

CONGRESSIONAL.

Monday, January 19.—Senator Harris, of Tennessee, addressed the Senate on the matter of its rules from time immemorial, so to speak, as follows:

Under the constitution the two Houses of Congress, with the approval of the President, can not abridge the right of free speech or of the press. The rule throughout all of this broad land of ours is universal as to the absolute freedom of speech and freedom of the press; and the Senate could not abridge the right of free speech upon any question but for the clause of the constitution that I have read, which gives to each House the right to make its own rules regulating its proceedings.

The Senate is a continuing body, and when a new Congress meets it has its code of rules in existence, and they are the supreme law of the Senate in the regulation of the business of the Senate, subject of course to any change that the Senate may make from time to time.

Sensors Cullom of Illinois, Butler of South Carolina, Berry of Arkansas, Turpie of Indiana, Walthall of Mississippi and Wolcott of Colorado presented numerous petitions remonstrating against the passage of the Conger lard bill and praying for the passage of the Paddock pure food bill.

The House legislation was very meagre, and Mr. McKinley of Ohio said:

There is not a gentleman on the opposition side of the House who would not declare if he were truthful, and he would be if he replied at all, that the whole purpose of their filibustering tactics has been to make it impossible, if the Senate should send us the elections bill, to give us the opportunity to pass it through the House of Representatives.

To which Mr. Flower of New York made the response:

We accept that issue and stand on it.

And then Mr. McKinley, in his usual reckless way of speaking, said:

The opposition did not secure power in the House of Representatives without the suppression of the votes of thousands and hundreds of thousands of citizens all over this country.

Senator Pasco of Florida, in a speech of considerable range, submitted a table which he presented in a speech made in the Senate on January 20, 1890, which gave the estimate of males twenty-one years of age and over in 1888, and "the silent vote" in the states in the Presidential election of 1888. From that table the following matter is presented:

Name of State.	Silent vote of 1888.
New York.....	481,411
Pennsylvania.....	381,472
Ohio.....	321,120
California.....	262,921
Massachusetts.....	241,512
Illinois.....	223,164
Georgia.....	222,371
South Carolina.....	198,539
Nebraska.....	196,708
Missouri.....	163,179
Mississippi.....	158,223
Kentucky.....	157,239
Michigan.....	151,067
Louisiana.....	138,246
Texas.....	134,607
Alabama.....	134,600
Arkansas.....	102,952
Indiana.....	92,931
Wisconsin.....	84,586
New Jersey.....	84,309
Minnesota.....	78,474
Colorado.....	76,792
Kansas.....	73,808
Virginia.....	71,807

In the above named list of twenty-four states, there were 196 electoral votes for Harrison and 118 cast for Cleveland, and there were eleven of the twenty-four states above named.

Speaking upon the United States election bill, Mr. Pasco continued:

The most serious crime against the election franchise is the improper use of money. There has been practiced a system of "paying off workmen in what are called "pay envelopes," upon which are printed persuasive arguments to vote the Republican ticket. Notices, too, have been posted in factories and workshops to the effect that work will be suspended or wages be reduced if the republican party is defeated.

While the pending bill is full of fines and penalties against the force and fraud which are charged to be universal at the south, there are no penalties against practices such as I have described and referred to.

In behalf of the Australian method of conducting elections, the Senator remarked:

Much has been accomplished by the states through the system of separating the voter from all outside influences when he casts

his vote, and making the ballot absolutely secret. If generally adopted, the briber, the intimidator, the ticket changer will be powerless. It is probable that the astonishing result of the recent election in many of the eastern states is due more to the operation of these laws than is generally supposed.

THE PENNSYLVANIA METHOD.

Mr. T. V. Powderly, the master workman of the Knights of Labor, is thus quoted by Senator Pasco:

There can be no worse intimidation practiced anywhere in the country than is practiced in Pennsylvania, the cradle of protection, and the headquarters of the great party of so-called morality.

I have seen the mine bosses stand around the polls with oigar boxes on their arms, in which were tickets, and as an employe came along the cover was raised and a ticket handed him. The poor workman was not told in so many words to vote the ticket, and if he failed to do so he would lose his job in about a week's time, without being told why he was discharged.

Mr. Pasco concluded his effort as follows:

The memories of the war are not longer to be employed as a political force. Reason and argument and truth shall take their place, and prejudice must be banished. The closing hours of this Congress should not be employed by a majority which has lost its support in an effort to defeat the popular will and turn back the sea of good feeling and returning justice.

In a speech of Senator Daniel of Virginia on the national elections bill, he said:

Free speech and free elections are the very soul of Republican institutions. You can not have a people's government if you separate the government from the people so that they can not lay their hands on it. Under this bill there is no people's government in plan or specification, but an arrangement which has been perfected with the most ingenuity so to segregate and mass the powers of government away from the people that they can never get their hands on them. The government, if this bill should become a law, stands behind a massive fortress and looks over at the people. They may surround it, but they can never enter it. And upon the eve of election does not every one know that all of these official agencies will be concentrated by the political power that manipulates them upon the weak points of its opposition?

Tuesday, January 20.—Mr. Anderson of Kansas, introduced a series of resolutions relating to the interstate commerce commission, making many inquiries and statements among which are the following:

This said commission is "hereby requested to furnish to the House of Representatives information whether the commission has reason to believe whether from public opinion or otherwise, that several railroad companies operating lines west of Chicago, or of the Mississippi river are seeking to enter into any form of combination as will enable said combination or its agents to control in whole or in part, the charges made to the public by any said companies for the transportation of interstate passengers or freight. Whether it has reason to believe that an article published in the New York Herald January 8, 1891, is substantially correct, and that the "new agreement" set forth in said article, or any agreement of similar tenor as to the more important points, is sought to be made or has been made by the presidents or other authorized officers of either of the following or other railroad companies, namely, the Missouri Pacific, Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe, Southern Pacific, Northern Pacific, Chicago & Northwestern, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, Denver & Rio Grande, Rio Grande Western, Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, Wabash, Iowa Central, Illinois Central, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Missouri, Kansas & Texas. Whether any combination of any of said companies has been formed or has been attempted to be formed, known as the Western Traffic association, or otherwise possessing power to affect the charges made to the public upon the traffic having origin or destination in Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, and the Peninsula of Michigan or any other state or territory west of the Mississippi river except business passing between points north and south of the Ohio river, both of which are east of the Mississippi.

Also the business to and from the Republic of Mexico via Rio Grande river crossings. Whether the territory served by the lines, parties to this agreement shall be divided into four or more sections or divisions, observing as nearly as practicable, the natural divisions of the territory as represented by existing associations, and each division may be put under the immediate supervision and direction of one of the commissioners chosen.

The representatives of this pool or syndicate formed to control the business of all the railroads west of Chicago, have

for the plant \$3,000,000,000 invested capital in these roads above designated, and the advisory board, composed of the president and one director of each road, assembled at New York on January 8, 1891, the general declaration of principles having been signed at a conference held at the residence of President Morgan, on December 15, 1890. These fifteen railway systems in the association have pretty nearly secured the adoption of their specific treaty as a whole, whose principal office will probably be at Chicago, possibly at New York.

Jay Gould had a good deal to say in favor of this pet scheme for abolishing the agencies of the company and for pooling freight between competing points. The names of several of these railway magistrates are here presented, omitting at this time the roads that they represent, or with which they are connected: Jay Gould, Allen Manvel, George P. Magoun, C. P. Huntington, J. C. Stubbs, Thomas F. Oakes, David S. Wagg, Sidney Dillon, Marvin Hughitt, Albert Keep, R. R. Cable, B. Brewster, David H. Moffat, George Coppel, William J. Palmer, David Dodge, Boswell Miller, Samuel Spencer, O. D. Ashley, Charles M. Hays, Russel Sage, C. H. Ackert, S. V. R. Cruger, Charles E. Perkins, Charles Payne, H. K. Enos, John J. McCook and J. Kennedy Tod.

The standing committees of each the House and Senate submitted reports on many bills.

The Senate devoted considerable time to the resolution before it relating to limitation of debate.

Wednesday, January 21.—The attempt to have "order reign in Warsaw," has not been very successful in the House since the late holidays, and Mr. Blount, of Georgia, commenting thereon, made the following remarks:

Mr. Speaker, for the first time during this session of Congress we have come back to the method of doing away with the rules of this house and adopting a special order for considering measures. I had hoped that had ended. By reason of the lessons of the last campaign I had hoped that it had ended in the special order, passed in a manner contrary to the rules on the tariff legislation, the silver legislation and the election laws. These were passed over our protest, and we were met with the declaration from the other side that "the country wanted business and not talk," to which there came an acclamation of vehement approval of the distinguished gentleman announced that as the maxim of the other side of the House such as the most ambitious person could have desired.

But, Mr. Chairman, there came later on, at the elections in November, another voice louder than the gentleman's on the other side of the hall, louder than was ever heard on any issue in the country heretofore, on all of those questions, adverse to the distributive we have listened to heretofore from our friends on the other side, and I had hoped that there would be some recognition of the declaration at the polls in matters of this sort.

We are told that notwithstanding this the majority have still a few days of power, and they are going to continue in their course for what little life they have left. And so we are here again with an order changing the rules of the House in reference to appropriation bills and the manner of consideration, a change as serious as any we have made in the past.

Now, sir, you are proposing that the committee of the whole may consider the District of Columbia appropriation by paragraph without reading them. Here is a bill involving millions of dollars, with legislation in it, and yet it is proposed that at a given time to-day this House shall say to the committee of the whole: "You have trifled with this business long enough; we mean to take it up and consider it, right or wrong."

Mr. McMillin, of Tennessee, remarked:

It is extraordinary for the committee on rules to undertake to cap all their unheard-of proceedings by proposing to enact a rule that a bill making appropriations to the amount of \$5,000,000 shall not be read either in the House or in the committee of the whole. That is exactly what this resolution proposes. I believe we have never gone that far before, but here we propose to provide that there shall be no reading of this bill; that this money, one-half of which is to be paid by this district and one-half by the people of the United States, shall be expended without an opportunity to discuss

the measure or even hear it read. We have appealed to the country once within the last six months, and there are a great many members on this side and a great many on the other who remember well the result of that appeal. This method in part was adopted by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McKinley) when in charge of the bill revising the tariff.

We said then, when you throttled us and put that measure through without due discussion or deliberation, that we appealed from you to the people whose power it was to make and unmake Congress and the people unmade one immediately.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean? We have ample time to consider the appropriation bills deliberately, but they are to go down the line in order that the deck may be cleared and a bill put through the other end of the capitol and through this House, providing for force at the polls, so that the people can protest again. That is the issue involved.

Mr. McComas, of Maryland, said:

To-day the right of the majority to rule in either end of this capitol, according to the constitution, is denied.

Let us hold up the hands of that gallant soldier and pure President, whose brave message called back the country to a juster judgment of the achievements of this administration and Congress. We can and will stand here with a quorum of Republicans to do right, to pass the election bill, should it come back. We will go on with the people's business, do it well, wisely and bravely, and challenge the high confidence the judgment of the people in 1892.

The Senate brought but very little to pass in its talk on "the closure rule."

AS TO VOTING.

The following from the *National Alliance*, the organ of the Colored Alliance, published at Dallas, Texas, will bear perusal by the people of Kansas. The Colored Alliance numbers "about one million members in the southern states, and they are ready at the drop of the hat to unite with a new party that shall represent the interests of the great industrial organizations, north and south:

"Perhaps nothing could be viler than the effort of some white people, and some colored people, too, to make the people believe that the Colored Alliance is a Democratic organization, or in any way connected with the Democratic party.

"Now the Alliance leaves every man free to do as he pleases. If he wants to, he may vote the Democratic ticket; if he wants to, he may vote a Republican ticket, or, if he prefers, he need not vote at all.

"Members of the Alliance, if they know anything, ought to know that before they took the obligation they were distinctly told that the Alliance would in no way interfere with their religious or political opinions.

"The Alliance is a non-partisan organization. If however the existing political parties will not furnish the relief we need, if they will make no effort to save us and our families from the clutches of mortgage and starvation, we may be compelled to organize a new political party that will take hold of the affairs of this government and do justice to the people.

"We must not forget that the Republican party has given away our lands to the railroads. They have given the railroads land enough to make eleven states as large as South Carolina, and leave a block as big as Georgia. They have given the railroads land enough to have furnished a home for every homeless family in the country. But why should the people be impoverished in this way and their property given to a few rich railroad men?

"Then, too, we have tried the Democratic party, and they did no better, perhaps even a little worse. It need, therefore, surprise no one if the Alliance people should drop both the Republican and Democratic parties and enter into an organization without party, and for the benefit of the whole people.

"After all why should we keep up the party business? Is anybody benefited by political parties outside of those few who can hold office?