Chapter 18

Insurgency Revolt: Part I

On the eve of the conflict, the House of Representatives had 391 members. Each of these gentlemen was usually assigned a place on any two of the fifty-six standing committees of the House by the Speaker, who, at the same time, chose the chairman of each of these committees. The Speaker also had the power to refer bills to committees where he knew they would be reported as he desired. As chairman of the all-powerful, five-man Rules Committee, he could make anything in or out of order at any time. In the Speaker's chair, Joseph G. Cannon usually refused to recognize anyone unless the member first stated his purpose. Consequently most members visited the Speaker's room beforehand and requested recognition rather than undergo the embarrassment of having their requests to speak denied and noted in the Congressional Record.

Committee assignments, as Norris and the other insurgents well knew, could make or break a member's reputation by placing him in the foreground on important issues or by relegating him to an insignificant position in the congressional hierarchy. The Speaker thus could curb the ambition as well as the ability and usefulness of any member. The insurgents, besides being demoted in their committee assignments, knew that no bill they filed would be seriously considered and that recognition from the Speaker would not be easily forthcoming. This knowledge, of course, did not silence them. When the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole for purposes of debate and amendment, all members were granted some time for speechmaking or questioning if they so desired.

The insurgents, as has already been noted, had no desire to repeal the strictly parliamentary rules of the House. They realized that rules were necessary in a large legislative body and were in accord with most of them. Their desire was to make the Speaker a presiding officer with no extraneous powers. Under the prevailing rules the Speaker was all-powerful and was responsible, once duly chosen and installed, to no one for the remainder of the Congress, while he had it within his power
to promote or destroy the careers of members who met with his favor or displeasure. As a journalist, referring to the insurgents' goal, put it:

They would take the Speaker's purely political power: to obstruct, impaire or control legislation: to thwart the will of the majority: to limit genuine debate: to pack important committees with the representatives of Big Business: to control the ambition, ability, and usefulness of members of Congress: to make him the sole political judge of what laws may be enacted and what measures shall be defeated.²

Until the opportunity to bring about this change presented itself, the insurgents by themselves could do little in terms of introducing or even improving bills. However, aided by the Democrats, they were able to take advantage of any slips Cannon and his lieutenants made. And, on their own, since they first organized in December, 1908, they exerted tremendous efforts to educate the public in the righteousness of their cause. Their nuisance value was a growing source of embarrassment to both Cannon and the Taft administration and a boon to the coalescing progressive cause.

Sentiment against the Speaker and his power was growing throughout the country, especially in the Middle West. In February, 1909, Success Magazine asked its subscribers, "Do you believe that the rules of the House should place in the hands of the Speaker the power of determining the membership of the Committees?" Within three weeks, 11,134 readers voted "No" and 364, "Yes." To the question, "Do you believe that Joseph G. Cannon should be elected Speaker of the House of Representatives?" 10,825 voted "No" and 539 voted "Yes."³ On a state-wide basis, T. A. McNeal, a columnist for the Topeka Daily Capital, published in January, 1910, the results of a poll he had conducted among Kansas Republicans. To the question, "Are you opposed to the rule of Cannon in the House and Aldrich in the Senate?" 1,579 answered "Yes" and 81, "No."⁴

By organizing, the insurgents were able to make themselves an effective group, though their membership fluctuated between twenty-five and thirty and complete unanimity was rare among them. After Hepburn's retirement at the end of the Sixtieth Congress, Augustus Gardner of Massachusetts served as chairman of the group. John M. Nelson of Wisconsin acted as secretary and his office was utilized as a meeting place. With Edmond H. Madison of Kansas they functioned as a committee on strategy⁵ which ably directed the insurgent forces in the first major conflict over the rules. However, by 1910, Norris had emerged as the outstanding figure among the insurgents.
As an indication of his rising prominence, Norris in 1910 published several articles in *La Follette's Magazine* explaining the insurgents' position, accomplishments, and desires for the future. His interviews and correspondence with members of the press increased substantially. In his letters, he explained the insurgent position and occasionally attempted to correct misconceptions that appeared in articles. Letters in the latter category were usually not for publication, while those in the former were. In his correspondence with journalists, Norris revealed more fully the workings of the House. He explained that there was not as much "log rolling" in Congress as there was subservience to the Speaker's will. Deals were made, Norris knew, but as a rule they had the approval of the Speaker, if, in fact, they did not originate with him. Furthermore, he understood that reform usually came slowly and in the way of compromise, and that many who had been most active in a fight might not be on the scene when victory was won. Actually, in the case of the insurgents, most of them were on hand when victory was achieved, and all of them must have known that it was, at best, a partial triumph.

Since the term "progressive" was coming into widespread use, Norris made some effort early in 1910 to distinguish between an insurgent and a progressive as they affected politics. The insurgency movement, he claimed, arose in the House when some Republicans demanded a change in the rules; its primary aim was to change these rules and to curb the Speaker's power. Progressives, on the other hand, sought more widespread reform; they wanted to curb not only machine rule in the political arena, but corporation control in the social and economic realm as well. While many of the insurgents were progressives as far as other reforms were concerned, some were standpatters on all but the rules issue. There was no attempt to organize Republican dissidents "along any line except that of taking away from the Speaker some of his extraordinary power." Norris summarized the insurgent position as follows:

We want the House to have an opportunity for itself to pass on the questions and we therefore desire to take away from the Speaker the power given to him by the Rules of the House which prevent the House from participating in legislative action. We want the House to be representative of the people and each individual member to have his ideas presented and passed on, and at the same time to be required to assume his share of the responsibility.

To his constituents, Norris explained that he was not discouraged, though he was convinced that Taft would be unable to carry out the
Roosevelt policies. Indeed, Norris believed that the president had allied himself with Speaker Cannon and Senator Aldrich against these policies. Yet despite overwhelming opposition, he knew that the insurgents had been making "some impression on the machine." Referring to the power of the Speaker, Norris, in mid-January, 1910, said, "It is going to pieces, there is no doubt about that." But he envisioned its collapse in the next Congress as a result of the 1910 elections.9

Throughout February Norris and the insurgents busied themselves with legislative matters. Then in March the insurgents, allied with the Democratic members, found an opportunity to inflict a petty personal humiliation on the Speaker; they amended an appropriation bill to deprive both the Speaker and the vice president of a fifteen-thousand-dollar allowance for automobiles.10 However, appropriations had nothing to do with the matter that soon thereafter provided an entering wedge and precipitated a revolution in the House. It started innocently enough with a discussion of the census.

Democratic Congressman Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois, a member of the Committee on the Census, introduced a resolution, not fifty words in length, providing that in the approaching census enumerators ascertain the mother tongue of all persons born abroad, thereby providing more adequate information about the languages and the national origins of the American people. On the next day, Wednesday, March 16, Speaker Cannon recognized Edgar D. Crumpacker of Indiana, chairman of the Committee on the Census, for the purpose of presenting this minor resolution as an amendment to the census bill. While there was no opposition to the amendment, Crumpacker's proposal brought forth a storm of criticism because it violated the sanctity of Calendar Wednesday which Cannon had conceded to the insurgents a year before in the first major battle over the rules. Many members felt that the introduction of the Sabath resolution at this time created a dangerous precedent and impaired the value of the one day when members did not have to seek the Speaker's permission to gain recognition.

Democratic Representative John J. Fitzgerald of New York, who had suggested Calendar Wednesday to Cannon as a compromise measure in the 1909 fracas, was vigorous in his protest and raised a point of order. Cannon, after listening to the debate in which, incidentally, the insurgents rarely participated, ruled that the census amendment was in order "under a higher law than the rule of the House, or, for that matter, higher than a statutory law under the Constitution." It was a privileged question under the Constitution (Article I, Section 2) and as such claimed precedence over all House proce-
dures. The Speaker's decision, however, was reversed by the members—a rare occurrence in the House—by a vote of 163 to 112.11

Crumpacker, like Cannon, thought the resolution was privileged. Somewhat piqued12 over the refusal of the House to consider it on Calendar Wednesday, he reintroduced it the next day, St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1910. When a point of order was again made, Speaker Cannon, rather than suffer another humiliation, shrewdly referred the question to the members for decision. The House, by a vote of 201 to 72, overwhelmingly decided that the resolution was privileged and in order, indicating that it was less concerned with the constitutional question than with the desire to preserve the integrity of Calendar Wednesday. Incidentally, Norris and other insurgents voted against the proposition that the census amendment presented a question of high constitutional privilege.13

Before the vote was taken, Norris engaged in a discussion with Marlin E. Olmsted of Pennsylvania in which Norris inquired if a committee report was necessary for a constitutionally privileged motion. He asked whether any member could come in with a bill that had not even been printed and take up the time of the House on the ground that it was a matter privileged by the Constitution. Olmsted, a Cannon supporter, adroitly parried Norris' probing by implying that the Speaker, and not a mere member, could answer such questions.14 Here then was the opportunity the insurgents had been awaiting, though it is doubtful if any but Norris realized it at the time.

Once the vote was taken which declared the amendment privileged, the House proceeded to adopt the amendment. Norris thereupon sought the floor, stating, "Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution." At about three o'clock in the afternoon on his third effort to gain the Speaker's attention, he was recognized. The revolution was under way:

MR. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution made privileged by the Constitution.

THE SPEAKER: If it is a resolution made privileged by the Constitution, the gentleman will present it.15

Amid general laughter, Norris pulled from his pocket a creased and crumbled piece of paper which he sent to the desk for the clerk to read. The smiling, deferential grin on the Speaker's face quickly gave way to a look of grim determination as the clerk read the resolution, similar to the one Norris had presented in the Sixtieth Congress (May 16, 1908). It called for a Committee on Rules consisting of fifteen members, geographically distributed, nine of whom should be members of
the majority party. The Speaker could not be eligible for membership on the committee which would choose its own chairman.

Cannon's chief lieutenant, John Dalzell, immediately made the point that this resolution was not in order, that it was not privileged. Norris, citing the census amendment, insisted his resolution was privileged under the Constitution and thereby entitled to consideration. Article I, Section 5 of the Constitution wherein it is stated that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings" provided the basis for the claim that the resolution was privileged. He said the Constitution granted him a right to introduce this resolution, that under the recent decision of the House on the census amendment it must be in order. Norris crystallized his position when he said:

When the House went on record that the census proposition was in order, it was not in accordance with my individual view. I did not believe it was privileged. But this must follow, as a logical result, it seems to me, in that case that the privileged nature of the resolution did not depend on its being reported by a committee or considered by a committee, but it was privileged, if privileged at all, because the Constitution made it so.

No committee consideration, no committee report, would add or take away from its privileged nature. I am not responsible for the position in which the House has placed itself; but to be consistent, it seems to me this resolution would have to be held privileged the same as the others.

Cannon, having been overruled the previous day by insurgent and Democratic votes, fully understood his precarious position. Ninety-nine members had not answered when the roll was recorded shortly after noon, and the Speaker realized that the absent regular Republican members would have to be present to vote on any ruling if he were not to suffer further defeat. Yet, if the entire membership of the House were on hand, Cannon knew that the insurgent Republicans and their Democratic allies could probably defeat him. The only chance he had—and it was a long one—was to delay making a decision until absent Republican members could be urged to return and he could seek ample precedents for deciding, despite the census decision, that Norris' resolution was not in order.

Thus the House settled down to a long period of discussion and debate. In one of the very rare instances in the history of the House, every member said what he wanted to say and took as long as he wanted in saying it. The debate on the merits of the question before
the House was presumably for the benefit of the Speaker, to provide him with information necessary for his ruling. But Cannon was rarely in the Speaker’s chair. Since the Democrats and the insurgents refused to countenance any adjournment until the Speaker made a ruling, and since there was no power to compel him to rule, the group supporting the Norris resolution prepared to spend the night in session and to maintain their forces on the floor to prevent any sudden recess for lack of a quorum. Norris personally had no objection to an adjournment, though he went along with the members who wanted the Speaker to make a ruling beforehand.\textsuperscript{18}

Partners to both sides of this controversy stated their positions in speeches of varying ability and eloquence. Norris, having had his say at the outset, said little. Frequently the House chamber reverberated with applause and cheers or cries of “Rule, Rule,” as the members, realizing it would be many hours before a ruling was forthcoming, gave vent to their partisanship while the Speaker, the central figure in the debate, could in effect do little to exercise authority and curb the more boisterous members. One of the more dramatic incidents occurred when Henry Allen Cooper of Wisconsin called upon a number of insurgent Republicans to testify to the punishment they had received in the way of unfavorable committee appointments. Speaker Cannon had been out of the chamber at the outset of Cooper’s speech. Upon his return he stood on the lower steps of the Speaker’s platform, resting his arm upon the clerk’s desk. From this vantage point, raised slightly above the crowd of members who were milling in front of him, he glared down into the face of the “insurging” Cooper.\textsuperscript{19}

Cooper had just mentioned the case of Augustus Gardner of Massachusetts. He shouted that Gardner had voted for the present Speaker, but because Gardner had voted against the rules he was deposed from his place as chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions. Suddenly the Speaker sprang into action and interrupted Cooper. He asked Gardner to come forth and explain why he did not retain his chairmanship. Gardner, called to the floor from an adjoining lobby, came forth and explained, while Cannon smiled, that he had retired voluntarily because he wanted to be free to speak and act as he pleased on insurgent matters.

However, Cannon did not have much time to enjoy this victory because Cooper then called upon Charles W. Fowler of New Jersey, Victor Murdock of Kansas, and Norris, each of whom related to the House how they were punished for opposing the autocratic rule of the Speaker and his organization. As Cooper called each of these gentlemen, they were pushed through the crowd up to the open space before
the dais to speak, while Cannon, leaning against the clerk's desk, "rigid in every line of his body," turned occasionally to Vice-President Sherman who, along with many senators, had appeared on the floor of the House.\footnote{20}

Once Cooper had concluded his remarks, Cannon resumed the Speaker's chair and explained he would rule on the point of order only after due consideration of precedents. After the House again refused to adjourn or recess, the Democrats amid great excitement continually shouted, "Rule, Rule." But Cannon, once the shouting started, merely smiled, kissed the tips of his fingers towards the Democrats, bowed politely, and then recognized J. Warren Keifer of Ohio who spoke at length in support of the Speaker, despite much disorder and many interruptions which now characterized these proceedings more and more.\footnote{21}

As evening turned to night and night to dawn, Cannon still refused to make a ruling on the Norris resolution. The wordy battle raged on, but fewer members appeared on the floor to participate. The Speaker sought a few hours' sleep in his office, while other members did the same at their desks, in their offices, or in the adjoining lobbies. There were so few members on the floor during the exhausting night session that the sergeant-at-arms and several deputies were ordered to seek members absent without leave and bring them before the bar of the House.

Continually the Democrats and the small insurgent group voted against any recess or adjournment despite efforts by Republican members to achieve one or the other.\footnote{22} Indeed, at times in the early morning hours of March 18, the House of Representatives did not appear to be in session, as the following entry in the \textit{Record} indicates:

\textbf{THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:} The House will be in order. Gentlemen will understand the impropriety of singing on the floor, even though the House is not at this moment transacting any business. The House is not in recess.

\textbf{CHORUS:} "There'll be a hot time in the old town tonight."

\textbf{THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:} That was last night, not tonight. (laughter). The House will be in order.\footnote{23}

In a more serious vein, Norris at 5:20 A.M. proposed an adjournment until noon. He felt that the group, having exemplified its principle, was now wearing itself out needlessly. Ollie M. James, a Kentucky Democrat, replied that "for the people's rule of the Congress of the United States" he was willing to lose a night's sleep. He protested against any concession to personal comfort which would tend to de-
tract from the impressiveness of the object lesson they were giving the American people of devotion to the public business.  

At 6 A.M. Speaker Cannon returned to the House chamber. He appeared slightly worried. His voice was not the least bit husky, and the early morning hours were spent discussing whether less than a quorum had the power to issue warrants empowering the sergeant-at-arms and his deputies to bring in absent members. During this discussion some members snoozed in their seats; some read the morning papers; others gathered in small groups. Though nothing of consequence occurred during the morning hours on the floor, the official reporters who had been at their posts since noon the previous day noted that thus far they had taken down 146,000 words, more than three times the daily average.

Throughout the proceedings on March 17, the galleries were filled with an appreciative audience that overflowed into the corridors. During the evening the entrance to the House was flanked by automobiles. While the audience had thinned out in the early morning hours of March 18, galleries once again reached capacity long before mid-morning. Men and women prominent in the life of the nation’s capital as well as members of the families of the participants below were on hand.

Meanwhile, behind the scenes, three distinct compromise efforts were made by the regular Republicans, and all were humiliatingly rejected by the insurgent Republicans and Democrats. The first conference was held in Gardner’s office. The proposition submitted by the Cannon delegates called for a ten-man Rules Committee, consisting of six Republicans and four Democrats. Nothing was said about keeping the Speaker off the committee, though the regulars said they were willing to make a gentleman’s agreement that the Speaker would not seek membership. The conference came to nought. The radical insurgents insisted that the Speaker specifically be excluded from the committee, though their more moderate colleagues were willing to accept a compromise which would have postponed the operation of the elimination provision until after Cannon’s tenure as Speaker had expired. The only point to which all factions agreed at this first conference was that the committee should consist of ten men.

No sooner had the delegates filed into the House chamber than the regulars requested another conference. This time they suggested a fifteen-man Rules Committee, but again said nothing about the Speaker’s membership. This conference, like the first, failed to reach any understanding and for the same reason. The insurgents and the Demo-
It now appeared that further negotiation was futile. Norris asserted that a majority of between ten and fifteen votes would carry his ruling. "We will beat them. There is no doubt of the result unless there is some legerdemain." This prediction was endorsed by Champ Clark, the Democratic leader. Both men felt, indeed all participants and observers knew, that Cannon would soon be compelled to face the issue he had been dodging for almost twenty-four hours in the vain hope that enough votes could be mustered to save him from humiliating defeat.

When the Speaker ascended to his desk just before noon he was greeted with jeering cries of "Rule, Rule, Rule." Cannon smiled grimly at his Democratic tormentors and announced that he would be prepared to rule in the near future. The delay in ruling was due to a desperate effort by Cannon's lieutenants to secure some sort of compromise. The Speaker's position was becoming even more precarious, not only because the Democrats and insurgent Republicans were holding their ground, but because many Republicans representing close districts, particularly in the West, were flooded with telegrams demanding that they vote against Cannon for a liberalization of the rules. This knowledge and the realization that several of his supporters would be compelled to break ranks undoubtedly forced Cannon to seek a compromise.

Thus, sometime before noon, the regulars sought another conference, their final effort at compromise. This time they announced their willingness to accept the Norris resolution, provided the sentence excluding the Speaker from membership on the committee be removed. This of course was not acceptable to Norris, Gardner, Irvine Lenroot of Wisconsin, and E. A. Hayes of California, the insurgent delegates. While this conference was in session, on the floor of the House of Representatives, W. E. Martin of South Dakota moved for a recess until 4 P.M. Champ Clark demanded a roll call and the conference came to an abrupt end as the participants returned to the floor to vote. On this vote the regulars defeated the insurgent and Democratic coalition by a vote of 160 to 152, and the House recessed for two hours, at the end of which time it was hoped the Speaker would make his ruling.

As soon as the recess was announced, the Democrats went into caucus and reiterated their decision to oust the Speaker from the Committee on Rules, though they decided to modify the structure of the committee from that proposed in the Norris resolution. They consulted
with Congressmen Dalzell, Walter I. Smith of Iowa, and John W. Dwight of New York, all prominent Cannon aides, as to possible concessions to which the Speaker might agree. The aides, however, refused to give any information as to the Speaker’s intentions. Norris, interviewed at the start of the two-hour recess, said the delay in proceeding had no significance. He appeared worn and haggard, his unshaven face was lined and pale. Yet his voice was clear and calm and exuded confidence as he said, “If the regulars will consent to take the Speaker off the Committee on Rules we will settle this matter in short order after the recess.” Both sides, he added, were already in agreement upon an enlarged committee. However, during the recess as during the earlier efforts at compromise, no side was willing to yield on its position on the Speaker’s place in relation to the committee; compromise was impossible on this point. The insurgents at a caucus during the recess reaffirmed their position. All groups realized that the outcome would be decided on the floor.

When the House reconvened at 4 P.M., the Speaker said he was ready to rule. James A. Tawney of Minnesota offered a motion to postpone the business before the House until the next day, March 19. After brief discussion the motion was carried 163–151 with the insurgent-Democratic coalition again in the minority. After twenty-six hours in continuous session, everyone concerned looked forward to the opportunity for a night’s sleep and a chance to freshen up before the final ordeal on the morrow.

On Saturday, March 19, the House of Representatives met at noon with more than 350 of its 391 members on hand and the galleries filled to capacity. As Speaker Cannon entered the chamber and ascended to the dais, a great burst of applause and cheers arose from the Republican side of the aisle and from the galleries. Cannon, with an air of deep concern, gazed about the chamber and brought down his gavel with a loud bang that reverberated throughout the room. Reverend Henry N. Conden offered a brief prayer. Upon its conclusion, conversation began again, though most members remained in their seats as the clerk read the Journal of the previous day’s proceedings. As the session started, people lined the corridors and stairways, in hope of witnessing the conclusion of this historic struggle.

Cannon announced his readiness to rule on the point of order, after the clerk again read the Norris resolution. The Speaker read his ruling in a deliberate voice that could be heard distinctly by everyone. When Cannon proclaimed the point of order against the Norris resolution, there was tremendous applause which soon gave way to table-pounding on the Republican side. Insurgent Republicans and
Democrats remained silent. Every seat in the press gallery was occupied, while on the floor below senators were sitting or standing in the rear.\textsuperscript{38}

Before order was fully restored, Norris was on his feet shouting, “Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision; and on that I move the previous question.” Dalzell immediately followed with a move to lay the appeal on the table. This was rejected by a vote of 182 to 164, whereupon Norris again moved the previous question on the appeal. His motion prevailed by a vote of 183 to 160. The House was now ready to decide on the Speaker’s ruling. The decision on this crucial question was another defeat for Cannon by a 182–162 vote. The Norris resolution (H.R. 502) was now pending before the House.

During these roll calls confusion reigned. A motion to adjourn was shouted down so vigorously that no roll call was taken. When the results of each vote were made known the opponents of the rules shouted and pounded. As the shouts over the defeat of Dalzell’s attempt to table Norris’ appeal pervaded the chamber, Cannon stood motionless in his place. His set features were silhouetted against the American flag behind his chair. With his opponents before him shouting, stamping, pounding, and applauding, Cannon presented a picture of a doughty old warrior, magnificent in defeat.\textsuperscript{37}

During these roll calls Clark was busily preparing an amendment incorporating the suggestions of the Democratic caucus of the previous day. At the same time Gardner and Norris consulted with each other. It soon became known that the insurgents and Democrats had agreed to an amendment to the Norris resolution. It would provide for a ten-man Rules Committee consisting of six Republicans and four Democrats, with representatives of each party selected by caucuses and elected by the House. In addition, the insurgents agreed to participate in the Republican caucus and abide by its results as to the choice of members.\textsuperscript{38} Though many insurgents were unhappy about this amendment, they had no alternative but to accept it if their fight were to accomplish anything at this time.

With his resolution pending before the House, Norris sought an agreement dividing the time for debate. Suggestions and counter-suggestions relating to the course that should be followed and the parliamentary status that would apply to the consideration of the resolution added to the confusion. Unable to reach any agreement and with the Speaker requesting “regular order,” Norris announced that while he preferred his original resolution many of his associates favored a substitute measure. Therefore he sent to the clerk’s desk the following amendment as a substitute for his original resolution:
There shall be a Committee on Rules, elected by the House, consisting of 10 Members, 6 of whom shall be Members of the majority party and 4 of whom shall be Members of the minority party. The Speaker shall not be a member of the committee, and the committee shall elect its own chairman from its own members.

Resolved further, That within ten days after the adoption of this resolution there shall be an election of this committee and immediately upon its election the present Committee on Rules shall be dissolved. 39

Representative James Mann of Illinois attempted to get Norris off the floor on the ground that his right to that privilege had expired, but the Speaker affirmed Norris' right to hold the floor and suggested that his resolution was in order. Norris held the floor for about an hour, yielding to such members, including a few regulars, as desired to be placed on record.

Champ Clark requested the floor and amid a storm of applause proclaimed that this was not "a fight against the Honorable Joseph G. Cannon personally," but against a system. Clark was followed by several other speakers including Lenroot, Gronna, and Victor Murdock. In concluding the debate Norris forcefully disavowed any personal feeling in his efforts for the revision of the rules, stating that "those of us who favor this rule represent a principle here far beyond the personality of any man or any set of men." He denied the charge that the insurgents were anti-Republican, concluding, amidst derisive laughter and applause, that "from every hamlet, from every fireside, and from every farm of Republican constituents today there are going up prayers and hopes that this resolution to change the rules of the House will be successful here today." 40

The amendment was approved by a vote of 193 to 153, and the insurgent revolution was then doubly consummated by the passage of the Norris resolution as amended by a vote of 191 to 156. During these roll calls the Speaker stood in his place, gavel in hand, presenting a countenance that gave no indication of his feelings. He was under the constant scrutiny of two thousand visitors as well as of all the people on the floor below. Earlier he chatted with a clerk and was seen laughing heartily. After the results were announced, Norris moved to reconsider the vote by which his resolution was adopted and to lay that motion on the table. Without objection, it was so ordered; the substitute amendment now prevailed as the adopted resolution. 41

Here, as far as Norris was concerned, the insurgency revolt should
have ended. The Speaker had been removed from the Committee on Rules. While this was not all Norris desired, a break in the Speaker's power had been made and further reforms at the convening of the next session of Congress would certainly be easier to obtain. Therefore Norris, upon the acceptance of his amendment, moved to adjourn. But this revolution in the procedures of the House, like all revolutions, would not proceed merely as far as its original movers desired. It soon got out of hand. From a fight for principle it degenerated to a squabble over personalities, presenting dramatic scenes which made those of the previous days pale by comparison. Norris, the more moderate insurgents and Democrats, would be swept aside as the extreme radicals among them gave vent to their passions, with some encouragement from the Speaker.