TELEGRAPHIC.

HOUSE AND SENATE.

Debate on the Appropriation for Howard University.

HAINER'S FIGHT AGAINST IT.

The Pre-Hay Appropriation Bill Discussed in the Senate—Strange Opinions Concerning Education.

WASHINGTON, April 2.—In the House the sundry civil bill was taken up. Under an arrangement entered into Hainer (Rep., Neb.) was given an opportunity to attack the amendment adopted yesterday appropriating $125,000 for Howard University.

It was Hainer who led the successful fight against appropriations for sectarian charitable institutions in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Hainer explained that the amendment was adopted yesterday while he was temporarily absent from the hall, and without opposition, in a way which made it seem probable that it had slipped into the appropriation committee. This was a private institution and every one of the persons mentioned that it was sectarian. He read from the prospectus of the institution to show that it was a Christian university and maintained so to the most favored department a school of theology. This was an institution for the further education of the colored people. Why should colored people be given an education at public expense if white people were not? He reverence higher education but the government had no right to single out a particular sect, race, creed or social class.

This was an insidious attempt to commit Congress liable to a principle that had in the past taken millions upon millions from the coffers of the government for the benefit of sectarian institutions. From 1871 to 1895, in the District of Columbia alone $3,000,000 had been given to sectarian institutions. As much more had gone to sectarian schools.

Members had told him that there were colored voters in their districts and they would not affect to vote against the amendment. This was a low estimate to be placed upon a race that had given the country Frederick Douglass and Booker Washington.

Evins (Dem., Tenn.) who had offered the amendment said that the opponents of the bill in opposition to Hainer, pointed to Bartlett (Dem., N. Y.) a member of the appropriations committee. The gentleman from Nebraska, Bartlett said, had evidently with defeating one appropriation bill through the indulgence of the chairman of appropriations, but made an attack on this bill, in which he advocated the proscription of every form of Christian religion. His feelings toward the Roman Catholic church led him today to attack the unfortunate race liberated and raised to its feet by the immortal Lincoln, in whose honor the House yesterday appropriated $20,000 for the purchase of his mansion within the Soldiers' Home. Proceeding, he denounced as terrible and monstrous the finite state doctrine being advanced in the House that we should denounce Christianity and couple every appropriation bill with a provision that not a cent of it should go to the furtherance of a Christian purpose.

Cannon followed in support of the amendment. The appropriation for the Howard university, he said, was first made in 1867, on motion of Mr. Morrill of Ohio. The appropriation for similar purposes was regularly made because the university contained a theological school, but when the amendment was offered, with the provision that no portion of the money should be used directly or indirectly for religious purposes, the amendment was free from plausible objection. From the standpoint of those particularly he believed that the race who were once slaves but were now free, though still ignorant, as a mass, yet desiring to aid in the defense of the white people of the county, so did he encourage in industry and education.

Sayers (Dem., Tex.) also supported the amendment and drifted into a sharp personal discussion with regard to the respective claims of the two parties to the friendship of the colored people.

Sayers called attention to the fact that in the South colored and white men worked side by side. The Democratic party in the South had been the real friend of the colored people. They were ready now to vote this money. He had no doubt that in every political sense made by the gentlemen from Nebraska he had not the colored idea that the Democratic party was not in sympathy with giving the colored people a full chance.

"Are you now in favor of giving them a fair chance?" he asked.

"I answered the Democratic party," replied Hainer, "in 1884 and 1886 in vain in the colored people were trying to secure the right to vote, and now you come to degrade them instead by offering them charity."

Sayers frequently denied that the colored people in the South were deprived of their rights. He (the speaker) in the fact that the White people of the South, who put nine-tenths of the votes, maintained schools for the colored people as good as those for the white. A their founding schools had been 30 years and Hainer followed, in the course of which Mr. Hainer insisted that he merely regarding the Sharp and Williams bill for the relief of Nashville as an equal footing.

"Can they get into the million in the North?" asked Sayers.

"They are on the equal footing with the whites," replied Hainer.

"We only decided to let every man who was called to West Point or Annapolis?"

"I do not know."

"Did you ever nominate one?"

"The cases in my district are where every competitive examination," replied Hainer.

"Oh, yes! we know about the competitive examinations," said Sayers, amid Democratic laughter.

"Have you ever nominated a colored boy?" asked Hainer.

"No," (reluctantly replied Sayers, "we have nominated I believe the white race is the superior race and should continue."

"And you are the boasted friend of the colored man?"

"Yes, and a better friend than the gentleman from Nebraska."

Sayers concluded with a protest against letting this discussion go in earnest.

Hepburn (Rep., Ia.) ridiculed the new champion of the colored race, and asked if the university of Texas, devoted to the higher education, admitted colored youths.

"Probably, no," replied Sayers, "but the State has ample other schools for colored people."

Hepburn intended the idea that the Democrats were the better friend of the colored race. Where were the proofs. Were they to be found in the fact that in the South, where the colored race were in majority, their votes were not only suppressed of higher education, but were robbed of their actual rights. The records in the election cases show that which power was used in the South. Speaker Reed's ruling was