THE MORNING SUN

"If Its Right We Are For It." Owned by the People of the State of Florida, Edited by CLAUDE L'ENGLE.

Volume 2
Number 18

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1909.

Five Cents a Copy
50c for the session

HOUSE MEMBERS SIGN AGREEMENT AGAINST AMENDMENTS.

Mr. Smith of Jackson Called Attention To It In Morning Session—Agreement Has Saving Clause.

"Be it resolved by each and every member of the House of Representatives who signs his name hereto, that we agree to vote against any, each and every constitutional amendment which shall come before the House to be voted on till the end of the present session: provided that any member who has promised and who feels it to be his conscientious duty to vote for any other amendment that is pending or shall pend before the House is absolved from the voting as hereinbefore provided with refereene to such amendment."

Signed: D. F. Pattishall, L. E. Roberson. C. L. Wiggins, J. F. Richbourg, J. H. Brown, J. R. Miller, Chas. Conway, J, B. Hodges, E. V. McCaskill, J. R. Kelly, T. A. Doke, A. J. Peaden, D. E. Knight, A. J. Boland, Walter Page, W. D. Carn, L. S. Light, A. E. Ogilvie, J. S. Godfrey, S. J. Hilburn, J. E. Alexander, R. E. L. Moore, J. A. Cox.

This is the paper that was referred to in the House yesterday morning by Mr. Smith, of Jackson, in his speech for the reconsideration of the vote by which the House indefinitely postponed his bill providing for negro disfranchisement by the famous "grandfather clause."

It may be that Mr. Smith did not intend to start a "rough house" when he took up the matter, but that is problematic. At any rate that is exactly what he did do, and the firing of both large and small-bore arms came in such rapid succession that it was hard at times to keep up with it all.

Mr. Smith's argument in favor of his bill was a masterly effort.

He said, in part, and speaking of the paper quoted: "Did you know the meaning of the oath you took here in the presence of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and in the presence of Almighty God. when you signed that paper? Did you think of the solemn obligation to your county and your State? Did you remember that ooth when signing a paper agreeing not to vote for any amendment, because of the State-wide prohibition amendment?

"And if you are false to that oath, you should have inscribed upon the stone that marks your grave an epitaph like this: The opportunity came to him to act in self-defence of home and State, but he was false to his country and to his home.

"I ask you again to vote, now your honest convictions, and not to let any one or two or three men fool you into voting against your own conscience.

"Now, I have no knowledge of this paper except that it was admitted on this floor yesterday that one member at least had signed such a petition, I hope it is a mistake, I should like to find that it is a mistake."

Mr. Roberson, of Suwannee, here interrupted the gentleman with the statement that he had the petition referred to, and would read it.

This was done and Mr. Malone, of Monroe, moved that it be spread on the Journal, which was objected to, and the motion was lost.

Cries of "read it all, read the names, read all the names," were now coming from different parts of the House, as Mr. Roberson, after reading the body of the paper, had declared that he was not at liberty to read the names.

Several signers of the petition here arose and announced that they had no objections to their names being read. Mr. Malone then moved that so much of the remarks of Mr. Roberson as could be reproduced, including the petition, should be spread on the Journal.

REPORT OF I. I. COMMITTEE IN HOUSE

Lively Talk on a Subject That Has Hung Fire for Two Years.

The house started again yesterday afternoon on its career toward sensationalism, when it resumed discussion of the minority report of the committe appointed to examine the report of the commission of 1907 to investigate the I. I. fund.

Mr. Miller of Lake spoke first, in opposition to the adoption of the minority report, contending that the opinion of most members had been formed by newspaper reports, and it had been shown that the newspaper, when called on for information, had denied having any.

He mentioned Stovall and the Times-Union men. He also laid some stress upon the fact that former Governor Jennings was being criticized without an opportunity being given him to reply, and characterized such criticism as unfair.

Mr. Wall of Bradford suggested that as each of the members had a copy of the report of the commission of 1907 on his desk, it was probable that their opinions had been formed from that, just as in the case of the gentleman from Lake.

Mr. Hardee of St Lucie suggested that the minority report, which was under discussion, contained no mention of Governor Jennings.

Mr. Miller resumed his argument, and spoke at some length, being frequently interrupted.

Mr. Hodge of Columbia spoke in favor of the adoption of the minority report, and said that the matters complained of had been testified to by records in the offices at the capitol, and not by newspapers.

Mr. Register of Hamilton said: "Having served the people of Hamilton county during the session of 1907, being one of the thoroughbred Crackers that helped to set apart the committee to investigate this I. I. Board, then having heard the speech that I have just heard, it brings me to my feet. I want to say in the outset that I feel a delicacy in attemping to follow such a fighter as the gentleman from Lake.

"In brief, I am going to state that the Governor or this state, Governor Broward, in his message to the legislature of 1907, asked this body to investigate that board. And for what? because the different newspapers throughout this state had accused him of misusing funds and doing that which he should not have done. I was an administration member from start to finish. I want that understood, and that I loved Broward at that day as, I loved no other man.

"Now if I get on your toes I can't help it, and if any of you want to fly into me, this is the craker that's always got a knot for you as big as a fodder stack. I'm going to tell it, let it amount to what it may. I'm going to tell it from start to finish.

"We were called on to investigate this question, and the first thing we did, we set apart some noble-hearted gentlemen to do the work, and I believe I can be corroborated in statement that when we went in that room there was an effort made to guard that committee in there and never let the proceedings be known to the people of the state who sent us here. I'm going to tell it. (Cries of "tell it, tell it").

"The understanding was, to we Crackers, that this report was to be made to the people and to this legislature during the session of 1907. Deny it if you dare—I have the documents. Bat they played and stayed and stayed and stayed, until after a while we were called on to get up a committee to investigate the investigation committee.

"Did we do it? Yes. That committee went in there, and the facts of the business got back to me, that those who had charge of it were not allowed to ask these people one single thing. And they were not asked anything by the people of state of Florida, but they were to ask the questions asked by that man in New York,(the expert accountant), and the devil take the people of Florida, they were going to run it as they saw fit.

"In the wind up, when this report came to this house, and we had prayed to see it come, that we might vindicate gentlemen that had been accused of first one thing and then anther, but it never came in until the wind up, and it was not complete.

"Mr. Carter of Alachua, and Mr. Reese of Escambia, I believe, refused to sign the report.

"I want to state that we've got it---the thing we prayed for to see so long, the investigation for the I. I. Board. It's here now, and what are we asked to do, if you please? We are asked to put a little bill of whitewash on it, and go back home to our people and tell them that they (the trustees) had made a little bit of a mistake. That's it from start to finish.

"Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of this house, I am supporting the minority report in this case. I want it to go broadcast among the people and let the chips fall where they may.

"I am representing the people of this state in a public capasity, as a public servant. I am put here by an element of people that wish well and want fair treatment; and I tell you they haven't had it from start to finish.

"The stuff throughout this state has been gobbled up and been put in the hands of a few individuals, and the devil catch the poor man, from start to finish. I hope the minority report will be sustained."

Mr. Carter of Alachua was in the midst of a peech in support of the minority report when a motion was made by Mr. Calkins of Nassau that further discussion of the matter be postponed to Tuesday week, and that Governor Broward be invited to address the House on the subject.

Mr. MacWilliams moved to strike out that part relative to Governor Broward, and Mr. Stokes moved to lay on the table Mr. MacWilliams' amendment.

This motion was carried, and the discussion resumed upon the motion of Mr. Calkins.

Before it could be decided. the hour of adjournment came, but it was moved and carried that the house meet again at 8 P. M.

BILL DEFINING AND PUNISHING GAMBLING

"Business Interests" Again the Plea—Some Snappy Talk Enlivens the Proceedings in the Senate.

Business interests! Business interests! Business interests! We have heard of them before. We heard of them when we had the prohibition amendment up; I want to know if the people of this State are to stand at attention while the business interests of Jacksonville plead for more time?" said Mr. McMullen, speaking in defense of Senator Sloan's bill defining gambling and providing punishment therefor.

This bill occupied the afternoon session of the Senate, and went to the committee on engrossed bills, after one of the prettiest fights that has been fought in the Senate this session.

As chatrman of the committee reporting on the bill, instead of moving indefinite postponement, Senator Buckman moved that it be made a special order.

The supporters of the bill thought this a ruse to put off action,

Senator Sloan told how the bill had been put off from time to time through the influence of Senator Buckman, principally that the "business interests" might be heard. He showed how their courtesy had cost them a favorable report from the committee.

"I appreciate the friendship of every man in this body, but in the name of Christian manhood, and in the name of Christian womanhood, I protest against the effort to defeat this bill. We have gone the limit in our endeavor to be fair.

"We are told this is a great industry, and must be fostered. We can't overlook the responsibility that confronts us. God will call us to account for our action today. I didn't introduce this bill to stand before this body as a reformer, but from a sense of duty to myself, and the great God which I try to serve."

Senator McMullen could not see the reason for delay. Quoting the Governor of New York, he said: "It is more important to improve the breed of men, than to improve the breed of horses." He drew attention to the fact that New York, Louisiana and California had cut out the race tracks.

He could not see what use they were to the people. "A one-eyed donkey would be of more service than a race horse."

As Senator Buckman seemed to have an inexhaustible supply of amendments, Senator McMullen obtained a vote on an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause.

The vote on this cut off further amendments.

The fight was productive of some clever parliamentary ruling.