

THAT IRON AND STEEL CAUCUS

The Washington correspondent for the Omaha World-Herald, upon whose report Mr. Bryan depended for his information concerning the July 25th caucus, has made a report to his newspaper, which report is hereinafter reproduced.

It will be seen that this correspondent practically reiterates the truth of his first report. But he says, "Mr. Underwood's quarrel is with the conclusions drawn from the article by Mr. Bryan and not with the article itself." The conclusions drawn by Mr. Bryan were that a resolution was offered providing for the revision of the iron and steel schedule, that Mr. Underwood opposed the adoption of that resolution, that Mr. Clark favored it and that Mr. Kitchin, in advocating it, reminded the caucus that Mr. Underwood himself had once said that his property was in the iron and steel business and that, therefore, failure to revise the iron and steel schedule might be wrongfully misinterpreted. So it seems that according to the testimony of the World-Herald correspondent and the official report of the speeches delivered by Messrs. Kitchin and Underwood, the conclusions as to fact drawn by Mr. Bryan were entirely warranted.

The World-Herald correspondent's report follows:

"Washington World-Herald Bureau, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., Aug. 11.—The only official version of what took place in the democratic caucus on the night of July 25 is to be found in the Congressional Report of statements made to the house on Wednesday, August 2, by Representative Underwood, chairman of the ways and means committee in response to the Bryan editorial in The Commoner and in the statement made at the same time by Representative Kitchin of North Carolina, (Page 3623.)

"After referring to the fact that he did remind the caucus, 'That the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Underwood), had, in a speech in the house, said that practically all the property he owned, except his house and home, was in the iron and steel business,' Mr. Kitchin said:

"I did remind the caucus of that. I took the position that not only was it right for the democrats to revise the steel schedule before adjournment, but it would be a wise policy for us to revise this schedule especially, as that candid, courageous and manly statement of the chairman of the ways and means committee might be taken as an occasion by our opponents to slander and libel the gentleman from Alabama and to slander and libel the position of the democratic membership of the ways and means committee and this democratic house, but I never dreamed that any democrat in the country would seize upon the incident to misrepresent the position of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Underwood), or that of the democracy of the house or to impugn the motives of either. In the caucus I took the position that we should notify the country; that we should notify the republican senate, the president and the republicans of the house that before the adjournment of this congress we intended to revise the steel schedule, the rubber schedule and the sugar schedule. But Mr. Underwood and a large majority of the democrats in the caucus thought it unwise for us at that time to notify the senate of our tariff program because it might affect its action on the beneficent measures we had sent to it. I submitted to the will of the majority in the caucus. I now believe, in view of the action of the senate on the woolen bill and the free list bill, that my judgment was wrong, and that the judgment of Mr. Underwood and a large majority of my colleagues of the caucus was right."

"Mr. Underwood's official statement of what took place in the caucus on July 25 is to be found on page 3623 of the Congressional Record of Wednesday, August 2. Referring to the resolution first offered by Representative Sisson and later modified by Speaker Clark, Mr. Underwood said:

"When we took up the cotton schedule in the democratic caucus I had no notice and no idea that a resolution would be offered directing the ways and means committee to prepare other schedules. A resolution was offered stating that before we adjourned we should revise the iron and steel schedule, the sugar schedule and the paragraph in the sundry schedule relating to rubber, and also the schedule relating to chemicals and dye-stuffs. I opposed the consideration of that resolution at that time. I stated to the caucus that I had no objection to the revision of the iron and steel schedule. I had already stated to the public press of the country that I desired the iron and steel schedule to be considered next by the committee. It had gone

out in the daily press. I simply stated in the caucus that at that time the senate had not acted on the wool bill. It had not acted on the free list bill. I stated to the caucus, that, not knowing what action would be taken by the senate in reference to our bills or what action would be taken by the president, I thought it was unwise for the democratic party to pledge itself to the course it intended to pursue the balance of this session until we could first have an opportunity to ascertain what action the senate was going to take in reference to our bills and what action the president was going to take. I stated to the caucus that before an adjournment resolution was passed I would bring the matter of adjournment and consideration of other schedules back to the democratic caucus for them to determine in the light of the facts that they would have as to the action of the senate and the president of the United States.

"It was not an effort to sidetrack any schedule; it was an effort to have the caucus of my party act with all the facts before it. I thought it the part of wisdom and the caucus sustained the position I took."

"The above quotations from the Congressional Record are substantially in accord with the article which appeared in the World-Herald on the morning following the caucus. Party caucuses of the house are secret and information of their proceedings is necessarily gained by all correspondents from members upon the adjournment of the caucus. That was the manner in which the information on which the World-Herald article was based was obtained that night. Mr. Underwood's quarrel is with the conclusions drawn from the article by Mr. Bryan and not with the article itself.

"J. C. WELLS."

THE JAMES-UNDERWOOD INCIDENT

From Congressional Record of August 9:

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Chairman, there is another question that I want the gentlemen on this side of the house to understand. You will surely build these four dams, because I say to you candidly if this bill is defeated, I shall insist, so far as I am concerned, that the engineers go ahead with their present work and finish that navigation, because that is what I want. I am not concerned about this power. We have plenty of power from other sources, but if you defeat this bill and require them to build four dams instead of one, you are going to put a continual charge on the government of the United States, according to the reports of the engineers, of \$6,000 each year from now on until eternity for each additional dam.

Mr. Taylor of Alabama. For each one of these dams?

Mr. James. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Underwood) if he thinks it is quite a fair argument to say to the house that unless we pass a bill giving a franchise to a corporation for half a century, with no limitation upon the amount that they shall charge the consumer for this power, an insistence is going to be made that certain work shall go on which will involve an expenditure of \$200,000 or \$300,000 out of the treasury more than would be expended if we give away this right to which we do not agree; that unless we turn the people over to the insatiable maw of this monopoly, which we are unwilling to do, he is going to insist that \$300,000 or \$400,000 more shall be expended. (Applause.)

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Kentucky has just come out of a successful campaign for senator, where a play to the gallery has purchased votes, but I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that to claim that one company controlling one water power is a monopoly, to answer me with that proposition that I am pleading for a monopoly, when I have just stated to him that there are five water powers in use, and that the smoke that comes out of these coke ovens is the power to produce electricity, for him to say these things is not a fair proposition to put to me. (Applause.)

Mr. James. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reply to the gentleman's statement that I just came out of a successful campaign in Kentucky where an appeal to the galleries purchased votes, that I should have expected a statement more considerate of the people of Kentucky, among whom the gentleman was born, than a statement such as he made reflecting upon them. (Applause.)

Mr. Underwood. Well—

Mr. James. And, in addition, I may say that Kentuckians are just as intelligent as Alabamians and they are just as little susceptible to the influence of playing to the galleries as any people

in this republic. It does not intimidate me any for the argument to be made here by the gentleman from Alabama that because I am unwilling to give a half a century franchise to a corporation in Birmingham, Ala., with an unlimited right to fix charges upon the consumers, to say that I am playing to the gallery. If that is playing to the galleries, the sooner the gentleman from Alabama commences playing to the gallery the sweeter the applause of the gallery will be to the gentleman. (Applause.)

Mr. Underwood. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, I have never learned to play to the gallery. (Applause.) I do not know how to do it, and I want to say this, my answer to the gentleman a moment ago was provoked by what he said. I do not think it was justified, and I wish now, in justice to him and myself, to withdraw what I said. (Applause.)

Mr. James. Then, in like justice to the gentleman from Alabama, I withdraw what I said. (Applause.)

Mr. Underwood. Just one word. We say sometimes in the heat of argument things between friends that we ought not to say, and I want to say that this franchise of 50 years is now the general law of the land, not fixed by this bill, and I do say it is fair for me to insist that the law that congress has adopted should be carried out. I do say it is fair for me to insist before the war department that the improvement of this river should go on, and go on at once, and I think it is perfectly fair for me to call your attention that here are four dams that will cost \$6,000 each year to maintain that if you bring it down to one it will only cost \$6,000 a year to maintain that one. Now, if you defeat this bill you lose \$15,000 in rentals, you lose \$250,000 in the additional cost of the improvements, and you put an additional charge of \$18,000 a year in perpetuity on the government. Now, that is all I have to say; that is all there is in the proposition. (Applause.) I believe it is in the interest of the government for you to build one dam, as this bill provides for instead of four as the law now on our statute books will compel you to build should you defeat the present proposition.

THE WILSON BOOM IN TEXAS

An Austin, Texas, dispatch says: All factions of the Texas democracy and all sections of the state were represented at the formation of the Woodrow Wilson state democratic league of Texas in Austin.

Nearly 200 democrats, most of them representative men of their various communities, attended the initial meeting in the parlors of the Driskill hotel. They cheered every reference made to the governor of New Jersey and predictions that the Wilson movement in Texas is "a prairie fire" were greeted with marked demonstrations.

Prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists forgot their differences and Bailey and anti-Bailey men fraternized joyfully together in the interest of the man all of them want to see elected president of the United States.

Thomas H. Ball, chairman of the state-wide prohibition organization, Judge James H. Robertson, who presided over the Fort Worth anti-statewide convention, authorized Col. O. T. Holt of Houston to sign their names to the roster of the Wilson league. It was proudly boasted by men present that for once, all warring elements in Texas politics were united.

Among those who participated in the two hours' conference were fully forty members of the legislature. Dozens of them telephoned their regrets and asked to be given opportunity to aid the movement in every way possible.

Following are the officers of the league, agreed upon after much discussion both in committee and on the floor: President, Thomas B. Love, of Dallas; vice presidents, T. W. Gregory of Austin and O. T. Holt of Houston; secretary, George D. Armstead of San Antonio; treasurer, Roger Roberdeau of Austin. These officers, together with the following constitute an executive committee of eleven: Judge Cato Sells of Cleburne, W. T. Bartholomew of San Angelo, Clarence E. Gilmore of Wills Point, Col. R. M. Wynne of Fort Worth and A. R. McCollum of Waco.

As provided for in resolutions adopted, the executive committee is to form a state committee composed of one from each senatorial district of the state and they in turn will effect county and precinct organizations throughout Texas. Judge Cato Sells was made chairman of the executive committee. It is expected the committee will meet in Austin again at the call of the chairman during the last week in August.

A formal and pressing invitation to Governor