

tended to give Mr. Babcock an opportunity later on to vote for the bill which his constituents had indorsed. Mr. Richardson also announced that an amendment to abolish the differential duty on refined sugar would be supported by an amendment and he added that if this amendment passed, \$506,000,000 would be taken from the sugar refiners and given to the American consumers of sugar. Mr. Fordney of Michigan opposed the bill. He declared in favor of the measure, and that every one of the witnesses for it was either an American citizen owning sugar land in Cuba or indirectly representing the influence of the sugar trust. Mr. Hepburn of Iowa opposed the bill and criticized Mr. Grosvenor of Ohio because the latter had said he would refuse to support a 25 per cent reduction but would support a 20 per cent reduction. "In other words," said Mr. Hepburn, "had it not been that last nickel of reduction, the gentlemen from Ohio, to quote his own language, would today have been with the insurgents, attempting to divide the republican party and destroy it." Mr. Hepburn added, "On what a slender thread hangs everlasting things." Mr. Tawney, republican, of Minnesota, closed the debate against the bill. He defended the course of those republicans who had refused to support the Cuban reciprocity bill, saying that they had not surrendered their convictions that "thrift might follow fawning." Mr. Tawney charged that the sugar trust was seeking, through the agency of this measure, to cripple and destroy the beet sugar industry. He accused the republicans of departing from the protective theory. Mr. Dalzell, republican, of Pennsylvania, spoke in favor of the bill. He maintained that there was no revision of the existing tariff laws or its schedule, and was justified as plain business principles. He added that it was a step toward the redemption of the pledge we made not to Cuba but to ourselves when we volunteered to intervene to right the wrongs which she was suffering under the Spanish regime. Mr. Morris, of the republicans opposed the Cuban reciprocity bill, amid much excitement, offered an amendment to remove the differential from refined sugar. The amendment was as follows:

"Upon the making of said agreement and the issuance of said proclamation and while said agreement shall remain in force there shall be levied, collected and paid, in lieu of the duties thereon now provided by law in

A BURNING BLACKSMITH

Changed Food and Put Out the Fire

Even sturdy blacksmiths sometimes discover that notwithstanding their daily exercise and resulting good health, if their food is not well selected trouble will follow, but in some cases a change of food to the right sort will quickly relieve the sufferer, for generally such active men have fine constitutions and can, with a little change of diet, easily rid themselves of the disease.

I. E. Overdorf, Vilas, Penn., a blacksmith, says, "Two months ago I got down so bad with stomach troubles that I had to quit my business. About ten o'clock each morning I was attacked by burning pains in the stomach, so bad I was unable to work.

Our groceryman insisted upon my changing breakfasts and using Grape-Nuts Breakfast Food instead of the ordinary breakfast of meat, potatoes, etc. So I tried and at once began to mend. The new food agreed with my stomach perfectly and the pains all ceased. I kept getting better and better every day and now I am able to follow my business better than before in years. I am a thousand times obliged to the makers of Grape-Nuts for the great benefits the food has given."

all sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard in color, and on all sugar which has gone through a process of refining, imported into the United States 1 825-1000 cents per pound."

Mr. Payne, the republican leader, at once made the point of order that the amendment was not germane. He argued that there had been rulings innumerable against such amendments. "I know," he cried, turning to his republican colleagues, "that the decision has gone forth on the other side that the rules are to be brushed aside to secure a vote on this amendment, but gentlemen must remember what the rules are. They are the outgrowth of the best thought of the great parliamentary leaders of the house in the past and I appeal to my colleagues to vote on this question according to the dictates of their consciences."

Mr. Littlefield followed Mr. Payne, taking the view that the amendment was germane. He had not proceeded far in his argument before he aroused intense interest by reverting to the report that at the democratic caucus last night Mr. Underwood stated that overtures had been made to him in regard to the Crumpacker resolution.

"An insinuation has been made here today," said he, "which has not been repelled as it ought to have been. I refer to the report that at the democratic caucus last night it was stated that approaches had come from this side of the house for the democrats to enter into an unholy, ungodly and infamous alliance to sacrifice human rights in order to save the face of certain leaders or protect the profits of an aggregation of capital."

Mr. Grosvenor (Ohio) was on his feet in an instant asking Mr. Littlefield to whom he referred, when Mr. Underwood arose and was about to interrupt him. But the latter was appealed to by some of his democratic colleagues and he took his seat. Mr. Littlefield, in reply to Mr. Grosvenor, said that Mr. Payne, the chairman of the ways and means committee, should make a statement and the republican leader was about to do so when Mr. Underwood again arose.

"I desire to say just one word," he said. "I have never made any such charge as the gentleman repeats, either in a democratic caucus or elsewhere."

The republicans applauded this statement and Mr. Payne and Mr. Underwood sat down.

"I have accomplished my purpose," said Mr. Littlefield. "I have succeeded in vindicating the republican majority."

He then proceeded with his argument that the Morris amendment was in order, as it bore directly upon the duties on sugar, which were to be disturbed by the proposed reduction on Cuba sugars. Other tariff amendments, however, he argued, would not be in order. He quoted a decision of Speaker Blaine in support of his contention.

Mr. Crow (Penn.) the venerable ex-speaker of the house, argued that the amendment was not germane because sugar was not mentioned in the original bill.

Mr. Richardson, the democratic leader, contended that the amendment was in order. He thought Speaker Blaine's decision was conclusive. As Mr. Richardson concluded, the democrats cried: "Vote," "Vote," but several republicans, including Mr. Grosvenor, Mr. Olmsted and Mr. Lacey, were on their feet clamoring for recognition. Mr. Sherman (N. Y.), who was in the chair, recognized Mr. Grosvenor, who called attention to the fact that Blaine, great as he was as a parliamentarian, had been overruled repeatedly, especially with regard to his proposition that one could lead a horse to water but not make him drink—the question of counting a quorum.

Despite the impatience of the members as evidenced by their demands for a vote, Mr. Lacey (Iowa) spoke

briefly in support of the point of order and urged his fellow republicans not to play into the hands of the democrats, who had bound themselves by caucus action last night to try to open the whole question of tariff reduction.

Mr. De Armond (Mo.) suggested that the chair should submit the point of order to the house. He observed that he thought the chairman had not made up his mind. Speaking to the merits of the point of order, he argued that the real object of the rules was to facilitate matters, not to restrict or hamper a free expression on questions brought before the house.

"Whether under the rules this amendment is in order or not," said he, "we will at least find out who are for the sugar trust and who are against it."

"As an ex-member from New York, said on a memorable occasion," suggested Mr. Olmsted, "what is the constitution between friends." (Laughter.)

"Oh, no," retorted Mr. De Armond. "The question is, How powerful is a poor little rule when the issue is between the sugar trust and the American people?" (Applause.)

Mr. Morris (Minn.) concluded the debate on the point of order with a strong speech against it. While he agreed with Mr. Crow that the word "sugar" was not in the bill, sugar was all over it. He said that as the bill increased the differential on sugar from Cuba 47 cents per hundred pounds, it was proper that the house should reduce the differential sugars from the remainder of the world.

In a very elaborate ruling Mr. Sherman (N. Y.), who was in the chair, sustained the point of order. In doing so he cited a long line of precedents covering three-fourths of a century of parliamentary procedure in accord with his decision. As soon as the decision was announced Mr. Tawney appealed from the decision of the chair.

The vote was taken by tellers. Speaker Henderson was the first member to pass between the tellers in support of the chair's ruling. It was an interesting spectacle as the issue was put to the test. The whole democratic side rose en masse and watched the republicans to see how many would decline to vote with their colleagues. Not a democrat voted to sustain the chair. The Louisiana delegation was the first to go through in opposition to the chair's ruling. Then came the recalcitrants, thirty-seven strong. The democrats cheered as they went through. When the announcement was made that the chair had been overruled, 130 to 121, the democrats and the republican insurgents cheered.

A dozen members were on their feet flourishing amendments and clamoring for recognition, but the chair recognized Mr. Payne, the republican floor leader. Amid profound silence he addressed his republican colleagues. He said it was useless to address the other side. The opposition on his own side, he said, claimed to be friendly to the beet sugar industry. The amendment was a proposition to reduce the duty on sugar from beet sugar countries. He warned those friends of beet sugar that he proposed to show his friendship for beet sugar by voting against the amendment to the amendment to reduce still further by 20 per cent the whole sugar schedule of the Dingley law, and Mr. De Armond offered another amendment to strike out the language of the Morris amendment which limited its operation to the period covered by the reciprocity agreement. Both were voted down without division. The vote then recurred on the Morris amendment, which was adopted amid democratic cheers by a vote of 164 to 111. The majority for it was so overwhelming that Mr. Payne did not demand tellers.

The next surprise came from the republican side when Mr. Roberts



The crowning joy of womanhood is motherhood and the crowning joy of motherhood is to have healthy

children. But there can be no joy in motherhood without health, and without health for the mother there can be no health for the child.

It is of vital importance for women to know that the health of mother and child is in general entirely within woman's control. The thousands of women who have used Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription when expecting motherhood, have testified that it made them healthy and happy in the days of waiting, made the baby's advent practically painless, and gave them health to give their children.

Mrs. W. J. Kidder, of Hill Dale Farm (Enosburg Center), Enosburg, Vt., writes: "During the past year I found myself expecting maternity, and in rapidly failing health. I suffered dreadfully from bloating and urinary difficulty. I was growing perceptibly weaker each day and suffered much sharp pain at times. I felt that something must be done. I sought your advice and received a prompt reply. Took twelve bottles of Doctor Pierce's Favorite Prescription, and also followed your instructions. I began to improve immediately, my health became excellent, and I could do all my own work (we live on a good sized farm). I walked and rode all I could, and enjoyed it. I had a short, easy confinement and have a healthy baby boy."

The People's Common Sense Medical Adviser, a book containing 1008 pages, is given away. Send 21 one-cent stamps for expense of mailing only, for the book in paper covers, or 31 stamps for the volume bound in cloth. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

(Mass.) offered an amendment to place hides on the free list. The chair sustained a point of order against it and when Mr. Roberts appealed many democrats and practically all the republicans voted to sustain the chair, and the chair was sustained, 183 to 70.

Mr. Roberts then modified his amendment so as to make it apply only to hides from Cuba, and as modified it was held to be in order. But on direct vote it was defeated, 120 to 136.

Mr. McClellan then moved to increase the reciprocal concession to 30 per cent. Two republicans (Parker and Thompkins) voted for the amendment and several democrats voted against it. It was defeated, 102 to 162.

Mr. Richardson (Tenn.) then offered the Babcock bill to place articles in the metal schedules on the free list; also cotton bagging, binding twine, wood pulp, etc. It was ruled out of order.

Mr. Corliss (Mich.) offered an amendment to authorize the president to negotiate a reciprocity agreement with Canada. It was ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. Newlands (Nev.) offered his amendment to establish free trade between Cuba and the United States and to extend an invitation to Cuba to enter the United States as a territory, with a view of ultimate statehood. It was also ruled out.

On motion of Mr. Payne the committee then rose and reported the bill to the house.

The previous question was ordered and Mr. Payne demanded a separate vote on the Morris amendment to abolish the differential on refined sugar, and the roll was called. The Morris amendment was adopted, 199 to 105. All the democrats voted for the amendment.