

BY TELEGRAPH.

FORTY-SIXTH CONGRESS.

EXTRA SESSION.

HOUSE.

WASHINGTON, 2.—An effort was made by Sparks to fix the time for closing the debate on the army appropriation bill. Suggestions were made to have a night session, to restrict speeches to 15 minutes each, and to close the debate to-morrow. Objection was made to all the propositions, Conger stating that a number of gentlemen on both sides have given notice of their desire to speak; also that many had prepared speeches and would not like to be restricted to 15 minutes; also that but few members would be present at night sessions. On both sides it was declared that there was no desire to cut off the debate, and the Speaker gave it as his experience that unlimited debate was the shortest debate.

A motion of Stevens that a vote be taken at 2 o'clock on Saturday was voted down.

Finally on motion of Dummell, of Minnesota, all general debate was ordered closed at 3 o'clock on Friday, leaving the five minutes debate open.

The House then went into committee of the whole.

The debate was opened by Williams, of Wisconsin, who stated that two things were absolutely indispensable, purity of the ballot box and peace at the polls. If it required all the power of the state and general government that power should be exercised, whether it be put forth under national or under state jurisdiction. He had heard much talk about bayonet government, but he knew of no government which did not rest ultimately on the bayonet. Whoever talked about the government without that final resort in case of resistance to civil law, talked about Utopia. The only bayonet rule this country knew was that which had just put down one of the most wicked and cruel rebellions that ever disgraced the earth or that had denied his southern friends the delectable pastime of shooting negroes. For since 1864 the republican party has been tripping over a chip, because then it began to allow the non-performance of the laws of the country. The President had the right to send troops even to the Church of Christ. It was not pleasant to see bayonets at the polls, but neither was it pleasant to see voters assailed by armed roughs. He, unlike Garfield, believed this was the centre of the whole question of Federal authority and national perpetuity, and not a mere skirmish line.

Townshend, of Illinois, spoke on the democratic side. He did not know by what authority Garfield spoke when he intimated that these bills would not receive the sanction of the President, but if the prophecy was to be verified, there was no man so blind or prejudiced as to know that their failure was due to the President. If government was to be starved, the responsibility for that was not to be laid at the door of the democratic party. He said, answering the charge that it is revolutionary for a democratic majority to amend the appropriation bills regarding the election laws, there was good republican precedent therefor and cited a number of them, and showing that Garfield's course now was inconsistent with his record in 1872. The first expression of the people on the issue before Congress, was given in Chicago yesterday by the election of a democratic mayor and other officers, for the first time in twenty years. He (Townshend) regarded the issue as solely one of free election and impartial juries.

Calkins held that the citizen, when not protected by the State, had a right to call on the government. If the President was celebrated for anything it was for keeping his own counsel, and no one knew whether he would veto the bill. If he did, then such a contraction would take place as the country was wholly ignorant of.

Herbert said the democrats would not be led away like mad bulls by this red flag of sectional hate. They adhered to the plain question shall troops be used at the polls?

White, of Pennsylvania, denied that the republicans desired force at the polls. They only wanted to protect the citizens. He denied the charge made against the republican party yesterday, of despotism and usurpation.

The committee then rose and the House adjourned.

WASHINGTON, 3.—The debate on the army appropriation bill was continued by Knott. He spoke of the great historical importance of the principle involved. He characterized it as the great fundamental principle of republican liberty, that the ballot should be protected from the slightest approach of military power, and that the voter shall be left entirely free in exercising at the polls the prerogative of a citizen. He quoted an English statute of George II for the removal of troops from the place where an election is to be held, and cited Blackstone, that it is essential that elections shall be absolutely free and that therefore all undue influences are illegal and prohibited. He had expected such a question would have been discussed on the other side with calmness and dignity, but in this he had been grievously disappointed particularly in connection with the speech of Frye, that speech, while it might have been appropriate to the "small fry" of his party at the cross roads or the village barroom was unjust to that gentleman's genial and generous nature.

Knott concluded his speech with a statement of the beneficent reforms that would be effected when the democratic party had captured the capitol, as he firmly believed it to be in the plans of Providence that the party of the people should so triumph. He did not intend his party to be led away from the question under consideration to the discussion of any collateral issue whatever, but it intended to move right on to the accomplishment of the high purpose upon which they were resolved. He expressed his astonishment at the statement that the obnoxious words which it was now proposed to wipe from the statute book had been inserted on a motion by Senator Powell, of Kentucky, and said that Kentucky was proud of many of her sons, but of none of them was she prouder than of Powell. He had done nothing in his long and useful career except to stand day after day and contend manfully, as he did, for the purity of the ballot box and for the non interference of the military with elections. That act alone would have secured to him the affection of every lover of liberty and a memorial more lasting than sculptured marble or molded brass. The democratic party simply intended to preserve the ancient birth-right of the American citizen to a trial by jury in all its purity. It intended that all ring masters and jobbers and knaves, who had fastened like vampires on the body politic of the country for years past, shall be driven forth as the money changers were scourged from the temple by the Savior of mankind; it intended that every abuse of power should be arraigned, not only before the bar of public opinion, but before the established tribunals of the country; it intended to preserve the rights, dignity and equality of all the states unimpaired as the safest protection of domestic concerns and as the surest bulwark against an anti-republican tendency; it intended to maintain the Federal government as supreme in its constitutional sphere, and to let all the States in the splendid galaxy of equal republics, move on forever in their orbits with the beauty and harmony that made the music of the spheres when the "morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." (Applause on the democratic side.)

He was followed on the republican side by Hank, who argued that it was absolutely necessary for the protection of lives and political rights of colored and white republicans of the south that the authority of the military to preserve peace at the polls should be maintained. This speech, being by a southern man, attracted much attention, and was frequently applauded on the republican side and jeered on the democratic side.

Robeson followed. He confined himself to the questions of law involved in the discussion, and said it is proposed here to restrain civil officers of the United States from keeping the peace at any election in any State, by what means? by civil means, not by military means, for the right of a civil officer, the marshal of the district, if you please, to summon a posse comitatus is the right to summon ordinary military companies that may be within the body of his bailiwick. The right to summon armed troops if they be within the body of the

bailiwick is civil and not a military right, and is in the interest of the inviolability and strength of the civil law. Can that be doubted by any lawyer? The jurisdiction of the United States comes within the States wherever it has any United States duty to perform. That is not only sense but good law. Wherever the United States has guaranteed a right, wherever a right comes by the Constitution and is guaranteed by it, there the United States has a right and must enforce and carry out that power.

Kimmel—Where has the United States guaranteed the right to vote?

Robeson—It has guaranteed the right to every man in Maryland, who has a right to vote for the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, and that he shall vote at a peaceable election, for members of Congress. (Applause on the republican side.) I know that the Supreme Court has declared that the United States has no voter of its own creation in the States; I know that it has declared that the right of suffrage is not given in the States by the Constitution of the United States. But this does not cover the case. The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and that electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the Legislature as given by the State. The qualifications, within the limits of the Fifteenth Amendment are made by the States. The United States does not confer the right of suffrage on those individuals, but the United States adopts its suffrage, by description, that class that has already the right of suffrage given to it by the States. It makes them its voters for the election of its officers and is bound to guarantee to them a free and fair election (applause on the republican side.) It is technically and verbally true that the United States does not confer the right of suffrage on those men who vote for the most numerous branch of a State Legislature. The right of suffrage and qualification necessary to it are prescribed by States. But the United States does say that every man who belongs to that class, and every man who has that qualification shall be an elector for members of the House of Representatives. That is a right which it guarantees. What is a guarantee of the United States worth if it is not able to carry it out. The proposed legislation is unconstitutional. He denied Hurd's statement that nations had always died of military power. They died because some branch of government has usurped the rights of the other. He instanced several cases in history that the sword was the last resort after the usurpation had necessitated its use. So long as the civil process of law may be properly executed by civil officers in this country there is no danger of a military power. Our people would never yield to a large standing army, unless it became absolutely necessary under the pressure of usurped and arbitrary power of some irresponsible member of a system to sacrifice liberty and order. That time will never come here unless you, my friends, disregard the plain teaching of history. My friend from Ohio (Hurd) also took occasion to say, in allusion to the executive of this country, that his title was in doubt and that his tenure was not yet certain. I do not think that my friend meant that, because if he did he meant to appeal to the giant of revolution. Let me say to him, that the responses all over the country, to-day, are but the mutterings of a storm which will increase in vigor and fury and in resistless power until the men and party who endeavor to unsettle the title of the President will be swept forever from the political horizon. (Loud applause on the republican side and in the galleries.)

Blackburn said he was a poor student of his country's history who was not able to satisfy himself that from the foundation of the Constitution down to the present time it had ever been held, and that by the highest authorities in the land, that it was in the power of the House to control the employment of the army by withholding the supplies. In the very nature of things, the proposed repeal could not be revolutionary. Negative legislation was never revolutionary. The Constitution did

not give the right to the President to send armed forces into any state even to suppress domestic violence. It required the President to protect any State from invasion, but only conferred upon him the right to send soldiers to that State to suppress domestic violence when the legislature of that State or governor should make a requisition upon him. He was not permitted to anticipate domestic violence, neither was a legislature nor a governor. Domestic violence must have been in existence, and that fact have been certified to him by the legislature. More that one-third of the permanent legislation affecting that arm of government had been put upon the statute books as riders upon the army appropriation bills. Did Garfield remember the record he had made in 1868 on an amendment offered by Wilson, of Iowa, to an appropriation bill proposing to revolutionize the judicial system of the country, proposing to rob a coordinate branch of government, and proposing to strip the Supreme Court of prerogatives and power that the federal Constitution had clothed it with? He declared that the record teemed with instances where the houses had withheld supplies to coerce the President, and a notable instance was when Garfield, with others, had compelled Andrew Johnson to sign the army bill under protest. One count in the impeachment proceedings against Johnson was his use of the veto power, and another was his interference to prevent the interference of the army in power in elections. Garfield always voted for the impeachment and had, standing by him, voting side by side with him, to impeach the President for the exercise of the veto power, one then comparatively obscure and who, but for a combination of accidents, would have remained to this day, and until his dying day, in that obscurity for which nature and his creator seemed to have designed him. Side by side with the gentleman from Ohio had stood and voted Mr. Hayes from the same state! (Loud applause on the democratic side and in the galleries.) and now, by what sort of authority had the gentleman from Ohio come to threaten the House with a probable and possible action of the Executive. What provision of federal constitution undertook to clothe anybody, either the President himself, on one of his privy council even, including his premier, the secretary of the state, to sit, as he had done on the floor of the House last Saturday, and by his presence, and approval, seem to intimidate, overawe and browbeat the American congress (derisive laughter on the republican side). For the first time in eighteen years the democracy is back in power in both branches of congress. We propose to celebrate our return to power by wiping from the statute book these degrading restrictions on free men and by striking away the shackles which partisan legislation has imposed. We do not stop until we have stricken the last vestige of your war measures from the statute books. If the gentleman from Ohio is to be excused, for certainly he cannot be justified, for parading before this House the argumentum in terrum of a veto, that is cut and dried, to be put on a bill which has not yet passed, and if he is to be pardoned for warning the House that the executive branch of government will never yield its assent to this measure in its present form, I ask whether I may not be warranted and justified in employing equal candor in assuming that the gentlemen of the ruling element in this body are also equally determined until their just demands, sanctioned by all laws, human and divine, protected and hedged around by precedents without number, demanded by the people of this land without regard to section, clamored for, not by the South alone, but in Philadelphia as well as in New Orleans, in San Francisco and Boston, as well as in Charleston and Savannah, are complied with. This code of the chamber which has demonstrated its power never means to yield or surrender unless this Congress shall have died by virtue of its limitation. (Applause on the democratic side.) A principle cannot be compromised. It may be surrendered, but that can only be done by its advocates giving proof to the world that they are cravens and cowards and lack the courage to maintain their own convictions. We cannot yield and we will not yield. (Applause and sensation.) Let me as-

sure my friends on the other side that this is the restoration to power of a party as old as the government itself, which, for 100 years almost, has stood the test as the freest and purest exponent, champion and defender of the doctrines of the constitutional limitations against the doctrine of the aggrandizement of power. It is this organization that has come back to rule, and rule in obedience to law. The issue is laid down, the gage of battle is delivered, lift it when you please, and we are willing to appeal to that sovereign arbiter to which the gentleman from Ohio so handsomely alluded—the American people—to decide between us. We intend to deny to the President of this republic the right to exercise such unconstitutional powers. We do not mean to pitch this contest on the grounds of objection to him who happens, if not by "the grace of God" by the "run of luck," to be administering that office. Even if Washington, the father of his country; were to step down into the White House chair, the democrats would not yield even to him unconstitutional powers. There is no tribunal before which they would not be content to carry this case. It was his deliberate conviction that not a man on his side would abandon one jot or tittle of the faith that was in him. They would stand on their convictions. "He who dallies is a dastard and he who denies is damned." (Loud applause.) At the conclusion, Blackburn's colleagues warmly congratulated him on his speech.

WASHINGTON, 4.—General debate was resumed earlier than usual to-day.

Singleton and Weaver made speeches, the latter's was of some length. It was warmly applauded by both democrats and republicans. He declared the Chicago election was a triumph for the national greenback party. He wanted no soldiers at the polls, nor any other armed men. The national greenback party do not want any marshals at the elections, unless the history of elections, after experiments have been made, should prove that the country could not get along without them. But he had not the least doubt of the constitutional power of the government to protect citizens at the polls. It was only a question of policy and necessity as to the supervisors. That feature ought to be retained in law with the modification that they should be chosen, not from the two parties having Congressional tickets in the field. That would give the greenback party a chance (laughter). His party also opposed the concentration of so much power in the hands of the appropriating committees. He wanted to say to both the old parties, or he might say to the factions represented here to-day, that the greenback party said to them that they could not make this sectional issue for 1880 or 1879. There was another Richmond in the field. He would have them understand that the recent election in Chicago was a decided national greenback triumph. He warned the House that unless it passed measures for relief of the people, very few of the people, very few of the gentlemen who now occupy seats on the floors will ever see the chamber again.

De La Matyr expressed his intention to vote for the bill as it stood. He thought the House had better show some desire to relieve the people instead of giving themselves wholly to a wrangle over the firing on Sumter, the returning to slavery of Burns, the fiasco of John Brown, and general criminations and recriminations.

Jones, of Texas, opposed the placing of political legislation on the appropriation bills.

Wright condemned the reopening of the dead issues of the war and predicted a defeat in 1880 for the party that raised them.

Hawley denounced a course which would cause the service of the country's officers to be revolutionary. He discussed the situation when the President should have vetoed the bill, and said the expressed determination of the democrats to force the approval or cut off the supplies was a desperate scheme, which would not meet the approval of the country. The minority was calmly informed it must vote for what was wrong or the government would be starved. (Loud applause.) You think because we love this child we will yield everything to you lest you strike it. You know we love the country, and you know, thank God, what we have done for it (loud ap-