

It seems that President Arthur does not wish to embarrass his successor by making appointments now. A number of post-masters have sent in their resignations, so that their successors may be appointed before the beginning of the new administration. President Arthur has refused to accept them in order not to anticipate Mr. Cleveland's policy.

The Kansas Senate and House passed a joint resolution condemning the action of the State Commissioner at the World's Fair, at New Orleans, in joining with others in inviting Jefferson Davis to participate in the reception of the Liberty Bell. Kansas people are not altogether wrong in thinking that repentance should come before forgiveness.

The preparations for the inaugural festivities indicate that the new regime will be ushered in with greater pomp and vanity than was ever before attempted in this land, where the simplest forms should be observed in inducting the servants of the people into office. A grand pyrotechnic display is to be given, one of the novel features of which will be the sending up of the largest balloon ever made, which will explode at from one to two miles, thus fairly illuminating the whole heavens. Just what this heavenward explosion is to be typical of, we have not seen stated. Perhaps it is intended to show how Grover Cleveland's administration may go to pieces if he should attempt to avert inflation of it.

The medical profession of the country is becoming very deeply interested in the reports concerning the discovery of a Brazilian plant called Alvelos, which is said to be a cancer cure. The fame of the plant reached this country last summer, and the attention it attracted resulted in the sending of a despatch by the Department of State to Consul Atherton of Pernambuco, requesting that he secure and forward sufficient of the medicine for experimental purposes. Early last month his report and medicine reached the department. Consul Atherton says he knows of a case where the juice of this plant cured cancer of the breast. A portion of this medicine, when it arrived, was secured by Dr. Smith Townsend, the Health Officer of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of trying it on a patient, Captain Dugay, a man of 65 years of age, who was suffering from a cancer of the nose of long standing. The effect was marvelous. The wound began to heal from the first application, and in a very short time it was, to all appearances cured. Dr. Townsend says he is now treating a lady for cancer of the face, and is apparently obtaining the same good results. He hesitates about expressing a positive opinion as yet regarding its virtues as a specific for cancer, but says that in these two cases it seems to have accomplished what no other remedial agent known to medicine has done. The quantity received by the Department of State was small. The department has ordered another supply. The juice of the plant has been used with remarkable success in the treatment of ulcers of different kinds, at the public hospital in Pernambuco.

Ind. Journal,  
Defeat of the High-License Bill.

The Democratic antipathy to everything suggestive of temperance was again manifested in the Legislature Monday. The House indefinitely postponed all the bills relating to the liquor traffic which were pending in that body, including the bill of Mr. Adams, providing that druggists shall require prescription for the sale of liquor in less quantities than the quart; the bill of Mr. Rivers, making any saloon keeper liable to a fine of \$200 for selling or giving liquor to minors; the bill by Mr. Deen to prevent an appeal from a board of county commissioners for refusing to grant a license as the bill of Mr. Robinson, requiring saloon-keepers to file with their bonds license receipts.

In the Senate the high-license bill by Senator Youche, requiring in cities and towns a saloon license of from \$100 to \$500 a year, came up on second reading, with an adverse majority report and a favorable minority report. On a motion to lay the latter on the table, which had the effect to prevent debate upon the minority motion, the vote was as follows:

Yeas—Bales, Bass, Brown, Bryant, B. C. Clark, B. C. Clark, Clark, Farnham, Hill, Hollings, Howard, John-

stone, Magee, M. V. McClure, McCullough, McIntosh, Null, Rahn, Richard, Ross, Sellers, Smith (Jenings), Thompson, Wier, Willard, and Youche. Nay—A. L. Edwards, Campbell (Hendrix), Drake, Dutton, (Hamilton) Foulke, Huston, Linley, Moey, Marshall, Overstreet, Peterson, Shively, Smith (Jay), Winter, Youche—14. \*Democrats.

In the House during the morning, the McHenry high-license bill was indefinitely postponed upon the committee's recommendation by 41 years against 26 nays. There was no discussion of the matter.

The high-license bill is the last important measure in any way connected with the temperance question that will be acted upon, and the vote yesterday is of some significance. The Democratic Senators, with the exception of Peterson, Shively and Smith of Jay, all voted against the bill, although protesting, as they have in their opposition to all temperance measures that have come up during the session, that the Democratic party is the friend of temperance.

Card from Prof. Atwater.

Exodus Passages.—I am in a late issue of our Christian church newsletter, one of which I received, speaking of the subject of the article in the "Daily News" of the 11th inst. The largest portion was contributed by Prof. Atwater.

By putting my name thus prominently forward, real injury is done to my brethren and fellow citizens whose interests and liberality have been most commendable. Where so many have given generously, it is hardly right that one be singled out from the rest. To build this church, three persons have each contributed \$500, two others each contributing \$300, and many more, who have each paid \$100, eight have each paid \$50, twenty giving \$10, and many others giving \$5 or \$10. Probably as many as five hundred have contributed to build the new Christian church and almost without exception, certainly with very few exceptions, the church members have given "according to their several abilities." School boys, school children, who have given to help build the church. Many who have given for this purpose have done so with great self-sacrifice. And here let me say that the thanks of our whole membership are due and are hereby tendered to a generous public which has aided the enterprise in the most liberal manner.

Amzi Atwater,  
Bloomington, Ind., Feb. 11, 1885.

Death in the Glass Burner.

Very few people know how much danger lurks in the base burner. In closing them for the night care should be taken to close the openings through which the gas can escape. We often read of suffocation by escaping gas, something like this from the Indianapolis News, except that they are fatal to the occupants of the houses where they occur: "Charles Henderson, with his brother and sister, and another relative, the first named children of J. J. Henderson, and visiting 168 East St. Joseph street, he other night before retiring, closed the base burner in such a way that the gas escaped into the room and permeated the entire house. About five o'clock in the morning one of the boys was awakened by a feeling that he was suffocating, and with his senses reeling, he finally managed to reach the street and give the alarm. All of the family including the domestic, were seriously prostrated, and Dr. Purman, the medical attendant, believes that had not discovery come when it did, the consequences would have been fatal.

—

Indianapolis News.

On What Slender Threads. That apparently a trivial matter, is sometimes of great importance. It was illustrated in the house the other day, when a ruling on a point of order made a difference of \$30,000 in an appropriation. The bill was pending to appropriate \$50,000 to the state university, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon made a minority report, recommending three things. That the appropriation be reduced to \$30,000. That the endowment fund be cut off and that the regular annual appropriation cease. It was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that that proposition was embodied in the bill, and the only question was whether any appropriation or one for the full amount should be made. Mr. Gordon moved to sustain it, and the bill was defeated, and then Mr. Gordon moved simply to cut down the appropriation to \$30,000. Mr. Kellogg raised the point of order, that