The Chicago Daily Tribune.

VOLUME XXXIX. TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1879—TWELVE PAGES. PRICE FIVE CENTS.

UMBRELLAS AND PARASOLS.

Umbrellas AND Parasols.

Field, Leiter & Co.

State and Washington-sts.,

Open To-day,

"NOVELTIES" IN Coaching Umbrellas,

Carved Club Handles of Unique Designs.

Fancy Striped, Satin Coverings,

In New Shades,

WITH FULL STOCK OF

Sun Umbrellas AND Dress Parasols

In Latest Shapes.

UNDERWEAR AND HOSIERY.

UNDERWEAR AND HOSIERY FOR MEN,

Direct from the most celebrated manufacturers of Europe and America, in all grades, from LOW PRICED to the BEST GOODS made. Many exclusive lines, which are very desirable. Buying direct from the MANUFACTURERS the inducements we offer are manifest. Your inspection is invited.

WILSON BROS.,

67 & 69 Washington-st., Chicago.

CINCINNATI. ST. LOUIS.

WEDDING PRESENTS.

MATSON & CO. IMPORTERS & JEWELERS COR. STATE & MONROE STS. CHICAGO.

Offer an Immense stock of New Goods in

STERLING SILVER,

Made by the Gorham Man'f'g Co., and elegantly cased, for

Wedding Gifts.

Many new and exquisite designs. Buy directly from us, and obtain the lowest prices.

REMOVALS.

REMOVAL.

GROMMES & ULLRICH

Have removed to their New and Spacious Stores,

Nos. 174 & 176 East Madison-st.,

Between LaSalle-st. and Fifth-av.

TO RENT.

STORES TO RENT.

110 South Clark-st.,

118 and 118½ Washington-st.

Will be rented low to good tenants.

CHARLES GOODMAN, Room 43, 110 Washington-st.

DESIRABLE LOFTS FOR RENT.

The Third and Fourth Floors of the New and Elegant Building 161 and 163 Dearborn-st.; they are very light and airy, steam power and heat and steam elevator, and will be rented at a low price.

CLEVELAND PAPER CO., 161 and 163 Dearborn-st.

SUMMER RESORTS.

PIGEON COVE HOUSE,

Pigeon Cove, Extreme Point of Cape Ann, Mass.

Open SATURDAY, June 14, 1879.

Mrs. E. S. ROBINSON & CO.

SUITS.

MANDEL BROTHERS.

Will offer this morning,

150

Light Figured Lawn Suits, 3 pieces, nicely trimmed in Ruffles, all colors, at $2.50.

75

Polka Dot Cambric Suits, Princess Skirt and Jacket, nicely trimmed, at $3.50.

300

Damask Linen Suits, trimmed in Plaitings, Folds, and Embroidery, at $4.00.

100

Fancy Batiste Suits, elaborately trimmed in Plaitings, Pipings, and Embroidery, at $6.00.

50

Hair Stripe "Border" Lawn Suits, very tastefully trimmed in Ruffles and Lace, at $6.00, $8.00, $9.00, and $10.00.

25

Madras Promenade Suits, trimmed in Ruffles and Torchon Lace, $8.00; with Parasol to match, $10.00.

These Suits are all well made, good styles, and

REMARKABLY CHEAP.

121 & 123 State-st.

ART SALE.

EXPOSITION BUILDING.

To-Night!

Will take place at the Exposition Building the sale of a portion of the

Haseltine Collection OF PAINTINGS.

No such opportunity was ever offered in Chicago to buy the BEST ART, for such a fine collection was never offered before in this city for sale.

WATCHES.

Watches! TO-DAY! AT THE M. KRONBERG'S, Wholesale Jeweler,

BANKRUPT AUCTION SALE,

167 STATE-ST.,

Under Palmer House.

Two Fine Chronographs and a full line of American and Imported Watches will be offered. Parties desiring other lines of goods can have them "put up" by calling for them as usual.

FLERSHEIM, BARKER & CO., Auct'rs.

Mr. JNO. H. FRENCH conducts this sale.

OPTICIANS.

MANASSE SIGHT OPTICIAN. IS PRICELESS TRIBUNE BUILDING

Fine Spectacles suited to all sights on scientific principles. Opera and Field Glasses, Telescopes, Microscopes, Barometers, &c.

WIRE SCREENS.

KEEP OUT THE FLIES.

WIRE SCREENS.

KELLEY'S PAT. CORNER are the best in the market. Send in your orders early and avoid the rush.

KELLEY, Tribune Building.

FINANCIAL.

MONEY to LOAN

On Fine Watches and Diamonds

At one-half brokers' rates. City Scrip bought.

D. LAUNDER, Private Banker,

Rooms 5 and 6, 120 Randolph-st. Established 1864.

Real Estate Loans

On Chicago Improved Property made at lowest current rates by

BAUM & BRADLEY,

Room 17, 90 LaSalle-st.

WASHINGTON.

The Democratic Obstructionists Confronted with Another Veto.

Their Army Bulldozing Scheme a Second Time Comes to Naught.

Some of the More Sensible of Them Beginning to Tire of the Fight.

Signs of Disintegration Are Visible in Various Quarters.

Senator Windom Arraigns the Bourbons with Becoming Severity.

Exposing the Many Weak Points in Their Revolutionary Programme.

The Annual Democratic Tax Bill Meets with Its Annual Defeat.

Saving Effected Under Secretary Sherman's Funding Operations.

VETO NO. 2.

ANOTHER SPECIMEN OF PRESIDENTIAL BACKBONE.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—The veto message was read in the House about 3 o'clock. Its reading was accompanied by expressions of great dissatisfaction on the Democratic side, and was interrupted by frequent applause on the Republican side. It has unquestionably made the Republicans a unit. The Democrats postponed voting upon it until to-morrow. Meanwhile Fernando Wood had introduced a resolution that both Houses of Congress adjourn finally on a day to be fixed in May. The resolution was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. It is understood that the Committee of Safety had agreed upon the 29th of May as the date to be inserted in the blank.

After this had been done the regular business of suspension of the rules as of Monday proceeded. Mr. Deering, of Iowa, was recognized. He very shrewdly sent up to be voted on the Army Appropriation bill without the political sections, and demanded a vote. There was instantly

CONSTERNATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC RANKS,

and an attempt was made to prevent a final vote by a filibustering motion, Proctor Knott moving to adjourn. This motion was defeated by a vote of 97 yeas to 114 nays. On this vote the following Democrats voted with the Republicans against adjournment: Blackburn, Bliss, Blount, Clymer, Coffrath, Culberson, Felton, Geddes, Martin of West Virginia, Persons, Poehler, Robertson, and Wellborn. A vote was then taken on the Army bill itself, resulting in 101 yeas to 109 nays, while two-thirds were necessary to pass it. The party lines were strictly drawn, the Democrats all voting no. Of the Greenbackers, Lowe of Alabama and Stephenson of Illinois voted with the Republicans to pass the bill. The defeat of the bill was received by the Democrats with great applause.

THE VETO MESSAGE.

ANOTHER FILE FOR THE DEMOCRATS TO BITE AT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—The following is the message of the President of the United States, returning to the House of Representatives the bill entitled "An act to prohibit military interference at elections":

To the House of Representatives: After a careful consideration of the bill entitled "An act to prohibit military interference at elections," I return it to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with the following objection to its approval:

In a communication sent to the House of Representatives on the 29th of last month, returning to the House without my approval the bill entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes," I endeavored to show, by quotations from the statutes of the United States now in force, and by a brief statement of facts in regard to the recent elections in several States, that

NO ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION WAS NECESSARY

to prevent interference with elections by the military or naval forces of the United States.

The fact was presented in that communication that at the time of the passage of the act of June 18, 1878, in relation to the employment of the army as posse comitatus, or otherwise, it was maintained by its friends that it would establish a vital and fundamental principle which would secure to the people protection against a standing army.

The fact was also referred to that, since the passage of this act, Congressional, State, and municipal elections had been held throughout the Union, and that in no instance has complaint been made of the presence of United States soldiers at the polls.

Holding, as I do, the opinion that any military interference whatever at the polls is contrary to the spirit of our institutions, and would tend to destroy the freedom of elections, and sincerely desiring to concur with Congress in all of its measures, it is with very great regret that I am forced to the conclusion that the bill before me is not only unnecessary to prevent such interference, but is

A DANGEROUS DEPARTURE

from long-settled and important constitutional principles.

The true rule as to the employment of military forces at elections is not doubtful. No intimidation or coercion should be allowed to control or influence citizens in the exercise of their right to vote, whether it appears in the shape of combinations of evil-disposed persons, or of armed bodies of militia of a State, or of the military force of the United States.

The elections should be free from all forcible interference, and, as far as practicable, from all apprehension of such interference. No soldiers, either of the Union or of the State militia, should be present at the polls to take the place or to perform the duties of

AN ORDINARY CIVIL POLICE FORCE.

There has been and will be no violation of this rule under the orders from me during this Administration. But there should be no denial of the right of the National Government to employ its military force on any day at any place in case such employment is necessary to enforce the Constitution and laws of the United States.

THE BILL

before me is as follows:

Be it Enacted, etc., That it shall not be lawful to bring to or employ at any place where a general or special election is being held in a State, any part of the army or navy of the United States, unless such force be necessary to repel armed enemies of the United States, or to enforce Sec. 4 of Art. 4 of the Constitution of the United States, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, on the application of the Legislature or the Executive of the State where such force is to be used; and so much of all laws as is inconsistent herewith is hereby repealed.

OBJECTIONS.

It will be observed that the bill exempts from the general prohibition against the employment of a military force at the polls two specified cases. These exceptions recognize and concede the soundness of the principle that military forces may properly and constitutionally be used at places of election when such use is necessary to enforce the Constitution and laws. But the excepted cases leave a prohibition so extensive and far-reaching that its adoption will seriously impair the efficiency of the Executive Department of the Government.

The first act expressly authorizing the use of military power to execute the laws was passed almost as early as the organization of the Government under the Constitution, and was approved by President Washington, May 2, 1792. It is as follows:

SECTION 2. And be it further enacted that, whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed, or the execution thereof obstructed, in any State, by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the Marshals by this act, the same being certified to the President of the United States by an Associate Justice or District Judge, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to call for the militia of such States to suppress such combinations and to cause the laws to be duly executed; and if the militia of a State where such combinations may happen shall refuse, or be insufficient to suppress the same, it shall be lawful for the President, if the Legislature of the United States be not in session, to call forth and employ such numbers of the militia of any other State or States most convenient thereto as may be necessary; and the use of the militia so to be called forth may be continued, if necessary, until the expiration of thirty days after the commencement of the ensuing session.

MORE PRECEDENTS.

In 1795 this provision was substantially re-enacted in a law which repealed the act of 1792.

In 1807 the following act became the law, by the approval of President Jefferson:

That in all cases of insurrection or obstruction to the laws, either of the United States or of any individual State or Territory where it is lawful for the President of the United States to call forth the militia for the purpose of suppressing such insurrection, or of causing the laws to be duly executed, it shall be lawful for him to employ for the same purpose such part of the land or naval force of the United States as shall be judged necessary, having first observed all the prerequisites of the law in that respect.

By this act it will be seen that the scope of the law of 1795 was extended so as to authorize the National Government to use, not only the militia, but the army and navy of the United States, in causing the laws to be duly executed.

THE IMPORTANT PROVISION

of the acts of 1792, 1795, and 1807, modified in its terms from time to time, to adapt it to the existing emergency, remained in force until by an act approved by President Lincoln July 29, 1861, it was re-enacted substantially in the same language in which it is now found in the Revised Statutes, viz.:

SEC. 5,298. Whenever, by reason of unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages of persons, or rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States, it shall become impracticable, in the judgment of the President, to enforce, by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the laws of the United States within any State or Territory, it shall be lawful for the President to call forth the militia of any or all the States, and to employ such parts of the land and naval forces of the United States as he may deem necessary to enforce the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, or to suppress such rebellion, in whatever State or Territory thereof the laws of the United States may be forcibly opposed, or the execution thereof forcibly obstructed.

THIS ANCIENT AND FUNDAMENTAL LAW

has been in force from the foundation of the Government. It is now proposed to abrogate it on certain days, and at certain places. In my judgment, no fact has been produced which tends to show that it ought to be repealed or suspended for a single hour at any place in any of the States or Territories of the Union.

All the teachings of experience in the course of our history are in favor of sustaining its efficiency unimpaired on every occasion when the supremacy of the Constitution has been resisted, and the perpetuity of our institutions imperilled. The principle of this statute enacted by the fathers has enabled the Government of the Union to maintain its authority and to preserve the integrity of the nation at the most critical periods in our history. My predecessors in the Executive office have

RELIED ON THIS GREAT PRINCIPLE.

It was on this principle that President Washington suppressed the whisky rebellion in Pennsylvania in 1794. In 1800, on the same principle, President Jefferson broke up the Burr conspiracy by issuing orders for the employment of such force, either of the regulars or of the militia, and by such proceedings of the civil authorities as might enable them to suppress effectually the further progress of the enterprise. It was under the same authority that President Jackson crushed nullification in South Carolina, and that President Lincoln issued his call for troops to save the Union in 1861. On numerous other occasions of less significance, under probably every Administration, and certainly under the present, this power has been usefully exerted to enforce the laws without objection by any party in the country, and almost without attracting public attention.

THE GREAT ELEMENTARY CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLE

which was the foundation of the original statute of 1792, and which has been its essence in the various forms it has assumed since its first adoption, is that the Government of the United States possesses, under the Constitution, in full measure, the power of self-protection by its own agencies altogether, independent of State authority, and, if need be, against the hostility of the State Governments. It should remain embodied in our statutes unimpaired as it has been from the origin of the Government. It should be regarded as hardly less valuable or less sacred than a provision of the Constitution itself.

There are many other important statutes containing provisions that are liable to be suspended or annulled at the times and places of holding elections if the one before me should become a law. I do not undertake to furnish a list of them. Many of them, perhaps most of them, have been set forth in debates on this measure. They relate to extradition, to crimes against the Election laws, to quarantine regulations, to neutrality, to Indian reservations, to civil rights of citizens, and to other subjects. In regard to them all it may be safely said that the meaning and effect of this bill is to take from the General Government an important part of its power to enforce the laws.

ANOTHER GRAVE OBJECTION TO THE BILL

is its discrimination in favor of the State and against the National authorities. The presence or employment of the army or navy of the United States is lawful under the terms of this bill at the place where an election was being held in a State to uphold the authority of a State Government. Under this bill the presence and employment of the army or navy of the United States would be lawful, and might be necessary to maintain the conduct of a State election against the domestic violence that would overthrow it, but would be unlawful to maintain the conduct of a National election against military power resorted to for the execution of the constitutional powers in support of the State or National authority. Both functions of the Government were put upon the same footing. By the act of 1807 the employment of the army and navy was authorized for the performance of both constitutional duties

IN THE SAME TERMS.

In all the later statutes on the same subject matter, the same measure of authority to the Government has been accorded for the performance of both these duties. No precedent has been found in any previous legislation, and no sufficient reason has been given for the discrimination in favor of the State and against the National authority which this bill contains. Under the sweeping terms of the bill, the National Government is effectually shut out from the exercise of the right and from a discharge of an imperative duty to use its whole executive power whenever and wherever required for the enforcement of its laws.

In places and times when and where its elections are held the employment of its organized armed force for any such purpose would be an offense against the law unless called for by and therefore upon permission of the authorities of the State in which the occasion arises. What is this but the substitution of the

DISCRETION OF THE STATE GOVERNMENTS

for the discretion of the Government of the United States as to the performance of its own duties?

In my judgment, this is an abandonment of its obligations by the National Government,—a subordination of National authority and an intrusion of State supervision over National duties which amounts, in spirit and tendency, to State supremacy. Although I believe that the existing statutes are abundantly adequate to completely prevent military interference with the elections, in the sense in which the phrase is used in the title of this bill and is employed by the people of this country, I shall find no difficulty in concurring in any additional legislation limited to that object which does not interfere with the indispensable exercise of the powers of the Government and the Constitution and laws.

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 12, 1879.

HOW IT IS RECEIVED.

REPUBLICANS ENTHUSIASTIC.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—The Republicans are, if possible, more enthusiastic over the last veto than the first one, and the Democrats, on the other hand, are much more demoralized than they were before. The Republicans say that the clear restatement of the President's position in regard to using troops at the polls, that present laws do not authorize it, and, further, that they will not be used in any event for the purposes of interference by this Administration, leave the Democrats little ground to rest their demands for the present measure of legislation upon. That part of the message setting forth that the proposed bill repealed the laws under which the Burr conspiracy and South Carolina nullification were crushed, and the law under which Lincoln first moved to suppress the Rebellion, in 1861, is regarded as

PARTICULARLY STRONG,

and as sure to command popular support. The pronounced position in regard to maintaining all the powers of the General Government, and allowing none of them to be abridged by the advocates of State Sovereignty, is applauded by all Republicans as very timely at this stage of the present contest.

The message has proved a surprise to most Democrats, and was unexpected by a good many Republicans. The Republican party was never more solid in Washington at any time during the War than it is to-night. Those who have supposed the President would sign the pending bill were prepared for renewing some of the old opposition of the early days of the Administration. But the strength and clearness and uncompromising tone of the veto has

ELICITED UNIVERSAL PRAISE

from those who stood ready to criticise. "It is the best thing Hayes has done," is the very common exclamation among Republicans to-night.

For the rest of the contest, all feel confident of what the President's course will be, and so there is an absolute solidity of the Republicans in Congress, and perfect accord between them and the Executive in regard to all pending political legislation. This accord also extends to the Cabinet, since it is understood that the veto had the cordial approval of every member. The Legislative bill, if presented with the sections repealing the Supervisors' law,

WILL CERTAINLY BE VETOED.

If these sections are then presented in a separate form they will undoubtedly encounter a veto. The Jurors' Test-Oath section is exciting little attention from the Republicans, and whether signed or vetoed cannot raise any issue between them and the President, and the Republicans are thus thoroughly united.

The Democrats are more divided and disturbed than ever. There will be a strong and probably successful effort to secure a final unity of action before the public, but the private wrangling and caucus disputes will be of an exceedingly bitter character. It is significant that, even under the general appreciation of the awkward position in which the veto has placed them, there has been scarcely any repetition of the threats to stop supplies, even in private conversation. The extreme to which those who were at first "for waiting till the marble of the Capitol crumbled before they would yield" now talk of going is to pass the Legislative bill, but allow the Army bill to fail. As they feel to-night, they will never give another cent to the army,—at least not just at present.

THE MESSAGE IN THE HOUSE.

To the Western Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—In the House, at 2:10 p. m. a message from the President was received, supposed to be the veto message of the bill prohibiting military interference at the polls.

Mr. Warner moved to proceed with the consideration of the Silver bill. Dented without a division.

Mr. Wood (F., N. Y.) hoped the President's message would be read at once.

Mr. Dibrell moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill imposing a tax of 2 per cent on excess of incomes over $2,000, and 3 per cent on the excess of incomes over $5,000. Rejected,—yeas 104, nays 94,—not the necessary two-thirds in the affirmative.

The Speaker then, at 2:50 p. m., laid before the House the President's veto of the Military Interference bill.

THERE WAS CONSIDERABLE APPLAUSH

on the Republican side when the sentence was read which insists that the power of Federal authority to employ troops when necessary should not be interfered with, and there was an incredulous sneer on the Democratic side at the President's assurance that he desired to act in harmony with Congress. The Republican applause was repeated at the reading of the sentences relating to President Jackson crushing nullification, and to President Lincoln issuing his call for troops to save the Union in 1861; also at the allusion to the hostility of State Governments, and again at the suggestion that the bill was an intrusion of State supervision, amounting in spirit and tendency to a state of supremacy.

On the conclusion of the reading, Mr. Knott offered a resolution directing the message to be entered on the journal, and that the House will proceed to-morrow to consider the same. Agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION.

On motion of F. Wood (N. Y.), a resolution for a final adjournment of this session on the —— day of May (date not fixed) was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Deering moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill making appropriations for the support of the army.

Mr. Knott thereupon interposed a motion to adjourn, which was defeated—yeas, 97; nays, 114.

The Democrats voting against adjournment were Messrs. Blackburn, Bliss, Blount, Clymer, Coffroth, Culberson, Felton, Geddes, Martin (W. Va.), Martin (N. C.), Persons, Poehler, Robertson, and Wellborn.

The Greenbackers voting "no" were Messrs. De La Matyr, Ford, Jones, Lowe, Murch, Stevenson, and Weaver.

Mr. Ladd voted yea.

The House then proceeded to vote on a motion to suspend the rules and pass the Army Appropriation bill (being the same introduced to-day by Messrs. Young and Townsend (O.), the same as the regular House bill, with the sixth and ninth sections out.

The motion was rejected,—yeas, 101; nays, 109.

As between the Democrats and Republicans, it was a strictly party vote, the Democrats all voting no and the Republicans all voting aye.

Of the Greenbackers, De La Matyr, Ford, Gillette, Jones, Lowe, Murch, Stevenson, and Weaver voted yea, and Ladd nay.

The result of the vote was greeted with the clapping of hands on the Democratic side, and with a counter demonstration on the Republican side.

The House at 4:30 adjourned.

IT WILL NOT PAY.

THE DEMOCRATIC BULLDOZING POLICY.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—There were some indications among Democratic Senators to-day of a determination to give up the effort to force certain conditions as a penalty for appropriating the money for the expenses of the Government. Senator Bayard, in conversation to-day, expressed the opinion that the effort will not last much longer, and he did not hesitate to express his disapproval of the whole attempt to force legislation on the Appropriation bills. He has not thus far felt like taking a course in opposition to his party, but it need not surprise anybody if he takes certain action within a few days that will place him in opposition to those Democrats who would stop the appropriations unless they could affix such legislation as they desired to the Appropriation bills. He thinks there is no occasion for the bills failing in the last Congress, but he thinks the other extra session was occasioned by the lobby.

In the House to-day more than half a dozen Democrats voted against their party on a question affecting the Appropriation bills. There are some indications of a break in the party, and it is certain that there are some of the Democrats, like Senator Bayard, who think the party has already made a record before the country, and that it is not the part of wisdom to act as obstructionists any longer.

IN THE SENATE.

A STRONG SPEECH BY SENATOR WINDOM.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—Senator Windom delivered an excellent speech in the Senate to-day on the pending political issues, and exposed with a great deal of force the inconsistency of the Democratic doctrine of peace at the polls as compared with their past history. He made a strong point on Ben Hill by quoting what that gentleman said on Saturday, and compared it with other utterances of his made at the beginning and also at the close of the War. On Saturday Mr. Hill had said that he went into the Rebellion under protest, and had actually prayed for union on the night that Georgia passed the ordinance of secession. At the close of the War, in a speech delivered before the Georgia Convention, Mr. Hill had expressed the wish that all the war-legislation of the Federal Government might be gathered together and burned up in a fire caught from Heaven, and had then declared that he wanted only one office on earth, and that that was the office of kindler of the bonfire. Mr. Windom ridiculed the idea that Ben Hill and his compeers in secession were ever Union men. Mr. Windom was aggressive throughout, and his speech is regarded as a very able exposition of the attitude of the two parties on the political issues.

Mr. Windom's arraignment of the Democracy

WAS VERY SEVERE.

He charged that the extra session was unnecessary; that it was demanded by no public emergency; that the country was prosperous; and that this extra session originated only in the persistent attempt of the Democracy to coerce the President into doing that which he was confident he ought not to do.

Mr. Windom made a somewhat

STARTLING ANNOUNCEMENT

in the course of his speech, that Atkins, of Tennessee, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, stated to him that one reason why the extra session was called instead of waiting until next December was that by such delay the House would have only four months in which to starve the Government: whereas, if the extra session was called, there might be sixteen months for that purpose. This statement was made in the House Committee of Conference on the Legislative bill.

The entire purpose of the Democracy, Mr. Windom charged, was to

REHABILITATE AND REJUSTATE THE LOST CAUSE.

Mr. Coke, of Texas, followed in a printed speech, which he read from proof-slips. The argument was a good one, from the Democratic standpoint, for Mr. Coke has the reputation of being a very good lawyer in his own section of country, but his delivery is execrable.

BEN HILL'S LOYALTY.

Senator Hill, in his speech last Saturday, tried to prove that he had always been a white-souled Union man, and that Zach Chandler was guilty of the original cause of the recent difficulty between the sections. In this connection the following resolutions, which were introduced into the Confederate Senate in October, 1862, by the gentleman from Georgia, will be of some general interest:

Resolved, That every person pretending to be a soldier or officer of the United States who shall be captured on the soil of the Confederate States after the first day of January, 1863, shall be presumed to have entered the territory of the Confederate States with intent to incite insurrection and to abet murder, and, unless satisfactory proof be issued to the contrary before the Military Court before which the trial shall be had, he shall suffer death; and this section shall continue in force until the proclamation issued by Abraham Lincoln, dated Washington, Sept. 22, 1862, shall be rescinded.

Senator Hill also introduced the following:

Every white person who shall act as a commissioned or non-commissioned officer commanding negroes or mulattoes against the Confederate States, or who shall arm, organize, train, or prepare negroes or mulattoes for military service, or aid them in any military enterprise against the Confederate States, shall, if captured, suffer death.

Every commissioned or non-commissioned officer of the enemy who shall incite slaves to rebellion, or pretend to give them freedom until the aforementioned act of Congress and proclamation by abducting or causing them to be abducted or inducing them to abscond, shall, if captured, suffer death.

WINDOM'S SPEECH.

To the Western Associated Press.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—In the Senate consideration was resumed of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill.

Mr. Windom addressed the Senate to show that the policy of the Democrats is revolutionary and unconstitutional. He said that wiser men of the party were overruled by their vicious and reckless party associates. If wiser men of the party could have prevailed the party would have been saved from much trouble, but King Caucus issued his decree that there should be no stragglers from the lines.

Mr. Windom read from the remarks of Mr. Beck to show that the Democrats meant to coerce the President, and that the programme was sustained by Mr. Thurman, whom Mr. Windom designated as the Cæsar of the caucus.

Mr. Windom said that toward the close of the session he said to one of the prominent conferees of the House: "I do not understand why the House should defeat the Appropriation bills, and thus force an extra session of Congress, as no Congressional elections will be held until after the next session of Congress." The reply was: "If we pass these bills the Government would have money till July, 1880, and would then manage to get along until the elections in November; but, if we let the bills fail, the Government would have money only until the 30th of June, 1879. The Government might get along for four months, but could not for sixteen months.

Mr. Windom said the Democrats were afraid that four months would not bring the President to terms, and therefore they agreed on

SIXTEEN MONTHS OF STRIFE

for that purpose.

Mr. Morgan—If the Senator has no objection, will he give the name of the gentleman he has quoted?

Mr. Windom—I will give the name to the Senator.

Mr. Morgan—I would not ask for the name if the conversation was a private one.

Mr. Windom—The conversation took place in a committee-room, and the gentleman was the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations,—Atkins.

The Democrats did not propose anything for the relief of the country, and to promote its prosperity. No State conventions, no citizens, by petition, had asked for such legislation as they proposed. They ignored all the great issues, and inaugurated revolutionary measures to accomplish their revolutionary purposes, to denationalize this nation and convert it into a mere confederacy of States, and to recover the power which they lost by four years of war. The assertion and advocacy of State sovereignty was the boldest form in which the design was presented

FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF FAIR ELECTIONS.

Democrats in the South had by fraud and violence prevented the Republicans from expressing their will at the polls, and the Democrats in the North had prevented honest elections. The motive for dishonest elections was plainly seen in the fact that without New York and Ohio the Democrats could not grasp the Presidency.

Mr. Windom then referred to the speech of Mr. Hill, and especially ridiculed that Senator's remark that if the South had known there would have been a war they would not have seceded, and that they seceded to accommodate the Northern conscience. All would recollect the opposition of the Democrats to the War. It was unconstitutional to do anything but aid the Rebellion, and the Democratic National Convention denounced the War as a failure, and demanded a cessation of hostilities. The Democratic party was masquerading as the guardian and protector of human liberty and the rights of man. To make the play harmonious Satan should be introduced as an angel of light, Judas Iscariot as a Christian, Benedict Arnold as a patriot, and Sitting Bull as a peacemaker.

Senator Hill, praying for the Union, should not be omitted. The Democrats would make the world believe before the scenes that the Republicans were trampling upon everything precious, human, and divine, while behind the scene a race was flying from Democratic rule

AS FROM A PESTILENCE.

While the Democrats were professing to be the protectors of human rights, 10,000 persons had fled from Southern tyranny to the West, and were now making appeals for food and shelter, and thousands more were lying on the banks of the Mississippi praying to be removed from the presence of their oppressors. At the footlights the Democrats hold up the Democratic banner inscribed with the initials C. S. A. The same spirit that brought on the Rebellion was here manifested to destroy the nationality of the Government and substitute State sovereignty, but the Democrats could not deceive the people, who would, as in the past, overwhelm them in their unpatriotic designs.

He would state to Southern Senators some of the reasons why the North was anxious and indignant. The eleven States that seceded had about 10,000,000 of people, 5,500,000 of whom were white, and 4,500,000 black. By the system of terrorism which had prevailed in that section the blacks could not vote, and the whites had sent seventy-three Representatives, who, through the caucus,

CONTROL THE HOUSE.

Through the same instrumentality the Senators from those States control the Senate, hence the 5,500,000 in those eleven States control the other 38,000,000. Therefore, one man in these States has more power to-day in shaping legislation than seven men of the North.

He presented statistics of the foreign imports showing that the South imported only 4 per cent of the foreign goods, and also statistics of internal commerce showing that these States have only 23,868 freight cars, and the other States have over 360,000 cars, from which he argued that these States conduct but 8 per cent of the internal commerce. He claimed that these figures go far to corroborate the facts stated by Mr. Conkling that they pay but about 6 per cent of the taxes for the support of the Government. Hence the 5,500,000 of people who pay only about 6 per cent of the taxes, who import only 4 per cent of the foreign goods, and who conduct only 8 per cent of the internal commerce, control the legislation for 38,000,000, who pay 94 per cent of the taxes, import 96 per cent of the foreign goods, and conduct 92 per cent of the internal commerce.

MR. COKE

said the remarks of the Senator, being calculated to excite sectional bitterness, would find no reply in what he now had to submit in favor of the sections of this bill, which proposed to repeal the Election laws. He had nothing to do with the past. He dealt with the present and future. He proposed to discuss, not who was right or who was wrong in bringing on the civil War, or its conduct and results, but to discuss the question whether these Election laws were constitutional or not. If unconstitutional, no matter who was wrong in the past, it was right to repeal them now, whatever the faults of the Democrats or virtues of the Republicans in the past.

After reviewing the President's veto of the Army bill, and pronouncing its premises untenable, Mr. Coke argued that the Election laws ought to be repealed because they interfered with the freedom of elections, and rudely intruded upon the rights and duties of the States to keep the peace at the polls. This was beyond the reach of Federal legislation. He spoke of the Election laws as unconstitutional, the election machinery being wrested from there it belonged, and placed in the hands of the Deputy Marshals and Supervisors, to the oppression of the people. He continued that the States are vested with exclusive power to prescribe the qualification of voters, and this carried with it the power to protect voters in the enjoyment of the elective franchise under conditions prescribed; and in order to do this the machinery must be framed and officers appointed under the State laws. If the Federal officers whose duty it is to enforce the national laws are empowered to control the elections, the authority of the States is nullified, as it is in the Election laws now sought to be repealed, and the State power overthrown. All history shows that the liberties of the people are safe only in their own keeping.

After executive session, adjourned.

A HULL DEMOCRAT.

ONE WHO RESORTED TO NO HALF-WAY METHODS

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—Mr. Noble A. Hull, one of the Democrats from Florida who holds a seat as Congressman in the present House of Representatives, was to have been put on trial to-day in Florida for instigating and procuring the forgery of election returns. Mr. Hull has probably left Washington to attend the trial, as he was bound over in $3,000 for his appearance at the May term of court. This trial may prove a very pleasing diversion for the Democratic Congressmen. The testimony on which he was indicted for the offense by the Florida Grand Jury makes a strong prima facie case against him. It is not easy to see how Mr. Hull can have any valid defense unless the witnesses against him are guilty of perjury. The most damaging part of the evidence is a letter by Mr. Hull himself, written Nov. 8, in which he states that he must have 200 more votes, and offers to pay his correspondent for procuring them. The original of this letter has been destroyed, but there are persons who swear that they have seen it in Mr. Hull's handwriting, and who recite in detail the manner in which the frauds were perpetrated. Unless he can impeach the witnesses and prove that they are unworthy of credit, he cannot escape conviction. But if the altered and forged returns can be produced in court the character of the witnesses will be of less importance. The case is not without interest in Washington.

THE DISTILLERS' BILL.

ALLOWANCE FOR LEAKAGE.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—The Committee appointed by the Western distillers, consisting of Dr. D. G. Rush, of Chicago; Woellner, of Peoria; Buffalo Miller, of Riverton; and Fairchild, of Terre Haute, this morning had their bill introduced by Representative Morrison. The text of the bill is as follows:

AN ACT authorizing an allowance for loss by leakage or casualty of spirits withdrawn from a distiller's warehouse for exportation:

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That where spirits are withdrawn from distillery warehouses for exportation, according to law, it shall be lawful under such rules, regulations, and limitations as shall be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, for an allowance to be made for leakage or loss by an unavoidable accident, and without any fraud or negligence of the distiller, owner, exporter, carrier, or their agents or employes, occurring during the transportation from the distillery warehouse to the port of export; nor shall any assessment be collected for such loss or leakage where the same has not been made on distilled spirits exported since the first day of January, 1878.

SEC. 2. That where the spirits provided for in the preceding section are covered by a valid claim of insurance in excess of the market value thereof, exclusive of the tax, the tax upon such spirits shall not be remitted to the extent of such excessive insurance.

The Committee is favorably received by those whom they have approached on the subject. Mr. Miller says he has not found a member opposed to it, and the checks and guards provided in the bill are such that it is believed the revenue cannot be defrauded. The distillers would have secured this legislation last session had they not thought that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had the power in his discretion to make the allowance for the leakage. It is scarcely probable that any definite legislation on the subject can be secured at this session.

RIGHT OF PETITION.

HOW IT IS VIEWED BY THE DEMOCRATIC HOUSE.

Special Dispatch to The Tribune.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 12.—There was a strange scene in the House this morning. A petition presented by Mr. McCord, of Iowa, had been printed in the *Record* without objection. The petition expressed the general sentiment of