

The Intelligencer.

The Movement Against National Banks.

There is, in some parts of the country, a decided feeling in favor of doing away with National bank circulation, and substituting in its stead a purely governmental currency. The popular idea is that National banks are parasites, and that they make a great deal of money at the expense of the public that could and should be saved by using Treasury notes or greenbacks. And yet National banks have been voluntarily retiring in large numbers from the system for years past, being quite willing to realize the premium on their bonds and go into the State system. Three banks in Wheeling have abandoned the National system, and the only remaining National bank has surrendered a very large portion of its circulation, and may, possibly, surrender all before a great while. This does not indicate that the system is popular of late years with capitalists, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose that it is not as profitable as other methods of banking.

The testimony of the Comptroller of the Currency, the other day, before the Congressional Committee on Banking and Currency, was to the effect that the average profit of National banks on their circulation is about 2.55 per cent, and that if at any time 4 per cent bonds should be substituted for 6 per cents, as security for their notes, this profit would be reduced to 1.9 per cent.

The popular prejudice against National banks has lately taken shape in Congress in the form of a bill which provides for issuing Treasury notes to the extent of \$25,000,000, whereof to replace that amount of bank notes, the banks being compelled to redeem their notes with greenbacks. By this arrangement we are to have a mixed circulation of government paper, part of it a legal tender, and part (the Treasury notes) only a legal tender to the same extent to which bank notes are now a tender—that is, for all accounts due by the government to its debtors, except interest to the public creditor. The volume of paper money would be just the same as now, only it would be all issued by the government. All banks would be State banks, and none of them would issue any circulation. They would simply receive government paper on deposit, and they would bank exclusively on their deposits. They would not be under the necessity of keeping any reserve, save such as prudence might dictate, and no government interest would come round as now and turn them inside out as a matter of course to depositors. Every banker would be a law to himself, save as State law might be enacted to regulate him.

Of course there would be some advantages in this change. The bill referred to provides that as fast as greenbacks are retired in redemption of the bonds held by the Treasury as security for the circulation of the National banks, they shall be used to purchase and retire outstanding 6 and 7 per cent bonds. This process would save the interest on these bonds, the amount now received by the government in the shape of tax on the circulation of the National banks. This tax amounts to about three millions per year, and the interest on the bonds amounting to about twenty millions, thus saving six millions per annum. This is, of course, a handsome saving, and one that is desirable to make in case all other considerations favor the change proposed? This is the question.

Comptroller Knox states as showing the security afforded by the National banking system, that during its existence 15 years, the sum total of losses to creditors is not over six millions, an amount that is probably not as large as the losses entailed upon the creditors of savings banks within the last year. Contrast this record with that of many of the old State banks before the war, with their lack of supervision, guarantee or security, their excessive issues, bearing a difficult question for every section of the Union, and their recklessness of management, and what a contrast is made the benefits which the country has reaped from the national banking system are at once apparent.

There is still another and a very important consideration involved in the subject. It is as to the desirability of converting the government into a bank of issue—in other words, into a paper money bank. Gold and silver coin is the only money known to the constitution of the United States. Paper money was issued under the war power, and was a forced loan upon the people. They were compelled to take it as a legal tender. Nobody supposed it was to become permanent, as if real money, after the war. Greenbacks were simply promises to pay on some day, and nobody supposed that promises were to be their own payment. Times change, however, and popular notions change with them. The tendency now is to regard greenbacks as permanent money. We "first pity, then admire, then embrace," says the poet, "referring to the tendency of human nature to weaken in its convictions and conscientious scruples as to what is wise and right."

To convert the United States Government into a paper money machine—to transform the people into seeing something that has no intrinsic value converted into money—to make the volume of this paper dependent on the number of Senators and Sen. Butler who may be in Congress—to foster the notion that the artificial value of trade can be indefinitely supplied with money, forgetting that every excess in money begets a demand for a fresh excess, and that the demand is as insatiable as the "daughters of the horse leech," is to do something for which there is no precedent in any existing experiment in finance, and which, as any one can see, is fraught with the gravest dangers. The strength of the Bank of England and the Bank of France, is in their immense metallic reserves. As late as November 15th last, the circulation of

the latter bank was \$491,110,950, and its coin reserve on the 15th of July previous was \$427,000,000. This is in a country where experiments with paper money have been tried to the full, and where the people have traditions that fill them with horror at the very idea of an immense volume of irredeemable paper money.

If to-day the United States government had in circulation a thousand millions of greenbacks (the National bank notes being wiped out) the rallying cry of Ewing and Ben Butler in the fall campaign would be for an increase sufficient to meet the wants of trade. Once the swell of inflation is commenced there is no limit to the wants of trade. No volume, however vast, will meet its ultimate wants. There are thousands of voters in this country reckless enough to go any length in demanding fresh issues of paper money, and there are Ewings and Butlers enough to cater to them on the stump and in Congress and add fuel to the flame. The delirium of irredeemable paper is the delirium of the opium eater—the more he eats the more he craves.

The Tuscarawas Road.
As published in our dispatches yesterday, the earnings of this road for 1877 were \$491,468.44, and the operating expenses \$309,934.54, leaving net \$181,533.90.

The details of these earnings are as follows: Freight, \$142,313.67; passengers, \$70,427.24; mail and express, \$8,207.41; miscellaneous, \$510.09. The total tonnage moved was 539,404, and the per cent of operating expenses 63.06.

By this time next year the cars of the Tuscarawas road will be running through to Wheeling. Indeed, we have been told that they will run through this fall. When they do run through, be it sooner or later, we shall see largely increased earnings. At present the road has no outlet. It ends almost in the woods at Ulrichville, and cannot make use of its splendid facilities at Black River harbor for delivering ore and lumber to the markets on the Ohio river.

When the Tuscarawas road is completed to Wheeling, it will be part of the Lake Shore and New York Central system of roads, and will afford increased facilities to freight and travel both East and West. In addition to this, it will have a fine local patronage through the rich country between Wheeling and Ulrichville. This will be the cream end of the line. Cleveland travel from this point will, by a large majority, go over the Tuscarawas road, and so also will a good portion of the Chicago travel.

What the Tuscarawas people want to do, to put themselves on a par with the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati & St. Louis line, now brought to our very doors on Water street, is not to stop short of deep water on this side of Wheeling Island. There is no better or more logical terminus for the road than the west end of the Suspension Bridge. The best water along the entire shore is right there, and there is a central radiating point for the delivery of freight by lighters, and by drays across the bridge, to all the mills and furnaces above and below, as well as to all the merchants of the town. It is also the natural point for the delivery of freight to the B. & O. and the P. W. & Ky. roads, more or less of which will arrive every day. Three important roads will thus be brought together at the river's edge, which is a very important consideration for the Tuscarawas road as well as for the general interests of this community.

Of course, our Bridgeport friends understand the necessity of some such arrangement as this, and as intelligent well-wishers of the Tuscarawas enterprise they have always looked forward to the probability of an Island terminus for the line. They will have a depot in their own midst, and perhaps also the shops of the company, and therefore will participate with us in all the conveniences and advantages of the terminus. They recognize that the road must have a deep water terminus as near as possible to the city, in order to reap the legitimate fruits of its completion to the Ohio river.

The Need of Patience Among the Iron Men.
At the outbreak of the American Revolution, Dr. Franklin made use of the memorable expression, "We must all hang together, or hang separately." We cannot but recall this expression when we think of the necessity that is laid upon the Iron men—especially the Nail men—of standing by their experiment, initiated weeks ago, of limiting production and maintaining their card price. Either this or a desperate plunge to the very bottom of the "Slough of Despond," from which they only emerged a few months ago, after months of weary efforts to market their product at even the smallest profit.

We make these remarks because we have heard that the feeling developed at the Pittsburgh meeting on Wednesday was not altogether satisfactory, although there was no disposition manifested to relax the hold of the association upon the present card. Every one acknowledged that to do so, after so many weeks of stopping, would indeed be most discouraging, if not altogether suicidal. Hence, while the meeting adjourned without a buoyant tone, it adjourned, as they say in war, in good order—under good discipline, and with its morale preserved.

All accounts from the West agree that just as soon as the roads become passable trade will certainly improve. It cannot be worse than it has been, and there is every reason to expect that it will change decidedly for the better. A Wheeling nail man traveling in the West, sends word that the prospects are encouraging for a good trade this spring. Therefore, let everybody be wise and patient, and not jeopardize the rewards of patience and conservatism up to this time by any hasty acts at this late hour in the season.

We are indebted to Thos. Hornbrook, Esq., for late and interesting papers from Hot Springs. One of these is an illustrated paper containing a photograph of General Kelly, the Government Superintendent of the Hot Springs reservation.

BY TELEGRAPH.

ASSOCIATED PRESS REPORT.

TO THE DAILY INTELLIGENCER

CONGRESSIONAL.

Senator Matthews on the Railroad Bill.

He Discusses the Legal Rights as well as the Public Policy of the Bill.

The Whisky Tax Bill Passed by the House.

An Enormous Loan to the Whisky Manufacturers.

A Genuine Specimen of Class Legislation.

A Gigantic Fraud on the Revenue.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, March 14.

A number of pension bills were passed during the morning hour; among them was one granting \$50 a month to the widow of Rear Admiral Charles Wilkes.

OBSCURE CASES FOR CUSTOMS.

Mr. Voorhees introduced a bill providing for the payment of all Customs duties and all other debts due the United States in legal tender notes at par, except in cases where it is otherwise expressly stipulated on the face of the obligation or contract. Referred.

Mr. Teller introduced a bill to regulate the passenger fare and freight traffic on the Denver Pacific Railroad and Kansas Pacific Railroad. Referred.

Consideration was then resumed of the unfinished business; being the bill in regard to the Union Pacific Railroad sinking fund, and Mr. Matthews spoke in support of the bill reported by the Committee on Railroads, and gave notice that he would thereafter submit it as a substitute for that reported by the Judiciary Committee.

THE RAILROAD BILL.

Mr. Matthews explained the bill reported by the Committee on Railroads, and said that the bill of the Railroad Committee did not embody the propositions which had been urged by the railroads. It was based, as it was based, on the consent of the parties. Without such consent it was his deliberate conviction that Congress had no authority of law, that the government had no authority to insist on matters the performance of which would violate an existing contract between the parties. He argued that the government, by the exercise of its sovereign power, could so bind itself that it could not unloose itself. Referring to the difference between the bill of the Committee on Railroads and that of the Judiciary Committee, he said he proposed to alter a contract by a contract, and the other was an act of power and nothing else. One was a settlement which was complete and final, and put an end to controversy and litigation. It contemplated nothing but the future of the sinking fund legislation, as it contemplated no further necessity for legislation, whereas the bill reported by his distinguished colleague (Thurman) from the Judiciary Committee did not even pretend to be a full and final settlement of the sinking fund interest. He said that the bill of the Judiciary Committee should become a law if it would the most deliberate attack on the rights of property and contract that he knew of in the annals of legislation. The bill of the Railroad Committee allowed interest on the accumulation of the sinking fund at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, while that of the Judiciary Committee allowed five per cent. If the companies should be allowed to make investments under their own control towards the payment of the debt they would certainly make their money at six per cent interest. He said that the bill of the Judiciary Committee, instead of collecting a sinking fund for the sole and exclusive use of the government of the United States in order to extinguish the claim of the United States against these companies, it carefully provided for the sinking fund, in respect to which the United States would have no lien whatever except subject to a prior lien of the first mortgage bondholders of the road. The amount of money required for the sinking fund must be paid by the passengers and those doing business over the road. It was a tax levied by Congress upon the commerce of the country transported over these roads. Suppose the tax be made burdensome, the companies must increase their charges. Would that be good policy? Would it be for the good of the public or the benefit of the government? He then spoke of the legal questions involved, arguing that the bill of the Judiciary Committee was an invasion of the rights of property and contract. He quoted from many legal authorities in support of his views.

The Vice President announced his signature to the House bill for the relief of Wm. H. Hammond, late Surgeon General of the Army, and it now goes to the President for his signature.

Mr. Christianity took the floor to speak on Monday on the sinking fund bill, and the Senate then adjourned until that day.

HOUSE.

Mr. Handenberger introduced a bill regulating the reserve fund of national banks. The bill authorizes such banks to dispose of their reserve fund and invest the same in United States bonds, which bonds shall constitute the reserve fund of such associations. Referred.

Mr. Durham, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, reported a bill limiting to \$3,500 the compensation of Clerks of District and Circuit Courts when one person holds both offices. Passed.

During the morning hour was discussed a bill reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice limiting the number of special attorneys appointed to assist District Attorneys to one, and limiting the fee to \$2,000.

The bill finally passed and the House went into Committee of the Whole on the bill extending to three years the time for withdrawing distilled liquors from bond.

THE WHISKY TAX BILL.

Mr. Sawyer stated the purpose of the resolution, to extend the bond period of whisky for three years instead of one year, as now provided by law; in other words, it was to give to alcoholic spirits manufactured in this country the same privileges that are given to liquors imported from Europe and put in bonded warehouses.

Mr. Conger said this resolution was an old acquaintance; its face was familiar to him and the House; it had been there before; its principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend the time for paying the tax. We were informed on the other side of the House that the Treasury had the principal claim at that time was that the expectation of a change in the tax on distilled spirits wholly disregarded business and threatened with loss and bankruptcy those engaged in the business. That claim had been promptly met by the adoption of a resolution that it was the solemn judgment of the House that it was inexpedient to change the tax on whisky. Now, under the stimulating power of four years, the House was asked to extend