

the house itself to say that filibustering shall stop.

Mr. Payne: But suppose that the majority of the committee on rules are in sympathy with the filibusterers, and a proposition is made to stop the filibustering and is submitted to the committee on rules, the committee on rules, the committee, of course, being in sympathy with the filibusterers, would not report such a rule. Now, in that case, how is the majority of the house to act? When the speaker is to determine, I can see very well that there may be an appeal from his decision, so that the house can vote and a majority may revise his decision; but if a majority of the committee on rules, being in sympathy with the filibustering, fail to bring in a rule to stop it, how can the majority of the house act?

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that in the Fifty-first congress there were instances where even the appeal from the decision of the chair was declared to be dilatory, and the gentleman from New York would find it very difficult to get the house to express itself upon such a question when the speaker refused to put the question.

Mr. Reed: If the gentleman from Nebraska will allow me to make a suggestion, the house has always power to revise the action of the speaker. It may not be always by way of appeal but, by direct action, the house has always the right to do that.

Mr. Bryan: Well, will the gentleman from Maine tell me—for he is informed—how the house would act in this case; suppose a motion is made and the speaker decides it to be dilatory motion, and therefore out of order; an appeal is taken from his decision, and he decides that that is a dilatory motion and out of order; in such a case, how can the house act?

Mr. Reed: The house, by a direct proceeding, could raise the question the speaker had decided improperly.

Mr. Bryan: The house itself?

Mr. Reed: Yes. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska that in the British house of commons no appeal whatever is allowed from a decision of the speaker upon a question of order, but the British house of commons is not powerless in such a case; for, where the speaker disregards his duty, it can, by a direct proceeding, attack his action.

Mr. Bryan: Do I understand, then, that the minority in the Fifty-first congress overlooked one advantage that they might have had—

Mr. Reed (interposing): One? They overlooked no end of them. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bryan: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I have done nothing else I have given a new weapon to the minority in future congresses, where the gentleman from Maine may preside if his prophecy of the other day shall prove true, for if he refuses to put a motion they can put it themselves—although, as has been suggested, it may be that when he takes the chair again his opinion will undergo the same change that it did upon the question of the right to count a quorum. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to detain the house longer.

Mr. Payne: But will not the gentleman from Nebraska, before he sits down, answer the question I asked him? Suppose the majority of the committee on rules are in sympathy with the filibusterers and refuse to bring in a rule to stop filibustering, how, then, can the house act?

Mr. Bryan: The question is a pertinent one. If the committee on rules does not bring the proposition before the house, the house will not act upon it. (Laughter.) But the committee on rules is composed of a majority belonging to the dominant party, and it is presumable that, in any important case, if it was the desire of the house and of the majority to stop filibustering the rule would be brought in and the filibustering would be stopped.

But I insist that the changes made by the last congress and by this congress from the rules of the Fifty-first congress on these two important questions were wisely made; that instead of adopting the rules of the Fifty-first congress we are as far away from the two vicious rules of that congress as we ever were, and that this congress can adopt the rules reported by the committee without fear that the members are thereby subjecting themselves to the same criticisms which they made against the republicans of the Fifty-first congress.

I was glad to find that in the Forty-sixth congress, although the democrats were in a majority, they refused to adopt the rule of the Fifty-first for the counting of a quorum. I was proud that the last congress, although the democrats had a majority there, refused to follow the example of the Fifty-first congress, and I

am glad that this congress refuses to take that power simply because it can do it, and in giving to the committee on rules the right to bring in a rule here stopping filibustering, we are simply putting power in the hands of the house to conduct its business and to stop delay—not putting that power in the hands of the speaker.

ANOTHER DEBATE

The question was debated again on August 30, 1893. The following is from the Congressional Record showing Mr. Bryan's remarks:

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word or two in reply to the gentleman from Arkansas. As I understand him, he does not discuss the principle, but, so far as I could gather from what he said, he seems to go upon the theory that this committee on rules is merely an advisory committee to act with the speaker and to carry out the speaker's will.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the idea, I desire to express my dissent. In doing so, let me say that no person in this house has been more kindly treated by the speaker than myself, and for that reason I am, perhaps, in a better position to express a dissent from the committee's report than if I were suffering from disappointment.

No man has greater confidence in the speaker than I have; and yet I must object to the idea that a representative body ought to place the direction of its legislation in the hands of one man, or a few men; and if it is necessary, in order to carry out the idea which is incorporated in our rule to do that, then I would be in favor of a change in the rule sufficiently comprehensive to bring us back to the democratic idea of a rule by the people themselves, and a rule by their representatives sent here to conduct their business.

If this committee were simply to report general rules like those we are now acting upon I would not feel called upon to object to its present size, but when the committee is given power to direct legislation by presenting a special rule for the consideration of each bill I insist, Mr. Speaker, that that can be more wisely done by a larger committee.

If the argument urged in favor of continuing the present size of this committee is correct, then a committee of one is just as good as a committee of five. If you want simply to centralize power why divide it among five men? Why not give it to one man?

But, sir, if you wish legislation to be conducted in the interest of all the people whose representatives are here, if you concede that every man on this floor should have an equal vote in its deliberations, if you concede that every constituency is equally interested in what goes on here, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this committee which has in charge the direction of our legislation ought to be large enough to comprehend every part of this country, and to give expression to all the large interests of the country. And it is not asking too much when we urge that this committee be enlarged.

Nor is it flying in the face of the administration. It is paying no compliment to the speaker of this house and those who are his intimate advisers to say that when we express a dissent we are in rebellion. It is paying no compliment to the speaker of this house to say that he or his advisers desire to control our legislation. I think I pay him a higher compliment when I say that as the speaker of this house he desires to give voice and expression to the wishes of the members who put him there, and not to control their deliberations, and that he will respect us if, in following our judgment, we dissent from the rule proposed and express it as our opinion that the interests of the country will be better served if the committee is made larger.

Practical Tariff Talks

Senate document No. 155, prepared by the bureau of manufactures of the department of commerce and labor at the request of Senator LaFollette discloses some very interesting things to confute the man who contends that the tariff has been reduced. This shows, for instance, that an increase of 17 per cent is made in the rate on laces and embroideries of whatsoever material they are made, save wool. When the matter was brought before the finance, ways and means committee of the house the request was made that the rate be reduced from 60 per cent ad valorem to 50 per cent. Laces and embroid-

eries never paid a higher duty than 40 per cent until the McKinley bill put it at 60. The Wilson bill reduced it to 50, Dingley put it back to 60, and now it is 70, an unnecessarily high rate, as the evidence before the house committee clearly discloses.

This industry is a very large one the world over, and it has been very prosperous in America under the stimulus of the old duty. Laces and embroideries are necessities of later day civilization, being used by persons in all grades of life. An idea of the immensity of this trade may be gained from the fact that the revenue in 1907 was \$25,000,000, representing imports of \$42,600,000. Most of the laces, especially the cheaper grades, come from France and Belgium, while Switzerland furnishes most of the embroideries. Expert testimony before the committee was that a reduction to 50 per cent would not close a single factory here notwithstanding it would increase the importations and the revenue. That presented what ought to appeal to a republican as an ideal condition, increasing the revenue while giving all needed protection to home industries. But what did the congress do? It increased the duty 17 per cent.

Laces and embroideries are the raw material of the wearing apparel manufacturers. The latter presented a long petition to congress asking a reduction in the tariff. Practically every manufacturer of women's, misses' and children's underwear, dresses, waists, corsets, hats, caps, aprons, etc., employing thousands of skilled operators—four alone giving employment to 11,000—joined in this request. They said a very large proportion of their labor is engaged in the application of these trimmings to garments. The larger the number of trimmings employed the more persons would have work. They said that the old excessive rate so enhanced the cost of laces and embroideries that their use on these garments was restricted. Another result was the use of cheap lace so that the price of the completed garment would not be too great for the masses to pay. These manufacturers also called attention to the fact that if they were given the raw material of lace and embroidery at a less cost they could, because of the artistic character of the garments turned out, compete in the world's markets, obtain an outlet in every civilized country. But the tariff makers preferred to pile on protection to the smaller industry. This protection, let it be added, goes entirely to the manufacturer and not to the laborer, because the wages earned by the operators of the power looms in Nottingham and Calais is practically the same as earned by American operatives, as shown in the hearing before the house committee. The lace-makers' union here is a branch of that in Nottingham, and fixes the same rate of wages.

There is another reason why the lace making industry in America needs no such protection as given it. Letters submitted to congress from makers of women's apparel showed that they bought domestic laces 15 to 20 per cent cheaper than they could the imported articles. This was due to the fact that women call for the Nottingham, Valenciennes and Torchon laces, and the American manufacturer simply copies the designs of the foreigner, thus saving all of the expenses of drafting and designing connected with making new patterns. If the American manufacturer is selling laces below the cost of imported goods, he needs no such protection, and the only result that can follow the 17 per cent increase in duty will be that he will embrace the opportunity to put up his own prices, knowing that the imported stuff, carrying a higher rate, must be increased in price.

C. Q. D.

LOVE'S SWEET SISTER

Thank God for Love's sweet sister, Tenderness!
The gentle watcher in the wakeful night,
When pain, mysterious and measureless,
Strikes quivering chords of anguish and
affright;
The mate of little children and the friend
Of all the patient, dear dumb beasts that are;
The priestess of the faithful to the end,
The white-souled lady of the Morning Star;
The second self of mothers seeing deep
Into the holiness of souls new-born;
The shrine where sinfulness and judgment reap
The measure of fulfillment free from scorn.
Sweet, softly sandaled saint, abide with me!
Without thee Love were less than Love should
be!

—Marie Hemstreet, in the Outlook.