

READY FOR DEBATE

House Committee Will Favorably Report Exclusion Bill.

CHANGES THAT WERE MADE

Laborers Are Prohibited From Entering the United States or Any of Its Insular Possessions.

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The House committee on foreign affairs today completed consideration of the Chinese exclusion bill and by a unanimous vote ordered it favorably reported to the House. The measure has been most carefully considered for more than a month, and it comes from the committee with quite a number of changes. The exclusion of Chinese laborers is made complete, both as to the mainland territory of the United States and all insular possessions, including the Philippines and Hawaii. The committee finally restored the prohibitory clause recommended by the Pacific Coast Senators and members, so that as reported it reads:

"And the prohibition shall apply to all Chinese laborers as well to those who were in such insular possessions at the time of acquisition by the United States as to those who have come there since and those who may be born there hereafter."

In addition, the committee framed the following new section, specially directing the Philippine Commission to put the exclusion law into force:

"That the Philippine Commission is hereby authorized and required to make such regulations necessary for the enforcement of this act in the Philippines."

San Juan, P. R., was struck out from the list of ports where Chinese may enter, as it was feared that would be a disadvantage to the island, owing to the lack of sufficient official force to make careful inspection. The other more important changes made by the committee are as follows:

The committee considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

The committee also considered the suggestion of certain Chinese, the Commissioner-General of Immigration is authorized to designate such other ports as may be necessary. The committee also considered the original bill was too severe in making it a felony for any official to neglect to detain a Chinese person seeking admission, and the penalty was changed to a misdemeanor. The original bill also subjected a vessel to forfeiture in case it brought over forbidden Chinese, but the committee changed this to a fine of \$2000 against the vessel, and in case the fine is not paid, the committee struck out the clause requiring the United States District Attorney to be present at all deportation proceedings.

Trade; Mahon H. Kilna, of Philadelphia, of the Trades Union; W. T. Noyes, of Chicago, of the National Civic League; George H. Anderson, of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce; W. E. Tucker, of the National Board of Trade; George H. Barber, of Detroit; Edward H. Sanborn, of Philadelphia, and E. F. Wilson, of Cincinnati, of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The bill of Senator Nelson, which was passed by the Senate, was chiefly referred to, although several other like bills have been introduced by members. Mr. Search made the opening statement, urging that the united business interests favor a measure of this character. He referred to the pre-eminence of the United States as a commercial Nation, with manufactured products valued at \$12,000,000,000 in one year. He also gave in detail the European cabinet systems, each of them having a representative of commerce. Mr. Elia stated that correspondence among branches of the business league throughout the states has shown them solidly favorable to the creation of this new department. His speech of the relief it would bring to the congested Interior and Treasury Departments, and he estimated its cost at \$50,000 a year. Some of the members of the committee inquired as to how far labor organizations approve the inclusion of the Labor Bureau, and Mr. Elia said he understood the Knights of

Washington, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

ATTACK ON OLEO BILL

MONEY DENOUNCES IT AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Says It Is Killing One Industry for the Benefit of Another—"Protection Gone Mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

WASHINGTON, March 25.—A sharp attack on the oleomargarine bill was made in the Senate today by Money. He denounced the measure as unconstitutional, dishonest, immoral and unjust. He said it is a proposition to tax out of existence one industry for the benefit of another, and is "protection gone mad."

constitution for the reason that it delegates to the Secretary of the Treasury and a board of seven tax experts selected by him the power to determine what the drinking qualities of tea imported shall be, entirely irrespective of either their genuineness or wholesomeness. It is also claimed that the act destroys without due process of law, property and also the natural rights and liberties which every citizen of the United States has to engage in any trade which does not encroach on the health, morals or safety of the public generally.

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The House today, by a majority of 18, unseated Rhea, of Kentucky, a Democrat, and seated in his place J. McKenzie Moss, who was formerly a Democrat, but who, according to his biography, is now with the Republican party on the dominant issues. The Republican majority in the House is 87. While only two Republicans, Hanbury and Vreeland, of New York, voted with the Democrats, enough Republicans declined to vote to reduce the majority to 10. The conclusion of the debate on the case was rather spirited, the majority being in the end, in favor of their right to the seat.

After the vote, the House began consideration of the Army appropriation bill, with the understanding that general debate should continue for 10 hours. Scarborough (Dem. S. C.) discussed the Southern election laws and Gaines the Philippine situation. So far as the State of South Carolina is concerned, Scarborough declared that her election laws would stand the most rigid investigation, but the Southern people objected to an investigation by a partisan, prejudiced committee.

The consideration of the contested election case of Moss vs. Rhea was resumed when the House met. Only two hours of debate remained. The hour was given to the contestant, Rhea, in concluding the argument begun by him yesterday in defense of his right to the seat. Just before Rhea concluded he made a severe arraignment of the majority, and himself a Republican, two weeks before the election he had registered as a Democrat and had pledged himself, if elected, to go into the Democratic caucus with the majority. He charged that the majority of his friends to deny this statement. "If it is denied," said Rhea, "I will prove him to be the poor, miserable creature I know him to be, and I will prove it to the committee of agriculture, and to the principles of the Democratic party and said he would not indulge in a cringing appeal to the other side for mercy. "I do not want you to violate the principles of the Democratic party, but I want you to address the Republican side. "If it is your belief that I was not rightfully elected to this seat, vote against me, but if, as honest men, you do not believe that the election was rightfully established, I ask you to rise above party and declare your judgment by your vote."

Rhea was warmly congratulated by his party as he took his seat. The debate on the case was closed by Mann, with a strong appeal in favor of the claims of the contestant to the seat. At the conclusion of Mann's speech the vote was taken on the substitute resolution offered by the majority, which declared that Rhea was entitled to his seat. The resolution was lost, 127-137. Hanbury (N. Y.) and Vreeland (N. Y.), were the only Republicans who voted for the resolution. A number of Republicans did not vote. This reduced the Republican majority from 43 to 19. The resolution declaring Moss entitled to the seat was then adopted without division, the demand for a roll-call being waived on the island. There was a round of applause from the Republican side as Moss came forward to take the oath, which was met with hisses from the Democratic side.

The House then went into consideration of the Army appropriation bill. It was agreed that detailed debates should run for 10 hours. Hull (Rep. Ia.) was in charge of the bill and explained its provisions. He estimated the cost of the bill at \$100,000,000, being \$100,000,000 less the estimates.

Gaines (Dem. Tenn.) submitted some remarks relative to the necessity of maintaining a large standing army in the Philippines. He said that the United States Army officer, who served in Cuba and the Philippines, but whose name Gaines declined to disclose, which declared that the Philippines could not be held unless the natives were assured that ultimately they should have independence.

At 4:30 the House adjourned.

THE RECIPROcity TANGLE.

President Roosevelt Trying to Secure Unanimity of Action.

WASHINGTON, March 25.—President Roosevelt today took the Cuban reciprocity question today with a view to securing unanimity of action in the House. Among his callers was Representative Long, of Kansas, the member of the ways and means committee, who was in charge of the tactical movements in behalf of the reciprocity plan. It was understood that Mr. Long's call was in continuation of the movement to bring the two opposing elements together, when Mr. Long conferred with Representative Morris, of Minnesota, who presented in detail the amendment which the opposition is supporting, to about which an agreement was reached. At present, refined sugar pays 15¢ per 100; unrefined, 12¢. By taking off the differential, all sugars would pay the uniform rate of 15¢ per 100. The present suggestion is to make a modification of the bill, so as to make this change in the differential, would probably bring about an agreement. The ways and means committee is understood to be giving the proposition respectful attention, but at its details. But there is no definite indication thus far of its acceptance, as there is reason to believe that the ways and means members look upon it as involving the first step toward a general revision of the tariff. The matter is still under consideration, however.

It was said late in the day that the element opposing the ways and means committee is not willing to make its first effort in the committee when Chairman Payne seeks to report the bill. The committee consists of 17 members, and, according to a poll made by the opposition element, only eight Republicans, or one short of the necessary number, will vote to report the bill in its present form. This, according to the opposition view, will make it necessary to rely on Democratic votes. But as against this, the confidence that it will be able to secure enough Democratic votes in the committee to take off the differential on refined sugar.

Chairman Payne will not call up the bill tomorrow, which is the regular meeting day of the committee, as more time is desired in order to let the situation clear.

Another conference was held at the White House this afternoon, and was presided over by the President and the House leaders, including Chairman Payne and Messrs. Dalzell and Long, of the ways and means committee, and Mr. Cannon, chairman of the Finance Committee.

Increased Number of Directors.

NEW YORK, March 25.—At a special meeting of the stockholders of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company a resolution was adopted to increase the number of directors from 18 to 24. John T. Waterbury, George F. Baker and Theodore N. Vall were then elected directors of the company.