

THE SILVER DEBATE.

Synopsis of the Discussion in the United States Senate.

On the 17th, immediately after the journal was read Mr. Dolph (rep., Ore.) rose to correct it on the ground that it was inaccurate in failing to recite the presence of Messrs. Allen (pop., S. D.) and Kyle (pop., Neb.) on sundry roll calls, they having been present in the senate and failed to vote. Mr. Hill (dem., N. Y.) said he had never shared in the criticism that in the absence of rules of order the speaker of the house had the right to tell the truth and to make the journal refuse to tell a lie; that the speaker had not the right to exercise his own senses, and when a member sat right in front of him and did not vote to have the journal show the fact of his presence. The senate, Mr. Hill said, was clinging to some traditions of past ages and there was no sense in it; there was no reason for it, and never had been. There was no harm in what was proposed to be done. The rights of no one would be invaded. The duty of senators was greater than that of merely remaining in their seats; it was their duty to take part in the transaction of business. He believed that the majority of the senate had had a perfect right under the rules to require a roll-call either upon his own suggestion or that of any senator, to first ask a senator who is in his seat to vote. If the senator refused to vote then the presiding officer had the right to direct the clerk to enter upon the journal that the senator was present and declined to vote.

Mr. Morgan (dem., Ala.) said he was not surprised that the senator from New York (Mr. Hill) had championed the rulings of the speaker of the house because he was the unfortunate instrument when he presided over the senate of New York, in the introduction of that heresy not only into the democratic party and its traditions, but also into the constitutional rights of legislative bodies. He said he did not wonder that a politician born and raised in New York, where arbitrary force was the moving agency in all political machinery, both democratic and republican, had at last come to believe that there was nothing else to be done in politics but simply to get a majority of the south. He was not ashamed of the fact.

Mr. Morgan, referring to the action of the secretary of the treasury, said he did not believe congress could confer the discretion upon that officer to coin or not to coin at his will.

Mr. Morgan's heresy in this respect had but partially executed a mandatory law. Mr. Morgan argued that the Sherman act should be repealed out and out.

At the conclusion of Mr. Morgan's speech a motion by Mr. Voorhees to lay on the table the motion of Mr. Dolph to amend the journal was agreed to 45 to 3.

Mr. Teller (rep., Col.) then moved to amend the journal so that it would show his presence on a certain roll-call when he did not respond to his name, and on this motion he addressed the senate. He quoted from a statement of Mr. Carlisle in regard to insisting upon the passage of the repeal bill and said: "What right has the secretary of the treasury to interfere with us in this matter? I resent it myself as a breach of privilege. I have heard a good deal about the dignity of the senate. The misconduct of one senator or a dozen senators will never degrade the senate. The senate will be degraded, not when, whenever it abandons its prerogative of independent legislative action given it by the constitution. Whenever the senate shall take its orders from cabinet officers or an executive, then there shall be degradation of the senate—degradation that the people of the country shall take notice of and understand. When we decline to be stampeded by boards of trade, chambers of commerce, etc., we will command the respect of the American people. But when we surrender our convictions, whether it be on the advice of the president or on account of public clamor, the degradation will begin and the usefulness of the senate will be at an end."

Mr. Morgan replied that he meant an agreement between the democrats and republicans who favored the pending bill that it should not be amended in any particular whatever.

Mr. Washburn (rep., Minn.) asked Mr. Morgan what he meant by his declaration of a coalition.

Mr. Morgan replied that he meant an agreement between the democrats and republicans who favored the pending bill that it should not be amended in any particular whatever.

Mr. Washburn desired to state that there was no coalition of any description.

An exciting controversy followed between the two gentlemen, in the course of which Mr. Washburn said he was not to be stamped upon and accused for his position.

Mr. Morgan responded bluntly that he was responsible for every word he said, either in the senate chamber or outside. Mr. Washburn understood that asked Mr. Morgan To this Mr. Washburn responded: "Perfectly."

Mr. Morgan then went on with his argument. In the course of it he alluded to Mr. Sherman as one of the leaders of the coalition and Messrs. Lodge and Hill he called "the juveniles from Massachusetts and New York."

On the question of closure Mr. Morgan defied senators to establish such a rule. He would not be alarmed into subordination to the scheme of anyone by anything of the kind, nor would he surrender his constitutional rights in response to having rampant demands of concession to the national banks.

"If I must die here," said Mr. Morgan in closing, "I will die like an honorable man at my post."

Mr. Hill (dem., N. Y.) said it was true that there were politicians in New York. He supposed there were no politicians in Alabama. They were all statesmen from that country. Mr. Morgan had spoken of his lifelong devotion to the constitution. "I suppose," said Mr. Hill, "that for a brief period my friend was supporting another constitution, but I may be mistaken."

As to Mr. Morgan's talk about dying at his post, Mr. Hill had heard like statements by men who were going to "die in the last ditch," but said Mr. Hill: "There are many of them left."

At 5:15 p. m. Mr. Voorhees moved a recess until 10 o'clock Thursday morning, which was agreed to.

On the 19th Mr. Stewart (rep., Nev.) took the floor on the motion to amend the journal and argued that in the midst of an exciting discussion he had time to change the rules of the senate. He said he appealed to the vice president to make himself famous through all ages was most outrageous. He was an American and would not lay his hand upon the constitution and laws of the country.

The rules of the senate were made for occasions like the present, to protect the minority, and they would protect the minority.

Mr. Mills did not reply to this question, but further along in the debate said there was no doubt a paramount and permanent power in both houses to get the rules necessary to enable them to dispense public business. "I do not believe the minority," he said, "I blame the majority for sitting still like children and permitting the government to be stampeded. The government is in a state of paralysis. You cannot pass an appropriation bill, or a bill reducing taxation, nor help your commerce, because we are told the senate has left its rules and abdicated its power, and that great branch of the government, intrusted with power to legislate for the people, is a dead body until the minority permits it to act."

At 5:15 p. m. Mr. Voorhees moved a recess until 10 o'clock Thursday morning, which was agreed to.

On the 19th Mr. Stewart (rep., Nev.) took the floor on the motion to amend the journal and argued that in the midst of an exciting discussion he had time to change the rules of the senate. He said he appealed to the vice president to make himself famous through all ages was most outrageous. He was an American and would not lay his hand upon the constitution and laws of the country.

The rules of the senate were made for occasions like the present, to protect the minority, and they would protect the minority.

Mr. Sherman (rep., Idaho) regarded the present as an unfortunate occasion to attempt to change the rules. In reply to a question by Mr. Hill Mr. Dubois said that any bill which the people of this country desired passed, and on which they had voted, would be passed by the senate. He said a majority favored a compromise.

In response to the criticism of himself for not voting Mr. Dubois said it was his pleasure and delight to sit in the senate, but if his expulsion from the senate would prevent the passage of the repeal bill he would not hesitate for a moment.

Mr. Palmer (dem., Ill.) regarded Mr. Teller's motion as his (Teller's) name be entered as present on a roll-call, when he did not answer, as a personal request. Mr. Palmer went on sarcastically to remark that he had understood the senate was a courteous body and that a personal request of a senator was always accepted on the lofty ground of courtesy.

Mr. Carl (dem., Fla.) opposed any change in the rules as was urged by Mr. Butler (dem., S. C.) in an amendment to the motion against the proposition of the senate from New York (Mr. Hill) and the senator from Texas (Mr. Mills). If their doctrine were the correct one why not make a bonfire of the rules of the senate. He declared that the proposition "to railroad through the senate a motion to change the rules" to enable, as was claimed, the majority to transact business, would never be done with his consent. It is answer to a question by Mr. Butler as to how a vote could be reached on a bill, Mr. Butler replied that when the majority had a strong, determined, sincere anxiety to pass a bill it would make some concession in order to get it through, and if that was not done, the bill ought not to pass.

Mr. Morgan asked whether the senator (Mr. Sherman) would vote for the unconditional repeal of the entire Sherman act.

"No," replied Mr. Sherman, emphatically, "and no other man who understands the subject would do it, in my judgment."

Mr. Morgan said he intended to offer an amendment to that effect and get a vote up on it.

Mr. Sherman stated that he would vote against it with the greatest pleasure and then, in conclusion, said: "Break down this barrier now maintained by the United States senate, break up this violent and insolent obstruction to the will of the majority; give the senate free power and play and in ten days from this time the skies will brighten, business will resume its ordinary course and all the clouds that have overhung our house will be in the deep bosom of the ocean below."

Mr. Mills (dem., Tex.) said Mr. Sherman had shot to the mark when he said that the responsibility rested upon the corporate senate.

Mr. Butler (dem., S. C.) inquired whether the senator from Texas would participate in and be bound by a cause of democratic senators.

Before Mr. Mills could answer the question, Mr. Hill asked Mr. Butler if he would go into a caucus of democratic senators and representatives and abide by the result.

Mr. Butler said he would, and in turn asked Mr. Hill whether he would go into a caucus of democratic senators and be bound by the result.

Mr. Hill preferred to go into a caucus where the entire body which had power to legislate was represented, and of that body the senate was only a part.

On the 18th Mr. Morgan (dem., Ala.) took the floor on the motion of Mr. Dolph (rep., Ore.) to amend the journal so as to show the

presence of Mr. Allen (pop., Neb.) when the roll was called at 6:30 o'clock Monday evening, that senator having failed to answer when his name was called. In the course of his remarks he said that while the decision cited by Mr. Hill (dem., N. Y.) relative to the right of the house to make rules to ascertain the presence of a quorum might be perverted into a political weapon. Mr. Hill's position, as a judicial decision, it could not be placed in that category except by the artfulness of an astute politician. A fair-minded lawyer could not do it.

There were men in the world whose consciences were so easy that they could follow the supreme court in all its decisions, who could bend their consciences to any purpose that political necessity required at any time, but such men had no just conception of the right and the rights of the representatives of the people and of the states.

Referring to Mr. Hill's allusion to his (Mr. Morgan's) connection with the confederacy Mr. Morgan said the eleven states which went out of the union did not do this in violation of the constitution, but to preserve it. He had more respect for those who had the piety to shoulder a gun and go to the front than for those who continually referred to that period, but remained at home. It was only those who hired substitutes and pleading the baby remained at home who were in the habit of rising in the senate and out and referring to the fact that he (Mr. Morgan) had participated in the secession of the south. He was not ashamed of the fact.

Mr. Morgan, referring to the action of the secretary of the treasury, said he did not believe congress could confer the discretion upon that officer to coin or not to coin at his will. The treasury in this respect had but partially executed a mandatory law. Mr. Morgan argued that the Sherman act should be repealed out and out.

At the conclusion of Mr. Morgan's speech a motion by Mr. Voorhees to lay on the table the motion of Mr. Dolph to amend the journal was agreed to 45 to 3.

Mr. Teller (rep., Col.) then moved to amend the journal so that it would show his presence on a certain roll-call when he did not respond to his name, and on this motion he addressed the senate. He quoted from a statement of Mr. Carlisle in regard to insisting upon the passage of the repeal bill and said: "What right has the secretary of the treasury to interfere with us in this matter? I resent it myself as a breach of privilege. I have heard a good deal about the dignity of the senate. The misconduct of one senator or a dozen senators will never degrade the senate. The senate will be degraded, not when, whenever it abandons its prerogative of independent legislative action given it by the constitution.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.

Mr. Jones yielded the floor with the understanding that he could continue in his speech until the adjournment of the session.