ESTABLISHED JUNE, 1850.

DESERET EVENING NEWS.

THE OLDEST NEWSPAPER IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

NO. 89. TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1892. SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH TERRITORY. VOL XXV.

CONGRESSIONAL.

Free Coinage Men of Both Parties Rightly Elated at the Result of Yesterday's Proceedings.

DEMOCRATIC GOLD MEN'S DISMAL FOREBODINGS.

Three Days Set Apart by the House for the Consideration of the Bland Bill.

By Telegraph to the News.

THE FREE COINAGE ISSUE.

It Must be Disposed of by the House Before the National Convention.

WASHINGTON, March 7.—The free coinage bill will not down. Gentlemen of both parties, who have been hoping it would be postponed until after the election, are longer in doubt that the issue must be disposed of by the House before the date of the national convention. The free coinage men are hopeful, of course, but not in a hilly parties are, of course, highly elated. The gold men in the Democratic party are filled with dismal forebodings; while anti-free coinage Republicans, who expected to secure aid of the Republican members in the House, are disposed to view the situation with consternation. The situation includes that the House will easily pass the Bland bill, as it does and overwhelming. Was the victory of the advocates of free coinage.

It was a significant feature of the proceedings, that, on all the disputes that arose on the parliamentary question, the anti-free coinage men did most of the talking. To use unfamiliar with political methods, the opponents would have been irresistible, either defending the rulings of the chair, or Speaker Crisp's rulings, or the impassioned oratory, to be doubtful predictions of those opposed to the free coinage bill, that the coinage laws were to be swept away in exhibited of popular indignation. In, when the vote came, not on the silver question alone, but on all the ancillary questions, the free coinage men came to the front in an unbroken phalanx, and by a vote of over two to do, rescued their opponents. On the last and vital proposition, that setting aside three days for consideration of the Bland bill, the free coinage men won by the overwhelming vote of 156 to 151.

In advocacy of his appeal from the decision of the Chair, Tracy said that it would be an unfortunate thing for the public, that the committee on rules, meeting practically of three members, could come into the House and force upon it three hundred odd measures for the consideration of any resolution they might desire to call up. The House should proceed with great caution, and the action of the entire session of the House this day, and its action upon a matter which concerned the people more than any question that had come before Congress for thirty years. With regard to the question of reading the journal, it was customary to read the journal every morning before proceeding to business. Knowing this, many members were absent, and a fair opportunity should be given them to reach the Capitol.

HE VIOLATED FIVE MINUTES

In Mr. Pitch, who seconded his colleague's remarks, prefacing his remarks with an expression of the highest respect for the fairness of the chair, but he concurred fully in what had been said in regard to the danger of the precedent which it was proposed to set. Those Democrats who had not voted, would ever again demanding the reading of the journal in the last hour, knew that the demand had always been granted, and that, in a Democratic House, for a case like this, that the refusal should be made, was as unlike to his mind as anything that had been done in the last House. There was a good deal of talk in this State about a premature or snap convention. If there was ever anything premature or unexpected to those who opposed the adoption of the resolution, it was the snapping of the resolution on them during the reading of the journal. The representatives from New York would stand by what they thought right in the Chicago resolutions and assure that they had stood by the present Speaker, who, as the gentleman from Georgia, had protested against things which were no more unjust than was the snapping in of this resolution before the reading of the journal. The party would stand by the Democrats of New York. It had no right to lead them down, and from them it most expect, as it is asserted, a misfemphatic protest.

MR. CUCKRAN,

[illegible] expressed himself as opposed to filibustering methods. The ruling of the Chair, he said, was a unanimous one. Until the journal was read no member could be heard in the House was legally in session.

Mr. Crisp of Texas inquired whether a motion to adjourn would be in order before reading the journal.

The speaker replied that it always had been so held, and never questioned, and the parliamentary language applies in this rule as applies to a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Cockerswell of New York said the resolution was that, during the Forty-first Congress, the Democrats always successfully protested against any business being transacted before the reading and approval of the journal.

Mr. Catchings of Mississippi closed the debate on behalf of the committee on rules and emphasized his remarks by moving to lay Mr. Tracy's appeal on the table.

CRISP STATES THE QUESTION.

Before putting the question Speaker Crisp stated the question and his position. He said in part: "The rule provides that it shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the committee on rules. The rules also provide that it shall always be in order to move to adjourn, to move a motion to fix a day to which the House shall adjourn, or to take a recess. Precedents have been held, so far as the Chair knows, that the House may adjourn before the journal is read. The Chair calls attention to rule 29 as illustrating the intent and purpose of this other rule. That rule provides that the presentation of the reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the journal is be up read, the right to be called of the House deciding on any proposition. Now, where respecting conference reports, the words shall always be in order are used, and if we desire to put any limitation upon it, such limitation is expressed in the rule. But in the rule providing for a report from the committee on rules, there is no limitation of words. The rule says that it shall always be in order. The Chair does not undertaken to analyze the rules of the House as he finds them. The Chair might say, however, that in the last House there was no such rule as this, providing that the reports of the committee on rules might be called up at any time.

The roll was then called, and by a vote of 156 to 151 the House tabled Tracy's appeal from the decision of the chair.

TRACY THEN RAISED THE POINT

that the question of consideration can not be raised. He spoke at some length on this point, and the Speaker quoted from the rules governing his position.

"The intention of the House," said he, "was, as the chair understood it, just what the rule itself proposed under the rules of the last Congress."

"Does the gentleman assume the last?" inquired Reed. (Great laughter.)

"Some parts of it he may and some parts of it he does not," retorted the Speaker. "The chair does not endorse, Mr. Speaker." (Applause on Democratic side.)

"The Speaker of the last House begs leave to say that he never expected the chair to endorse him," replied Reed. (Applause on Republican side.)

"Quite right," commented Speaker Crisp. "I was just going to say when interrupted that the gentleman from Maine, the Speaker of the last Congress, held that a question of consideration could not be raised against the order of business."

"Well, I didn't want to have anything to do with the rules of the Fifty-first Congress," said Mr. Tracy, emphatically. "The rules of that Congress should not be applied to this House, excepting possibly by the gentleman from Maine." (Great laughter.)

Once More Mr. Tracy appealed from the chair, and Mr. Warner, another New York Democrat, warned his colleagues that they were on the point of a Democratic House adjourning.

A NOVEL ARBITRARY RULING.

In a more arbitrary manner than any enforced by the Fifty-first Congress, by virtue of whose rulings the Democratic majority is here.

Again the yeas and nays were demanded, and again Mr. Tracy's appeal was tabled—156 to 151.

Mr. Tracy then again made a

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE RESOLUTION,

with instructions to the committee on rules to report it back with an amendment, allowing the House to consider the action of the silver bill from March 22nd to December 15th. The motion was defeated—Yeas, 70; nays, 202.

The previous question was then ordered upon the resolution without further division.

Williams (Miss.), opposing the resolution, said that to enlarge now would need much consideration before the Democratic party got through explaining to the people why it left free coinage out of this platform of 1892, and appealed to the people on the ground that it was supposed to free coinage. It was now proposed to give the House no time for debate. In the North the pledge meant something, and the pledges of the Democrats in the North was changed a great minority into a great majority. It was the majority made up? By accession from the Republican party. And, if those accessions were lost, it would be because the Democrats were false to their pledges. If free coinage is established by Democratic votes, reform of the tariff is at an end. The people of the North would need taxation under our present laws, but they are not ready to go into national bankruptcy and pay 70 cents of the dollar. The Democrats would have to choose between two things: The Farmers' Alliance in the South, or the Democratic Alliance in the North. He didn't know which was the more important, that Congressmen should be returned from Georgia and Mississippi, or a Democratic President elected this year.

REED (REP.) CORDIALLY AGREED,

for one, with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The latter had pointed out that the Democratic majority in the South, or the Democratic Alliance in the North. He didn't know which was the more important, that Congressmen should be returned from Georgia and Mississippi, or a Democratic President elected this year.

REED (REP.) CORDIALLY AGREED,

for one, with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The latter had pointed out that the Democratic majority in the South, Upon the debate ensued that longer means were need to the Fifty-first Congress, the Democrats had gone before the people denouncing unless which this very day they supposed. (Republican applause.) They themselves had overridden what they called the sacred rights of the minority with a harder fist than they had ever been ridden over twice. They deliberately overruled the decision of a Speaker of Congress, in the Fifteenth Congress, decided that no business could be transacted until the journal was approved. In their eagerness to overrule the rights of the minority, they had overridden the decision of a Speaker they had hitherto said they were delighted to honor. Here was tomfoldrie of the capital stock of the last election flung to the winds. When the people got up to express them the people would gladly rectify the frightful mistake they made in 1890. Never since the world was created had there been such a monstrous exercise of the power of lying over that of truth. The gentleman from Massachusetts now heard the tramp of the grand army of truth, marching forward, sometimes defeated, but in the end eternally triumphant. (Republican applause.)

Hense (Tenn.) said that within the last four years twenty-eight Democratic State conventions had declared for the free coinage of silver. The Republicans in 1888 had deceived the people when they declared that they were in favor of the free coinage of silver.

Bland said the free coinage question was one which ought to be considered independent of any party exigency connected with it. Carter's speech, referred to by Reed, did not apply to the present case.

THE VOTE.

After further debate, the yeas and nays were ordered, resulting in the adoption of the resolution, yeas 156, nays 151. The vote was as follows:

Yeas—Abbott, Aldrich, Alderson, Allen, Arnold, Bedolt, Bailey, Baker, Bankhead, Barwig, Bartine, Belloney, Bergen, Blanchard, Bland, Blount, Boatner, Bowden, Bowman, Brawley, Brookshire, Bryan, Bunn, Burnes, Bower, Butler, Byram, Byrns, Cannatti, Cabaniss, Caruth, Catchings, Cate, Clark (Ala.), Clark (Ala.), Glover, Cobb (Ala.), Cooper, Cox, Cowles, Cox (Tenn.), Crain (Tex.), Crawford, Culberson, Cutting, Dalzell, Davis, De Armond, Dixon, Dockery, Dockery, Dunn, Dunphy, Elmore, Ellis, Enloe, Evans, Epes, Everett, Fithian, Flick, Forman, Forney, Fowler, Fyan, Gaines, Geary, Geissenhainer, Gorman, Grady, Grant, Halvorson, Hamilton, Hare, Harris, Hatch, Haugen, Hayes (Ia.), Henderson, Henderson (Ill.), Henderson (N.), Henderson, Hill, Hooker (Miss.), Hooker (N.Y.), Hopkins (Ill.), Hoff, Hull, Johnson (Ind.), Johnson (N. D.), Johnson (Ky.), Jones, Jones, Kerr, Kerr, Kyle, Lawson (Va.), Lawson (Ga.), Layton, Lester (Ga.), Lewis, Lind, Livingston, Lodge, Lowe, Mahon, Maguire, Martin, McKinney, McMillin, McRae, Meredith, Middleton, Montgomery, Moore, Moses, Norton, Oates, O'Donnell, O'Ferrall, O'Neill (Mo.), Otis, Owen, Parker, Patterson (Tenn.), Patton, Payne, Pendleton, Perkins, Pickler, Pierce, Post, Price, Pulsen, Randall, Richardson, Rich, Robertson, Rogers, Scott, Seely, Shively, Simpson, Smith, Snodgrass, Snow, Stockdale, Stockdale, Stockdale, Stone (Ky.), Stone (Mo.), Strait, Taliaferro (Fla.), Taylor (Ala.), Taylor (Ill.), Taylor (Tenn.), Taylor (Ohio), Terry, Tillman, Turner, Turpie, Turner, Walker, Warwick, Washington, Watson, Wauch, West, Wheeler (Ala.), White, Whiting, Wilson, Williams (O. M.), Williams (Ill.), Wilson (Ky.), Wilson (Md.), Wilson (W. Va.), Wise, Wise, Wright, Tennison—156.

Nays—Anderson, Andrew, Barwig, Bellinger, Bennett, Bingham, Blakeslee, Bloxam (N. J.), Bretting, Bushnell, Cabell, Campbell, Cadwalader, Carter, Chapin, Chipman, Clancy, Cole (Mich.), Coleman, Cooper (Ind.), Cooper (Ohio), Cooper (Wis.), Cooper (Tenn.), Cooper (Ill.), Cooper (Ohio), Cooper (Ind