, and had served near him during the whole war, and he had risen now, not to discuss the bill, but to deprecate an intimation made by Mr. Logan in the first part of his speech, that the board might possibly have been influenced by improper motives, and that questions then likely to arise concerning promotion in the army might have something to do with their judgment. He thought it should be put upon record that his friend, Gen. Terry, had earnestly begged to be excused from service upon that board; had told the secretary of war that his judgment was made up; that he was against Porter, and therefore not a fit man to go upon the board. If there be an honorable man in the world, said Mr. Hawley, it is Gen. Terry; and that he came out of that investigation with the recommendation he did was the only thing that even staggered me in my judgment of the case, and I have recovered from that. I am obliged to differ with some of the dearest friends I have in the world, whose sincerity I cannot for a moment question, but I am equally certain that I am right, and that is the misfortune.

Mr. Hale moved that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. Sewell called for the ayes and noes, and the motion was lost by the following vote—yeas, 20; nays, 28:

YEAS.

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Miller of Cal.,
Blair,	Frye,	Mitchell,
Cameron of Wis.,	Hale,	Morrill,
Chilcott,	Hawley,	Platt,
Conger,	Hill,	Rollins,
Davis of Ill.,	Lapham,	Windom.
Dawes,	Logan,	

NAYS.

Beck,	Harris,	Pendleton,
Brown,	Jackson,	Pugh,
Cameron of Pa.,	Johnston,	Saulsbury,
Coke,	Jones, of La.,	Sewell,
Davis of W. Va.,	Jones, of Fla.,	Slater,
Garland,	Lamar,	Vance,
Gorman,	McPherson,	Voorhees,
Groome,	Mahone,	Walker,
Grover,	Maxey,	
Hampton,	Morgan,	

The following pairs were announced:

Allison with Bayard, Anthony with Barrow, Harrison with Cockrell, Plumb with Vest, McMillan with Ransom, Ferry with Farley, Sawyer with Camden, Van Wyck with Fair, Saunders with Williams, Ingalls with Harris.

The bill was then reported to the senate.

Mr. Hoar moved to postpone its further consideration for a week in order to give senators time to examine the evidence in the case. Having read Gen. Grant's article in the *North American Review*, he had come to Washington this session with the idea that it would be his duty to vote for this bill, and if the case turned altogether upon the question of the right of a corps commanded to act upon his own discretion under certain circumstances he would still incline to be guided largely by the judgment of the advisory board and Gen. Grant, because they were better judges in such a matter than he could hope to be; but the argument of the senator from Illinois had raised other questions in the case, such, for instance, as the alleged failure of Gen. Porter for hours to obey an order to march, and if he were compelled to vote now without having an opportunity to examine the evidence upon this and other points he should have to vote against the bill.

Mr. Conger said that twenty-eight senators, one-third of the senate, were not present to record their votes and take their share of the responsibility for this wonderful proceeding, and he thought the senate ought not to act finally upon the bill without their presence. No measure had been introduced in congress since he had been a member whose passage would so shock the moral sense of the people of the north; yet the senate was asked to act upon this bill in a hurry, while one-third of its members were absent, and before the arguments were printed. Why this unseemly haste? If Fitz-John Porter had shown a tithe of the diligence to get into the army, when it was struggling for existence at Groveton, that he and his friends were exerting now to get him put back into it, the result of that contest might have been different from what it was. From the zeal with which the senator from New Jersey (Mr. Sewell) labored in this cause, it might be supposed that he thought it would be an honor to New Jersey to have this citizen of hers restored to the army.

Mr. Sewell. I do think it would be an honor to the state and to the nation. If I did not think so I would not urge it.

Mr. Conger said the avowal of the senator from New Jersey showed that a man may become so deluded by the pursuit of a favorite object as to think that an honor which the rest of the world would regard as a great disgrace. New Jersey was an old state, whose soldiers were always famous for patriotism, and she did not need to add to the list a man whose "patriotism" had to be created by law—a man who had confessed his guilt in the face of the whole world by asking the President to pardon him.

Mr. Sewell denied that Gen. Porter had ever asked pardon for any "guilt."

Mr. Conger repeated that he had appealed to the President to pardon his crime and to relieve him from the consequences of the judgment of the court martial.

Mr. Sewell. Yes; to relieve him from the consequences of the judgment, but not to pardon his crime.

Mr. Conger insisted that his statement was correct. The advisory board, he said had been appointed in a fit of "gush" and had made its recommendations in the same spirit. Yet, even that board had not declared Porter innocent, but had made for him the plea usually made for the pardon of criminals—namely, that he had suffered enough. He (Conger) warn any northern man who voted for this bill that no matter how many pensions he obtained for soldiers or how many pension arrears act he voted for, he could not deceive the people. But he had no fear that the bill would ever become a law. It might pass the senate now, but it would not pass the house, either in this congress or the next; because, although the political friends of Porter would have a large majority in the next house, the members would have heard from the people in the meantime, and members of congress were sometimes afraid to meet their constituents when they had done some unpopular thing.

Mr. Cameron, of Pennsylvania. And demagogues always are.

Senators McPherson and Sewell appealed to Mr. Hoar to withdraw his motion to postpone the bill for a week, but he declined.

Mr. Logan said he had supposed that the senate would not think of voting to reverse the action of a court without taking time to examine the evidence. He did not ask anybody to read what he had said, but he thought senators ought to read the evidence. He did not believe there were five senators who had ever read the record in this case. The contemptuous manner in which the facts in the case were treated by those who were determined to force this man back into the army and give him a certificate of good conduct during the war was very remarkable, and would excite much inquiry and comment throughout the country. The unanimity with which the democratic party in the senate was voting to restore this man was suggestive of what was to come in the future. What did it mean? How would the country understand it? He had believed that the men who emerged from the smoke of battle waged against the government of their country and came into the senate had so far forgotten the passions of the past that they would be ready to examine facts and weigh evidence before voting on a question of this kind, but that appears to be a mistake. The vote on this bill showed that they were prepared to restore to the army men who had been false to the government in its struggle against the rebellion.

Mr. Cockrell said that if any man who had left the army and gone into the rebellion ever applied for reinstatement, he would give him notice in advance that he could not have his vote.

Mr. Logan said he had been speaking not of men who had gone into the rebellion, but of men who had been dismissed from the union army. There were 115 officers who had been dismissed under a sentence like that pronounced on Fitz-John Porter, and if he were restored, there was no reason why they should not be. Continuing his remarks about prejudice governing the action of senators on the other side, Mr. Logan asked Mr. Brown whether he had ever read the testimony in the Porter case. In reply to an inquiry by Mr. Brown, Mr. Logan said he had appealed to him because he appeared to be the senior senator on the democratic side, and also because they were on very good terms.

Mr. Brown expressed his regret that Mr. Logan should accuse senators who favored this bill of acting from prejudice, and said that as he had been singled out by that senator he would say a few words about his own action upon questions growing out of the war. He reminded the senator that he had earnestly supported Mr. Logan's bill to restore Gen. Grant to the position of general of the army, and said he had taken pleasure in so acting as to show that he believed that the war was entirely over. Coming to a matter more closely connected with the pending case, he had strongly favored the promotion of Gen. Pope as a major general. Gen. Pope had been in Georgia as a military dictator, and had behaved as well as anybody could in that position, and, although he had been a leading federal officer he (Brown) took pride in his elevation.

As to the case of Gen. Porter, he regarded the trial by court-martail as in the routine of a criminal proceeding, and he applied the rule usually applied in such cases, and gave the accused the benefit of the doubt. He understood that to be a fundamental principal of English and American law.

Mr. Frye. It must be a reasonable doubt.

Mr. Brown. Yes, it must be a reasonable doubt, and I think there is a reasonable, a very reasonable doubt in this case. And, while the senator from Illinois (Mr. Logan) has made a strong case from his own standpoint, the doubt in my mind is increased by the action of the Schofield board. I know something of Gen. Terry, who was on that board. He, too, was one of our military dictators, and I regard him as a very high toned and honorable soldier and gentleman. Now the senator from Connecticut (Mr. Hawley) tells us that Gen. Terry went upon that board against his own protest, that he told the president that his mind was made up that Porter was guilty, yet he came off the board with a recommendation that he be relieved from the penalties inflicted upon him by the court martial. The action of that board has much to do with raising the doubt in my mind; but above all is the opinion of Gen. Grant, who, no matter which side he belonged to, as a military man has probably had few superiors in the world. When Gen. Porter was convicted the evidence from the confederate side was of course inaccessible, but the Schofield board and Gen. Grant have had the benefit of all the evidence, and they have both come to the conclusion that the finding of the court martial was erroneous—not owing to any fault on the part of the members of the court, but because they had not all the facts before them. When this case was before the senate on a former occasion I read most of the testimony, and from what I have read and from the judgment of the Schofield board and of Gen. Grant I have come to the conclusion that there is a reasonable doubt—a strongly reasonable doubt—of Gen. Porter's guilt, and I shall give him the benefit of that doubt in the vote that I shall cast in this case. And, while some of my colleagues on this side of the chamber may be satisfied beyond doubt that he is not guilty, probably others who vote in his favor entertain the reasonable doubt that I do and give him the benefit of it as I do. I feel it my duty to do that, and I do it with no disposition to harrow up the feelings of anybody, north or south. I know there is a strong feeling at the north in one quarter in Gen. Porter's favor, and I have no doubt that there may be in another quarter an equally strong feeling against him. But that shall not influence me one way or the other, and I think that the course I take upon this question will do most to harmonize public feeling and meet popular expectation north and south. As to the union soldiers and their pensions which have been referred to, I have this to say on behalf of the democratic party here: We have not thrown any obstacles in the way of the acts of congress that have voted them $100,000,000. We from the south; we who were "rebels"; we who fought the government when we believed we were right; we who were conquered, and who surrendered unconditionally, have come back to our allegiance, and have done it honestly, determined to vie with you who are northern men, and were in the union armies, in patriotism, and everything else that is necessary to build up this country and make the United States a great nation. And, so accepting the situation, we have not hesitated to vote with no niggard hand pensions to the soldiers of your armies, when the poor men in our own section who suffered as much could, of course, have none. Therefore, I think, with all due deference, that the senator from Illinois (Mr. Logan) does us on this side injustice when he attributes our vote to any improper motives or to any disposition to deal unjustly or to make war upon any northern sentiment.

Mr. Logan said he was glad that his remarks had led Mr. Brown to make his speech; but he still insisted that the passage of this bill would be the beginning of the reversal of the acts of the authorities done during the war.

Mr. Allison moved to pass to the consideration of executive business. Lost—ayes, 24; noes, 29.

Mr. Conger asked for the reading of the report of the committee on the Porter case, and the secretary began to read it.

Mr. Sewell said it was evident that Mr. Conger was determined to prevent a vote on the bill this evening, and therefore he moved to adjourn. The motion was agreed to, and the senate accordingly adjourned.

THE HOUSE.

Yesterday the house was entirely given to the army appropriation, with no action. There was, however, a scene, which was more interesting than a vote could have been. The debate took a political turn as soon as Mr. Hewitt accused the republicans of purposely cutting down appropriations with a view to leaving deficiencies for the democrats to supply. Then there were reminders of the deficiencies left by the Forty-fourth (democratic) congress, and to cap the whole Mr. S. S. Cox read the Guiteau "I'm Going to the Lordy" doggerel. Nobody could see how he intended it to apply, and the only effect was to shock the best sense of the house. With one impulse there came a hiss, and the usually witty and effective Cox took his seat with a painful sense of having "flatted" that time. The democrats were rather inclined to blush for him, and he got nervous under the few minutes of awkward silence. Cox's mistake seemed to spoil the effect of all that had been said on the democratic side.

Mr. Hatch presented a telegram from the St. Louis Mercantile exchange asking for the immediate passage of the "Sherman extension bill." Referred.

Mr. Sherwin presented a memorial of the American Social Science association asking congress to distribute such moneys as it may see fit among the several states for the education of the people. Referred.

The house then, at 11:15 went into the committee of the whole (Mr. Townshend, of Ohio, in the chair) on

THE ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL,

the pending amendment being that offered by Mr. Browne, of Indiana, for the gradual abolition of the pay corps of the army,

Mr. Upson offered as a substitute for that amendment an amendment providing for the retirement of such paymasters or officers of the pay department as are incapable of performing the duties of their office or are incapacitated for active service, and providing, also, that there shall be no more appointments to the grade of major in the pay department until the number of majors in that department shall have been reduced below fifty.

The substitute further provides that in future appointments to the grade of major and paymaster shall be made from the rank of captain in the line of the army.

The substitute was ruled out of order. Mr. Browne's amendment was adopted—111 yeas to 36 nays.

Mr. Upson, in speaking to a formal amendment, expressed his interest in all matters which looked to increasing the efficiency of the army. Having lived for many years on the frontier he had learned, from personal experience, the importance of a well disciplined, well appointed army. The occurrences of the past should serve as warnings for the future. Communistic and socialistic mutterings of human slaughter, spoliation and outlawry, under the guise of labor strikes encouraged by loud mouthed demagogues, were unmistakable warnings of internal danger to the peace and good order of the country. Thoughtful minds would not treat this matter with indifference, but would consider as the most serious problem of the day—the question of preserving the rights and liberties of individuals. He was in favor of keeping the army up to a high degree of efficiency, and therefore opposed many provisions of this bill, which in his judgement would bring it into disrepute.

In concluding his speech Mr. Upson called attention to the high degree of efficiency of the English army.

This brought Mr. Robinson, of New York, to his feet, with a statement that he could not tell whether the gentleman's speech was an eulogy of the American or English army. [Laughter.] He would yield to no one in his admiration of the American army, but he did not want to see its officers trotting around after the representatives of monarchy, whether dressed in the uniform of an American soldier or dressed in the kilt of Argyle. [Laughter.] He was alarmed at the spread of English feeling that had invaded Texas. The glory of the English drum beat was the sound of despotism and the death knell of liberty. [Applause.] He did not want to increase the army, or imitate anything English. He wanted to blot out all that abominable feeling that was getting into the heads of snobs and flunkies to imitate monarchy without having the brains that surrounded it.

Mr. Holman offered an amendment providing that it shall not be lawful for an officer on the active list to be employed by any corporation or individual under pay or emolument, unless expressly authorized by law.

Mr. Calkins inquired whether Mr. Holman knew of any case to which the amendment would apply.

Mr. Randall stated that he had learned at the War department that an officer absent on sick leave was in the employ of the Pullman Car company.

Mr. Reed and Mr. McCook thought that that was a case which, if true, deserved the attention of a court martial.

The amendment was withdrawn after some discussion.

Mr. Ryan offered an amendment, striking out the proviso that all retired officers shall receive the pay now provided by law as of the rank they actually held in the army at the date of their retirement, and inserting the following proviso:

All officers on the retired list of the army on account of disabilies occasioned by wounds received in battle shall hereafter bear on such retired list the actual rank held by them when in the regular or volunteer service at the time such wounds were received, but this shall not apply to those officers who had been in service as commissioned officers for twenty-five years at the date of retirement; nor to those retired officers who had lost an arm or leg, or had an arm or leg permanently disabled by resection, by reason of wounds received in battle, nor to such officers who have been retired originally by special acts of congress.

Mr. McCook, though admitting that the amendment had more merit than the original provision, expressed his opposition to them both.

Mr. Calkins offered an amendment to the amendment, providing that it shall not be construed to retire any officer on a rank less than his actual rank in the army at the date of his retirement. Adopted.

Mr. Steele offered an amendment excepting from the provision of the amendment any officer who is suffering from disabilities equal to the loss of a leg or an arm.

Mr. Bragg said that he had read the debate which had occurred on this subject before the holidays. Every class which had a friend upon the floor at that time who could speak against the outrage had been provided for by the amendment offered to-day. He had a friend, but he had not been here to speak for him. His friend was justice to all; and no justice to the volunteer or regular army could be put into execution if the appropriation committee was continually tinkering and patching a section of a law without taking up the whole law and making it homogeneous. Congress had tinkered and patched at the pension laws until they were a shame and a disgrace to that body, and it was doing the same with the law for the retirement of army officers.

Mr. Steele's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Reed offered as a substitute for Mr. Ryan's amendment the following:

Provided, That the provision of section 2, chapter 178, of the law of 1875, shall apply to all cases which have arisen since the passage of that act or which shall arise hereafter, except those cases where the redress is by special act of congress.

He explained that his amendment would simply carry out for those who have been retired since 1873 the same principles which are applied to those retired before that law.

Mr. Ryan accepted the substitute, stating that it had the same effect as his amendment

After some debate all amendments were withdrawn and the original proviso in the bill was struck out by a viva voce vote.

Mr. Hewitt called attention to the fact that in various items of the bill there was a reduction of appropriations, and inquired whether the reduction was for the purpose of making a good showing, or whether the amounts appropriated were sufficient for the needs of the service. If the latter, he was glad of it; but he took no stock in trying to make a record of economy which would necessitate a deficiency appropriation in the future.

Mr. Butterworth replied that the appropriations were sufficient, declaring that, like the gentleman from New York, he took no stock in what was called buncombe. He would assure the gentleman that the republican party would not turn over to the next congress as many opportunities for making up deficiences as it had encountered when it came into power.

Mr. Hiscock denied that there existed any preconceived plan to create deficiencies to be provided for by the next congress, though the committee on appropriations in the forty-sixth congress had intentionally thrown a large amount of deficiency upon the forty-seventh congress.

Mr. Blount. Give us the items.

Mr. Hiscock replied that the gentleman would find the items if he referred to a speech delivered by him (Mr. Hiscock) at the last session. The deficiencies to be provided for amounted to $27,000,000.

Mr. Atkins, chairman of the appropriation committee in the forty-sixth congress, asked the gentleman from New York to give something besides his bare statement, his bare assertion in support of so serious a charge as he had made against the political and representative integrity of that committee.

Mr. Hiscock. I will give the evidence here and now. The committee on appropriations, over which the gentleman had the honor to preside, failed to make appropriation in the sum of $24,000,000. Now, I say to him, I say to the committee, and I say to the country, that a fact as startling as that either proves the incompetency of that committee on appropriations or its dishonesty; either that for a political purpose it struck down the appropriations, or else that it did not give to the service, for which it was appropriating, that investigation which that service demanded. On two occasions—

Mr. Atkins. I do not yield further to the empty platitudes of the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.] I am amazed that the gentleman should stand in his place and make such an arraignment as he has made of the committee on appropriations of the forty-sixth congress, of which he himself was a member. When this is the first notice he has ever given to the country that he entertains such opinions as he has had the hardihood to express, it is a matter of surprise to me and ought to be to him. He charges that that committee was either dishonest or incompetent. That is a wholesale charge that the gentleman makes before the country. That committee will average with the honorable gentleman for intelligence, and I imagine that there is nothing in its record that would disparage it in the matter of honesty when compared with the honorable gentleman. I imagine that the members of that committee are ready to compare their records with his in either particular, and I have further to say that I hurl the charge back to the gentleman as a slander.

Mr. Blount said that he hardly knew how to answer politely the speech of the gentleman from New York. That gentleman could account for deficiencies only on the idea of the dishonesty or ignorance of the gentlemen on the appropriations committee in the forty-sixth congress. He had sat silent until the result of the last election, but now he charged the democratic party of the house with the crime of stupidity. The country would know no honest economy until the democratic party and its principles should take possession of the executive as well as the legislative branch of the government.

Mr. Hiscock said that he had insinuated last session all that he had plainly said to-day. The gentleman had said that he had never protested against the practice of the appropriations committee of the forty-sixth congress. There was no man on the floor for whom he entertained more respect than he did from the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Blount.)

Mr. O'Neill. This is affecting. [Laughter.]

Mr. Hiscock said that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Atkins) had declared that he (Mr. Hiscock) had reflected upon the appropriation committee of the forty-sixth congress and had hurled back something or other. [Laughter.] He did not mean to say that the committee had been dishonest in that way that it should be indicted and punished, but he had meant that the democratic congress had been accustomed to shove a deficiency over year after year.

Mr. Randall said that, having been a member of the appropriations committee in the forty-fourth congress, the last remark of the gentleman had struck him, and he wanted to reply to it. In the first place, he did not believe that any executive officer of the government had the right to involve the government in indebtedness of any sort beyond what congress in its wisdom provided for. This system of deficiencies had grown up during the war, and until both political parties combined to break it up at every session this abuse would continue. It was a violation of the statutes for an executive officer to involve the government in expenditures not authorized by congress. He did not think that economy ought to be a matter of politics at all, and he believed that the one thing above all others that had brought a democratic majority into the next congress was the wasteful, wicked, unjustifiable expenditures of the public money by the republican party.

Mr. Robeson thought that the debate had simmered down from direct proportions to Pickwickian explanations. All that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hiscock) had meant to say was that the las democratic appropriation committee either had not given sufficient time and attention to investigating the necessities of the government or had been willing to postpone those necessities for the purpose of acquiring a seeming political advantage. There was a difference between parsimony and economy. Parsimony sought only for reduction without knowing the lasting result; economy was a broad system of political expenditure, where the relations of everything were understood and where small appropriations adapted themselves to the conditions of political affairs. The democratic party had pursued a system of paring parsimony, but had not risen to the dignity of political economy.

Mr Calkins said that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Randall) had not been particular to specify any appropriation which was reckless and wicked. A democratic congress had appointed the Mississippi river commission, and it had reported that a certain amount of money should be expended for the improvement of that river, and believing that that improvement should be made a republican congress had bravely voted for a large appropriation. On every stump in the north the democratic speakers had assailed the republican party for that vote.

Several democrats. No; we did not.

Mr. Calkins, continuing, asserted that the northern democrats did one thing in congress and said another on the stump. The assertion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there had been reckless appropriations would not help him in the high aspirations which he had. The presidential chair was within his view and he held up his longing hands in that direction, but he had sung that song for six years in a democratic majority, and that majority had been swept away.

Mr. Springer. It will come back.

Mr. Calkins. Yes; on account of our dissensions; but don't think, my friend, that two years hence we will go in divided. [Applause on republican side.] The republican party will never be broken until it has vanquished the old bourbon democracy, which it will do.

Mr. Randall controverted the assertion that the democratic party had not given that consideration to the interests of the Mississippi river which they deserved. He had had the opportunity, as presiding officer of the house, to assist in the creation of the Mississippi river commission, because he wished that that river should be improved, so as to increase its commerce and the safety of the people living along its banks. He had always been ready to vote appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. Humphrey. Did you vote for them?

Mr. Randall. I did not; because you crowded them over with many items which I could not approve of.

Mr. Humphrey. Every dollar was needed for commerce.

Mr. Randall. That is a matter of opinion about which I might wait until your President specified his objections before mentioning mine. Never has there been a time when the democratic party has not been ready to give constitutional appropriations for rivers and harbors.

Mr. Humphrey. The President had become actuated by the same feeling that pervaded the east. It had got what it wanted for rivers and harbor and was unwilling to do justice to the west and south.

Mr. Randall. Let the gentleman settle that question with his President.

Mr. Cox said that he recognized the economy of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Robeson), the accepted leader of the other side, who was never so much of a leader as in defeat, for he stood defeat and the rest did not. He (Mr. Robeson) had the courage of his convictions (for he has convictions), while the rest had not. The gentleman had given the house Mr. Burke's definition of economy, but he did not draw his lessons of economy from Mr. Burke. The republicans got their lessons of economy from the man who killed the president while he babbled as men babbled to-day of a future glory in store for them, "Glory! glory, I am going to the Lordy, and I'm so glad." [Hisses on the republican side.]

Mr. Humphrey. Let him sing the democratic song.

Mr. Cox. The democratic song is "Hail Columbia." This is the song sung by the man who was justly hanged, and who in his babbling gave the same sort of voice you have given here to-day to your claim to have been murdered in your politics, because you are so pious and good.

Mr. Cox then went on to say that the democratic party was in favor of the improvement of the Mississippi river.

Mr. Reed said that there might be some gentleman in the house to whom the present scene was not familiar, but if so it was because they had been elected since last session. He supposed that this hash and rehash had been going on since the beginning of time. In his personal experience the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania had been warmed over six times. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was not reaching for the presidency; he was reaching for a place to reach for it from, and he had been enabled to put himself right with gentlemen from the Mississippi valley, if they chose to believe him. Then the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cox) had pranced forward. The farce always had to come after the tragedy. It was a comfort to have the gentleman come forward, because it was known that another candidate for speaker had entered the ring. [Laughter.] And now the house and country waited to hear another candidate for speaker present his views of life and duty to the Mississippi river; and, upon his soul, he hoped that the next might be providentially able to seek some other literature than that of the deceased scoundrel, whose words filled so comfortably the mouth of the gentleman from New York.

The consideration of the bill was practically concluded (with the exception of the compensation allowed to Pacific railways for transportation) and the committee rose.

Mr. Ketcham, from the committee on appropriations, reported

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL,

and it was referred to the committee of the whole. It appropriates about $3,350,000—a decrease of $30,000 from the appropriation of the current year.

The house then (at 4:50 p. m.) adjourned.

AID TO COMMON SCHOOLS.

What Congress May Do, and What Is Needful To Be Done.

Rev. C. C. Painter.

There are in the United States 6,239,958 persons, ten years of age and over, who cannot write their names. More than three-fourths of these are found in the old slave states. More than one-half of the whole number are colored. If the general government should provide means to sustain a school for this class alone, for three months in the year, at a salary for the teachers of $30 per month for a school of thirty pupils, it would require the sum of $18,719,958. Of this $14,439,579 would go into the old slave states; $9,187,922 because of colored illiterates, leaving $4,961,657 for the whites, and $4,579,439 would go to the other states for both black and white illiterates.

In 1879 North Carolina raised for common schools a sum which would give $20 per annum to each school of thirty illiterates (not school children).) How long it would take that state to make intelligent and safe voters of her citizens at that rate is a matter for sober reflection, not alone to the politician, who remembers what the electoral vote of that state is for president, but to every citizen.

If the government should enable North Carolina to keep up her schools for four months at fair wages, instead of one month, as at present, at such a salary as can secure only an inferior teacher, it would be something, but not all that is needed. If such a sum should be given, Mississippi would receive as her share of it $1,119,603; New Jersey, with nearly the same population, would receive $159,747. But $959,529 of Mississippi's share would be because of colored illiteracy, leaving nearly the same amount for white illiterates which New Jersey would receive, which shows conclusively that it is because of the negro chiefly this help is needed, and for him, as a voter, the nation at large is responsible. In considering the disparity between the sum that would go to the south and the new states of the northwest respectively, not only must we remember the negro as a factor in the problem, but also these facts: By the ordinance of 1787, by which Virginia ceded the great northwest territory to the general government on such terms—Mr. Webster said, in his great speech on the Foote resolution—as "fixed forever the character of the population of the vast regions northwest of the Ohio by excluding from them involuntary servitude, and impressed on the soil itself, while it was yet a wilderness, an incapacity to sustain any other than freemen." And six days after, in his reply to Hayne, he said, also, that "it set forth and declared it to be a high and binding duty of the government itself to support schools and advance the means of education on the plain reason that religion, morality, and knowledge are necessary to good government." By this ordinance of cession, Virginia stipulated that the proceeds from this vast territory should be considered as a common fund for the use and benefit of such as have become or may become members of the confederation or federal alliance of states. The other states claiming unsettled lands within their territory also ceded their titles to the general government, which became possessed of the whole. From time to time Congress has made most liberal grants of this land to the new states for school purposes, so that Minnesota, for example, has realized from her share, or has the land from which at the same rate of sale she can realize a fund of $20,000,000 for educational purposes, while the old states have not had a dollar excepting the share in the grant for the endowment of agricultural colleges by act of 1862, in which the new states as well as the old shared ratably. It may be truly said, then, that every instinct of self preservation demands that the unquestionable right of the general government shall be exercised in using the means at its disposal to meet the great danger which threatens us from the presence and power of ignorant voters; and that every sentiment of justice to the negro himself as the subject of many wrongs and the possible avenger of them, and to the states themselves, requires that governmental aid shall be given to the common schools of the country.

The Tariff Bill Completed.

The senate finance committee at its meeting yesterday virtually completed a tariff bill, which will be reported to the senate to-day. The tariff agreed upon on some of the most important articles is as follows: Thrown silk, $1 per pound; silk thread, $1.50 per pound; chromate and bichromate of potash, 3 cents per pound; white lead, 2½ and 3 cents per pound; China, porcelain, Parian, and bisque ware, 60 per cent.; polished plate glass, from 15 to 20 per cent. below the scale recommended by the commission; steel ingots, 6 cents per pound; iron ore, 50 cents per ton; iron or steel T rails and iron and steel flat rails, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound, instead of twelve-tenths, as proposed by the commission; steel and wire rods, 1 cent per pound; steel and iron wire, 2½ and 4 cents; jute butts, $8 per ton; rice, 20 per cent. ad valorem; rye and barley, 10 cents; tobacco valued at 40 cents per pound and upward, 75 cents per pound; books, periodicals, &c., 20 per cent. ad valorem. In wool and woolens the distinction between washed and unwashed wool is removed, and the duty is fixed at the same rate as that imposed upon washed wool by the present law. In sugar the polariscope test is retained, and the duty is fixed on all sugars from 75 (polariscope test), saccharine strength, to No. 16, Dutch standard, at 1¼ cents per pound, instead of 1½; from No. 16 to No. 20, Dutch standard, 3 cents, instead of 3¼; all sugars above 20, Dutch standard, 3½ cents, instead of 4½; molasses, 5 cents per gallon.

Weapons for the Navy.

The house committee on naval affairs failed to get a quorum yesterday morning, but members present informally discussed the merits of various guns, torpedoes, and other machinery of naval warfare without giving hearings or taking any action. A resolution was discussed advising the naval board of inquiry to examine and report upon the best located and best adapted navy yard for the establishment of a government foundry, and also to inquire with a view to the purchase of a 100-ton steam hammer. The Capt. Hopkins dismissal case was referred to a subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Harmer, Dezendorf, and Talbott. To-day the naval appropriation bill will be considered.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Those of a Religious Character Considered by Rev. Joseph Cook.

The Congregational church last evening held the largest audience which has yet come out in the lyceum course, the seating capacity of the large auditorium being fully tested, and the eminent lecturer, Rev. Joseph Cook, of Boston, had reason for pleasure at the cordiality with which he was received and at the close attention given to all of his utterances.

Rev. Dr. Sunderland introduced Mr. Cook, a task he performed with more than ordinary pleasure, as one who had exceeded even the apostle Paul in his missionary travels and labors.

In beginning the lecturer, in reply to Dr. Sunderland, disclaimed the credit of exceeding the labors of the great apostle to the Gentiles. In his time travel was so arduous that the swiftest Roman chariot could not have gone from limit to limit of the empire in an hundred days. Now a letter will make the circuit of the earth in ninety days. He had made the circuit of the earth, and at his return he wanted to preface his lecture with a few words of congratulation. God he thanked that to-day there are no hermit nations; that there are no secluded peoples; that there are no more foreign nations; that one of the chief religious signs of the times is in the fact that no people can live behind a screen, and among the nations now (by Christian influences which have pervaded the world) brought into fraternal relations, Christianity is everywhere winning its way to a deeper and more reverent attention. And as Christianity in its infancy was able to overturn the idolatry of the Roman empire, now in its colossus growth, we may expect it to overturn and displace the paganism of Asia, and eventually to fill the world. There is encouragement in the fact that reliable statistics show that the increase of Christianity in the world in the present century is equal to its entire growth in the previous eighteen centuries. In 1800 there were only about 50,000,000 of copies of the bible in existence in fifty languages; now it is printed in nearly 390 languages, and there is more than one copy for every ten of the inhabitants of the planet. The growth of the Christian churches in the United States is full of encouragement. In 1800 they enrolled one in fifteen of the population; to-day they include 10,000,000 of the 50,000,000, or one in five. These 10,000,000 are the membership who have made solemn public professions of faith in Christ. In this century the cause of temperance has received a great impulse; the cause of missions has take organic form, and the contributions for the purpose of advancing Christianity by missionary effort, aggregate more than $11,000,000 yearly. In the last quarter of a century the abolition of slavery has been accomplished. To-day fourteen millions of children are taught in the Sabbath schools; Christianity is to-day more philanthropic and aggressive than ever before, and in the character of the population he felt a solid foundation for his confidence that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" is to be perpetual. There is an idea that part of this spiritual life is superficial—hypocritical. Admitting that one in twelve, as in the first group of disciples, may be a Judas, the other eleven-twelfths now, as at the beginning, may be depended on to carry forward the cause until all shall know the Lord.

In the magnificent colonies of Australasia the cause of independence of the church from patronage and control by the state is making progress. Japan feels the need of a theocracy pervading the masses of the people, and ennobling them so as to make democracy safe in its self-mastery. In that country, through an interpreter, he had before large audiences assailed buddhism and advocated Christianity, and was listened to with profound attention. In India, which has more than twice the population of the Roman expire in its prime, the educated classes are abandoning brahminism, and the way is opening there for a rapid advance of Christianity.

The same proofs needed in Boston and in London were welcomed there—proofs of God, of his personality; proofs that the first cause was not himself caused; proofs that God was good, though in his wisdom he had permitted evil to test character; proofs that Christ had supernatural attestation of his mission; that the character of Christ forbade his possible classification as a mere reformer. His advocacy of Christianity in Calcutta was as eagerly welcomed as in Yokohamo. While infidelity has to-day the world for its field, so has Christianity; as bad books encircle the world, so do the good, and the chief usefulness of his journey had been in harrowing in the spiritual seed sown by good books that had preceded him. A book which deepens the soul's sense of its dependence on the infinite will have an audience surpassing that of the most important decree of a Cæsar.

The question now to consider, the speaker said, is Christianity holding its own with the scholarship of the west. The chief materialistic writer, Herbert Spencer, has for his distinguishing characteristic, faintness, evasiveness, slatternliness in definition, and is not recognized in England as an authority. While skeptical scholarship says we do not know, even goes so far that we do not know an