the gentleman from Harford (Mr. Galloway) a substitute for the original article?

The PRESIDENT. It is submitted as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott.)

Mr. GREENE. What has become of the amendment I submitted? It appears from the Journal that my amendment was adopted by a vote of 45 to 38.

Mr. STIRLING. That is so; and after it was adopted, I moved an amendment as a substitute for it, which was adopted. This morning the vote adopting my amendment was reconsidered, and I then withdrew my amendment. Does not that leave the amendment of the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Greene) as the subject before the House?

The PRESIDENT. The Chair will state his understanding of the matter. The original amendment was the one submitted by the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Scott.) To that amendment the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Greene) submitted an amendment which was adopted, and the question then was upon the amendment as amended. Subsequently the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) submitted a proposition in place of the one which the House had inserted in the place of the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott,) and the House adopted it, thus disposing finally of the one submitted by the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Greene,) which was thus removed entirely from before the House. The question this morning was upon the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott,) as amended upon the motion of the gentleman from Baltimore city, The amendment of the gentleman from Baltimore city having been withdrawn, the question now comes up on the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, which has never been disposed of by the House.

Mr. STIRLING. The gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott) withdrew his amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The Journal does not so record it. The chair must be regulated by the Journal. The question now is upon the original amendment proposed by the gentleman from Cecil, which is susceptible of further amendment. And the amendment of the gentleman from Harford (Mr. Galloway) is submitted in the form of an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Scott.)

Mr. DANIEL. The amendment of the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Greene) having been adopted, it took the place of the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Scott.) The amendment of my colleague, (Mr. Stirling) which was submitted in place of that of the gentleman from Alleghany, having been withdrawn, does not the question come up on the amendment of the gentleman from Allegany, which I think was decided yesterday to stand in place of the article originally reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT. If the House had not substituted the proposition of the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling) in place of the one adopted on motion of the gentleman from Allegany, (Mr. Greene) thus effectually removing that proposition from before the House, it would now be in order, as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Scott)

Mr. GREENE. I would state that when the amendment I submitted was adopted by the House, it being in the nature of a substitute for the original article, and accomplishing the object the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott) had in view, that gentleman withdrew his amendment.

The PRESIDENT. The Journal does not mention that statement.

Mr. STIRLING. The Journal as printed now reads:

"The original amendment submitted by Mr. Scott, to wit:

"Strike out all between the word 'that' in the first line, and the word 'every' in the third line."

Now the Journal stops, evidently showing that there is an omission of something, and that something is that the amendment of Mr. Scott was withdrawn.

Mr. HEBB. I move to amend the Journal by inserting after that portion which has just been read by the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Stirling) the words "was withdrawn by unanimous consent."

The PRESIDENT. If the amendment of the the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott) be withdrawn, it being the original proposition to amend, and not disposed of by any vote of the House, and all the others being amendments to that amendment, all the amendments necessarily fall with it.

Mr. STIRLING. How can the amendment of the gentleman from Allegany (Mr. Greene) be regarded as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Cecil, (Mr. Scott) the one being a motion to amend a portion of the original article, and the other being a substitute for the entire article?

The PRESIDENT. The one was submitted as an amendment to the other. The Chair did not feel called upon to decide whether it was properly an amendment to the amendment, or a substitute for the whole article, but left that for the House to decide, which it did by receiving it and voting upon it. The Chair would remark, however, that strictly speaking, there is no such thing known in parliamentary law as a substitute for a pending proposition. All changes made in a pending proposition must be in the nature of amendments, by way of striking out a portion, or inserting or adding to it additional words, or striking out a portion and inserting other words in place of those stricken out. But in that case there must always be left a portion of the original proposition, if but one word,