BY TELEGRAPH.

FORTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

EXTRA SESSION.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, 16.—Consideration was resumed of the army bill and Beck continued his speech. He read Hoar's resolution denouncing the democratic programme as revolutionary, etc., and denied the truth of the facts therein alleged. They merely intended saying the President should not recall the troops from the frontier to be used for political purposes; that while the courts were in harmony with the judicial machinery only a governor's or a legislature's call should justify the use of troops. The democrats said the taxpayers' money should not be used to enable the President to use troops politically. The republicans had themselves, in various particulars, acted in a revolutionary and unconstitutional way by adopting the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery in the manner they did, and by enacting the supervisors' law by attaching it to an appropriation bill.

Hoar said Beck had promised but had entirely failed to answer his argument. Nobody charged that it was revolutionary to attach legislation to appropriation bills. It was the senator's assertion that if the President failed to sign the pending bills the government supplies would be cut off. This was revolutionary. Did Beck stand by that proposition?

Beck said he believed the President would sign both bills in question. He had last session recommended that the bills which failed in conference be re-enacted this season. He had said that he believed congress would pass every appropriation bill and adjourn. If, however, the President vetoed these bills he believed they would be again enacted, and it would be for the President to determine whether he would block the wheels of government and thwart the representatives of the country in their wish to repeal odious laws. Hoar had been almost impertinent in misrepresenting him. In the issue made he would consult the wisest men in his party and action would be taken in consonance with the best interests of America. Then he hoped there would be patriotism, integrity and intelligence enough to devise means to remove the troubles. He had made no threat.

Hoar said he had denounced as revolutionary, not the engrafting of this legislation, but the expressed purpose to refuse the necessary supplies to carry on the government.

Beck said the difficulty with Hoar's speech simply was that it was not the truth. He never said the democrats would block the wheels of government if the President vetoed the bill. Hoar was trying to make a false impression that he (Beck) had said he would vote to refuse to pass the appropriation bills.

Hoar said he would not be diverted from his point by plantation manners. Hoar restated the proposition announced by Beck, and said Thurman had concurred in it. He asked Beck if he still adhered to that statement in his speech.

Dawes said the administration, believing the promise of the south, that if left to itself it would restore peace and harmony and protect the negroes in their rights, would be kept, had adopted a new plan of reconstruction and reconciliation, with what result? The south had broken its promise and the colored men had not a single representative in the House to-day, where, formerly they had several of their own race. The south had, under a false pretense, obtained full control, and its ultimate object now was to deprive the negroes of their rights of suffrage and gradually and surely bring back the state of things existing before the war. He denounced the theory of States rights.

At this stage, Wade Hampton appeared on crutches, he was sworn in with the modified oath.

Dawes, resuming, said his friends on the other side ought not to prate about the purity of the ballot box until it was forgotten how 16,000 republican voters in the State of New York were wiped out in 1868, in accordance with the circular sent out before in the name of their chief, S. J. Tilden, who afterwards did not know anything about it, just as he does not know anything about every other political iniquity that has been transacted in his name and in his house. He supposed that it was only a question of time when the threat to wipe out all the war measures and restore the old order of things would be fulfilled, but he had felt called upon to raise his protest as a representative of a State whose people would always be found in the van of any movement necessary for the defense of true republican principles.

At the close of Dawes' remarks, a lively passage took place between Blaine and Eaton, in which the former quoted the speeches of Webster, in which he said, "This is not a confederacy of States but of a nation."

Withers said he would ask the Senate to insist on longer daily sessions until the army bill is disposed of, and stated that it was desired that a vote be arrived at before the middle of next week.

The Senate then went into executive session and adjourned.

WASHINGTON, 17.—On the expiration of the morning hour, the army appropriation bill was taken up.

Morgan said hereafter he intended to speak in vindication of the attitude of southern members of congress, which had been the object of much unjust aspersion. The south was not responsible for the existence of the question now agitating the public. He had considered it best at present to yield to his friend from Indiana.

Voorhees called attention to what he feared was not generally realized—namely, that federal interference extended not only to congressional but to all state and local elections. American citizens, by thus having overseers put over them, were reduced to the condition of slaves. The protection of the ballot box had been wrested from the proper local officers and given to corrupt federal officials The spirit that declared this law was a distrust of the people and their capacity for self-government under free elections. The whole power of the Constitution was thus perverted. The people would resent this insulting tyranny when the facts should be clearly presented to them. There was no American who was not liable to arrest for no other reason than that existed in the mind of the supervisor or deputy marshal, thus placing every person's liberty at the mercy of party malice or hate. The Constitution plainly guarded the citizen in all his rights; but that instrument was violated by the arrest and imprisonment of citizens on insufficient warrant by malicious spies as informers. The spirit that produced this law was like that which preceded the French revolution, and caused the fires of the revolution to break out, and which made every citizen tremble with fear of a blow in the dark. It emanated from the spirit that ruled in Venice, where the look of suspicion was more to be dreaded than the blow of the dagger and doomed the victim to walk the Bridge of Sighs to prison and a wretched death. Charles I lost his throne, and George the III. his rule in America for less evils than those inflicted by some of our federal laws. All history showed the danger and injustice of leaving the means for usurping liberty on the statute books. Cæsar, Cromwell and Napoleon I were not slow to secure sovereign power, when the people left their laws to pave the way to despotism. We were not at a loss to conjecture what could be done with the laws to which he had referred, and which had been enforced over our liberties to an extent which would force any people to revolt except the serfs of Russia. In order to show the abuses committed on suffrages, he referred to the city of New York, where acts had been committed which brought shame and disgrace to the whole country. John Davenport was the chief supervisor, the autocrat of the ballot box. He with his cohorts had intimidated voters from going to the polls, and thousands remained away rather than place themselves in the way of lawless persecution. The deputy marshals and supervisors were the federal Ku Klux, organized to intimidate freemen and cheat them of their rights. What happened in New York might occur elsewhere. No man would say that such a statute should longer continue in force.

Voorhees implored the American people not to forget that their liberties are trampled under foot with scorn and contempt. He then proceeded to another branch of the law on the subject of popular elections, that of the President, on certain occasions, being authorized to employ the naval forces at the polls. The President, as commander-in-chief chief of the army and navy, could give such orders as would tend to crush the liberties of the country, after the manner of Cæsar, Napoleon the Great and Napoleon the Less. Like them the President could send out his emissaries to stir up trouble in the south, and thus the pretex for employing the army in that section. The President was the judge of the number of troops he would employ, and under the present laws he might order ships to New York and New Orleans on election days to overawe the people, simply under the pretence of keeping the peace at the polls. Under the civil rights bill of 1869, the President could use the army anywhere under the pretence of enforcing its provisions. There was not a phase of human affairs in the States and Territories that could not be interfered with by the army. The veriest reptile of a party, a United States commissioner, could call upon the military and naval forces to support him in his proceedings. The senator from Maine (Blaine) saw no reason for alarm in the provision which the pending bill designed to repeal, but he would refer him to what Daniel Webster uttered. It was: "If men would enjoy the blessings of a republican government they must govern by reason and mutual concession, and with due regard to the general interest and an acquiescence of the minority in the will of the majority, and that the military must be kept, according to right in strict subjection to such authority." Wherever these principles do not exist there can be no political freedom. The laws to which he had referred formed a complete system to withdraw all power from the people and the States, and to centralize it in the executive department for a revolutionary movement against the Constitution and for an ultimate monarchy. In the earlier days of the republic there was a party in favor of a monarchy. The party is larger now, and there were laws in force by which the scheme could be put into actual operation. He denied that the south disregarded law. On the contrary, they submitted to every legal requirement. The people of that section had, under adverse circumstances, vindicated themselves as law-abiding people. They had been slandered by a sectional spirit.

Teller followed. He quoted judicial decisions to support his argument that the law was constitutional, and said that its constitutionality being established the only question was as to the expediency or policy of retaining it. He deprecated the use of the army to enforce civil processes, except in extreme cases. In conclusion, Teller said he did not know what the President would do, but he did not think that any threat to deprive the army of its sustenance would affect the action of any republican senator, nor the President.

Conkling asked if a vote could not now be taken on the pending Blaine amendment, but Butler thereupon moved an executive session. Agreed to. Adjourned.

HOUSE.

Under the call of committees, Stephens, chairman of the committee on coinage, weights and measures, reported a bill for the interchange of subsidiary coin for legal tender money in sums of $10 and multiples thereof and making such coin legal tender in all sums not exceeding $20. The report of the committee states that the bill is based upon petitions referred to the committee.

Conger raised the point of order that no bill on the subject had been referred to the committee and therefore the committee had no right to make a report.

The Speaker overruled the point.

The morning hour expired before any action was taken on the bill and it went over until to-morrow. Some annoyance was shown by members of the committee on banking and currency, that the petitions on which the bill had been based had not been referred to that committee.

The House then went into committee of the whole on the legislative appropriation bill.

The pending question was Springer's amendment to insert the Potter bill, which authorizes anybody having a claim against the United States, not barred by the statute of limitations, to file a bill in the court of claims, to which amendment Young had offered an amendment to strike out the words. "Not barred by the statute of limitations."

Atkins offered a substitute abolishing the southern claims commission, after March 10th, 1880, and directing the transfer of all cases then pending to the court of claims and then enacting the Potter bill.

Young's amendment was rejected.

Springer accepted Atkins' substitute and supported it. He said that in the last presidential campaign the republicans attempted to alarm the country on the subject of war claims, and make the north believe the success of the democratic party would bankrupt the treasury. He believed that it was the desire of some persons, and perhaps gentlemen on the republican side, to keep that question still before the country as a live one on which to go again to the country at the next presidential election, and endeavor to excite the people on the subject of war claims. He did not recollect a single bill for the payment of war claims that was passed in the last congress and there was not a member on the democratic side who had favored the payment of a dollar to a claimant who had not been loyal during the late war, and no proposition of the kind was now made. He hoped the amendment would be adopted so that no claim could hereafter be paid that had undergone the scrutiny of an exclusively republican court.

Keifler opposed the amendment inasmuch as it would allow disloyal as well as loyal claimants to present their cases and to be paid.

The amendment was rejected and the committee proceeded with the succeeding clauses of the bill.

At 2.30 the committee had disposed of all the bill except the portions especially reserved for general discussion.

White raised a point of order against the provision which repeals the test oath and prescribes the manner of drawing jurors. This provision is included in the paragraph which appropriates money for the supreme courts, and reduces the *per diem* of jurors, but it was held by White that it was competent for him to raise a point inasmuch as the proposition against which it had been raised was a separate proposition, although not in a separate paragraph.

The chair overruled the point.

An effort was made to limit the speeches to thirty minutes, but it failed.

The chair said there were ninety-six names in the list of those desiring to speak.

Lewis opened the debate with a legal argument against the election laws He denied that the south was solid for any illegal or unconstitutional purpose or out of antagonism to the north. The southern people need help and sympathy too much for that.

Stamford was the next speaker, and when he concluded Kelly obtained the floor, but yielded to a motion, which was adopted, that the committee rise. Adjourned.

WASHINGTON, 17. — After the reading of the journal, the bill reported yesterday from the committee on coinage, weights and measures, providing for the exchange of subsidiary silver coins for legal tenders, in all sums not exceeding $10, came up. The question was on the motion made by Buckner, chairman of the committee on banking and currency, to refer the bill to that committee. After a long discussion the previous question was moved, and the motion to refer the bill to the banking committee was rejected, 88 to 97.

The bill was then before the House, but went over till to-morrow, after the morning hour.

Atkins moved that the debate on the legislative bill close on Saturday. A personal pointed tilt ensued between Atkins and Conger. Atkins then substituted Tuesday, and Garfield moved Friday next. Agreed to, 131 to 91.

The House then went into committee on the legislative appropriation bill, and Kelly spoke thereon. He proposed to state his conclusions in the commencement of his remarks. He voted for the repeal of the test oath for jurors, but thought it should come before the House as a separate measure. During the last congress he had advocated the repeal of the provision requiring that oath, and he said now, as he said then, that it was an exasperating incongruity in law, and therefore should be repealed. He would also vote for the repeal of the section under which soldiers were sent to the polls, as proposed by Garfield, to vote for the provision in the army bill, which had passed the House, which was a provision in restraint of the use of the military as it new stood, and would be an injustice to the republican party which, when it had two-thirds in each house, had passed it, and to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, who had given it his presidential sanction. He would vote, as a separate proposition, to repeal the provisions of the law under which deputy marshals were sent to the polling places of the country. He believed that those provisions of law had been abused. At any rate the sections had been all passed when the country was at war, or during the process of reconstruction, when a majority of the voters of some of the border States—at least one of them—had been disfranchised by the State constitutions; but he would not vote for the repeal of the essential modification of the law authorizing the appointment of, and fixing the duty and power of supervisors of elections. As he understood the Constitution, it vested the ultimate control of elections, relating to national offices, in the Congress of the United States; but he would not vote for any one of those provisions as riders on the appropriation bills, and disclaiming all knowledge of the purpose of the President, he would say, here and now, that if the bills were sent to the President in this present form, and he should veto them, he (Kelly) would sustain the veto with all his power. If the President disapproved either of those bills, it was his duty, under the Constitution, to veto them, and he warned the gentlemen that the party who attempted to overcome the veto by any other means than those provided by the Constitution would be trampled out of existence. The American people loved the Constitution, and neither the north nor the south wished a sustained action outside of the Constitution for subverting the powers of any of the departments of government. Within two years, the people would have it in their hands to determine whether the veto was right or wrong, and, if right, to maintain it by the sovereignty of the nation; if wrong, to send a congress here which, in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution, would redress the executive action as to the point of the riders on the bill. He did not charge that the putting of such provisions on the appropriation bills was revolutionary. The whole system of putting a rider on appropriation bills was vicious and to be repudiated, but it was not revolutionary, as had been said by Garfield, whose speech laid before him under the title of "Revolution in Congress." That gentleman has experienced a thorough revolution in opinion since 1872, if he believes this action to be revolutionary.

Garfield—I had supposed that there was nobody in this House that at this late day, would say that I had ever asserted it was revolutionary to put a rider upon an appropriation bill. I never said so in my life. It is not in any printed written or spoken remarks that I have ever made.

Kelley — The gentleman should speak for himself in the language he then used. Kelly then quoted from the speech, in the course of which Garfield said: "When the majority undertakes to say that thing, the attaching of legislation upon appropriation bills shall not be done, it is simply an end of parliamentary government." Kelly continued: I say to the gentlemen on the other side of the House now that they have but to adjourn, leaving the lighthouses on our coast unlighted, the courts and all other branches of the government unprovided for, to make the north solid as it was from 1861 to 1865. We will, irrespective of party, stand by the Constitution as it stood by us when it was being applied to maintain the life of the nation and the unity of the country. Nor (addressing the democratic side of House) are you sure of a solid south on this unconstitutional a matter. Your south is not solid to-day. Those who constitute what you sneeringly as "the centre," one comes from Texas and one from Alabama, both presenting democratic districts. You have on your side three independent democrats, who beat the regular nominees, and there are among you a score of gentlemen