

# Congressional Record.

FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

Free Coinage of Silver.

SPEECH  
OF  
HON. LAFE PENCE,  
OF COLORADO,  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Friday, August 11, 1893.

The House having under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to repeal the Sherman law—

Mr. PENCE said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Were it not for the extraordinary interest of the people who have sent me here, in the solution of this question and in the termination of this discussion, I certainly should not presume, a new member, and here upon the first day of the discussion, to take advantage of the opportunity given me by grace of the Speaker of the House. But there is not a district, saving and excepting only the district of my colleague from Colorado, whose people, old and young, all of them, will watch with as much concern the developments of the next fourteen days.

I was sorry, Mr. Speaker, to note the tone and words of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] who opened this discussion; sorry to see him carry here what we have seen carried now so long through the columns of the metropolitan press, a disposition to treat those of us in Western districts who happen to live in the rugged hills where silver is digged, as if we were foreigners or aliens. I do not exactly gather the reason why the gentleman from Maryland should speak of the Treasury Department acting the part of a pawnbroker to the silver miners of Colorado and Nevada. Mayhap the gentleman knows more of pawnbroking than I do; I know but little. Maybe it was because as I thought then, the sign that is hung out is a golden sign, and the strife within is to deliberately, constantly, always, Jew down the men who bring the silver to them.

That that has been the policy of the present Department is now beyond doubt. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman might have passed by any such allusion as he made to those who have builded up the empires of Colorado and Nevada. It is true that the people of Colorado mine silver, and, under the law since 1873, are compelled to sell it and can not coin it. It is true that they must come with it as a commodity, and not as a coin metal, and it is because the people of that section have come to understand that the platform promises were what the gentleman from Maryland called them, "glittering catch words"—I suppose "catch words" was intended—that within the last twelve months there has been there, not only within the cañons among our hills, but upon all the broad acres of our prairies, an assertion in line with the feeling of political independence which has wiped old party lines and distinctions absolutely out of existence, and not a man there but stands ready to give some reason for his action and for the faith that dwells in him.

Mr. Speaker, some of us in Colorado had been Democrats until, from the gallery of this House, a year ago last March we witnessed a scene in the Fifty-second Congress, a Congress with an overwhelming Democratic majority pledged to the remonetization of silver according to the "glittering catch words" of its platform—until, I say, we saw that House of Representatives assembled in this Hall and saw that it required the vote of the gentleman who was then and is now Speaker to make a tie, to prevent the untimely death of the Stewart silver bill which had passed the Senate.

That was what put to more serious thought those of us who had been Democrats all our lives and had never learned how to scratch a ticket. That, followed by the acts which came later in the year, was what drove us out of the Democratic party. And I am here to bring to the serious attention of the members of this House the reasons of the political uprising which occurred there, and to trace it, if I may in the short time allotted to me, directly and distinctly to this issue. It was not due to the issues that have been mentioned in the Democratic or the Re-

publican press, not to the tariff issue, and above all, not to the issue spoken of by the New York Sun, which claims that the Democratic party came into power because Mr. Reed of Maine had been a Czar! [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, in 1834, when the silver issue was first formally presented before the people, the Democratic party declared its position in unequivocal terms, and at that time every Democrat in the land, East and West, accepted its declaration as standing for the remonetization of silver. The scene here to-day is strange enough to attract the attention of every thoughtful voter. Is it possible that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], uttering the sentiments he does, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], uttering the sentiments he does, were both elected last fall upon the same identical platform? [Laughter and applause.]

Yes; since 1884 and the departure that was inaugurated between November, 1884, and March, 1885, just such incongruous possibilities have sprung up within the lines of the good old Democracy. When the Democratic party in 1884 met in convention it declared itself in this language:

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

That meant the remonetization of silver at its old ratio, and it was so accepted by the producers of this country, and the party that had lost its power and its prestige in 1860 was reinstated at the other end of this avenue; but, before the inauguration of March, 1885, that platform had been deliberately slapped in the face and spit upon. What followed during the four years of the first Cleveland administration? Not one sincere effort, so far as the Administration was concerned, to remonetize silver.

When in 1888 the party convention met, we found that the Democratic party, not being brave enough, not having temerity enough, to go before the American people and again present Mr. Cleveland upon a silver platform, was absolutely silent upon that question, and the Republican party, which it seems to me has been for many years "working" one side of the street, while the other fellows worked the other—the Republican party declared:

We have always recommended the best money known to the civilized world, and we urge that an effort be made to unite all commercial nations in the establishment of an international standard which shall fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage.

No, Mr. Speaker, I mistake. I have read the language of the Republican platform of 1884; but in 1888 the Democratic platform having been, as I have said, silent on the silver question, the Republicans declared their position in this language:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose here or now to go one step farther in allusion to political parties or to take part in a partisan discussion. Anything like that would be farthest from my purpose to-day. Elected last fall by a people as brave, as buoyant, as hopeful as any constituency which ever in any day has honored any member of this House, I know that now their industries lie prostrate, pinned to the earth by the course of the present Administration; by the course of the past Administration; by the surrender, past and present, of those who had been elected upon silver platforms and silver pledges.

I certainly would be guilty of a violation of my duty to them if I should at this time go into any partisan discussion which might be calculated to alienate from the silver forces one single positive or negative man, one single positive or negative vote. And inasmuch as the Democracy dominates in this House—inasmuch as, according to all reports which we have been able to obtain, the bulk of the vote in favor of silver must come from that side—I desire to recall to them the words of one or two of their own statesmen. Inasmuch as the doubt which exists, exists as to how votes shall be cast by members of the majority of this House who were elected last fall upon the platform adopted at Chicago, I want to remind them of some words of their own people.

May I be permitted to read, without sending to the Secretary, the words of that statesman who, when un'ettered and free, standing the manly representative of an independent constituency, uttered the words of wisdom with which he has always

been gifted and which, until lately, have been accompanied by a courage equal to their wisdom and patriotism. Mr. Carlisle upon this floor, in 1878, used the words which I am about to read. And how came he to use them? Let me recite one or two explanatory circumstances. Senator Stanley Matthews had introduced at the other end of the Capitol the resolution known as "the Matthews resolution," which recited the nature of the legislation that governed the issue of various bonds, and concluded with this language:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.*

At that same time this House had under consideration important matters in this same line. The gentleman who so long and bravely has borne the silver standard—the gentleman who preceded me in this discussion—"Silver Dick" BLAND, as we love to call him in our country—was at that time chairman of the coinage committee which had in preparation a free-coinage bill. The Matthews resolution, which had passed the Senate within a few hours after its introduction by a vote of 43 to 22, came to this House, and three days afterward it was passed by this House without debate by a vote of 189 to 79. Mr. Carlisle voted for the resolution, and when a few days afterward, on the 21st of February, 1878, the Bland coinage bill was under consideration in this House, he, then untrammelled and free, a leader and not a follower, a sender of messages, not a bearer, used these words:

I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever become so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry. According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence, and famine that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money of the world.

At that time the Democratic side of the House applauded these words. Do they stand ready to applaud these words now? Do they believe that Mr. Carlisle uttered a truth, or do they propose, under the use of what one of the gentlemen from the State of New York, in a recent article in the North American Review, spoke of as the "use of all the means in the hands of the Administration"—do they propose, under such pressure now, to follow in the surrender that the Secretary of the Treasury himself has made?

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that all the trust that has been placed by the people in the promises of the two great parties has been entirely misplaced. I do not—and shall not until the last moment and under compulsion—accept the declaration now made, that the President having construed the platform of 1892, all those who were aligned with him last fall must accept his construction. It is true that his message was not an entire surprise to the people of the West. We had here and there for some time been noting the signs of the times—trying to determine what the indications were and what must inevitably be the result of this discussion and of the action of the Administration.

While Mr. Harrison was President Mr. Carnegie contributed to the columns of the North American Review, his famous article upon the "A B C of money," and seemed to speak for many when he said that, though a life-long Republican and a life-long protectionist, if in the next campaign (that was the campaign of 1892) there should be upon one side a candidate who was a single gold-standard man and a free-trader, and upon the other a high protectionist in favor of the double standard, he, Andrew Carnegie, the owner of fortunes which we had supposed were chiefly gained through protection, should support the free-trade, gold-standard man.

Is it any wonder that we were put to thought, to serious thought? But last fall the Chicago platform in our section, as in all of the wheat, cotton, and corn States of this Union, had received that construction which has been placed upon it by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] here to-day, and not the construction placed upon it by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], and we still believed that it was possible that the promise was to be kept. Many hesitated and doubted, and those who had been for life allied with the Republican party turned to the Minneapolis straddle of last year and claimed that it must be accepted as meaning the coinage of silver. If that be true, where are the members of this (the Republican) side of the House who used to maintain that construction? What

proportion of them are to be found maintaining by their vote to-day the position maintained by their representatives in the corn and wheat States in last October and November?

A little time passed by, Mr. Speaker, and we first took serious alarm this summer. We still had hoped against hope, and even now hope, perhaps, against hope. But last June when from the pen of the gentleman [Mr. COCKRAN] who now leads, as I understand it, the New York Democracy in this assault against silver in this country—when he in the North American Review in his article on the financial outlook said to the world and to us that—

The recent utterances of the President and of the Secretary of the Treasury, however, appear to settle the question that the present Administration is determined to use all the means at its command to maintain a gold standard—

and when further he said—

The question of free coinage of silver by the United States may be excluded from consideration, as nobody deems the passage of such a law within the limits of possibility during the present Administration—

well indeed might those who had hoped as against hope have become terrorized with fear and apprehension. And since that utterance of last June, followed by this construction which Mr. Preston, Acting Director of the Mint, placed upon the Sherman law of 1890, an encouragement thereby was given to the English creditors, who in the nature of things desired a gold standard in this country, little by little the hopes of our people have been cast down, and not, Mr. Speaker, until within the last forty-eight hours have the hopes of any of us been revived. And why?

Because we have found upon consultation with members of this House, upon both sides of it, that they appreciate and realize the fact that the people who sent them here sent them with the expectation that under no conditions and under no circumstances would a surrender on this vital principle be made to such a message as that which has been sent to us by Mr. Cleveland; and that the people—I do not mean the bankers who meet every night and flood us with petitions, nor the committees of boards of trade, but I mean what George Wilson, of Missouri, calls "the fellows who follow the mule in the corn rows under the hot July and August suns"—I mean that these people still believe that this House of Representatives, equal in dignity with the body that sits in the other end of this Capitol, equal in power, closer to the people, fresher from their midst, will not sooner hang out the white flag of surrender than will the gentlemen of the higher body at the other end of the building. And within two weeks the people will have come to know whether that conclusion is well founded or otherwise.

I say, then, Mr. Speaker, that we have renewed our hopes because the members of this House can not fail to recall, when once reminded of it, that nowhere, at no time, at no State convention within the limits of the United States, except once in the State of Massachusetts two years ago, has the Democratic party ever presumed to declare for the single gold standard now urged by the President. No member of the House in the majority, and but few in the minority, and none in the smaller minority to which I belong, came here with any other expectation upon the part of the people who sent them than that silver would be raised, not stricken down; elevated, not made prostrate; and that the standard dollar which has been the Republican dollar, which has been the Democratic dollar, which has been the dollar of all the people, should receive, not the cold shoulder, but the bright and warming and beaming smile of the members on all sides of this question.

Is there any member here from a wheat or cotton State who feels that he can go home and explain to his people that he did a patriot's duty and well-fulfilled the commission with which he was intrusted when he suddenly, without notice to his constituents, surrendered to the call of the gold-standard men? It may be that there are those who can. I mention this, not as a threat, but as a simple reminder to the members of this House that the same voters who sent us here last fall by their suffrages certainly have not all of them become forgetful of the conditions upon which we were sent. They have not all of them failed to regard the understanding upon which we were honored and trusted.

Upon what theory, I ask, can a Republican minority, by a preponderance of its votes or by any considerable number of its votes, find justification before the people of this country in carrying out the behest and command of a Democratic Administration? Upon what line or theory are they to explain when they go home next time that their duty was patriotically performed and that their pledges were fulfilled? It is strange—and we have regarded it as strange since this discussion originally began—that to-day, not perhaps amongst the members of this House, and I will not say so, but in the columns of the metropolitan press, Democratic and Republican, we find the same men who, upon the tariff question, have for years and years besought the American people to stand out against England, and England's

pauper conditions, and to maintain here under our own bright Stars and Stripes an American policy, now most active in trying to prevail upon the members of this House, by their editorial utterances, to surrender absolutely any idea of America having any policy of her own upon the money question.

We find this true in the press of both of the great parties, and why does it happen? How does it happen that those who were so jealous of the American plan and the American policy, who have so roundly denounced the attempt of the Democracy to surrender to the Cobden Club and to the free traders of England and to bring our poor laboring men into competition with the pauper labor of Europe, how does it happen that now and here upon this question of greater importance you protest that we must wait upon England, that we must not remonetize until England consents, and that when we remonetize we must do so at a ratio which meets with the approval of England?

What! Wait upon England to fix the ratio for us? With one twenty-fifth of the population of the earth, producing two-fifths of the silver, shall we yield the entire vantage that comes thereby to them? Just as well say to them that by arbitrary law, final and irrevocable, we would go into international commission with England and Germany to determine what should be the price of the wheat, the corn, and the cotton; for, as they need the one they need the other, and like as they must have the one they must have the other.

But we find this condition of affairs: We find, according to the claims that are made, a considerable proportion of the Republican minority standing ready to do that which they never would do for a President of their own selection—ready to surrender.

Let me say to the gentlemen from the West and South that in the East we find no difference. When this vote comes, two weeks from now, unless the political denomination of each member is designated, when you go down the call of the "ayes" who support the message of the President, how are you to tell the Eastern Democrat from the Eastern Republican?

According to prophecies made, you will find them standing together; and I maintain, now and here, to the members from the West and South, that there should be that same degree of vigor and energetic organization for the protection of our people that you find down here, east of the Allegheny Mountains. Regardless of party, Democrats and Republicans alike, you should find a determination and a purpose to redeem now, in Washington, the promises that were made out in Illinois and Tennessee and Iowa last September and October. Unless that is done, the reckoning that must finally come—mentioned now in no sense as a threat—must be one that will call upon the members of those sections for a plain and candid explanation of the reasons for the surrender now contemplated by the bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

I say, why is it, Mr. Speaker, that, regardless of party, we find the Eastern and Northeastern members of this House united? Because, according to the course of the financial legislation ever since the war, every benefit has been diverted to them and every burden has been shifted upon our Western people. And when I speak of our Western people I allude now only to those who dwell in the mining States. Those who dwell in mining States went into the vastnesses of those hills, into that wilderness upon the very frontier of what you gentlemen in your old-time geographies marked as the Great American Desert, and by their energy and pluck they have there builded up an empire of wealth. They went there under what protection of the Federal law? They went there under the protection of a law that had been upon our books since the days of Washington, Hamilton, and Jefferson. Never once had that policy been interfered with. Never once had any of the people asked that it be revoked. Never once under any circumstances had there been any body, commercial or otherwise, asking for the repeal of that law.

Now, the transaction done in this House in 1873, according to all the testimony from members of both political parties then here represented, was done covertly and secretly by fraud; and the people who had settled that section, who had developed the mines of that country, who had produced the silver necessary for the money uses of this land, had no notice in the world that the doors of the mints at Philadelphia, New Orleans, and Carson were to be suddenly, without notice, without demand from anywhere, closed against their product. It is not necessary now and here, or at this day, to review any of the testimony as to the manner of the demonetization of silver.

We all know to-day that there lives but one man, and he the senior Senator from Ohio, who pretends that the demonetization act was demanded by anybody, or that anybody except himself understood it to be a demonetization act. And from that time, as soon as the people understood that silver had been stricken down or assaulted, an effort has been made by the people of this country to secure from one or the other of the

great political parties a promise that has been made in each successive campaign for its remonetization.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know—of course, no man can tell now—how many there will be to follow the course of the eminent gentlemen who but a few years ago stood upon this floor and advocated the remonetization of silver and who to-day are members of the President's official family and seem to be committed against that policy. It is hard and difficult, at this stage of the proceedings to reach any determination; but I have said, and say again, that the people in whose behalf I speak upon this floor still are gathered together to-day in their homes and idly around the furnaces where the fires have been compelled to expire.

In that Commonwealth which possessed but six months ago a degree of wealth equal to any State in this Union, they are bracing each other up to-day with the expression of hope that in this body there will be found enough and more than enough to stand against the message of the President, and to stand for the fulfillment of the promises that have been made, to stand courageously and valiantly in behalf, not of the creditor class but of the debtor class of this land, and here finally to say by their votes that the time has not yet come when one branch of this Government can be compelled by another, or driven by another, or persuaded or cajoled by another into an act which will add to the amount of the indebtedness of every debtor and add to the credit of every creditor, whether on this or upon the other side of the Atlantic Ocean.

Let me ask of the gentlemen from the New England States, while it is to your plain advantage to increase the value of the dollar, while it is to your advantage to make it so that it will take more of wheat and more of corn and more of the products of every kind of the broad acres of the West with which to buy it, whether that product is purchased or taken in the payment of a debt: Can you afford as Americans, can you afford as the fathers of the boys and girls who went into our country and there raised the flag and extended the wealth and the territory over which it waves—can you, because of the pitiful percentage of advantage you will get, vote for a policy which gives the bulk and the majority of the increase of credit to those who have no citizenship or interest in this land?

It is true, as we look upon it in the West, that Boston will get its share of the benefit of sustaining the law which the President seeks. It is true that New York will also; but after all, London, England, will have four-fifths of it. Can you, Representatives from the New England States, afford as patriots, as Americans, for the pitiful share of advantage you will secure, join in the demand of England for the legislation that is here proposed?

Why do I suggest this? Mr. Speaker, only a year or two ago we in the West heard, as you did in the South and East, the proclamation of the "Plumed Knight," who was then upon his visit in France, I believe, and we remember that the cable carried to us and to you the account of the vast increase of the wealth of this land, and we joined and shared in the pride and satisfaction that came to us when that eminent leader of his party pointed out that we not twice more, but five times more than any other nation upon the face of the globe, had increased our wealth from 1880 to 1890; and so we had.

We found an aggregate wealth of sixty billions to sixty millions of people; and a simple arithmetical calculation gave us the average for every man, woman, and child in arms in the country at \$1,000. I do not know what the facts were in Massachusetts. The average there may have been all right, but in Iowa, Colorado, and some other States, the average was not found to turn out exactly right. The aggregate was all right, but a further study was had and the same census upon which our pride in the West had been founded, the same sworn returns, reports, and statistics which had filled us with satisfaction and joy, pointed out to us that within that decade the increase in wealth of Massachusetts alone had been \$569,000,000.

Five hundred and sixty-nine millions! If that were true, what must be the increase of wealth in the broad, rich acres of Illinois and of Indiana? Well, the same statistics brought us to a realization of the fact that Nebraska, and Iowa, and Illinois, and Indiana, and Louisiana, and Mississippi, and Alabama, and Georgia, and North Carolina, nine empires of rich acres, teeming with industrious men and women, containing fifty-eight times as many acres as Massachusetts, fourteen times as many people to start with in 1880, and twice as much assessed value, the census, I say, brought us to a realization of the fact that the whole nine of these great empire States had gained in wealth in the same period but \$559,000,000. Massachusetts alone had gained ten millions more than the entire nine!

These are the facts and figures, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, which have been studied in the humble cottages and homes of the western plains and hills. These are the conditions which the people there will no longer hesitate to re-

buke. It is no wonder that Mr. Carnegie, standing not only for a protected class but for the creditor class, for the class that holds the evidences of indebtedness over all the productive sections of this country, the class that holds the State and county and town and city and township bonds of every agricultural State and levies the first tribute as an interest charge that is levied up in the people's toil—it is no wonder that he should say that if he were compelled to relinquish either the dimes which came to him through protection or the dollars which came to him through infamous and imbecile financial legislation, he would hold on to the dollars and say good-bye to the dimes. It is no wonder that he should say that in 1892, if put to a selection between a free trade gold-standard candidate and a high-protection double-standard candidate, he would support the free trader.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] spoke of the Sherman law as one that had brought crisis and disaster upon this country by its enforcement. The trouble has been that at no time since its enactment has either the letter or the spirit of that law been enforced.

It seemed very strange to us that any bill which purported to provide for either the purchase or the coinage of more silver should be called by the name of the "Sherman act." It seemed anomalous to us that a bill sometimes called a silver bill should at other times be called the Sherman bill, and it took some time and some research to discover why the Senator from Ohio, whose position on this subject has always been understood, should in 1890 have voted for and supported a measure which provided for the use or the purchase of more silver than was provided for under the Bland-Allison act. It of course was found to be the proviso in that bill, which permitted the Secretary of the Treasury, after a fixed date, in the exercise of his discretion, to practically terminate and cut off all coinage of silver.

It was not because the law provided for the purchase of four and one-half million ounces of silver per month as against \$2,000,000 worth under the Bland law that the Senator from Ohio gave it his support. It was because after a fixed time—the 1st of July, 1891—the Secretary of the Treasury, in the exercise of his discretion, was given authority to cut off entirely the future coinage of silver, and that was done. It was that proviso in the bill

that secured the support of the Senator from Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is not, and it has not been at any time, the extent of the use of silver, but the kind of the use of silver, to which our people have objected.

When Mr. Harrison last fall spoke of an enlarged use of silver, in line with his policy of purchasing it at the lowest possible price and as a commodity, the objection upon our part was not to the extent of the use, but to the kind of use. Upon the floor of the Senate in 1850 and odd, when there was a discussion upon the repeal of the Missouri compromise act, Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, spoke in feeling terms against an arbitrary law that would prevent him from carrying into the State of Missouri the beloved family servant that had dwelt with him for years; and the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Wade, in answering him, said:

The law and we do not protest against the Senator carrying with him his colored servant into the State of Missouri. What we protest against is his selling her after he gets her there.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it is the kind and not the extent of the use of silver that we complain of; and we believe, as sincerely as any class of citizens ever believed in a political tenet, that the rehabilitation of silver will be as directly and positively to the advantage of all the producers on all the acres in the West and South and to the laborers in the East as it will be to the advantage of the silver miners in the mountain States.

As to figures and statistics touching this matter, I shall trust to my colleague and others who may follow me in this discussion to advise the House. Without detaining the House further, I thank it for its attention. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call attention to a portion of the language of the order adopted this morning. That order provides that the daily sessions of the House shall continue from 11 a. m. until 5 p. m., and that "night sessions may be held for debate only, at the request of either side." Unless some provision be made for a night session, the Chair, at the hour of 5 o'clock, will declare the House adjourned until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. The Chair does not know the disposition of the House as to a night session; that matter the House will determine for itself.