

in keeping with the character of General Lee. [Laughter.] Gentlemen may laugh, but I say to the honorable member from California, who indulges in merriment, that General Lee is as honorable a man as any man to be found in the State of California. He has offended; that I admit.

Mr. CONNESS. I suppose the honorable Senator will permit me to reply to him, as he has just now replied to the Senator from Pennsylvania—

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly I will.

Mr. CONNESS. I reply that I have no doubt that is the Senator's opinion, but it is not mine.

Mr. JOHNSON. That I understand. The honorable member need not have interrupted me for that, for he said so in advance.

Mr. CONNESS. I ask the Senator's pardon; I had heard just such an answer from him.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am perfectly willing that my opinion and his shall go before the country to be judged of by the great tribunal of the people.

Now, Mr. President, we have been told that Mr. Thomas is obnoxious to objection upon the ground that he concurred with Mr. Buchanan in saying that there would be no war waged against a State. That is nothing new. Nobody ever supposed that there could be, by Congress or by any department of the Government, war waged against a State; and the error, the capital and the fatal error of the President of that day, was in confounding the authority to declare war against a State with the duty of enforcing—as against the citizens of the State—obedience to the Constitution and laws of the land. Sir, when gentlemen charge Mr. Thomas with doing what I have no knowledge at all that he did do—concur with the President in the opinion that war could not be carried on against a State—they should remember what the Supreme Court said, while the war was going on, in the cases known as the prize cases, upon that point:

"By the Constitution, Congress alone has the power to declare a national or foreign war. It cannot declare war against a State or any number of States by virtue of any clause in the Constitution."

That is what President Buchanan said; and even supposing that my colleague concurred in that doctrine, he has a right to refer for an authority in support of it to the unanimous decision, as far as that point is concerned, of the Supreme Court of the United States that under the Constitution of the United States neither Congress nor any department of the Government has any authority to declare war against a State.

Mr. CONNESS. Will the honorable Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. CONNESS. In speaking I spoke of the doctrine of the Government not having the right to declare war against a State, only because that language had been so used generally. For my own part I regarded it always, and do now, as one of the meanest fictions and pretenses ever gotten up, when Mr. Buchanan presented it in the first instance as a fiction, not a reality.

Mr. JOHNSON. In that "meanest of pretenses," the Supreme Court seems to have participated.

Mr. CONNESS. The Senator does not understand me. I say that in my opinion it was a pretense, as stated by Mr. Buchanan. Everybody admits the proposition as stated by the Supreme Court, but that condition of things did not exist.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then the proposition is true that no war can be carried on against a State, and that is what Mr. Buchanan said. The motive for saying it, whether it was resorted to for the purpose of avoiding his constitutional obligation to enforce, as against the citizens of the States, obedience to the Constitution and laws of the United States, is another question. I refer to it now merely to satisfy the honorable member and the Senate that, under the Constitution of the United States, a

State cannot be in a state of war with the United States.

Mr. President, I implore Senators maturely to consider the principle which they will establish if they reject my colleague from his seat. His present loyalty nobody calls in question. He is said, however, at one time to have entertained opinions inconsistent with a true loyalty. Suppose he did; is he to be excluded on the ground that he entertained opinions not in consonance with those entertained by the majority of the Senate? Where are you to stop if difference of political opinion is to be sufficient ground of exclusion? May not difference of moral character also be sufficient ground? When you leave the standard of the law you are at sea, and no man can tell where you will stop.

Mr. President, in the judgment of a large portion of the people of the United States, supposed by many to be a large majority of the people of the United States, the legislation which has been already adopted by a majority of this body and of the other branch of Congress, and that which it is proposed to adopt, violates the Constitution in several of its most important provisions. It subjects ten of the States of the Union to what in the opinion of many is esteemed to be a mere military despotism. I charge no such thing as intended on the part of Senators; but that is the charge, and that is the impression which is evidently fastened upon the minds of a large number of the people.

Now, suppose that the predominance of party power shall be changed, and that the men who entertain the opinion I have just stated shall constitute a majority of the members of this body, if any member of the present majority who has voted for these laws and who proposes to vote for the measures upon the table shall be reelected and demands admission under this precedent, if you shall establish it, he may be excluded; and I greatly fear that it will lead to dangers unheard of. I repeat, I implore honorable gentlemen, instead of adopting a harsh measure of this kind, to avoid any and every thing which looks to the continuance of the present disorganized condition of the country, its almost total demoralization, and as far as possible to let by-gones be by-gones, and show by their conduct, wherever they can do it without a violation of obvious duty, that they desired to again take by the hand those who differed with them during the late civil war.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Maryland, on which question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HOWE. Before the vote is taken I desire to say that on this question I am paired with the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. EDMUNDS.] If I voted I should vote for the resolution; and if the Senator from Vermont voted he would vote against it.

The question being taken by yeas and nays resulted—yeas 21, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Buckalew, Cole, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Frelinghuysen, Grimes, Hendricks, Johnson, Norton, Patterson of Tennessee, Ross, Saulsbury, Tipton, Trumbull, Van Winkle, Wiley, and Williams—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Cameron, Cattell, Chandler, Conkling, Conness, Corbett, Cragin, Drake, Ferry, Fowler, Harlan, Henderson, Howard, Morgan, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Morton, Patterson of New Hampshire, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Stewart, Sumner, Thayer, Wade, Wilson, and Yates—28.

ABSENT—Messrs. Edmunds, Guthrie, Howe, and Nye—4.

Mr. DRAKE. I offer now the resolution which I previously laid on the desk, and which I ask to have read.

The Secretary read the following resolution:

Resolved, That Philip F. Thomas, having voluntarily given aid, countenance, and encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility to the United States, is not entitled to take the oath of office as a Senator of the United States from the State of Maryland, or to hold a seat in this body as such Senator; and that the President *pro tempore* of the Senate inform the Governor of the State of Maryland of the action of the Senate in the premises.

Mr. DRAKE. On that resolution I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 27, nays 20; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Cameron, Cattell, Chandler, Conkling, Conness, Corbett, Drake, Ferry, Fowler, Harlan, Henderson, Howard, Morgan, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Morton, Patterson of New Hampshire, Pomeroy, Ramsey, Sherman, Sprague, Stewart, Sumner, Thayer, Wade, Wilson, and Yates—27.

NAYS—Messrs. Anthony, Bayard, Buckalew, Cole, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, Fessenden, Frelinghuysen, Hendricks, Johnson, Norton, Patterson of Tennessee, Ross, Saulsbury, Tipton, Trumbull, Van Winkle, Wiley, and Williams—20.

ABSENT—Messrs. Cragin, Edmunds, Grimes, Guthrie, Howe, and Nye—6.

So the resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. YATES. Not for the purpose of its being considered now, but that it may be left as the unfinished business to come up to-morrow, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. No. 11) for the admission of the State of Colorado into the Union.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn; and I give notice that I shall to-morrow move to take up the funding bill. We can hardly settle the question of precedents now; and therefore I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 19, 1868.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. C. B. BOKTON.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The first business in order is the unfinished business pending at the adjournment last evening, under the operation of the previous question on the amendments reported by the Committee of the Whole to the legislative and executive appropriation bill, on which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WASHBURN] is entitled to the floor one hour.

Mr. WASHBURN, of Illinois. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. LAWRENCE.]

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Mr. LAWRENCE, of Ohio, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported a bill (H. R. No. 765) to establish a law department; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. LAWRENCE, of Ohio. The Committee on the Judiciary have had under consideration a resolution sent to them in these words:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 12, 1867.

On motion of Mr. WILLIAM LAWRENCE,

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing by law that solicitors in the Departments of the Government and other law officers shall all constitute a part of the Attorney General's department.

Attest: EDWARD McPHERSON, Clerk.

In pursuance of that resolution a bill has been prepared, which I am directed to report to the House. It proposes to establish a law department of the Government.

It is a fact perhaps not generally known that while there is a War Department, a Navy, Interior, Treasury, Post Office, and State Department, there is no law department. The Attorney General is a mere "officer," and, unlike the other Cabinet officers, is not the "head" of a department. Every one of the Departments has one or more law officers responsible to no common head, each giving different constructions frequently to the same laws, thus creating a constant conflict between the Departments. The law officers of the different Departments are some or all of them engaged in construing the same laws, thus requiring the same work of different officers at the same time. These offices have been created from time to time as the public necessity seemed to require. They are presented in the following table, showing the names of the officers, their salaries, and the annual expense of the law officers of the Government at Washington:

Name of Officer.	Acts of Congress creating Office and fixing salary.	In what volume of U. S. Statutes at Large.	Page of Briggley's Digest.	Present salary per year.	Total salary.	Officers under the bill.	Salary.	Offices abolished.	Salary of abolished offices.		
1. Attorney General.....	Sept. 24, 1789, sec. 35	1 Statutes 98	92	\$8,000	\$8,000 00	Attorney General.....	\$8,000				
2. Assistant Attorney General.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 4	10 Statutes 212	818	3,500	3,500 00	Assistant Attorney General.....	3,500				
3. Chief clerk.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 4	11 Statutes 420	1089	2,200	2,200 00	Chief clerk.....	2,200				
4. Two clerks.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 4	13 Statutes 516	50 sup.	1,800	3,600 00	Two clerks.....	3,600				
5. Two clerks.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 4	13 Statutes 516	50 sup.	1,600	3,200 00	Two clerks.....	3,200				
6. Temporary clerks.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 4	13 Statutes 516	50 sup.	1,200	2,400 00	Temporary clerks.....	2,400				
7. Examiner of claims in the State Department.....	July 25, 1868, sec. 2	14 Statutes 226		3,000	3,000 00	Solicitor in the Bureau of Internal Law.....	3,500				
8. Solicitor of Treasury.....	July 25, 1868, sec. 2	4 Statutes 414	833	3,500	3,500 00	Solicitor in the Bureau of Revenue Law.....	3,000				
9. Three clerks.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 2	12 Statutes 730	182 sup.	1,600	4,800 00	The clerks in the office of the Solicitor of the Treasury are transferred.....	15,400				
10. Seven clerks.....	March 3, 1833, sec. 2	10 Statutes 200	134	1,200	2,500 00	Assistant Solicitor in Bureau of Revenue Law.....	900				
11. Messenger.....	May 29, 1830, sec. 11	4 Statutes 414	884	3,000	3,000 00	Assistant Solicitor in Bureau of Revenue Law.....	2,500				
12. Assistant Solicitor of the Treasury.....	July 23, 1836, sec. 5	14 Statutes 207	108	4,000	4,000 00	Assistant Solicitor in Bureau of Revenue Law.....	2,500				
13. Solicitor of Internal Revenue.....	July 12, 1836	12 Statutes 765	98 sup.	3,500	3,500 00	Solicitor in Bureau of the Court of Claims.....	3,500				
14. Solicitor of the Court of Claims.....	Feb. 24, 1855, sec. 2	11 Statutes 30	290	3,500	3,500 00	First Assistant Solicitor in the Bureau of the Court of Claims.....	3,000				
15. Assistant Solicitor.....	August 6, 1856, sec. 2	11 Statutes 30	200	2,500	2,500 00	Second Assistant Solicitor in Court of Claims.....	750				
16. Deputy Solicitor.....	August 6, 1856, sec. 2	11 Statutes 30	200	750	750 00	One messenger.....	3,000				
17. Messenger.....	July 2, 1836, sec. 8-14	5 Statutes 80	762	3,000	3,000 00	Solicitor in the Bureau of Postal Law.....					
18. Auditor of the Post Office Department*.....	July 3, 1836, sec. 44	5 Statutes 81	761								
19. Judge Advocate General, as head of the Bureau of Military Justice, a part of the War Department, during the continuance of the present rebellion, made permanent by act of July 28, 1867.....	June 20, 1864, sec. 5 July 17, 1862, sec. 5 and 6 July 28, 1866, sec. 12	13 Statutes 145 12 Statutes 598 14 Statutes 334	25 sup. 25 sup. 25 sup.	Rank, pay, and allowance of Colonel of Cavalry..... Rank, pay, and allowance of Colonel of Cavalry..... Rank, pay, and allowance of Colonel of Cavalry.....	4,273 19 4,400 00 4,400 00	Judge Advocate General after April 1, 1869.....	5,673 19				
20. Assistant Judge Advocate General.....	July 23, 1866, sec. 12	14 Statutes 334	25 sup.	1,800	1,800 00	Assistant Judge Advocate General after April 1, 1869.....	4,475 20				
21. One fourth-class clerk, one third-class, one second-class, two first-class clerks.....	July 23, 1866, sec. 12	14 Statutes 334	25 sup.	1,500	1,500 00	One fourth-class clerk.....	1,800				
22. "Solicitor and Naval Judge Advocate General, as officer in the Navy Department," for service during the rebellion, and one year thereafter.....	March 2, 1865 March 2, 1867, sec. 1 Feb. 20, 1863, sec. 3 Repealed by act of July 28, 1866, sec. 26	13 Statutes 468 14 Statutes 430 12 Statutes 656 14 Statutes 337		2,500	3,500 00	One third-class clerk.....	1,500				
23. Solicitor of the War Department.....	July 4, 1836, sec. 5	5 Statutes 662		2,500 00	2,500 00	Solicitor of Bureau of Military and Naval Law.....	3,000				
24. Solicitor of the General Land Office.....	July 4, 1836, sec. 5	5 Statutes 662		2,500 00	2,500 00	Solicitor of the Bureau of Land Law.....	3,500				
25. The amounts paid for legal assistance for the Attorney General in the United States Supreme Court, were as follows: For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1855..... To Mr. Coffee..... To Mr. Willis..... To Mr. Evans..... To Mr. Russell..... Total..... For year ending June 30, 1856..... To Mr. Coffee..... To Mr. Willis..... To Mr. Standley..... To Mr. Butler..... Total..... For year ending June 30, 1857..... To Mr. Willis..... To Mr. Coffee..... To Mr. Evans..... To Mr. Russell..... Total..... Total for three years..... Average each year.....	\$2,000 3,000 3,000 1,500 6,500 \$4,000 3,000 3,500 2,300 13,000 \$3,000 1,300 3,500 7,900 27,300 \$9,100				9,100 00	Solicitor General..... Solicitor of the Bureau of Patent Law..... Stenographic clerk for Attorney General.....	6,000 3,000 2,000				
Total annual expense of the system heretofore in force.....					\$97,738 39	Expenses of the new system.....					\$91,650

*The legal duties of this office under section fourteen of this act are performed by a fourth-class clerk, called "Solicitor of the Sixth Auditor's Office," though no law creates such office. See also, act of March 3, 1825, 4 Statutes 102. This includes the duties of a fourth-class clerk and one third-class clerk, increase by act of March 2, 1867, 15 Statutes 102. Communication for fuel and quarters. To be transferred from the Bureau of Military Justice to the Bureau of Military and Naval Law. He continues in office now. † Abolished June 12, 1864, but its duties are devolved upon the Recorder or such employe in the General Land Office as the Commissioner shall designate.

This does not include expenses of counsel employed by the various Departments in the Court of Claims and for services otherwise at Washington, which would probably reach \$10,000, and which, with the additional twenty per cent. to civil employes, authorized by the joint resolution of Congress of February 28, 1867, amounting to about eight thousand eight hundred and fifty dollars, makes the total annual cost \$116,648 39.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, referring to the accounting officers of his Department, says:

"The Secretary respectfully recommends the reorganization of the accounting offices of the Treasury Department, so as to place this branch of the public service under one responsible head, according to what seems to have been designed in the original organization of the Department, and followed until the increase of business led to the creation of the office of Second Comptroller, and subsequently to that of Commissioner of Customs. There are now three officers controlling the settlement of accounts, each independent of the others, and, as a consequence, the rules and decisions are not uniform where the same or like questions arise. In the judgment of the Secretary the concentration of the accounting offices under one head would secure greater efficiency, as well as greater uniformity of practice, than can be expected under a divided supervision. It is believed, also, that it would be advantageous to relieve the Commissioner of Customs of the duty of settling accounts, and to confine his labors to the supervision of the revenue from customs, now sufficiently large to demand his whole time. It is therefore recommended that the office of Chief Comptroller be created, having general supervision of the accounting officers and appellate jurisdiction from their decisions, to which should be transferred the duty of examining and countersigning warrants on the Treasury and of collecting debts due the Government, now constituting a part of the duties of the First Comptroller; and that the adjustment of accounts pertaining to the customs be restored to the latter office."

The reasons here presented apply with greater force to the law officers of the Government. The law officer of the internal revenue department is required to decide questions affecting the business interests of the whole country without the sanction or approval of the Attorney General. To remedy the defects of the present system this bill proposes to establish a "law department," of which the Attorney General shall be the "head." It provides for bureaus in the law department of "international law," "revenue law," "military and naval law," "postal law," "patent law," "land law," and of the "Court of Claims;" with a principal officer, to be called a solicitor, for each of said bureaus. Assistant solicitors are provided in the bureau of revenue law and of the Court of Claims.

It provides for the transfer to these bureaus of the solicitors and assistant solicitors and other law officers now in the different Departments, and leaves them in office until April 1, 1869, when new officers may be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It proposes to abolish the office of Judge Advocate General and of Solicitor and Naval Judge Advocate General. It proposes to abolish the office of Solicitor of Internal Revenue, devolving his duties on the solicitors of the bureau of revenue law. It requires the approval of the Attorney General to all opinions, and thereby secures uniformity in the construction and administration of all laws. It requires an annual report from the law department of its operations, including the statistics of crime, national and State. It requires the officers established by the bill to perform all legal duties of the Departments and of the Government at Washington, and puts an end to the favoritism and expense heretofore existing of employing extra counsel in cases. In some cases the Attorney General or Solicitor General may manage cases in the circuit courts, and thus save the expense of employing assistant counsel there. The whole expense of the law department is estimated at about one fourth less than the expenses now incurred. I move that the bill be printed, and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was recommitted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SURRENDER OF CRIMINALS.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 719) for the surrender of persons convicted of certain crimes.

The bill was read. It enacts that no person who may have been duly convicted and adjudged guilty of murder, piracy, assassination, arson, robbery, or forgery, and whose conviction has not been reversed, shall be allowed to enter or remain in the United States.

Section two authorizes the President of the United States, upon the production of satisfactory proof that the person so convicted of either of the said crimes as aforesaid has entered, or is about to enter, the United States, to return, or to cause to be returned, such convict to the country from which he came or in which he may have been so convicted.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report two amendments to this bill which I think will remove any objection that might be brought against it. The first amendment is to insert after the word "duly," in the first section, the words "arrested, tried." The second amendment is to insert in the second section, after the word "so," the words "arrested, tried, and."

Mr. CHANLER. I desire to ask if there is anything in the bill which changes the usual practice of insisting upon conviction before surrender?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. It provides that the party shall have been arrested, tried, and convicted.

Mr. CHANLER. I did not hear the words. Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The purpose of the bill is simply this, to prevent persons in foreign countries who have committed the crimes of murder, robbery, arson, or one or two other of the higher grades of crimes mentioned in the bill, from seeking an asylum in the United States.

I will state that the particular case which gives rise to this bill is one which demands immediate action, but I do not feel authorized to state the circumstances of the case, because such a statement might defeat the object. In that particular instance it is of pressing importance that it should be passed, and it interferes with no person except a person who has been arrested, tried, and duly convicted of one of these high crimes and has escaped from the jurisdiction which convicted him and is seeking an asylum in the United States.

Mr. CHANLER. I would ask the gentleman the further question, if this bill touches those cases which have arisen in our intercourse with foreign nations relating to desertion under the military laws of foreign countries?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Oh, no; it has no reference to cases of that kind.

Mr. CHANLER. Does it directly and practically protect our citizens from foreign laws in that respect? That is a question of some importance.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. It has no reference to cases of that kind nor to the protection of citizens of the United States in any foreign country. It merely operates to protect the United States against the presence of persons duly convicted of these high crimes, and who seek an asylum within the United States. That is all.

Mr. CHANLER. My object is simply to prevent any construction of this law by implication which would bring our citizens under any charge of the kind I have mentioned.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. There can be none whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Pennsylvania. I was not present at the meeting of the Judiciary Committee when this bill was considered. I have no objection to it except in one particular. It strikes me that its phraseology needs correction. If I heard it correctly, it provides

for the surrender, not only of persons who have entered the country, but of such as are "about to enter" it. Now, we cannot do that; we cannot return parties who are about to come into the country.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I do not think the gentleman's point is well taken against the bill, because it merely authorizes the President to act, and the President can only act within the jurisdiction of the United States. But the gentleman will at once see that a person may be on board an American ship and before he sets foot upon American soil—except that which is practically American soil, the deck of an American ship—he may be surrendered by the President under the operation of this bill. I ask the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. ROBINSON. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa if this bill would include persons convicted of treason?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. That crime is not mentioned in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. If that is so I have no objection to the bill. But there might be such a thing as shutting out an Emmet or a Kossuth.

Mr. JUDD. I desire to ask the chairman of the Judiciary Committee if this bill would not, by its terms, exclude from this country a party who may have been convicted of these crimes and afterward pardoned by his own Government?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Why, not at all.

Mr. JUDD. I so understand the language; perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The President cannot surrender, under the terms of this bill, the subject of any other country seeking an asylum in the United States unless the conviction is still operating.

Mr. JUDD. I desire to ask an additional question. Suppose a party has served for the term for which he was convicted, and he comes to this country twenty years afterward; is this bill intended to exclude such a person?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Certainly not; and it could not by any possibility be so construed.

The question was upon the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Upon that question I call for the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered; and under the operation thereof the bill was passed.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MYERS. I desire to make a statement in regard to my vote upon the bill passed yesterday appropriating \$50,000 for the relief of American citizens abroad. My vote is recorded in the negative. I voted in the affirmative, and then changed my vote under a misapprehension. I am in favor of the bill.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CHANLER. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which has been reported from the Committee of the Whole with sundry amendments. The previous question has been ordered, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WASHBURNE] is entitled to the floor for one hour.

Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to ask consent of the House to withdraw the