

In all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, to propose to increase this schedule when it was expected that it would be decreased 20 per cent is as ridiculous as it is pernicious. I desire here to insert a letter from the Green-Joyce Company, of Columbus, Ohio, one of the largest jobbing concerns of dry goods and notions in Ohio:

THE GREEN-JOYCE COMPANY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 26, 1909.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will recall the writer as having lived in Newark for a great many years, and who was well acquainted with your father and his family. I have been associated with and part of the company for which I write for a number of years.

I write you on behalf of this company for the purpose of protesting, most vigorously, against a proposed advance of 20 per cent duty on cotton hosiery. It is uncalled for and unfair to wholesale and other dealers and to the consumers. We do not know whether you so understand it or not, but the large part of cotton hosiery imported is cheap goods, such as are used by people in moderate circumstances, laboring people, etc. In other words, the majority of cotton hosiery imported is that of medium price and the cheaper grades, and not silk and fancy qualities, which would be classed as luxuries.

It was generally understood among, and acceptable to the trade and manufacturers, that a reduction of 20 per cent would take place on this item, instead of an advance.

We are advised by what we consider good authority that an interested combination has either accomplished this advance, or is about to accomplish it. This combination controls a large percentage of the imported goods we refer to, and are prepared to advance the price very considerably beyond what it now is. It won't do. It must not be done, and we ask you as one of the Representatives from this State to oppose it. It is against the welfare of every dealer, large or small, and against the welfare of the people, the majority of whom are now having one of the hardest struggles in history to make ends meet, and many to even get the commonest necessities. It is one of the serious things, and we ask you not to pass it lightly.

We shall be pleased to hear from you.

Very respectfully, yours,

THE GREEN-JOYCE Co.,
E. B. DENNIS.

Mr. Chairman, the Green-Joyce Company know that if the duty on cotton hosiery is increased 20 per cent they will be compelled to add that amount and a small increased per cent of profit to the cost of their goods to the retailer; the retailer will be compelled to add a small increase in his per cent of profits, so that by the time the goods reach the consumer a conservative estimate makes an increase of 35 per cent to 40 per cent. Why? Is this the revision of the tariff downward promised by the Republicans during the last campaign? Does not the Payne bill show an increase of 1.56 per cent, and is upward, not downward? Has the Standard Oil fastened its fangs on the manufacture of cotton goods, too? Will this help the cotton grower of the South? Not a penny. He will sell his cotton in the markets of the world, and the combinations will reap the rich reward.

No doubt all of the Members are being deluged with petitions and personal letters from the merchants and the people generally in their districts, protesting against the advance on gloves, hosiery, and manufactured cotton goods, as well as a dozen other objectionable schedules. If all of the Members receive as many complaints as have poured into my office since this debate has been on, I do not envy you the job of reconciling the folks at home if you vote for these schedules.

I here have three letters received in my last mail. L. Hirschberger, proprietor of the Great Western Clothing House, of Newark, Ohio, under date of April 2, says:

Kindly use your best efforts against a further increase in the duties on gloves and hosiery; everybody uses these articles; the duty is now high enough. This is only intended to benefit the rich manufacturers at the expense of the multitudes. We know you will vote to protect the common people.

And here is another letter of the same date from Nick Amster, of Wooster, Ohio, a large merchant in that city:

As merchants we are strongly opposed to an increase in the duties on gloves. The market is now in a very good condition. Just as soon as this duty is increased, the American manufacturer will take advantage of it. Kindly do all you can to oppose this bill.

Here is what one of the largest merchants in my home county, John J. Carroll, of Newark, Ohio, has to say:

We desire to express our disapproval of the advance in duty on hosiery as proposed in the new tariff bill. It is uncalled for as far as protection to American manufacturers and employees are concerned, and would really be a great burden on the majority of our people for the benefit of a few who are never satisfied with a fair profit. We hope and believe you will work for the people's interest.

I have also received similar letters to-day from Louis Forlow, a prominent dry goods merchant at Millersburg, Ohio, and from the Fountain Dry Goods Company, of Coshocton, Ohio.

I should hate to go back to my people, having voted for such outrageous increases in these schedules, and I promise you that I will not vote for it; and I warn those who do vote for it that unless you are in districts controlled by these interests you will find yourselves in the "lame-duck" class when next you have an accounting with the people.

And there is the countervailing duty on petroleum. Innocent looking little thing in type, but it takes millions out of the pockets of the people and gives it to the greatest trust the world has ever known. Strange, too, that very few people know anything about it and dream on under the sweet delusion that coal oil, like salvation, is free.

Paragraph 637 is found on page 159 of the Payne bill "snugly tucked away" in the "Free list." Let us read it:

637. Oils: Almond, amber, crude and rectified ambergris, aniline, aspic or spike lavender, cajeput, caraway, cassia, cinnamon, chamomile, civet, cocanut, cotton seed, croton, fennel, ichthyol, juglandium, limes, mace, olive oil rendered unfit or incapable of use for food or for any but mechanical or manufacturing purposes, by such means as shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury and under regulations to be prescribed by him; palm, sesame or sesamum seed or bean, thyme, origanum, red or white, valerian; spermaceti, whale, and other fish oils of American fisheries; petroleum, crude or refined: *Provided*, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

Read the proviso again and you will find what is called a "joker." Let us read the "Provided" carefully:

That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

The principal producers of petroleum outside of the United States are Russia and Mexico. Both impose a duty on petroleum, so that neither can import their products into this country except by the payment of the same duty as is imposed on these products imported into their countries. Does that put coal oil on the free list? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KÜSTERMANN], an independent Republican—would that there were more like him—who has made an incessant fight against this little "joker," informs me that this "proviso" costs the American people \$13,000,000 annually.

If the Standard Oil needs protection—and the Republicans contend that it is protection to infant industries, and the people are willing to be longer fooled—then I withdraw to the ranks of "free trade," on oil, at any rate. It remains to be seen whether or not we shall have a right to vote on this schedule. If we do, it goes out; if we do not get a vote on it, prepare for the wrath to come; and I again predict many of those who vote for it will themselves go out. You can not fool all of the people all of the time.

Before I leave the "joker," permit me to make another illustration by again referring to the lumber schedule. The people generally think of the discarded card when they play seven-up, or the end man at the minstrels when they read about the "joker" in a tariff bill, and I want them to become better acquainted with the Washington "joker."

On page 54 we find paragraph No. 197:

197. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of whitewood, sycamore, and basswood, 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; sawed lumber, not specially provided for in sections 1 or 2 of this act, \$1 per thousand feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished, 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, \$1 per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, \$1.50 per thousand feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing and grooving: *Provided*, That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever upon, or any discrimination against, any forest product exported to the United States, or if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government forbids or restricts the exportation of any forest product to the United States in any way, there shall be imposed upon all of the forest products of such country when imported into the United States the duties prescribed in section 3 of this act during the continuance of such export duties, charges, embargo, discrimination, or restriction.

Here we are supposed to get a cut of just one half. But do we? Well, we do until we strike the "joker," whose non de plume is "Provided." Read carefully on after you strike that word "Provided," and you will find the same old "nigger in the wood pile." If the Province of Nova Scotia should put a duty on cord wood or toothpicks, the duty would remain the same in the Payne bill as in the Dingley bill. Surely Mr. FORBNEY was the right man in the right place on the Ways and Means Committee to see that the poor lumberman does not "get his toes tramped on." We believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORBNEY] is a truthful gentleman, and he told us he did not believe this schedule would affect the present Dingley duty or that it would reduce the duty on lumber at all. But why try to fool the people? He evidently believes that Barnum told the truth.

The tariff is the most insidious disease with which the American people were ever affected. They pay it and do not know it. "He tolleth not, neither does he spin."

When the taxpayer goes to the county treasurer to pay his taxes on real and personal estate, the rate and amount of the tax is clearly shown when the receipt is given, and he knows to just what extent he is assessed. If the rate happens to be a trifle higher than he believes it should be, somebody hears about it; but when the same taxpayer goes to the merchant and buys the necessities of life, he pays the price apparently unconscious of the fact that he is paying tribute to some trust—a tariff tax—many times in excess of what it costs him for schools for his children and for local, county, and state purposes.

When the poor man and the middle class vote for Congressmen and help send Senators to Washington to represent their best interests, who, under the guise of protection, enact tariff laws like the Payne bill, he is outrageously duped, to put it in the mildest possible terms. He does not know that when his good wife pours out a cup of coffee or a cup of tea that there will lurk behind his back the taxgatherer; that when he drops a lump of sugar in the cup, the sugar trust takes its pinch of about 2 cents per pound, and so on down the simple bill of fare.

Diamonds and rubies come in free, but calico dresses are taxed 50 per cent. But, then, the poor man, his wife, and his children should not despair. While it is true that the poor man pays the burden of the tax, yet asafetida, Balm of Gilead, catgut, whipgut, wormgut, cuttlefish bone, dandelion roots, dragon's blood, divi-divi, fishskins, fossils, hones, whetstones, ice, ipecac, old junk, leeches, marrow, musk, nux vomica, pulu, rags, rennets, salip, fennel seed, shrimps, spunk, turtles, vaccine virus, whalebone, and so forth, are on the free list. Halle-lujah!

When he lays in his winter supply of dragon's blood, diamonds, catgut, whetstones, leeches, and so forth, he can thank the Lord and the dear old Republican party that no trust gets a "rake-off" on these useful and indispensable articles.

The trouble is the people pay too little attention to those things that ought to concern them most. They do not bother themselves about "drawbacks," a "maximum and a minimum," a "countervailing duty," and "jokers," but live on sweet campaign promises from year to year, apparently oblivious of the fact that the opulent become more corpulent and the patches on their pants more prominent.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am no free trader; but in my humble way I propose whenever I get the opportunity to help strike down and out these "fossils" of protection and "leeches" of infant industries preying on the poor man and the duplicity of the people.

In conclusion, I wish to urge the American people to give more thought and consideration to those things in which they are most vitally interested. I read an editorial in the Cleveland (Ohio) Press yesterday which illustrates better than it is possible for me to do why the people are being robbed, with little protest, of many, many millions every year of their hard-earned dollars:

A WOMAN'S PALLID FACE WILL INTEREST MOST PEOPLE, BUT HOW ABOUT THE TARIFF?

Two facts are before the editor of this newspaper to-day for consideration in this column. They are unusual facts, and one is certain to interest you. They are:

(No. 1.) Mrs. Clarence Mackay, one of New York's richest and most conspicuous society women, has adopted a new cosmetic fad. She puts gray powder on her forehead and cheeks, paints her upper lip with light carmine and her nether lip in dark red.

It is said that the effect of this pallid face and brilliant mouth is startling, and that many fashionable women, especially those who have lithe figures like Mrs. Mackay, will adopt the fad.

(No. 2.) The tariff revision which Congress is about to perpetrate will be the most colossal fraud (in so far as the consumer and real producer are concerned) since the revision of 1892-93. The bill that will become a law will increase the cost of the poor or salaried man's living, will heavily tax the woman of moderate means, but will be perfectly satisfactory to the trusts and the millionaires of both sexes. It is highly probable that there will be no tax on inheritances or on stock certificates.

The tax will be increased on gloves of moderate grade and size, such as shop girls wear, but there will be a reduced tax on very expensive gloves, long 16-button affairs, such as Mrs. Mackay wears. Indeed, in every tariff schedule you will find that the revision upward will be upon articles that common folks use, and the revision downward will be upon articles consumed by the rich; and in every instance you will find the revision will consider the interest of the capitalistic producer, giving him full protection, and will disregard the interest of the consumer and labor producer, who is one and the same person.

Which of these facts interest you? They appear to have no relation to the other, but they have. It is this: Congress is to pass a vicious tariff measure, because the majority of citizens are not concerned about anything that Congress does in any tariff measure. The word containing a "t," an "a," an "r," an "i," and two "fs" frightens most people, and they do not study the really great question under discussion in our country to-day. You, for instance, may pass over without reading

or serious thought the columns containing tariff discussion in this newspaper to-day. But will you miss the item concerning Mrs. Mackay's gray powder and red lip paint? We think not. You will remember the pallid Mrs. Mackay after you have forgotten that you are paying absurd tribute to the trusts as a result of the thievish tariff revision which is now being made and which you are doing nothing to stop. This seems to be the happy-go-lucky American way. And it fully explains why a little minority of rich men is able to dominate and rob the great majority of people in this country year after year.

"What can I do," you ask? Well, what did the trust do? It sent its cleverest lawyers and managers to Washington and demanded revision in its interest. The leather trust demanded protection. It explained its needs and politely described its desire to make you pay more for shoes. It, with all the other trusts, was on hand to fight for revision beneficial to the trusts and the rich.

We have printed the Payne bill. Did you read it? If so, do you not see that the brunt of the new tax is to fall upon you? You have a right to protest. Write to your Representatives in Washington. Tell them that you are paying all you can stand for shoes, tea, coffee, cotton goods, oil, and other articles proposed for increased tax. Tell them to see to it that the tax is put upon luxuries, not necessities. Ask why uncut diamonds should come in free of duty and tea come in with a heavy tax. And if your Representatives do not respond to your bidding, like the servants they are, cut off their pay envelopes at the end of their terms and send men to Washington who will represent you and not the trusts. That is your weapon. Let your Representatives know that you will use it if they fail to think of the consumer, you, before they think of the producer, the trust.

Do you see the relation, now, between Mrs. Mackay's cosmetic and the tariff? The majority of people are so engrossed by frivolous news that they overlook the serious questions of the day—overlook them even when they mean harder work with less profit.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that I certainly hope that no rule will be adopted which will prevent every Member going on record on free lumber, free hides, free shoes, free oil, free iron ore, and on all of the schedules in this bill in which the people are demanding a reduction. The people are patient and long-suffering; but it was the last straw that broke the camel's back, and the passage of this bill without radical amendment will surely break the backs of the American people and the future prospects of many Members across that aisle. [Applause.]

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, as reported by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, calls for an estimated annual collection from the pockets of the people of the enormous sum of \$326,724,732. Its magnitude and far-reaching effects demand that we should consider it carefully and dispassionately from a business standpoint. From statements made here by members of that committee, it is manifest that only those who have an ax to grind have been heard in the make-up of this bill; ample time should be afforded the great masses of consumers to be heard from before its passage; undue haste would be wrong. I am not the least surprised that the special interests, having succeeded in obtaining a bill to their taste, are now busy creating a sentiment for its immediate passage. If this bill did not serve the purposes of the special interests, there would be an increasing cry for extended discussion. From the very nature of the situation, the 85,000,000 ultimate consumers who are affected by it, or any considerable per cent thereof, could not appear before the committee at its hearings. The only possible way for them to be heard is through their Representatives who have the courage to voice their contentions, and to that end, I for one protest against inordinate haste in the passage of this bill.

At the very beginning let it be remembered that the expense of running the Government for the past twelve years amounts to \$8,122,508,367, almost twice the sum required for the same purpose for the twelve years next preceding July 1, 1897. The first session of the Sixtieth Congress, and since the panic of 1907, appropriated \$1,008,884,884 to be expended during the fiscal year 1909. The revenue of the Government for that fiscal year was over \$35,000,000 less than the appropriations. The appropriations for the fiscal year 1910 amount to \$1,044,014,295, and the revenues for this are now over \$90,000,000 short, with three months of the fiscal year 1909 remaining; so that it can be seen at once that, if this bill comes up to the full measure of its proponents' expectations, there will still remain to be raised by taxation from other sources the sum of \$717,289,565, with a prospective estimated deficit of \$140,000,000. Instead of the panic serving as a signal to slow down and take the situation under control, you have thrown the throttle wide open, and as a result you are in the ditch.

While it does not come within the official scope of Congress to take cognizance of municipal, county, and state taxes, which in every instance are at the highest limit, with in many instances their bonded indebtedness strained, I insist that it is proper for the Members of this body to bear in mind that the burdens being placed upon the people in the way of taxation are intolerable and must be lightened. It may be well in this connection to bear in mind that the bonded indebtedness of the Federal

Government has increased since July 1, 1897, to March 16, 1909, from \$847,365,130 to \$913,317,490, and that the total amount of interest paid on the outstanding interest-bearing debt of the Government during the period just stated amounts to \$343,058,701.

The striking feature of the two sessions of Congress in which I have had the honor to sit has been the prodigal and lavish expenditure of the public funds. The RECORD will disclose the fact that I have consistently opposed this course by my votes. The Republican party, claiming to be a party of constructive legislation, has done little, if anything, during the last two years other than to make the most extravagant appropriations. You are preeminently a party of spenders, and your whole aim in the passage of this bill is to collect more taxes off the people that you may still further increase appropriations. Whenever any effort is made to check your untoward course in this particular, your invariable response is that this is a billion-dollar country. As well might the individual spendthrift undertake to justify his course by saying that he has the wealth to squander. That there is, and has been for a number of years, an alarming annual waste of many millions of dollars, due to duplicate appropriations and unbusinesslike methods and a general all-round leakage, is admitted by the belated effort to constitute a committee to supervise appropriations.

Instead of curtailing expenses, stopping these duplicates and leaks, you are casting about to find additional sources from which to derive more revenue, as is evidenced by the inheritance-tax feature of this bill. This is a method of raising taxes that has been resorted to by many of the States for raising revenue for state purposes, and it is manifestly unjust to these States that have been compelled to resort to this method for the Federal Government to forestall this right, for the legislative bodies of these States will be compelled to repeal their laws, since they are closer to the people who will rebel against this double taxation. The vice of this proposition is in creating a condition by extravagance where it becomes necessary to find new sources of revenue without eliminating some of the present sources of taxation.

Following the panic of October, 1907, the business of the country has fallen to lower and lower levels during each month succeeding that date; yet, in the face of these admitted conditions, Congress, by the policy and action of the majority party, has permitted appropriations to increase till it staggers the mind to contemplate their stupendous proportions. Mr. CLARK, the minority leader, in his discussion of this bill on the floor of the House, made this statement:

The tariff is a tax. The tariff is a tax paid by the consumer. Nobody with any reputation for veracity or intelligence to lose will deny either of these two propositions. If he does deny them, he will be confounded by the evidence of high protective advocates contained in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, which hearings are made up almost exclusively of the evidence of such advocates.

No one on that side to this date has challenged this statement or can do so successfully, so that it must follow that the \$326,724,732 to be raised by this bill is a tax that must be paid by the consumer.

The right to tax is the right to destroy, and by taxation you have exercised well-nigh to the limit this right to destroy the property of the people. All efforts on this side to check or curb the placing of this intolerable burden upon the people is met, with derision and sneers. The businesslike procedure under such circumstances would be to reduce expenditures to at least meet existing revenue, not to increase taxation for more lavish expenditures. Efforts looking to economy are made sport of. At the present time no one can contend that business is increasing in such volume, for that is the usual plea of the extravagant, as to demand additional expenditures to meet expanding conditions. At such seasons as this it is imperative that the Government, like individuals, live within its income. The chairman of the committee extolled the Dingley bill as a revenue producer, conveying the impression to the country that by it the Spanish-American war was financed. The controlling idea of the proponents of the bill is not to lighten the burdens of the people, but to raise additional revenue with which to meet additional and increased appropriations, the chairman stating in his opening speech that "the time had come to hunt for more revenue in a tariff bill." Economy is an unknown quantity on that side of the House. Anybody can spend money, but it is an evidence of wisdom to save it. Nor do I expect to see a return of a period of prosperity until the legislative bodies controlling the commercial nations of the world, realizing this fact, act accordingly; for, and I repeat it with emphasis, national, as individual, prosperity rests primarily upon the same underlying principle. The estimated annual revenues from custom duties to be raised by this bill show an increase over the Dingley bill of \$11,666,748. This, together with the \$20,000,000 from inheritance taxes and

\$1,500,000 additional internal revenue, represents an estimated annual increase in the amount of taxes to be collected from the people of \$33,166,748.

In all, you propose to collect under this bill, by way of taxation, from the people \$326,724,732.39; and at a time when the country is still suffering from severe business depression, and as against \$293,557,984.14 collected in 1906, when the country was at its high tide of prosperity. And yet there are gentlemen here on this floor, in the face of these indisputable facts, claiming that this bill is a "revision downward." Neither the facts nor the figures warrant this statement. If it were true, we would be in the ridiculous attitude of undertaking to meet a daily increasing deficit with a daily decreasing revenue. At what point, pray, do you expect these two diverging conditions to meet and strike a balance?

The apologists for this bill claim to have recently discovered that some of the rates of the Dingley bill are and have been prohibitive. Yet you have inserted prohibitive rates in many instances in this bill in spite of your additional contention that reduced rates increase revenue and that you must have and are hunting for more revenue. Again, if you have full confidence in your prophecy that the passage of this bill means the return of vanished prosperity, why in addition to taxing inheritances do you provide for \$50,000,000 Panama bonds to refund a liquidated charge, and in addition make provision to increase the amount of certificates of indebtedness from \$100,000,000 to \$250,000,000; and this in the face of the fact that the average or equivalent ad valorem rates of taxation in this bill are higher than the rates in the bill which this extraordinary session of Congress was called to revise, and, as the country understood it, to revise downward?

To my mind, these are distress signals for the approaching financial storm that you expect to break in fury over the commercial business of this country following this bill's enactment into law. You have made provision in said bill to issue interest-bearing obligations of the Government equal to almost two-thirds of the revenue that you claim this bill will raise, so that it might well be termed "a bill to increase the bonded indebtedness of the country," instead of "a bill to raise revenue." This function of the bill will be used to its full extent, if it shall result, as I expect it to, that the expenses of the Government for the next twelve years shall, as they have in the past twelve years, redouble.

The Republicans have, with amazing effrontery, but with their accustomed inconsistency, claimed that every blessing—including, I presume, increased cost of living—that humanity has enjoyed since July, 1897, when the Dingley bill became effective, has resulted from the provisions of that bill. In the first instance, if true, why repeal it? Mr. DALZELL, speaking of that measure, in addressing this House during the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, after rehearsing the wonderful strides this country had made along commercial lines, added:

And yet, notwithstanding this wonderful prosperity which, if not contributed to by, is at least coincident with our existing tariff laws—
And so forth.

Later, in his efforts to account for the panic that was then on, he said:

The most remarkable thing about the whole situation is the suddenness with which it passed.

Has it "passed?" If so, when? This Dingley bill, panacea for all previous business disorders—this bill that you claim rekindled the fires in the furnaces, started the wheels of prosperity to revolving—is to be repealed and succeeded by a bill that a Washington Post correspondent, on March 24, 1909, styles "A bill to kill business," over an article bearing a New York date line and written by an economic expert, and which is in full as follows:

"BILL TO KILL BUSINESS"—ECONOMIST WRITES IN CRITICISM OF PAYNE TARIFF MEASURE—BY KEEPING 2,000,000 IDLE, HE SAYS, IT WILL PREVENT EARNINGS OF A BILLION AND TEN BILLIONS OF TRADE.

NEW YORK, March 24, 1909.

Among the criticisms of the new tariff bill received by Wilbur F. Wakeman, general secretary of the American Tariff League, is this by R. Benedict, a New York lawyer and economic expert:

"The Payne bill, as I read the House draft, looks in the wrong direction, for it looks rather toward less than more employment for our people. It is said that there are now idle in this country all the way from 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 of our workers of all grades and classes. Call it the smaller number, 2,000,000. If these people were put to work they could hardly earn and spend yearly less than \$500 apiece upon the average. That would mean an initial impulse of \$1,000,000,000 more annually paid to our merchants, which alone is quite worth while; but that is the initial value only of the reemployment of our idlers; the final annual value must be at least ten times as great, for \$1 paid into the market to-day would certainly have changed hands ten times by this day of next year, and upon each exchange it would have represented a total employment of \$1—that is, it would have swollen to the value of \$10 in a year, which would mean a final value yearly of \$10,000,000,000 to our domestic business of merely putting the present idlers to work.

"From every human point of view the reemployment of our 2,000,000 of present unemployed is the main thing to be looked out for in the new tariff measure. Of course, one does not have to say that unemployment means death by starvation at one place or another. It means the swelling of our bread lines and our pauper rolls, not to mention the increase in business at police headquarters. But from a cold business point of view, the Payne bill as it comes from the committee is a sad mistake.

"I believe it is expected to bring in about \$300,000,000 a year of revenue by keeping the people unemployed, and even in many cases adding to our sum of unemployment. If it merely keeps idle those who are now out of work, it will destroy \$10,000,000,000 of business here annually to realize \$300,000,000 of revenue. That is, for each dollar of customs revenue collected it will kill \$33.33 of domestic business. But from the vice of reductions in many directions inherent in the bill there is every reason to believe that unemployment will be eventually doubled by it—that is, to collect \$1 customs revenue we will throw away \$66.66 of domestic business.

"It seems to me that if this were my job, and I were the giant of wealth called 'Aggregate domestic business interest of the United States,' I would put my hand in my pocket and pay the Government \$300,000,000, which it seeks to raise by the Payne bill in exchange for a fiat closing our ports against foreign competition in this market for our workers. I should be miles and miles ahead of the game at that."

In this article it appears that there are from 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 idle workers of all grades. Is it possible that this condition could still exist and this wonderful Dingley bill still in full force and effect? In the language of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, yet notwithstanding this appalling idleness, "which, if not caused by it, is at least coincident with a Republican administration."

In 1897, the date of the passage of the Dingley bill, following the period of business depression, the Republicans went before the people proclaiming that the remedy for the situation was the passage by Congress of a highly protective tariff. The battle cry was "Start the factory and prosperity will come to the farmer, as night follows day." But, behold, idle and smokeless factories for two years, and the farmer prosperous in spite of this situation. You are simply groping, or else boldly undertaking to deceive by false impressions; for this same party, with a siege of hard times, with an increasing army of unemployed, are now telling the people that the remedy for a situation paralleled to the situation preceding 1897, requires a reduction of customs duties or taxes in order to restore prosperity. And yet they are offering a bill that is a revision upward, as the figures disclose. Notwithstanding the gentleman from New York, chairman of the committee proposing this bill, displayed violent indignation and wrath when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], on the floor of the House, during his opening statement of the bill, ventured to intimate that the bill now under consideration was a revision upward, and denounced, with the wrath of Jupiter hurling a thunderbolt, the statement as unjust and unfair, vehemently asserting that this bill was a revision downward. Verily, it is the "voice of Esau but the hand of Jacob."

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in the course of his remarks on this bill, in response to a question from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REEDER], made use of this expression:

Now, get the farmer's vote out of your mind and try to consider this question fairly and squarely as between man and man.

This bill places a tariff of 25 cents per bushel on wheat and 15 cents per bushel on corn. When did a farmer ever sell a bushel of wheat at a higher price than that at which wheat was selling at the same time in the Liverpool free-trade market, except, possibly, when the gamblers on the board of trade had cornered the market? If the market abroad is not higher than the home market, what man would be so foolish as to pay freight abroad and sell in a lower market than at home? Until the farmer gets more for his products at home than abroad the tariff is of no earthly advantage to him. This is no new proposition, I confess; but if this matter is to be treated "fairly and squarely as between man and man," why put this and many similar features in this bill to hoodwink the farmer? Canada is the only country from which we import wheat into the United States. The chairman said that it was necessary to have the hard wheat of that country to mix with the soft wheat of this country in order to make a flour that our mills can export. Again, if the duty placed by this bill on agricultural products could be of any possible advantage or benefit to the farmer, under the drawback clause of this bill Canadian wheat can be brought in in unlimited quantities, converted into flour by American millers, and made to supplant the American export trade, not by blending it with American wheat, but by using Canadian wheat exclusively to supply the market that is now supplied, at least in part, by home-grown wheat. Under this same drawback clause, by which the import duties paid by the importers are refunded to them, Canadian, Mexican, and other foreign cattle and live stock and farm products generally can be imported and, after rehandling, made to compete with our home products, so that the farmer will be compelled to sell his raw material in an un-

protected market—the markets of the world, as it is best understood—and at the same time be compelled to purchase every thing he must buy in a taxed or protected market, while, by the provisions of this measure, you are attempting to mislead him into believing that it is his products that are protected.

From the Republican point of view this is what you call "treating the matter fairly and squarely as between man and man." No; the ultimate effect of this bill is, with a line drawn north and south through Pittsburg, that the section of country west of that line is treated as an alien and foreign country, in that the domestic raw material from this section must compete in price and quality with the best of imported raw material free of duty. Another deception for the farmer is in the placing of iron ore on the free list. The effect of this, in plain English, is to enable the steel trust to import its raw material from Cuba, Canada, and Mexico, where it has acquired extensive and high-grade ore deposits, free of duty, thereby putting into the pockets of the trust millions of dollars which formerly went into the Treasury, while the fencing wire, the roofing, structural material, and iron material used in agricultural implements remain unrelieved of the protective rates that have been and are placed upon them by this bill. Still another deception, intended for much the same class, is in the sugar rate, whereby each consumer's annual saving, under the new rate, reaches the preposterous sum of 4 cents.

During the year 1906, 1,058,926 dozen pairs of gloves were imported—that is, 12,707,112 pairs. On these the duty under the present law was from \$1.75 to \$5.90 per dozen. This bill proposes to increase the duty on the \$1.75 kind—the cheapest gloves imported—an increase of 100 per cent. The poor woman's glove is to be taxed 90 per cent; the rich woman's 44 per cent. There are 3,000,000 pairs of the gloves which are taxed 90 per cent annually imported and only 28,000 of the gloves that are taxed 44 per cent, so that the total taxes on the poor woman's glove will be \$930,025 a year and on the rich woman's glove \$12,749 for the same period.

These are but samples of the deceptions sought to be imposed upon this country's army of consumers. Did time and opportunity permit, I could point out scores of others. The country might as well expect to gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles as to expect real relief from a "revision of the tariff by its friends."

I declare any tax-levying bill that takes one penny from the wages of the working girl to pay for the increased salaries of an increasing army of federal officeholders or for big navies and armies to be, if not unhalloved, at least criminal. I am opposed to increasing the price of the cheap gloves that the poor must use in order to lower the price of the gloves that the rich wear. I am for the girl that must wear the cotton stocking because she can not afford the silk one.

And, now, before closing this particular branch of the discussion, and in response to the statement of the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], who, in his inimitable style, twitted this side of the House because of the depression of prices during the last Democratic administration, I wish to submit, in order that the people may be enabled to form their own conclusions as to how far the Republican party's legislation was instrumental under similar circumstances in increasing prices of live stock and farm products, the following reports of the Chamber of Commerce of Cincinnati for the years indicated:

Annual average price of hogs.

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		
1893	per hundred	\$6.90
1894	do	5.10
1895	do	4.35
REPUBLICAN YEARS.		
1897	per hundred	3.30
1898	do	3.85
1899	do	4.65

Annual average price of cattle, same market.

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		
1893	per hundred	\$3.61
1894	do	3.85
1895	do	3.85
REPUBLICAN YEARS.		
1897	per hundred	3.54
1898	do	3.70
1899	do	3.85

Average price leaf tobacco, same market.

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		
1893	per hundredweight	\$10.00
1894	do	11.85
1895	do	10.05
REPUBLICAN YEARS.		
1897	per hundredweight	8.05
1898	do	9.10
1899	do	7.95

Corn, No. 2 (St. Louis, Milwaukee, and Cincinnati).

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		Cents.
1893	per bushel	31½-41½
1894	do	31½-56
1895	do	23½-53

REPUBLICAN YEARS.		Cents.
1897	per bushel	19½-29½
1898	do	25½-36½
1899	do	29½-36½

Clover seed (Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce).

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		Cents.
1893	per hundredweight	\$10.67
1894	do	8.80
1895	do	7.64

REPUBLICAN YEARS.		Cents.
1897	per hundredweight	5.82
1898	do	5.08
1899	do	5.48

Timothy seed (Cincinnati).

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		Cents.
1893	per hundredweight	\$1.68
1894	do	2.10
1895	do	2.07

REPUBLICAN YEARS.		Cents.
1897	per hundredweight	1.20
1898	do	1.11
1899	do	1.05

Timothy hay (same market).

DEMOCRATIC YEARS.		Cents.
1893		\$12.55
1894		10.95
1895		12.70

REPUBLICAN YEARS.		Cents.
1897		9.80
1898		8.67
1899		10.00

The present bill bears a strong resemblance in its operations to the concessions granted by the governments in the Latin-American republics. There the government grants a monopoly direct to its favorite, which in time, by intolerable oppression of the people, engenders revolution. This bill grants special favors by legislative enactment to particular industries, and the result is scant difference between the monopolies born of and fostered by such legislation as contained in this bill and the concessions of the republics south of us. In operation they are the same. What is the difference in the status, as a result of this bill, of Standard Oil, the steel trust, the sugar trust, the beef trust, the International Harvester Company, and kindred companies in the United States, and in that of the concessionaires of the South American republics? The concerns first named are in as complete control of the commodities that the American people must have as the concessionaires are in their respective governments. There are indications that the people of this Republic are becoming aware of the similarity of these situations; and when they do become fully advised, and these glaring evils are not eradicated, the result will be one about which I entertain grave and serious apprehensions.

When the panic of 1907 came, it was the farmer who was to the panic-stricken financiers what reinforcements are to a routed army. He saved the day and averted a direful disaster. In return for that service, he is in this, as in all other bills written by the friends of the tariff, made to retain his position as the principal burden bearer of an extravagant and profligate Republican administration.

The failure of the bill to in any measure alleviate the gross injustices that have been imposed on the vast army of American consumers forbids that I lend my vote or support to any feature of it.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pleasure that the Members of this House have listened to the able argument upon both sides of this Chamber upon the tariff bill now before us. The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee have been exhaustive in so far as the protected interests are concerned, and they have clamored to be heard in the committee room in the interest of protection to their industries. Some very able speeches have been made on this floor, and we are indebted to the chairman of the committee for his explanation of this bill; yet in all his argument in support of the bill, it seems to me, he does not show where the consumer will be given the benefit of a downward reduction of duties. The minority leader, Hon. CHAMP CLARK, in a very able and exhaustive address before this House, has shown that this bill is not a downward revision of the tariff, but that all the protected industries are very well taken care of in the Payne bill now under consideration, and if this bill becomes a law as now reported no relief of taxation will be given the people. [Applause.]

An attempt has been made by these men who are asking that special privileges be given them under this bill to show how the consumer will be benefited. The selfishness of human nature has always been such that each is trying to take care of himself, and while the arguments, from a protection standpoint, might seem to be conclusive that these protected industries are making goods for the consumer as cheap as he ought to expect to buy them, yet they are attempting to have a bill passed that will enable them to take from the consumer a portion of his earnings for the purpose of enriching themselves.

We have seen, under this protective-tariff system, institutions grow from small concerns and then, forming immense combinations and trusts, attempting through these combinations to control the price of their own product and thereby be enabled to charge the people whatever price they determine as fixed by themselves in combination. The argument in this House has demonstrated, it seems to me, that Members are sometimes unable to look beyond their own districts and are asking the privilege of taxing other people for the benefit of their own districts.

I like the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE] in a speech on this floor, when he said:

We ought to be patriotic enough to look to the welfare of all the people and legislate in their interests.

[Applause.]

Too often, through selfishness, people advocate a high tariff, not for the purpose of placing revenue in the Treasury, but that they may have the benefit of this tax to enrich themselves.

I believe in the principle that every man is entitled to the full benefit of his own labor, and that no man or class of men have a right to take from another man's pocket a portion of his earnings and put it into his own without giving him something of value in return.

The protected industries have so long enjoyed the privilege of taxing the American consumer that they feel it is their right to continue to do so. Under the guise of protecting the American manufacturer and laborer they attempt to show that protection is necessary or their factories will have to close and the workman be thrown out of employment.

I believe in the principle that whatever tariff is levied is that much taxation upon the people, and that the Government has no right to permit, by law, any man to tax another for his own benefit. It seems to me that the principle that you advocate of taxing the people to make a business profitable that otherwise would not be is wrong. The farmer or workman has no assurance of a profit by law, but must take his chances in open competition in the markets of the world. I believe that all taxation should be as light as possible on the necessities of life, and only so much should be collected as is necessary for an economical administration of the Government.

The farmer who works from early morn to late at night, many times in rain as well as sunshine, in the cold and heat, often being compelled to keep his children from school, thus depriving them of an education, and at the end of forty years of hard labor has a few hundred acres of land is considered a rich man in the community; and yet these men in protected industries have been able, on account of a high tariff and with the aid of combinations, to amass immense fortunes in a little while. It was said by a Republican candidate for the United States Senate in Wisconsin in the last primary that since the Dingley bill had been enacted into law more than \$500,000,000 had been collected each year by the protected industries of the country that had gone not into the Treasury of the United States, but into the pockets of these protected industries. So that the people have been taxed for the benefit of these protected industries while this law has been on the statute books over \$5,000,000,000. This certainly is an enormous tax on the people of our country.

The farmer by law is compelled to pay a tariff on everything he buys and sell his products in the open market of the world. In this bill you intend to fool the farmer by making him believe he is protected by a tariff, when you certainly know it is of no benefit to him. The farmer does not ask to be relieved of his just proportion of taxation, and is willing to be taxed when that money goes into the Treasury, but he has a right to object to being taxed on everything he buys and compelled to sell in competition with all the world. The beef trust is enabled to pay him what it desires for his stock when placed on the market, and he is powerless to help himself. If he ships a load of fattened stock to one market and he is dissatisfied with the price offered him, which is fixed each day by the trust on all the stock in the market at that time, and he should decide to reload and ship to another market, the combination will telegraph ahead to look out for this particular shipment, and when he arrives there is offered less for his stock than before. So he is compelled to sell his stock at a reduced price. The beef

trust is determined that he must sell at the price they fix in the first instance or take less. Again, when this product is finished and shipped back to the local merchant, the beef trust again fixes the price, and he is compelled to pay whatever they ask. The trust is enabled, through combination, to fix the price in both instances. Thus it is, like the old man's coon trap, he is "caught coming and going." [Applause.]

The protected industries have enjoyed the privilege of taxing the American people so long that now they are doing their utmost to hold the privilege granted them. The great corporations have capitalized their concerns so much more than they have actually invested—and have millions of watered stock—that they are now trying to make the people pay a profit on this fictitious capital with the cry that they are entitled to a fair profit on the capital invested. The great cry of the protected interest is that protection is for the benefit of labor; that the tariff is levied for the purpose of protecting labor; and yet, under the provisions of this bill, material is shipped in here and manufactured and shipped abroad and sold to foreigners cheaper than to the men who work in the factories. The laborer must come in competition with the labor of the world. There is no protection for the men who labor in the factories. Many times the tariff is much higher than the total cost of the labor. Whenever there is any agitation of a lower tariff, then there is a cry of reducing wages by this class of protected interests. If the tariff is levied for the interest of labor and to cover the difference in cost of production in this country and abroad, there ought to be a provision that when the Department of Commerce and Labor determines that the product of such protected industry is selling for more than the difference in the cost of labor here and abroad, then the President of the United States should have the right to lower the tariff accordingly. [Applause.]

During the last campaign the people were promised genuine reduction of the tariff, so that they might secure the necessities of life at a lower price. It was said that the schedules in the Dingley law needed revising and that this Congress would reduce the rates of the present tariff law. Mr. Taft told the people on the platform that if he were elected he would call Congress in extra session for the purpose of revising the tariff, giving genuine reduction, so that the people might be relieved of the unnecessary burdens of taxation. I ask the Members of the other side of the House if you think you are keeping faith with the people? Have you given them in this bill a reduction in the price of the necessities of life? Can they buy cheaper clothing or other necessities of life when this bill becomes a law than they do now? The Treasury experts have estimated that the average tariff in this bill is nearly 2 per cent greater than the Dingley law. Is that the kind of reduction promised? Is that the kind of reduction the people expected from the hands of this Congress? I think not. In my judgment, a genuine reduction should be made on the articles the people are compelled to buy for everyday use. No Member of this House wants to see a single industry of the United States injured in the least. Everyone desires to see labor employed at good wages. The man who works with his hands is entitled to a fair division of the profits of his labor; but in the passing of this bill this end is not sought by the men who are asking for a continuance of the right to tax the people through the tariff; they want the right by law to continue to shut out foreign competition and control through combination the markets of our own country. The people will not tolerate a species of legislation like this, that increases taxation when they are promised a reduction.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means can fool the people no longer. They will drive from power the majority in this House and send Representatives here who will give them genuine tariff reduction. The expenses of the Government have grown so enormous through extravagant appropriations that the high rates of the present tariff do not produce sufficient revenue to pay the expenses. We ought to cut down our expenses. Many millions could be saved if an effort were made to be more economical. There seems to be no effort to reduce expenses any place, but useless appropriations are made and millions of dollars are spent from which the people derive no benefit whatever. No true American citizen desires to hinder a just administration of the Government, and he is willing that all necessary money should be appropriated for all just needs of the Government; but, Mr. Chairman, he does have a right to object to being taxed and have that money extravagantly spent. Every dollar that goes into the Treasury must be produced by some one's labor. Every dollar means the toil of some one. The people will no longer bear this heavy burden of taxation. They expect this Congress to take such steps as are necessary to lessen this load that they are now com-

pelled to bear. The money that is spent by Congress is not the money of the Representatives, but belongs to the people; and it is the duty of the officers of the Government to see that it is economically used. [Applause.]

It is hard to understand why the great State of Ohio, through its representatives in the legislature, should petition this Congress to remove all the tariff on lumber and still desire to retain the high tariff on such products as the people of that State produce. It is just as essential that the people should have other necessities of life as they should have cheaper houses. The people of New England want the western people to give them free hides and yet desire to retain a high tariff on shoes. Very few shoes are imported into this country, and all the tariff levied on boots and shoes is for the benefit of the shoe factory. It certainly seems to me that the tariff should be made as light as possible on those articles of necessity, so that the people will be able to supply themselves with cheaper clothing and other necessities for themselves and their families.

The shoe men, before the Ways and Means Committee, have asked that the tariff on hides be removed, so that they would not be at the mercy of the packers' combine, and yet they want to retain the duty on shoes. Let us remove the duty on leather goods, such as boots, shoes, and harness such as the farmer buys, so that our people can buy leather goods at less price than they are now compelled to pay. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WEISSE] has repeatedly said on the floor of this House that he, as a tanner, was willing to have all tariff removed from leather if he were given free hides and free tanning materials. The great shoe manufacturing firm of Wolfe Brothers, of Columbus, Ohio, has said, in the following letter, that if they are given free hides they can make the shoes for the world:

WOLFE BROTHERS SHOE COMPANY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 29, 1909.

HON. MARTIN D. FOSTER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the largest manufacturers of shoes in the country, we urge you to lend your influence to place shoes on the free list.

The American shoe manufacturer needs no protection. With free hides and cheap raw material, the American shoemaker can shoe the world.

Very respectfully,

THE WOLFE BROS. SHOE COMPANY.
R. F. WOLFE, President.

Yet, in the face of all this Congress is asked to remove the duty on hides and allow a high tariff to remain on leather goods. Be consistent and remove the duty on shoes also. Do not attempt to take care of the interest of the New England shoemakers and forget all the consumers. There are so many "jokers" in this bill that nobody can tell what will be its effect until after it is passed and becomes a law, and its different provisions construed by the Treasury officials and the courts. [Applause.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] in a great speech in this House a few days ago showed how the "joker" in the lumber schedule would raise the tariff on all classes of lumber, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] acknowledged that such a "joker" existed, and that it would not reduce the duty on lumber one cent.

Mr. KITCHIN is to be commended for his loyal stand for the people in his efforts to relieve them from this unjust tax. He has been able to look to the interest of the home builders, and not to the interest of the men who are trying to tax people for every stick of lumber they are compelled to buy. People must have lumber to build houses, and no combination controlling the price should be permitted to compel our people to pay outrageous prices for this necessary product that God has placed here for our use. It seems that the defenders of the tariff on lumber have worked overtime, and the representatives of this interest have been the best organized of all the interests asking protection in this bill. Every mail has brought to the Members arguments and appeals to continue this unjust tax on the American home. Even so great and good a man as the Hon. Gifford Pinchot has been induced by some argument to reverse himself on this question.

The duty on sugar has been reduced 5 cents on the hundred pounds. This reduction does not amount to anything, and so far as giving any relief to the people from the sugar trust, might just as well have been left where it was in the Dingley law. Each person would have to eat 100 pounds of sugar before he would save one nickel with the reduction contained in this bill. The people must continue to pay the enormous profits to the sugar trust, and the people must continue to buy of the sugar trust and pay tribute to that gigantic monopoly if this bill becomes a law. No one has yet pointed out the "joker" in the watch schedule, but it, no doubt, is there.

I confidently expect my colleague [Mr. RAINY] to expose the iniquity of the schedule on watches, as I am sure he can so ably do, as in the past he has shown the injustice of this schedule in the Dingley bill. There is not much doubt that the watch trust will find some way to keep out competition and continue to sell its products abroad cheaper than to the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Democratic doctrine of tariff for revenue, the burden being placed the lightest on the necessities of life. With all the protected interests clamoring at the doors of the committee room and the lobby about this Capitol working overtime for protection, the people, I fear, will be forgotten; and when this bill passes both the Senate and House and becomes a law, it will be demonstrated that the people's interest has not been looked after, and they must go on paying tribute to the rich combinations who have already grown too rich off the labor of the country. When this bill was first introduced it was heralded over the country that the tariff had been revised downward, but the more it is examined the more it is shown that the bill will again fool the people and still give the tariff beneficiaries all the advantage they desire. I would have been glad to have voted for a bill that would lighten the burden of the taxpayer, though it had been proposed by a Republican Congress; and I am sure this side of the House would have gladly supported such a measure. Not only to the people of the districts we have the honor to represent, but to the people of the whole country, do we owe an effort to give them a tariff law that will not burden them with taxation and compel them to pay of their earnings to the trusts of the country that shield themselves behind a tariff wall.

Mr. Chairman, I would be untrue to the interests of the people should I vote for this bill without it is changed in such a way as to give substantial relief to them in taxes. I expect that next Monday a rule will be brought in here closing debate and permitting such amendments as the committee may consent shall be offered. No opportunity will be given to reach this bill under the five-minute rule, and the claim will be made that the interests of the country demand that the bill shall be passed immediately. I submit to this House that it would be better to take a little time and pass a bill that will be in the interest of the people. The protected interests are here to look out that they be taken care of, and it is our duty as representatives of the people to see that those who labor and pay the taxes, those who are the consumers, should also be looked after. We should not permit our people to be robbed of their hard earnings by a class of men who give them nothing in return for the money they take from them. Mr. Chairman, there will come a time when the people can not be fooled. They will rise in their might, and instead of these paid lobbies being about in this Capitol they will demand that the Representatives shall no longer give heed to this class of citizens who only act from selfish motives; and if we fail to heed the people's voice and keep faith with them, they will send men here who will secure legislation favorable to their interests and who will revise this tariff in the way the people have been promised it would be done.

I can not attempt in the brief time allotted me to discuss in detail the different schedules, but have contented myself in dealing in a general way with this bill. I had hoped that in this bill there might be relief for the wage-earner, for the farmer and producer generally, but, it seems to me, this bill is only in the interest of that class who want to profit from the labor and producer of the land.

Mr. Chairman, this House should not be so hasty in its endeavor to pass this bill that no opportunity be given to amend it in such a way that the promise made to the people will be fulfilled. Let us take a broad view of the rights of the people and legislate in the interest of all of them. Let us not forget that we have no right to tax all the people of this country for the benefit of any one class. Let us see that the rights of the people are maintained against the greedy combinations and trusts that would build a high tariff wall around our country, keeping out all competition from abroad and stifling competition at home, thus controlling the market of our own country and collecting an unjust tax from our people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ELLERBE. Mr. Chairman, it has not been my intention to make a speech on the Payne tariff bill. I have realized from the first that Democrats would have practically nothing to do with framing the law. The most that we will be permitted to do is to protest against the bill as a whole. Because of the unjust burdens imposed upon the masses of the people, for the reason that the bill is sectional, particularly does it discriminate in favor of the East and against the South and West, because the burden is the greatest ever imposed upon the American

people the bill should not pass. At this time I shall simply call attention to one paragraph of the Payne bill.

Paragraph 652 of section 2 of the Payne bill is identical with paragraph 644 of the Dingley law. This paragraph in the Dingley law places sulphate of potash and muriate of potash on the free list. Paragraph 652 in the Payne bill nominally does the same thing. As a matter of fact, placing this paragraph of the bill under the heading "free list" is a pretense and a fraud. It is one of the many paragraphs in the Payne bill to be denominated, popularly speaking, a "joker" and is intended to hide the real purpose of the framers of the bill in imposing a duty of 20 per cent on all the articles enumerated in the paragraph mentioned.

Section 3 of the Payne bill, beginning at line 24, page 172, reads as follows:

Upon each article enumerated in the following paragraphs of section 2 of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

A number of paragraphs are mentioned, among them paragraph 652 of section 2. This "joker," hidden away in section 3, is intended to impose a burden or tax of nearly \$1,000,000 on the farmers of the South. I take the following from Notes on Tariff Revision, a publication gotten up for the use of the Ways and Means Committee, and only in the last few days available to the membership of the House:

Sulphate of potash is a salt that occurs in nature in considerable quantities. In the Stassfurt (Germany) mines it is found in combination with sulphate and chloride of magnesium, forming the mineral kainit. Sulphate of potash is employed in the production of carbonate and also as a fertilizer.

Importation of sulphate of potash: Quantity, 58,306,202 pounds; value, \$1,013,045.31; value per unit, \$0.018. Germany's share of this importation was 55,407,933 pounds, the United Kingdom furnished 1,773,932 pounds, and the balance came from Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, and Canada. Muriate, or chloride of potash, called "sylvine," occurs in the Stassfurt beds and also in Vesuvius. It enters largely into the manufacture of saltpeter, alum, and chloride of potash. From it is made, by decomposition with sulphuric acid, the greater part of commercial sulphate of potash, and it is used to a considerable extent as an ingredient of artificial manures.

Importation of muriate of potash.—Quantity, 231,327,378 pounds; value, \$3,863,311.45; value per unit, \$0.017. Of this importation, 226,586,102 pounds came from Germany, the balance from Belgium, the United Kingdom, and the British West Indies.

The total value of these two items imported into this country in 1907, \$4,876,356.76. Twenty per cent duty, or tax, on this amounts to the sum of \$975,271.35. Heretofore these items have been on the free list; now, it is proposed to tax the farmers of the South in order that the trusts and great industrial corporations may not be required to pay their quota toward defraying the expenses of the Government.

It may be claimed by some that the 20 per cent duty levied in section 3 will not apply to potash shipped from Germany, unless conditions are such that the provisions of section 4 apply to the imports from Germany enumerated in paragraph 3 and particularly including paragraph 652, relative to potash. Section 4 of the Payne bill reads as follows:

Sec. 4. Until sixty days after the passage of this act, and whenever thereafter any country, province, dependency, or colony admits each and every article imported into said country, province, dependency, or colony from the United States, or any of its possessions, the growth or product, in whole or in part, of the soil or industry of the United States or any territory belonging thereto, upon payment thereon of duties, imposts, excises, or taxes which shall not be in excess of those levied upon like articles imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, and admits such articles on terms as favorable as those accorded to any article imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon articles imported into the United States, and all territory belonging thereto (except the Philippine Islands), from such country, province, dependency, or colony, the growth or product of the soil or industry of such country, province, dependency, or colony, and whether such articles are shipped from the ports of such country, province, dependency, or colony, or from any other foreign port or ports, the rates of duty prescribed in section 1 of this act, and in like cases the articles mentioned in section 2 of this act shall be admitted free of duty.

Whenever, on or after sixty days after the passage of this act, any country, province, dependency, or colony discriminates against any article imported from the United States, or any territory belonging thereto, the growth or product in whole or in part of the soil or industry of the United States, or any territory belonging thereto, by levying duties, imposts, excises, or taxes thereon in excess of those levied upon similar articles imported from any other country, province, dependency, or colony, or in any way fails to admit any article imported from the United States, or any territory belonging thereto, on terms as favorable as those accorded to any article imported from, and the products of any other country, province, dependency, or colony, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into the United States, or any territory belonging thereto, the growth or product of the soil or industry of such country, province, dependency, or colony so discriminating against any article imported from the United States, the rates of duty prescribed in section 3 of this act: *Provided, however,* That these provisions for additional duties shall not apply to the cases where the preferential duties to other countries are those who are given by a province, dependency, or colony to the mother country only.

It is a notable fact worthy of all condemnation that the Payne bill in section 4 substitutes maximum and minimum rates for

reciprocal rates provided in section 4, the corresponding section in the Dingley law. In other words, the Dingley law in section 4 provides for reciprocal treaties with other countries.

It will be observed that the proviso in section 4 specifies that the additional duty shall not be imposed where the preference is given by "province, dependency, or colony to the mother country only." Germany has three forms of tariff—maximum, conventional, preferential. The United States by treaties is only entitled to the conventional rate of tariff with Germany. Should Germany give a preferential rate on an article imported from any other country or one of her provinces, dependencies, or colonies, which she denies the like imports from the United States, then the rate imposed in section 3 is applicable.

Nearly all of the sulphate and muriate of potash brought into this country comes from Germany. At the present time Germany discriminates against us on considerably more than 100 articles or tariff numbers by giving preferential rates to other countries. In my humble judgment, she will never make the concessions we demand in this bill; therefore, in sixty days from the passage of the bill the maximum rate goes into effect and a 20 per cent duty is placed on all sulphate and muriate of potash imported from Germany into this country.

Now, gentlemen, potash is used extensively in the manipulation of nearly all fertilizers used in the South. Therefore, this tax places a burden upon every man who grows cotton and tobacco in the South, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and elsewhere. It does seem that in selecting this item the committee was evidently armed with a "search warrant" to find a paragraph which would injure the farmers of the South and tobacco growers of other sections.

You can not claim that you are protecting anything by this, for we do not produce sulphate or muriate of potash in this country. You gentlemen of the Republican side claim to be the friend of the farmer, and yet you would place this burden upon him. Every time a poor man comes to town with his mule and cart and carries home a bag of fertilizer he will realize more and more your deceit and treachery.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that this will tax the cotton grower more heavily than anyone else. In the name of high Heaven, has he not troubles enough? Some one has well said that it took thirteen months to make a cotton crop. If many of you gentlemen on the Republican side of this Chamber were forced to go South and make a support for yourself and families growing cotton under conditions as they have existed for the past twenty-five years, you would raise a howl over this tax that would be heard around the Nation. Gentlemen, I appeal to you not to place this tax upon the people of the South, who now bear more of the burdens and receive less of the benefits of the tariff than any section of the country.

The southern cotton grower not only clothes the world, but he holds the balance of trade in favor of this country. In the name of common fairness, is he not entitled to some consideration?

And now, Mr. Chairman, though in a measure tied as I am because of my being on this side of the Chamber, yet I feel that I would be untrue to myself and untrue to the millions of farmers who must bear this burden did I not enter my most vigorous protest against such unfair, unjust, and discriminatory legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. OLCOTT having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1438, and had instructed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 6 o'clock p. m. having arrived, the House will stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, at 8 o'clock p. m. the House was called to order by Mr. OLCOTT, the Speaker pro tempore.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the day of reckoning has come at last. For ten years the Republican party has promised a substantial revision of the tariff—a proper readjustment of the bur-

dens of tariff taxation. Every two years, just before the elections, the Republican party has promised a revision of the tariff by the friends of the theory of protection, and upon that promise that party, for the last decade, has succeeded always in electing a majority of this House. Just after the elections, however, the leaders of the party have invariably pointed to large Republican majorities as an evidence of the alleged fact that there was no demand in the country for a revision of the tariff, and so the years dragged their weary length along. On the farms of the West men labored under the burning sun of summer and paid tribute to the trusts; in the East, amid the clang of machinery, men toiled and paid tribute to the trusts, and saw the product of their own brain and muscle sell 3,000 miles away, in the capitals of Europe, 25 and 50 per cent cheaper than they themselves could buy it in the markets of the city where they labored. A feeling of unrest prevailed last year throughout the country.

In order to carry the elections last fall, it was necessary to make a promise that apparently meant something, and the Republican candidate for the presidency, rising to the demands of the occasion, agreed, in the event of his election, to call Congress in extra session immediately after his inauguration for the purpose of revising the tariff. He has kept that promise, and we are here now for that purpose. For over a week, day and night, this debate has dragged on. The country now understands the situation. The bill you propose retains all the bad features of the present law and adds many new features infinitely worse. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a Republican measure pure and simple. The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee boast of the fact that they excluded the Democratic members of that committee from their deliberations, and, consulting only the trusts and the law-defying corporations, framed this the most infamous measure of tariff oppression ever conceived by tariff beneficiaries and their representatives.

THIS BILL TO INCREASE BONDED INDEBTEDNESS AND TO TAX INHERITANCES.

The bill we are considering proposes to increase the bonded indebtedness of the country by hundreds of millions of dollars in order to avoid disturbing the tariff barons of the land in their enjoyment of ill-gotten gains. This measure proposes to invade the States and levy a tax on inheritances. Nearly 30 of our States now levy a tax of this character. The National Government proposes now, in this measure, to usurp the functions of the State, and to levy additional inheritance taxes. Under prior Republican tariffs everything was taxed from the cradle to the grave—clothes, food, medicines, books, the tools of the artisan, and, finally, the very boards out of which his modest coffin was constructed, the nails which held it together, and the hammer which drove them into the yielding wood. This bill goes further than that, however, and fines his widow and children because he is dead. The poorer he was, the more it is proposed to fine his widow and children. If he only leaves \$500 worth of property, the fine for dying is fixed at 5 per cent of that amount; if, however, he leaves \$100,000 worth of property, the fine is only 1 per cent, and so this bill preserves, even in this feature, the Republican policy of compelling the poor to bear the real burden of paying the expenses of government—the same old Republican policy of making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

BEER AND OIL PROTECTED IN THIS MEASURE.

There has been a pretended attempt for some years to regulate railroads, but even the pretense has vanished now, and a great railroad attorney sits in the counsel chamber of the President. A great temperance wave has just swept over the country; but the President of the United States, safe behind his substantial majority, has defied it all and has given an important place in his Cabinet to the personal attorney of the greatest brewer in the world, who contributed \$50,000 to the Republican campaign fund last fall. With a fine of \$29,000,000 hanging over him, the head of the Standard Oil trust called on the President-elect, pledged to carry out the policies of the man who made the fine possible, and to-day the Standard Oil Company is represented in the Cabinet of the President. No sane man ever expected a dollar of this fine to be paid, and a few days ago the fine was set aside by the courts. The present administration is taking no further serious steps against the Standard Oil.

Beer and oil seem to have played a prominent part in the framing of the present tariff bill. The tax on gloves, cotton goods, and hosiery is increased 20 per cent, but the country is safe—no additional burden is placed on beer and the counter-vailing duty is preserved on petroleum. In fact, this bill comes to the relief of the millionaire brewers of the country and proposes to give them cheaper raw material by reducing the tax on barley. The millions of voters in this country who have been lead to believe that a real fight was being waged against the

Standard Oil trust and who have been registering their protest at the polls against beer will be glad to know that beer and oil have both been taken care of in this bill. There may be a tax on coffee; the burden of maintaining the breakfast table may be increased; but beer is safe and oil is safe, and contributions from millionaire brewers and Standard Oil magnates will continue to pour into the treasury of the national Republican committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

FREE LUMBER.

The demand for free lumber is almost universal; it has been granted in part by this bill; kindling wood is now on the free list. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The tax on American homes and home builders continues, but the Republican party in future campaigns can call attention to this important concession; and the farmer of the West has now the opportunity, if he cares to accept it, of purchasing his kindling wood in Canada and bringing it in free of duty. I apprehend, however, that there will be no great rush across our northern boundary for kindling wood.

INCREASE OF TARIFF TAXATION.

There are four or five thousand articles embraced in our tariff schedules. This bill reduces the tariff tax on less than 400 articles. The juggling of ad valorem and specific duties in the present bill makes it impossible to tell upon how many articles the tariff is raised. The comparison of the Payne tariff bill with the present tariff law prepared under the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, which means the Republican members of that committee, and which is now a public document, shows that the tariff tax is increased from 44.16 per cent under the present law to 45.72 per cent under the pending bill.

It is impossible, however, to tell how much the pending bill will increase the rate provided for in the Dingley law. The actual effect of the maximum and minimum provisions of this bill can not be fully understood at the present time. They certainly can, under no circumstances, at any time lower the rate of duty. They amount in reality to an emphatic declaration of trade war against every nation in the world. Our position will be, if this bill becomes a law, that whenever any nation in the world gives the slightest preference on the most unimportant little article imported into that country from any other country, or even from any of its provinces, automatically and at once we put into operation on everything we import from that country the maximum tariff rates, which are to be made by adding to the rates prescribed by this bill sometimes one-fourth, sometimes one-fifth of the same. In other words, if the rate is under the present bill 50 per cent ad valorem on some particular schedule, automatically and without notice that rate becomes over 60 per cent ad valorem. I undertake to say that it will be impossible to find at any time in the future a commercial nation which does not on some little article give some slight preference over us to some other nation or to some one of its own provinces.

The real effect of the present bill, therefore, is not to raise the tariff taxes 1 or 2 per cent over the present law, but to raise the tariff taxes 20 or 30 per cent over the present law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

WATCHES.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have more present now than I had a few minutes ago; in fact, I seem to have an excellent audience—for a night audience. In view of that fact, I want to discuss just one feature of this bill as briefly as I can, and to point out one more "joker" for the benefit of my old friend, the watch trust. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] It has been nearly three years now since I talked about watches on this floor. I have spent a large portion of that time trying to get the watch trust prosecuted, but it seems, under a Republican administration, to have grown stronger and stronger all the time, and stands to-day in this bill shoulder to shoulder with beer, and shoulder to shoulder with Standard Oil and its products. You can usually find in the watch schedule of a Republican bill a fair index of the entire bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under the Dingley law the tax imposed upon imported watches was higher than it ever was before. After the Dingley law went into operation this great watch combination was formed. Under a pretense of revising the tariff downward, this schedule has been juggled, as all these other schedules have been juggled, by switching tariffs from specific to ad valorem and from ad valorem to specific, adding ad valorem tariffs to specific tariffs, until it takes an expert to know what they mean. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill was framed without consulting any Democratic members of the committee; in fact, the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means openly boast that they excluded

the Democratic members from their deliberations while framing the bill; and while they do not openly boast of this further fact, the bill shows that in framing it they consulted only the representatives of the trusts. There is not any lowering of the duty in the watch schedule. In this bill a method has been found to increase almost 100 per cent the tariff on the poor man's watch.

PRICE OF POOR MAN'S WATCH TO BE INCREASED.

Watches are divided into two classes. The more expensive watches—those containing 17 jewels, and more than that—are known as "railroad movements." The watch trust, under a Republican administration, has found a way to protect itself absolutely so far as these movements are concerned. I have shown on this floor before that every jobber, if he wants to handle their goods at all, is compelled to agree to sell railroad movements for not less than a certain price, and every retailer is compelled to agree to sell railroad movements at a certain minimum price. It does not matter how much more than that they charge. Their mode of fixing in this way the price of watches does not extend to the cheaper grades. In this bill they have found a way to increase the price of these cheaper grades.

Under the tariff of 1894 the duty on all watch movements was 25 per cent ad valorem. The present tariff law retained the ad valorem duties and added certain specific duties, and the present tariff law made possible the watch trust in this country. The bill we are now considering increases the tariff tax on all the cheaper grades of watches. It does not change the tariff as to the watches containing 17 jewels and more than 17. In the Payne bill there is a specific duty of \$1.25 on a 17-jewel watch, in addition to a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem. On watches containing more than 17 jewels the specific duty is \$3 each, and to that is added 25 per cent ad valorem. This is not an increase. The same rates are charged in the Dingley bill. The bill we are considering, however, abandons the ad valorem duties of 25 per cent on all grades of movements containing less than 17 jewels, and the 7-jewel movement is taxed 70 cents specific; the 11-jewel movement, \$1.35 specific; the 15-jewel movement, \$1.85 specific. Under the present law there is a tax of 35 cents on each movement containing 7 jewels and less than that, to which was added 25 per cent ad valorem. The tax on movements containing 11 jewels and more than 7 jewels, under the present Dingley schedules, is 50 cents each, and 25 per cent ad valorem. On watches containing 15 jewels the tax is 75 cents each, and 25 per cent ad valorem.

Assuming that the unit value of watch movements is 85 cents under the Dingley law, a 7-jewel movement would be taxed 35 cents plus 25 per cent ad valorem. In other words, under the present Dingley schedules, a watch movement costing, at wholesale, 85 cents would pay a duty of 56 cents. Under the Payne bill the duty on this movement would be 70 cents, an increase of nearly 50 per cent. The New York Standard Watch Company filed a brief with the Ways and Means Committee in which they claim that a Swiss movement can be produced in Switzerland for 50 cents wholesale. Under the Dingley tariff the tax on this watch would be 47 cents. In the proposed bill the tariff would be 70 cents. Under the present law the tariff on a watch of this character is over 100 per cent. This certainly ought to satisfy the watchmakers in this country. Under the proposed bill, however, the tariff will be 125 per cent.

The object of this schedule in the Payne bill is, therefore, to increase the price of the poor man's watch, and the effect will be to practically prohibit the importations of the cheaper grades from Switzerland, and therefore to enable the watchmakers of this country to fix prices to suit themselves. The burden falls upon the retailers and the ultimate consumers. This bill is supposed to be a revenue measure, and yet, in this schedule, the effort is to exclude from the Treasury the revenue heretofore derived, even under the high Dingley rates, from watches.

PROPOSED WATCH SCHEDULE MEANS LOSS OF REVENUE.

In 1907 the importations of watch movements containing 7 jewels and less amounted to \$57,184, and upon this grade of watch movements in that year alone there was collected duties to the amount of \$482,847.33. There was in 1907 brought into the United States only 18,600 watch movements containing 17 jewels, and only 6,113 watch movements containing more than 17 jewels. The 17-jewel movements and the movements containing more than 17 jewels paid in that year a revenue amounting to only \$118,441.50. From this showing it can be seen at once that the poor man's watch has in reality been paying the revenue derived from this schedule. The more expensive grades pay only a small portion of it. As a revenue measure, therefore, this bill, having the effect of excluding the cheaper movements from this country, has the effect of increasing not only to the poor man the price of his watch, but it has the effect of decreasing the revenue heretofore derived from watches.

THE JOKER IN THE WATCH SCHEDULE.

The watch manufacturers, however, fearing that it might be possible for some Swiss movements to get over this proposed high-tariff wall and interfere with their plans for exacting tribute from retailers and consumers, have provided a joker, which the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee have kindly included in this bill.

Section 189 of the Payne bill contains the following proviso:

Provided, That all watch movements and cases of foreign manufacture shall have the name of the manufacturer and of the city, town, or village, and country of manufacture cut, engraved, or die-sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the plate of the movement and the inside of the case, respectively; and the movements shall also have marked thereon by one of the methods indicated the number of jewels and adjustments, said number to be expressed both in words and in Arabic numerals; and none of the aforesaid articles shall be delivered to the importer unless marked in exact conformity to this direction.

I am delighted to see that I have now present a large number of the Republican Members of this body, and I appreciate the attention my argument is receiving on that side of the House. In order to be able to make perfectly clear the effect of this proviso, I have brought into the House to-night certain Swiss watches. They are from the establishment of A. Wittnauer & Co., of New York City. This firm is among the largest of the importers of Swiss watches. Practically all of the watches imported into this country come from Switzerland. I have here a watch which is marked, for the purpose of this argument, No. 1. It is what is known as a "ball watch." No firm in this country manufactures anything like it. It is one of the smallest watches made. The dial of the watch is less than one-quarter of an inch across, and the entire watch could be put in the end of an ordinary sized lead pencil; and yet it is a complete watch.

The watch is hardly as large as an ordinary hazelnut. I would like to have some gentleman on the other side of the House explain how it is possible to engrave, or cut, or sink conspicuously or indelibly on the plate of the movement, and on the inside of this case, the name of the manufacturer, the name of the city, town, or village where this watch is manufactured, the country where it is manufactured, the number of jewels the watch contains, and the number of adjustments the watch contains, expressed both in words and in Arabic numbers. I submit that it is physically impossible to comply with these requirements, and this bill would exclude absolutely on account of this proviso alone from the United States this beautiful little watch.

I have here another watch, marked No. 2, for convenience, on the tag attached to it. This movement is just a fraction larger perhaps than the one I have just displayed. It is, of course, impossible to mark this movement in any of the ways indicated, on account of the small size of the watch. This watch is known as a "locket watch." It has considerable sale in this country and is incased in a locket-shaped case when sold. This little watch, marked on the tag No. 3, is a trifle larger than the other, but not large enough to contain the legend required by this bill. The watches I have been displaying are of the more expensive kind. The ball watch sells in this country at wholesale for \$115, case and all. The locket watch sells at wholesale in this country for \$78 in the case. The movement in the watch I am now displaying sells at wholesale in this country for \$70. It is incased in an American case, and the case sells at wholesale for \$15. These watches would probably retail for 33 per cent more than the wholesale price. There is no attempt, however, on the part of importers to regulate the retail price of Swiss watches in this country, and retailers are at liberty to fix their own price.

This little jewel-size silver watch, marked on the tag No. 4, is of a slightly different pattern from the others. It sells in this country at wholesale for \$12.50, and is what is known as a silver "Niello" watch.

The watch marked No. 5 on the tag is also a jewel-size watch. The price of the movement at wholesale in this country is \$12.50. The movement is contained in the American case and the price of the case is \$4.50 at wholesale.

The two watches I am displaying now, marked No. 6 and No. 7 on the tags, are much larger in size. No. 6 is the equivalent of a 12-size American watch. No. 7 is as large as a 14-size American watch. The ordinary American watch of this size would have in its plates large enough to contain several words. I am displaying these two watches, however, for the purpose of showing that these models do not contain room for the smallest inscription. It is not possible to find in them a plate large enough to contain any inscription, and certainly not the long pedigree required by the bill we are considering. I have displayed only ordinary models of the Swiss watches imported to this country. All of them show, whether they are large or

small, the absolute physical impossibility of engraving upon the Swiss-watch movements the matter required by this bill.

In these larger watches it would be possible, of course, to comply with the law so far as the case is concerned, but the larger movements are usually encased in American cases. In order to more fully explain this particular phase of the bill, I will print here a letter from the company which so kindly loaned these watches to me. This firm is well known on two continents, and its standing can not be questioned.

A. WITNAUER COMPANY,
MANUFACTURERS OF WATCHES, 9-13 MAIDEN LANE,
New York, March 27, 1909.

The Hon. H. T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At your request, we are sending to you by to-day's express, prepaid, the following watches, the numbers indicated below being duplicated by the same numbers on the tag attached to each article. All of the watches are intended to illustrate the physical impossibility of complying with the proposed regulations as to the marking of watch movements and watch cases.

No. 1. This article, which is called a "ball watch," has admittedly no surface whatever inside the case or movement whereby we could comply with said regulations. It would, of course, be absurd to insist upon putting these requirements upon the outside of the case, inasmuch as it would obviously render the article unsalable.

No. 2. On this watch the same argument is offered as on the preceding, and is merely sent to show a variety.

No. 3. On this article, although a regularly made Swiss watch, it is admittedly impossible to comply with the proposed markings, as there is not surface enough on the entire movement on which to place the required wording.

No. 4. This watch will give you a good idea of a medium-sized Swiss watch, of a model at present largely imported. Here, also, although much larger in size than the preceding examples, it is obviously impossible to comply with the proposed regulations.

No. 5. This watch is the same size as the preceding and is intended to show that although of a different pattern of movement, here also there is no room whatever for the lengthy pedigree required.

No. 6. We are sending this model to refute any objection that may be made against the size of the former models. You can easily see that notwithstanding the large size of this watch there is absolutely no room on the surface of this movement for even the smallest inscription.

No. 7. We are sending this, which is equal to the No. 14 size American watch, to show good faith in our contention that modern watches are so made that it would, in nearly all instances, be impossible to comply with the regulations requiring the lengthy pedigree proposed.

We would call your attention to the fact that No. 5 and No. 6 are both cased in American cases, and desire to say that the larger portion of all foreign movements imported are cased in this country in American-made cases.

We trust that these 7 models will be conclusive evidence that our request to leave the marking of watches the same as at present is correct in every respect and furthermore, we might add, that a large portion of the retail trade of the United States imports most of their foreign watches, with their own trade names and places of business, in the United States, which it is certainly their privilege to do, besides being a resident guarantee to the purchaser to the American consumer, who has an American firm to fall back upon. Furthermore, if the proposed regulations were to be enforced, it would react as an injury to the retail dealer, inasmuch as by being compelled to have his wares marked with the name of the maker, place of production, etc., there would be no reason why the consumer could not be in direct communication with the European manufacturer, purchase there, and if purchased there in person, the article would then be brought in as personal property, thus working injury to the retail dealer who loses legitimate profit to which he is normally entitled, besides losing the revenue to the Government, which is no small item.

We would add again that if the regulations were to be enforced, it would, as you can judge by most of the exhibits sent, prevent the importation of a large quantity of watches, which at present represent considerable revenue to the Government.

Without wishing to take up too much of your time, yet we would like to touch in a few words the fact that the proposed increase of duty on the movements having 15 jewels and less, if enforced, will, first, cause a considerable shrinkage in the amount of Swiss watches imported, to the serious detriment of the revenue, which from the standpoint of your honorable body is the main object of the Payne bill. Second, there are several independent American watch-case factories which derive a very large portion, if not their entire business, from their imported movements, classed from 7 jewels and less, and if therefore the importation of this class of Swiss movements is curtailed by the proposed new duties, aside from the fact that the revenue from this importation will be lost, these various American case factories will be compelled to reduce their output and even go entirely out of business.

In conclusion, we desire to register the fact that we are not asking an impossibility; we believe in reasonable protection for home industries and for revenue, but, as is well known, the American watch industry has for many years, and even previous to the Dingley Act, needed no protection above the old 25 per cent ad valorem to become a power in the land and so increase their output as to be able to control not only home models, but seriously compete with foreign watches in their place of production.

We wish you every success in your argument and desire to thank you for the interest you have taken, and beg to remain,

Very sincerely, yours,

A. WITNAUER CO.,
V. C. DESSIAN, Secretary.

Certain alleged Swiss movements were displayed before the Ways and Means Committee. All of them were supplied with plates large enough to contain this legend. I have had the pleasure of inspecting these movements. It is impossible to believe any of them could be sold in this country to any appreciable extent. No respectable retailer would think of carrying them in his stock, and no watch purchaser with the slightest degree of judgment and ordinary common sense could be in-

duced to buy them at any price. It would surprise me very much to learn that any of them could be made to run for as long as sixty minutes. It is absurd to say that these models could injure in this country the business of any watchmaker. Any ordinary blacksmith ought to be able to make a better watch than the watches displayed before the Ways and Means Committee, on account of which they claim this proviso was inserted in this bill. I challenge the watch manufacturers in this country to name a single reputable retailer who carries in his stock the movements they displayed before the Ways and Means Committee. A watch manufacturer in this country whose business is injured by such clumsy watch-movement imitations as these has no right to continue in the business of manufacturing watch movements in this country. [Applause.]

The great firm of Tiffany & Co., in New York, sell only Swiss watches. The purchaser of a "Tiffany watch" buys a Swiss watch. This great firm simply prints across the dial of the watch the word "Tiffany" and indicates in some place on the watch the fact that it is of Swiss make. They become, therefore, responsible for the watch. If the watch is defective in any particular, the purchaser relies upon Tiffany to make it good. This firm has built up its watch business by extensive advertising. If it is compelled now to engrave on a watch movement the matter required by this bill, the watch business of this firm would be completely ruined. Any retailer operating in any part of the country where rents are cheap would be able to take advantage of all the advertising Tiffany might do. He could order "Tiffany" watches direct from the makers in Switzerland and could point to the fact that they were identical with the watches Tiffany was selling, except that they did not contain on the dial the word "Tiffany." The effect of years of advertising and business enterprise will be completely and immediately destroyed by this bill, even assuming that it is possible to so modify the Swiss movements that they will contain a plate large enough to permit the legend required in this bill to be engraved on the same.

Admitting that it is possible to induce the Swiss watchmakers to modify their methods of making watch movements so as to insert in the movement a plate large enough to contain the required inscription, I respectfully insist that this law would compel every consumer who purchases a Swiss watch to carry around with him the business card of a Swiss firm 3,000 miles away. Many thousand American tourists visit Europe every year. Nearly every one of them goes to Switzerland. This law—if it is possible to carry it into effect, and if it is possible to keep up the importation of Swiss watches—will therefore have the effect of fully advising American tourists as to the location of the great Swiss watch factories, and any one of them can go directly to the manufacturer and buy there his Swiss watch and bring it back, free of duty, through our custom-houses. Swiss watches purchased by Americans who go abroad are usually of the most expensive type, watches costing from \$300 to \$500, and even more than that; watches which strike the hour and quarter hours, and watches which contain other curious and unusual features. I submit that this situation would be most undesirable from many standpoints.

In nearly all our large cities great firms of retailers can be found who handle only the Swiss watches. The Tiffany firm is not the only American firm that will be injured by this bill. The proposition in this schedule, therefore, will have the following effect:

First. To increase the cost of the poor man's watch.

Second. To make it impossible to import the cheaper Swiss watches at all on account of the prohibitive duty on the same.

Third. The bill will deprive the Government of practically all the revenue it collects on watches.

Fourth. Assuming that the tariff is not absolutely prohibitive, this proviso is intended to make it physically impossible, in the case of Swiss watches, to comply with the same.

Fifth. Assuming that the Swiss manufacturers will for our benefit modify their method of constructing movements so as to permit this legend to be engraved on the movement, and assuming that watches can be brought in at the rates provided in this bill, to handle Swiss watches would completely ruin the watch business of any ambitious advertising retailer.

Sixth. The physical impossibility of engraving the required matter on the movements and on the cases of the smaller watches would, in the absence of anything else, absolutely prohibit the importation to this country of the smaller watches.

Seventh. There are six large independent watch-case manufacturing companies in the United States. Their product is used largely for the purpose of encasing the cheaper grades of Swiss movements. If the cheaper grades of Swiss movements can not be brought into the country, we may expect the greater number of these watch-case companies to be driven out of business.

WATCH CASES.

The American watch trust could therefore fix its own price on all watch cases. The watch trust controls—as every retailer in this country well knows—the following watch-case companies: The Crescent Watch Case Company, of Philadelphia; the Keystone Watch Case Company, of Newark, N. J.; and the Philadelphia Watch Case Company, of Riverside, N. J.

There are no other companies than these trust companies and six independent watch-case companies engaged in the manufacture of watch cases in this country, except the Dueber-Hampden Company; and inasmuch as this latter company only manufactures cases for its own movements, it would not perhaps be seriously affected.

IMITATION SWISS WATCHES.

I have here a letter from an independent watch-case maker in this connection, which I will presently read. The makers of watch movements in this country are so sure that the provision I have been discussing will become a law that they have for a long time been getting ready for it; and within the last few days they have placed upon the market a watch which I was able yesterday to secure. It purports to be made by the Swiss-Anglo Association, of Liverpool and New York; as a matter of fact, it is made in New Haven, Conn. It will surprise many Members of this House to know that it is proposed to sell at wholesale this watch, complete—case and movement—for 75 cents. I have had it now for about two days, and have kept it wound up. I set it yesterday by the clock over the Speaker's desk, and I can testify that for nearly two days it has kept the best of time.

In the face of the fact that our watchmakers can produce this watch and sell it complete, case and all, at home and abroad, for 75 cents, is it not absurd to insist that in order to protect them it is necessary to insert a provision in this bill by which the very cheapest Swiss movement is taxed 70 cents in addition to 40 per cent ad valorem on the case that contains it?

I want to call attention to the fact that this watch is called the "Swiss-Anglo" watch. It is, as you see, an open-face watch, provided with a very heavy crystal, and although no part of even the material that goes into the watch was brought from Switzerland—although it is completely manufactured in this country—they propose to call it the "Swiss-Anglo" watch. This watch is evidently to be placed on the market to take the place of the cheaper Swiss movements, when, by the operation of the schedule we are considering, the cheaper Swiss movements are absolutely excluded from this country. This watch can be sold to a purchaser who wants a cheap Swiss watch, and he can be made to believe he is getting a watch of that character.

They have just commenced to advertise in the trade papers the watch I am now displaying, and I have here some advertisements clipped from watch-trade papers now advertising the watch. I do not know just what connection the American watch combination has with this so-called "Swiss-Anglo" watch. I want to call attention to the fact that the watch as placed upon the market is sent out in this neat little box, with a hinged lid, and that the watch itself is contained in a chamois bag. The cheaper grades of watches are usually sent out in little canvas bags, like the one I hold now in my hand. If the watch trust is not interested in this particular watch, those gentlemen who are putting it on the market, whoever they are, have copied very closely their methods, and in order to show that this watch is intended to be sold all over the world, I propose to print here, for the benefit of the retail watch dealers of the country, the guaranty and agreement which appears printed here on the bottom of this little box which contains the watch:

License.

THE SWISS-ANGLO ASSOCIATION,
LIVERPOOL AND NEW YORK.

Agencies in London, Toronto, Chicago, and San Francisco.

The movement fitted in this watch is completely covered by the strongest basic patents, and is not sold separately from the case. Any infringement will be rigorously prosecuted.

Guaranty: The watch carries with it our guaranty, and if without misuse it should fail to keep good time, it should be at once returned to any of our branches, preferably New York, together with 6 pence (or 12 cents) for packing and remailing, and it will be repaired free of charge.

AGREEMENT.

The finished watch is sold under the following agreement, assented to by purchase and controlling all sales and uses thereof, any violation of which agreement revokes and terminates all rights and license as to watches of makers in violator's possession, and, continued, subjects the violator to suit for infringement of said letters patent:

1. Jobbers may sell only to retail dealers, and accompanied by this notice, and may sell only at rates specified in the schedules.
2. Retailers may advertise and sell only to buyers for use at 6s. 3d., 7 francs 85 centimes, \$1.50, 6 marks 35 pfennigs, 2 rubles 95 copecks.

No rebate or bonus allowed with any sale at wholesale or retail.

One absolutely standard price, f. o. b. London, Liverpool, Chicago, or New York.

3. Guaranty, with date of sale, with each watch.

Not long ago I notified these gentlemen that I was going to make this speech—I mean the gentlemen who have been defending the watch trust.

Mr. TIRRELL. That being the case, will the gentleman answer one or two questions?

Mr. RAINEY. With great pleasure.

Mr. TIRRELL. The gentleman stated at the opening of his remarks that the watch trust had got in their work, the raising of duties in the Payne bill. Can the gentleman tell us by whose brief or testimony or evidence the rates were changed in the Payne bill? Is he informed on that subject?

Mr. RAINEY. Inasmuch as the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means would not even permit the Democrats who were members of that committee to be present when they framed the schedules, I can not say what influences were brought to bear on the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. Then the gentleman has not seen the brief which was filed.

Mr. RAINEY. I have seen all the briefs that have been filed, including the brief filed by young Mr. Dueber, to whom the gentleman evidently refers. I want to say that his father, who built up that great business, spent the last years of his life fighting the watch trust.

Mr. TIRRELL. On June 25, 1906, did not the gentleman say, in reference to that concern whose brief has been filed with the Committee on Ways and Means, in regard to the watch trust—

Mr. RAINEY. I can make the gentleman's question much shorter by saying that I said a great many complimentary things about the Dueber Company. I said a great many complimentary things about the old gentleman who built up that great industry, and who spent his life fighting the watch trust. And the watch trust is probably delighted with the fact that he is now dead. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. Did not the gentleman say at that time that the Dueber-Hampden Company is the strongest opponent of the watch trust—

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; and I could not think of any greater compliment at that time, and I am sorry I can not say it now.

Mr. TIRRELL. Does not the gentleman know that the company filed a brief and furnished the evidence on which the tariff on watches has been changed?

Mr. RAINEY. No; I do not know it.

Mr. TIRRELL. And that this company whom you alluded to as the most independent and vigorous opponent of the watch trust, this very company, is the one that has recommended the changes in the watch tariff, and the reason given principally—

Mr. RAINEY. What authority has the gentleman for disclosing the secrets of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. TIRRELL. Because I had sources of information that perhaps the gentleman did not possess.

Mr. RAINEY. And nobody else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. That is an assertion that will compare with some of the assertions the gentleman has made about the watch trust.

Mr. RAINEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman. It is evident from the work the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee have been doing that the gentleman who defends always upon this floor with so much energy and so much ability one of the most infamous trusts in this country has had access to the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee when they were framing this bill to such an extent that they consulted him and told him what they are going to do with reference to this particular schedule.

Mr. TIRRELL. The information was open to the inspection of the gentleman from Illinois, if he had had the industry to look it up.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can not charge me with lack of industry.

Mr. TIRRELL. I want to ask the gentleman if this very company to whom he has alluded as the opponent of the watch trust is not the principal witness, and the one that furnished the principal evidence giving the reasons for the changes in the watch tariff in the Payne bill?

Mr. RAINEY. The New York Standard Watch Company and various watch companies furnished evidence before the Ways and Means Committee, and also young Mr. Dueber. I have read this evidence—all of it. I told the gentleman that I read Mr. Dueber's brief. I know what he said.

Mr. TIRRELL. Then, why did not the gentleman spread it before this House?

Mr. RAINEY. I read everything having reference to watches in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. TIRRELL. And the gentleman has not said one single line about anything said in that brief.

Mr. RAINEY. I know all about everything that was printed. I did not know, as the representatives of the trust seem now to know, just exactly what the Republican Members were going to do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. And the gentleman should know that the independent men, who the gentleman says are outside of the trust, are those who furnished the evidence upon which the present schedule was prepared.

Mr. RAINEY. That is the trouble about the protective tariff. It reaches down through all ranks of men and corrupts everybody it touches. You can not fight one hornet without fighting the whole colony. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every manufacturer of anything, when he looks up high above him and sees a man worth millions of dollars which he has stolen from the people, carries around in his heart the fond hope that that system will be continued in force until some day he has had the opportunity and time enough to steal millions himself from the people.

That is the trouble with your protective system. We stand for tariff for revenue only. You stand for that system which reaches down and corrupts everything it touches, which makes men, when they see the profits of legalized robbery, anxious to continue in the career that makes that kind of robbery possible; and so you get them all together here, all agreed upon one proposition, all agreed upon the proposition that the way for thieves to succeed is to stand together and to prey upon honest men. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, in all that declamation we have not heard one fact or one argument. I want to ask the gentleman this question—

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman can ask all the questions he wants if I can have the time to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has four minutes remaining, and it rests with him whether he will yield or not.

Mr. RAINEY. Very well; I will ask the gentleman to make his question as short as he can; and if I anticipate it and answer it in advance, I hope he will acquit me of any desire to be discourteous.

Mr. TIRRELL. The gentleman has spoken about prices. Can the gentleman inform this House as to the difference in wages as it appeared in Mr. Dueber's brief between the workmen in Switzerland and in this country? As a matter of fact, is it not nearly three times as much here?

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is the old story, maintaining a system that makes possible millionaires and paupers and sustaining it by calling attention to wages and wage differences. We make watches here by machinery. They simply feed metal into one end of a machine and it comes out the parts of a watch at the other end. There are no watchmakers now. The highest paid men in the watch factories are employed about what they call "assembling" watches. This tariff is for the benefit of machines, not men, and in order that a man may earn \$3 a day, it is necessary for him in some grades of these cheaper movements to assemble 100 movements a day. He can not hope to work every day, except Sunday, in a month assembling 100 movements a day. It affects a man's nervous condition, so that he is compelled to take days off occasionally. Is the gentleman through with his questions?

Mr. TIRRELL. If the gentleman would answer the question, instead of going off into a declamation, I would submit more questions.

Mr. RAINEY. I would be glad to answer them if I have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUNDIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed ten minutes more to finish his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not aware that the gentleman from Illinois desires ten minutes more.

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I will take all the time I can get, provided I am not taking up time allotted to other gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are a good many gentlemen who desire to be heard.

Mr. RAINEY. I do not want to impose on other gentlemen, and I shall not ask for it.

Mr. LUNDIN. I think it nothing but fair that he be allowed ten minutes more, inasmuch as his time was taken up consid-

erably. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that he be granted ten minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. If those gentlemen who desire to be heard are agreeable, the Chair will put the request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE INDEPENDENT WATCH-CASE COMPANIES.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another feature of this proposition. There are six large independent watch-case manufacturing companies in the country. Their output is used largely for the purpose of encasing the Swiss movements that are brought to this country. This tariff, keeping out, as it will, Swiss movements entirely, means that most, if not all, of these independent companies will be compelled to go out of business. Now, I want to read a letter from one of them for the benefit of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIRRELL], the watch-trust expert on the other side of this House. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] This is from the North American Watch Company, and at least the gentleman from Massachusetts, who knows so much about watch prices and the secrets of the Ways and Means Committee so far as they relate to the trusts and the protection they are getting under this bill, will admit that this particular company is not a part of the trust he defends. This letter is dated New York, March 30, 1909:

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The "colored person in the wood pile," or the Payne tariff, so far as the watch interests are concerned, is Mr. Zerbrugg, the president of the Standard Watch Company, of Jersey City, N. J.—

I supposed he was the man who wrote this schedule. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts familiar enough with the secrets of the Ways and Means Committee, so far as it relates to trusts and this particular infamous trust, to tell me whether he did or not?

Mr. TIRRELL. I do not know this gentleman or anything about him.

Mr. RAINEY (reading)—

The "colored person in the wood pile," or the Payne tariff, so far as the watch interests are concerned, is Mr. Zerbrugg, the president of the Standard Watch Company, of Jersey City, N. J., and the Philadelphia Watch Case Company—

And he will agree those two case companies in addition to the Keystone Company are controlled by the watch trust—

who is also the moving spirit and the "boss" of the alleged watch trust. He wishes the United States Government to give him an absolute monopoly on low-priced watches in America by putting an excessive tariff on imported movements, thus not only stopping their importation and cutting off from the Government the revenue tariff on same, but also preventing six large independent watch-case factories in this country, who have a large market for their cheaper line of watch cases with imported movements in same, from doing any business in watches of similar cost to his, and throwing all this trade into the hands of Mr. Zerbrugg and his factories. We are willing to compete with him in watch-case making, but do not desire him to shut out our customers from buying our cases with imported movements in same, by getting the United States Government to put a prohibitory duty on such movements for Mr. Zerbrugg's benefit. This is creating a monopoly by congressional action and reducing the Government's revenue on same, as no low-priced watch movements in the cheaper grades can be imported and sold in America under the Payne tariff.

Mr. Zerbrugg can and does sell his watches, which he claims cost him 72 cents at present, for \$1.25; that should be profit enough for him and his infant industries.

Yours, very truly,

NORTH AMERICAN WATCH COMPANY,
W. A. MOORE, Vice-President.

Now, this "Swiss-Anglo" watch movement takes the place, so far as this particular factory is concerned, of the cheaper Swiss watches. They were so sure of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, just as sure as my friend from Massachusetts is, and they make a confidant of him because he is the watch-trust expert of the House, that the cheaper grades by the Payne tariff bill would be taxed 70 cents specific on the movement alone and 40 per cent ad valorem on the cases, that they put this watch out just a few days in advance of the appearance of the Payne bill.

This company could not wait. They were so sure and so anxious to take advantage of the other companies that they have put their Swiss movement, manufactured in this country, on the market now in order to take advantage of the barring out of this country by this bill of the cheap movements made in Switzerland or in any other part of the world.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I will yield to anybody, and I will gladly yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WEISSE. The gentleman from Massachusetts spoke about the labor cost in Switzerland. According to the census report, the labor cost of watches in the United States is 51 per cent; the tariff is 75 per cent. Who gets the other 24 per cent? Will the gentleman answer?

Mr. RAINEY. I can tell you who gets the other 24 per cent—you need not wait for the gentleman from Massachusetts to answer. These watch-trust millionaires the gentleman represents—some of them live in his district—get the other 24 per cent. He owes his election to the fact that watch-trust employees are compelled by their employers to vote for him. The Waltham watch factories are located in his district. He is here earning his salary. He is here repaying—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must call the gentleman to order. That is going a little too far.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman does not object; and if he does not object, it is not necessary for the Chairman to object for him.

Mr. TIRRELL. I will say to the gentleman that both Democrats and Republicans seem to like a defense of their industries on the floor of this House from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RAINEY. I have no doubt they do.

THIS BILL AIDS THE WATCH TRUST.

I have been for some time now fighting, to the very best of my ability, the American watch trust. This bill establishes for many years to come the tyranny of the watch trust and makes it more complete than ever. No provision in the bill is so absolutely unnecessary and so oppressive as the provision I have been discussing. The American watch trust can, whenever it pleases, destroy the business of any watch jobber or watch retailer in the country. The existence of this trust was made possible by the provisions of the Dingley bill. It can become, under this bill, more oppressive than ever. It has so far received splendid assistance from Republican administrations. I called attention nearly three years ago to the business of Charles A. Keene, of 180 Broadway, New York, who at that time had commenced to reimport American-made watches. I produced on this floor the evidence of his reimportations; I brought here a number of his watches; I put the numbers of the movements in the RECORD; I challenged the companies comprising the watch trust to say that these movements were not sold abroad at the price I stated. I produced on this floor the evidence and published it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in speeches I made here on the 5th and 6th days of April, 1906, and on the 25th day of June, 1906; and the evidence I produced on those occasions stands absolutely uncontradicted to-day.

A number of speeches have been made in reply to my speeches, but no Member speaking on this floor for the watch trust has ventured for a moment to refer to or discuss the evidence I presented. Articles of American manufacture can be brought back, under the Dingley law, without the payment of duty, if they have not been improved upon or advanced in value abroad. It gives me great pleasure to state that Mr. Charles A. Keene is still engaged in the business of reimporting American-made watches, and is still engaged in the business of retailing them in New York City at prices less than any American wholesaler is able to buy them for.

In view of the fact that American watches are being sold abroad at prices ridiculously low, compared with prices they charge at home, is it not now absurd to insert in this bill these prohibitory provisions, thereby fixing stronger than ever upon watch retailers and upon purchasers of watches the power of this infamous trust?

I will print at this point in my speech some letters I received recently from Mr. Keene, who has so successfully defied the trust, in which he discusses the provisions of this bill:

CHARLES A. KEENE,
WHOLESALE WATCHES AND DIAMONDS,
New York, March 27, 1909.

Hon. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAINEY: I received the copies of the Payne bill and the Dingley tariff law of 1897, and have compared the sections you mention. I was already familiar with section 189 of the Payne bill and also section 191 of the Dingley tariff law; in regard to section 490 of the Payne bill, I do not think that has any bearing on the watch business.

When Mr. Dueber informed you that the omission of the ad valorem duty on the 7-jewel movements, on the 11-jewel movements, and on the 15-jewel movements really made the duty about the same as before, he either did not know what he was talking about, or he wished to willfully mislead you. As I told you in my letter of a few days ago, the omission of the ad valorem duty was intended for a severe blow against the very cheapest grade of watches that are imported. For instance, I have been talking with an importer to-day, one of the largest in New York, whom I have known these twenty years; he says a watch movement can actually be produced in Switzerland at 40 cents each. Under the old tariff law (before the Dingley) tariff on this movement would amount to 10 cents; under the Dingley tariff law it would amount to 45 cents; under the proposed Payne law it amounts to 70 cents. Now, then, the watch trust may say that there are some 7-jewel movements that cost a great deal more than 40 cents to produce in Switzerland that will be allowed to come into this country under the 70-cent rate. That is true, but government statistics will show that three-fourths of the movements imported into this country at the present

time contain 7 jewels and less, and the average cost to the importer is 70 cents each; the average cost to produce is something less, so you see this fact alone will null any argument the watch trust can produce.

Now, then, under the old tariff law—that is, before the Dingley—the duty was 17½ cents; under the Dingley, 52½ cents; under the proposed Payne law, 70 cents, or 100 per cent on the average importations against a little less than 80 per cent.

Mr. Dueber was right in regard to the 11-jewel not being made very much in this country, and it is also true that they are not imported much. The 15-jewel Swiss can be made as cheap as \$1.60; under the old law the duty would have been 40 cents; under the Dingley, \$1.15; under the new proposed Payne bill, \$1.85; and at present there is being imported in all grades of Swiss watches about \$2,000,000 worth annually; and if this new Payne law goes into effect, it will keep out at least seven-eighths of these goods, therefore depriving the Government of just so much revenue. It will also deprive the American workman of cheap watches and deprive the independent American case makers of the business they have now in making cases for these cheap Swiss movements that are imported, and to transfer the business to the Philadelphia Watch Case Company and the New York Standard Watch Company, which practically belongs to Mr. T. Zerbrug, who was one of the leaders in forming the watch trust; he also controls the Keystone and Crescent Watch Case Company.

I wish to point out to you the extreme percentage of duty in the new proposed Payne tariff bill is 70 cents on an article costing 40, or 175 per cent, and I am told by a Swiss manufacturer that the actual difference in the cost to produce one of these very cheap movements and the 11-jewel movement is 10 American cents, and the difference in the proposed new tariff is 65 cents, or about 650 per cent. I understand that Mr. A. Wittauer, of New York, is to call on you tomorrow; although I never met Mr. Wittauer but a few times I know him well by reputation. He is one of the largest importers we have. His goods are sold by the finest stores throughout this country.

I understand that Tiffany & Co., of this city, will be hit very hard if this bill becomes a law, as you are aware the bill provides that the full name and address of the manufacturer shall appear on all movements that are imported, and of course Tiffany & Co. would object to that as they have all their movements made abroad and prefer to have their own name and address put on them here, and I sincerely hope you will find time to make a strong speech in favor of having the Dingley tariff reduced, as even at the present rate the tariff fosters a trust which coerces and blacklists the dealers at will. As I said before, I am personally most interested in seeing a clause inserted in the new bill that will permit the free entry of reimported American watches as a whole or in part of American manufacture. As it is now, the Waltham and Elgin companies send their movements to Europe and have Swiss dials, hands, and some other minor parts put on which costs a few cents; then duty is charged against the entire watch when it goes back. This work is being done on their part simply to keep the goods out, and I certainly hope that you will be able to beat them at that game.

With best wishes, I remain,
Yours, very truly,

C. A. KEENE.

CHARLES A. KEENE,
WHOLESALE WATCHES AND DIAMONDS,
New York, March 30, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAINEY: About a week ago I sent a letter to my agents in London requesting them to cable to me in francs the actual cost in francs to produce the very cheapest grade of 11 and 15 jewel movements. You will notice by the inclosed cablegram that the 11 jewel cost 6 francs, or about \$1.20; the 15 jewel 6 francs 50, or about \$1.30; so you will see the new bill proposes to put a new tariff of \$1.35 each on an article that costs but \$1.20, and \$1.85 each on an article that costs but \$1.30.

Hoping you will be able to make use of this information, I remain,
Yours, very truly,

C. A. KEENE.

CHARLES A. KEENE AND THE WATCH TRUST.

Under the Dingley law and under the proposed bill it is possible by making slight alleged improvements on an article of American manufacture to prevent its reimportation to this country unless there is paid on it the full tariff rates. While the watch trust three years ago was very vigorously denying that Mr. Keene was purchasing Elgin and Waltham watches abroad at ridiculously low prices and bringing them back into this country for sale here, they were asking the assistance of the Treasury Department in their efforts to prevent the reshipment of their own watches. They were causing to be placed on their watches while abroad Swiss dials, so as to be able to claim that the watches had been "improved upon" or "advanced in value" while abroad.

At that time I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, asking him if he had been requested by the American Waltham Watch Company to be on the lookout for American-made watches "improved upon" while abroad, and therefore dutiable. I received a reply from him, dated the 9th day of May, 1906, in which he declined to give me information of that character. I expected this refusal before I wrote to him. I wrote to every collector at every one of our ports of entry, and I received answers from many of them which prove absolutely that at the request of the watch trust the officials of this Government stand guard at every one of our ports of entry to prevent Charles A. Keene, of New York City, from bringing back to this country the American watches he has purchased abroad at the foreign price. The bill we are considering preserves this feature of the Dingley law and makes it still possible to make alleged improvements on articles of American manufacture of only a few cents in value while those articles are abroad, and thereby prevent the bring-

ing back of the same to this country. It will be impossible, under the rule you propose to bring in, to amend the bill, even in this particular. The party in power therefore makes it possible for American manufacturers to keep up their prices at home and to make 3,000 miles from here prices 25 and 50 per cent cheaper. Mr. Keene is able, however, I am glad to say, by carefully removing the dials they place on their product abroad, to bring American watches back into this country and to continue his business. He is still furnishing the American people with the very best evidence in existence as to the fact that our industries no longer need protection, and that we are maintaining our present system for the benefit alone of the men who have already profited to the extent of untold millions of dollars at the expense of the great mass of the American people. [Applause.]

I will print at this point in my speech some of the letters I received at the time I was investigating this matter, from the collectors at some of our ports, and I submit them as proof positive of the fact that the watch trust is exerting itself to the utmost to prevent the reshipment to this country of the goods they still insist they do not sell cheaper abroad than at home, and I submit them as an impeachment of the standing and of the veracity of the officials of the watch trust, who still make these assertions [applause]:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of New York, May 7, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your letter of April 30 was received and held awaiting reply from the Treasury Department in regard to your application for copies of the affidavits and information lodged with this office with reference to an importation of watches by C. A. Keene, of New York.

I beg to state that I am unable to give you the desired information, for the reason that the department do not feel that they can with propriety authorize this office to supply the same.

Yours, respectfully,

J. J. COUCH,
Special Deputy Collector.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1906.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Please advise me whether you have been advised by the American Waltham Watch Company, directly or through any of their agents, or by any other American watch company, directly or through any of their agents, to be on the lookout for American-made watch movements improved upon while abroad by adding Swiss dials or in some other way? Have you been requested by any watch company, or their agents, to notify the collectors at the various ports to look out for American-made watch movements improved up, and therefore dutiable? Can you send me copies of such letters of advice from any watch company? I am looking up the question of the reimportation of American-made goods, particularly the question of the reimportation of American-made watches.

Yours, truly,

HENRY T. RAINEY.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 8, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 2d instant, in which you request to be furnished with copies of letters received from certain American watch companies relative to the importation of watches made by them and sold abroad, I have the honor to state that information of the character referred to is considered as confidential by the department, and can not therefore be disclosed.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW, Secretary.

The following letter I sent to the collectors of nearly all our ports, believing that the Secretary of the Treasury would refuse to furnish the desired information. I attach some of the replies, which show how completely the Roosevelt administration indorses the method by which the watch trust attempts to make the law inoperative.

I wrote to the collectors a week before I wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury, in order that they could not be directed by the Department to refuse to furnish me with the information I desired. The wisdom of this course was fully demonstrated. The nearer you get to a Republican administration the stronger the determination is manifested to give out no information that will show the necessity for a tariff revision downward:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1906.

JOHN C. CLINE,
Collector United States Custom Service,
Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Cal.

DEAR SIR: I am advised that the Waltham Watch Company, and perhaps some other American watch companies, have notified you to be on the lookout for Waltham watches imported by C. A. Keene, of New York; also advising you that these American-made watches have been finished and improved upon abroad, which makes them more valuable when returned, and therefore they are subject to duty as any foreign-made goods. Please advise me if this is true or not; also send me a copy of the letter of notification received by you from the Waltham Watch Company, or any other American watch company, together with your fees, or let me know what your fees are and I will remit.

Yours, truly,

HENRY T. RAINEY.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR,
Portland, Oreg., April 30, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 24th instant in regard to the importation of certain watches manufactured by the Waltham Watch Company, and in answer thereto beg to inform you that no such importations have been made at this port, but this office has been instructed by the Secretary of the Treasury to assess duty on watches manufactured by this company which have been exported and returned with certain improvements. You, no doubt, can obtain the information desired from the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury, to whom the letter from the Waltham Watch Company was addressed.

Respectfully,
I. L. PATTERSON,
Collector of Customs.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of Buffalo, N. Y., April 30, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In answer to your letter of the 24th instant regarding the Waltham Watch Company et al., I beg to say this office has had no letters from any firm direct, but did receive a copy of a letter of Robbins & Appleton, agents of the American Waltham Watch Company, of No. 21 Maiden Lane, New York City, dated April 2, 1906, to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, which was forwarded here with department's letter of April 13, 1906, for our files.

If you will apply to the Secretary of the Treasury, you will be able to get the information desired.

Respectfully,
W. H. BRADISH,
Special Deputy Collector.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of New Orleans, La., April 26, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Committee on Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 24th instant, I beg to state that the information relative to reimported American watches came from the Treasury Department, and you can doubtless obtain a copy thereof on application to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury.

Respectfully,
HENRY MCCALL, Collector.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of Chicago, April 26, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt of yours of the 24th instant, making inquiry whether we had received any communication from the Waltham Watch Company, or other American watch companies, in regard to the American-made watches that were being finished and improved abroad and returned to this country.

We have had no communication from the Waltham Watch Company, nor from any of the other watch companies, but our attention has been called by the Secretary of the Treasury to the reported reimportation of such watches, and we are cautioned in regard to the same.

Respectfully, yours,
WM. PENN NIXON,
Collector of Customs.

CUSTOMS SERVICE, OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR,
Detroit, Mich., April 26, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
Committee on Labor, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 24th instant relative to the return of American-made watches to the United States after the same have been advanced in value abroad, and in reply would inform you that this matter has been made the subject of correspondence between the honorable Secretary of the Treasury and this office.

Respectfully,
JOHN B. WHELAN, Collector.

CUSTOMS SERVICE, OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR,
Toledo, Ohio, April 26, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY, M. C., Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have your letter of the 24th instant relative to American watches imported after having been improved abroad, and I beg to state that we have had no correspondence with the Waltham or other company upon the subject. We have had, however, instructions relative thereto from the Secretary of the Treasury, with citations from manufacturers' correspondence, which, it is assumed, would be available to you through the department.

Respectfully,
JOS. C. BONNER, Collector.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of Boston, Mass., May 1, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of date April 28, 1906, further in regard to the question of watches.

In reply, I would state that I do not feel at liberty to make public any correspondence from importers to this office without direct authority from the department.

Respectfully, yours,
GEORGE H. LYMAN, Collector.

CUSTOMS SERVICE, OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR,
San Diego, Cal., May 14, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Respectfully referring to yours of April 24, 1906, requesting certain information from this office relative to the Waltham Watch Company, I have the honor to respectfully refer you to the honorable the Secretary of the Treasury.

Yours, respectfully,
F. W. BARNES, Collector.

I was fortunate, however, in securing from the collector at Los Angeles, Cal., a copy of the letter of the Waltham Company,

sent by the Secretary of the Treasury to the collectors at all our ports. I print here the letter of this collector to me and the copy of the letter of Robbins & Appleton sent to me by him:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Port of Los Angeles, Cal., April 30, 1906.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,
House of Representatives, United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated April 24, 1906, requesting me to advise you whether or not it is true that the Waltham Watch Company, or any other American watch company, has notified this office to be on the lookout for Waltham watches exported and again imported by Keene, of New York, advanced in value.

In reply, I have to state that such notice has been received from Messrs. Robbins & Appleton, agents of the American Waltham Watch Company, Waltham, Mass., and I herewith inclose a copy of the said notice.

Very respectfully,
CHAS. W. SPOBERG,
Special Deputy Collector.

ROBBINS & APPLETON,
AGENTS AMERICAN WALTHAM WATCH COMPANY,
WALTHAM, MASS.,
New York, April 2, 1906.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On or about March 15, 1906, about 1,300 Waltham watch movements, made by the American Waltham Watch Company, of Waltham, Mass., and consigned to Charles A. Keene, arrived at the port of New York. Upon examination by the appraisers it was found that some 1,218 of these movements bore foreign-made dials, which were attached to the watches so as to form an integral part thereof. Also, that 88 of the said watch movements bore American-made dials. Reference to the books of the American Waltham Watch Company showed that 1,210 of those bearing foreign-made dials, and 6 of those bearing American-made dials, had been shipped from the factory of the said company to London, England, without any dials, and that while said watch movements had been timed and regulated and subjected to final inspection, after which they were imported into this country as first above stated. The said two lots of watch movements, namely, 1,210 bearing foreign-made dials and 6 bearing American-made dials, attached in a foreign country, were classified as dutiable at the usual rates applicable to imported watches.

We have received information, which is believed to be reliable, that other shipments of Waltham watches or watch movements may arrive in the future at one or more of the ports of entry on the Canadian border, and not improbably at some other port of entry along the Atlantic or Pacific seaboard, which watches or watch movements will be dutiable, because of a similar state of facts to that above referred to. In order that the Government may be able to collect the proper duties in the event of any such future shipment, we suggest that the proper officers at each port of entry of the United States, and particularly at each port of entry on the Canadian border, be notified to hold all consignments of Waltham watches or watch movements upon their arrival until an opportunity be given to show whether such watches or watch movements went abroad without dials and were furnished with dials or other parts and had work done upon them in foreign countries, and that for that purpose, and immediately upon such arrival, the American Waltham Watch Company be notified at its office at Waltham, Mass., in which event the proper evidence will be immediately furnished by such company.

Respectfully,
ROBBINS & APPLETON.

I call particular attention to the latter part of this letter. The Waltham Watch Company agrees, if they are "immediately" notified of the arrival of Waltham watches, they will "immediately" furnish evidence showing the watches have been improved upon while abroad. The question arises, How can the Waltham Company "immediately" furnish such information? It can only be answered in one way: The Swiss dials are put upon the watches, or the other alleged improvements are put upon the watches, while abroad, by the Waltham Watch Company themselves, or the alleged improvements are made here in the factory of the Waltham Company in Massachusetts and a careful record of the same kept, so as to prevent their reimportation.

The Waltham Company can and probably do obtain in this country the material for the improvements they claim they make abroad, and to prove this assertion I print here an affidavit I received to-day from an importing firm in New York City:

HIPP, DIDISHEIM & BRO.,
New York, April 3, 1909.

We hereby testify that we have imported in large quantities for various American watch factories watch material, such as dials, watch hands, mainsprings, hair springs, balances, jewels.

HIPP, DIDISHEIM & BRO.

Sworn and subscribed before me this 3d day of April, 1909.
[SEAL.] CHARLES SIMON,
Notary Public, New York County, No. 117.

FREE TRADE WITH THE PHILIPPINES.

For a number of years the proponents of a high protective tariff have insisted that it was being maintained principally for the purpose of protecting labor. This year they have thrown aside the mask and this bill proposes to take down the tariff wall between the United States and the cheapest labor in all the world.

As a Democrat, I have been in favor always of expansion, but I have been in favor of that kind of expansion which would extend our national boundaries until they stretched from a frozen north to a frozen south. [Applause.] Take the map of

the world and find that place in the world where labor is the cheapest, and you will find to-day the American flag floating there. Did you ever hear any Republican orator insisting that the flag should remain on the island of Cuba, and yet more American blood was shed there than was shed in the Philippine Islands. Twice we have sent our regiments to Cuba to maintain order and to secure honest elections, but the tariff beneficiaries who control the destinies of the Republican party have never insisted that the flag should remain there and that Cuba should be annexed.

The reason for this situation is not far to seek. There are no laborers in Cuba who are willing to work for a few cents a day. There is no great storehouse of cheap labor in that part of the world.

The Republican platform of last year contained the following startling announcement:

Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in the free interchange of products, with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests.

This declaration was not taken seriously by the organized labor of the country; but the proposed tariff bill follows the declaration contained in the Republican platform and provides for absolute free trade with the Philippine Islands, except that shipments of sugar from the Philippine Islands to the United States in excess of 300,000 gross tons and the excess of shipments of tobacco in each year over a certain amount fixed therein shall pay a duty when brought into the United States.

We propose to build up industries in the Philippine Islands by providing for them free trade with the United States. We propose to maintain industries here by high protective tariffs. An easy method, however, of escaping the tariff in this country when it becomes burdensome upon any of our industries has been discovered within the last few years. The industries so burdened simply establish branch plants in those sections of the world where they expect to sell their product. Within the last four or five years the Westinghouse Company has escaped the exactions of the steel trust by simply establishing in England its largest plant, and from that point, employing cheaper foreign labor, under the direction of American foremen, they are attempting to carry on the fight for supremacy with the great German factories.

Only one thing at the present time seriously interferes in this country with the law-defying progress of predatory corporations. The only thing that seriously interferes with the plans of our so-called "captains of industry" is the demand for shorter hours and a higher wage, which comes from the organized laborers of the country. They are making in this country the real fight for the future of the race. If our great industries could escape these demands, do not you think they would accept any opportunity presented?

This bill, if it becomes a law, presents to them the opportunity they need, and it may explain the tenacity with which Republican party leaders have clung to the idea that the flag must be maintained in the Philippine Islands. Under this bill industries can be established in the Philippine Islands, where conditions of living are cheap, close to the world's great storehouses of cheap labor, and there, with the cheapest labor in all the world, the market even in this country can be supplied with the articles produced now by our own skilled laborers.

NOT SAFE TO EXCLUDE JAPANESE LABORERS FROM PHILIPPINES.

At present the Chinese-exclusion laws have been extended to the Philippine Islands. It would not be safe, however, to attempt to exclude Japanese laborers from the Philippine Islands if they show a disposition to go there. The consequence of legislation of this character might be much more serious than could ever have come from the recent attempt to exclude Japanese from the public schools on the Pacific coast and to limit their holdings of real estate in that section of our country. A few years ago the Japanese nation fought and won the battle of the Sea of Japan with cruisers and battle ships built by the United States, by England, and by Germany.

To-day, with Japanese workmen under Japanese foremen, in Japanese shipyards they are turning out that most complicated of all machines, a modern battle ship; they are building *Dreadnoughts* in Japan now in less time than they can be built in English shipyards. These imitative, skillful little workmen, willing to work for a few cents a day, it is reasonable to suppose can in the near future turn out almost as much product in a day as our own skilled workmen.

The present bill opens up alarming possibilities in this direction. The Philippine Islands are exempted by the bill we are considering even from the operation of the maximum and minimum provisions of this bill. The great Empire of China, with its teeming millions of population, lies immediately adjacent to and within easy reach of the Philippine Islands. Even now the Chinese cross back and forth, 8,000 of them, every year in

their little boats. There are 18 Provinces in China, and 14 of them are rich in iron ore. Within the next decade China will furnish the world with its chief supply of iron ore.

THE STEEL TRUST AND THE IRON ORE OF CHINA.

Not long ago the real head of the steel trust, and the most conspicuous example of what the protective tariff can do in the matter of producing millionaires, testified before the Ways and Means Committee and made the apparently patriotic declaration that the steel industries needed no further protection. A well-defined rumor is now being circulated in this Capitol to the effect that this gentleman and his associates have acquired large interests, perhaps controlling interests, in the iron-ore fields of China. What is to prevent these gentlemen from transporting to the Philippine Islands ore from the iron-ore fields of China, adjacent to the sea, and there, with the cheapest labor in all the world, manufacturing steel with which to supply the markets even of this country? The ore consumed now at Pittsburg and the iron ore they propose to use at Gary comes, all of it, from Canada by water, through the Lakes to Gary—through the Lakes, and then by rail to Pittsburg.

It would be easier and shorter and less expensive to carry iron ore from China to the Philippine Islands than it is to carry iron ore from the Lake Superior region in Canada to Gary or Pittsburg. The Philippine tariff law of 1903 furnishes no obstacle to this kind of a programme.

The Democratic party is not in favor of free trade with any nation in the world. We realize that under present conditions half the revenue of this Government must be derived from duties on imports. The Democratic party favors a tariff for revenue, and I undertake to say that there can be found in the history of the Democratic party no tendency to take down the bars between this country and the cheapest labor in the world. [Long-continued applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STURGISS. Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side are never so happy as when pleading the cause of the Swiss or some other foreign workman. They are more interested in giving employment to those who owe allegiance to a foreign government, who pay their taxes to that government, who fight for its flag in case of war, than they are in taking care of the interests of their fellow-citizens who live under our flag and will fight for our Government and sustain all of its industries. I shall not in the time allotted to me engage in a controversy touching any of the matters discussed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], but I shall endeavor to present what I conceive to be an accurate and philosophic statement of the principles that separate and distinguish the two great parties that are contending for supremacy in this country.

The existing tariff law, known as the "Dingley Act," was passed by a Republican Congress and approved by that apostle of protection, the martyr President McKinley, in fulfillment of the pledges of the Republican party as contained in its national platforms. In 1888 it declared that—

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; the protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests, except those of the usurer and the sheriff.

In 1892 it "reaffirmed the American doctrine of protection," and called attention to its growth abroad. In 1896 the party platform gave expression to this idea by declaring:

We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection as the bulwark of American industrial independence and the foundation of American development and prosperity. This true American policy taxes foreign products and encourages home industry; it puts the burden on foreign goods; it secures the American market for the American producer; it upholds the American standard of wages for the American workman; it puts the factory by the side of the farm, and makes the American farmer less dependent on foreign demand and price; it diffuses general thrift.

The people approved these declarations and commissioned a Republican Congress and President to crystallize them into legislation, and on the 24th day of July, 1897, the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States" was approved.

Did that title honestly set forth the real character of the act? I insist it did.

AS TO REVENUE.

First. Official records show that it yielded ample revenue for all the legitimate and ordinary expenses of the Government, and provided for the extraordinary expenses of the war with Spain and for many new public buildings and a greatly increased navy. The total receipts and expenditures have been as follows, July 1, 1897, to March 16, 1900:

Total receipts.....	\$8, 097, 920, 296
Total expenditures.....	8, 072, 508, 367
Surplus.....	25, 411, 929

Included in the expenditures is the sum of \$99,143,479, being the excess of cost of the rapidly expanded postal service over its earnings, but not including \$50,000,000 paid or advanced on account of the Panama Canal, which will be reimbursed by the sale of bonds authorized for the expenses of constructing the canal, which was an extraordinary expense, intended to be defrayed by the issue and sale of bonds.

But it is asserted that the revenues have fallen off and the Treasury is facing a certain deficit, and, therefore, a new tariff law is required that will provide more revenue. I doubt the assertion. A very marked and world-wide depression in business, beginning abroad in 1906, culminated in this country in the fall of 1907. I am of opinion that if our importers had not permitted the dumping upon this country in 1906-7 of about \$200,000,000 worth of foreign goods in excess of the usual imports for the same period we should have suffered very slightly from this world-wide panic; but the foreign manufacturers, pressed by demands for money to meet debts contracted in an undue expansion of manufactures, and finding no home market for their products, sold at temptingly low prices to American importers this large excess, which not only caused a drain of gold to Europe and England in payment of the same, but glutted our markets, caused suspension of work in the home factories, threw our work people out of employment, and disturbed all forms of business and destroyed confidence.

Revenues fell off rapidly, both customs and internal, but the scale of government expenses projected when the country was in the full tide of prosperity could not be immediately curtailed, and there is consequently a temporary deficit in revenues as against expenditures. That this is only temporary is shown by the already increasing volume of business in all domestic enterprises as well as in imports. I have no fear that the existing tariff law would fail to provide ample revenue for the current ordinary expenses of the Government in the future, when normal conditions have been restored.

ENCOURAGING INDUSTRIES.

Second. Did the Dingley Act "encourage the industries of the United States?" No other period of a little less than twelve years can show so marvelous a growth in all the industries and business of the United States. More mines were opened and more coal, ores, and minerals produced; more factories, furnaces, mills, and industrial plants were built and equipped, and a vastly larger output, both in quantity, quality, and value, than ever before, placed upon the markets. The forests and the farms teemed with industrial life. Wages were higher than ever, employment more steady and constant; more railways were built, greater additions to the deposits in our savings banks made, and the general prosperity was the admiration and marvel of the whole civilized world, and capital and population were attracted here in larger degree than ever before.

And so every pledge in party platforms and the declarations of the caption of the act were most abundantly fulfilled and redeemed.

THE PROTECTIVE POLICY.

It would seem too late in the history of this country to have to defend the right to levy duties which should be for the purpose of not only providing revenue for the Government, but also to encourage the industries and provide for the general welfare of the United States, but the assertion has been repeatedly made and in many forms by Democratic Members of this House during the present session that no constitutional authority existed in Congress to levy taxes of any kind "except for revenue only," and that party has repeatedly enunciated that proposition in its state and national conventions, and at this time that is the cardinal difference between Democrats and Republicans. We believe a distinct grant of power was conferred upon Congress to so arrange national taxes and duties as to not only raise revenue, but also in the so doing to provide for the general welfare. The people of the United States ordained and established the Constitution "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity," and also "to promote the general welfare," and in pursuance of that declaration, the grant contained in the eighth section of Article I, defining the objects for which the taxing power might be exercised, includes the right "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense," and also "for the general welfare of the United States."

If, then, a tax or duty may be so laid and collected as to provide revenue for all the purposes enumerated, and in its expenditure provide for the general welfare, it certainly can not militate against the right to levy and collect such tax if the mere

levying and collecting it, apart from any purpose for which the money collected might afterwards be used, will redound to and enhance the general welfare. And if this double advantage may be secured by arranging schedules and the free list, and by regulating the rate of duties, then not only is the right clearly conferred, but it becomes the plain duty of every Member of Congress, and in accordance with the soundest dictates of patriotism and statesmanship to so arrange schedules and rates that this double advantage may accrue.

It is alleged that taxation in any form is a necessary evil, and if this be conceded, then it becomes more plainly apparent that we should not only mitigate the evils, but as far as possible convert them into blessings.

A PROTECTIVE POLICY DEVELOPES NATURAL RESOURCES AND MAKES A NATION STRONG AND INDEPENDENT.

I conceive that it is of the utmost importance that a nation and people organized into a body politic that desires to maintain its independent existence must be self-sustaining, capable of defending its soil and people from the aggressions of every other nation, whether in the form of actual physical war or in commercial warfare and rivalry. In order to acquire this actual independence and to maintain it, the material things that supply food, clothing, shelter, weapons of warfare offensive and defensive, must be produced and provided within the territory and jurisdiction of the nation. Until all this has been done the nation exists only by the tolerance of other and more powerful and better equipped governments.

It therefore is the part of political wisdom, of patriotism, and the highest statesmanship to encourage the development of all the resources and natural advantages that the nation possesses. Agriculture, mining, manufactures, shipbuilding, commerce, banking, and diversified occupations and employments should all be encouraged and stimulated, until the nation, like a well-trained athlete, should be systematically and symmetrically developed and fit to meet all comers, to suppress insurrection and rebellion, and repel invasion.

If a nation were composed of tillers of the soil only, or of artisans and manufacturers alone, or of merchants and traders, or of miners, or woodsmen and shipbuilders and sailors alone, it would be at the mercy and exist only at the sufferance of those nations that had a diversification of industries, occupations, and resources all well developed.

THE SOUTH AND THE CIVIL WAR.

No more impressive and gigantic illustration of the wisdom and importance of such a symmetrical development of the resources and diversification of the industries and the training and occupations of a people can be found in the pages of either ancient or modern history than in the late civil war in our own country. I challenge the attention of Members on both sides of this House who participated in that struggle, as well as every thoughtful student of the events and conditions that preceded and were a part of the history of that unhappy war, to consider the admitted facts.

Nearly 9,000,000 people, banded together with enthusiasm in a common purpose to establish an independent government, fighting on interior and shorter lines, with half their frontier protected by the ocean and the Gulf; with a docile slave population to cultivate the soil and care for the families of the absent soldiers; with as gallant and brave soldiers as ever wore uniform; with a dash and élan unsurpassed by the veterans of Napoleon; with brilliant generals skilled in the science and art of war; with a Johnston, a Jackson, and a Lee, equal in genius, daring, and devotion to our Sheridan, Sherman, and Grant; with wives, mothers, and daughters of the Southland most devoted and self-sacrificing; these people, who were born and bred of our bone and blood, fought a losing fight, and were doomed from the beginning to defeat and disappointment. Yet, never before in the history of the world had such a combination of numbers, qualities, and devotion failed in such a struggle.

The explanation is a simple one. Hinton Rowan Helper, a native of North Carolina and a slave owner, whose tragic death took place in this city since this session began, pointed out as early as 1857 that slavery would make the States in which it existed almost exclusively agricultural, because slave labor must necessarily be crude, ignorant, and unskilled, and only profitable in the cultivation of the soil; and that skilled artisans and mechanics would not go to or remain in a State where slave labor degraded free labor and reduced its wages.

Alexander H. Stephens, one of the ablest and purest public men this country ever produced, declared upon the floor of the Georgia convention as it was about to pass the ordinance of secession that that step meant war; that the South was not prepared for war; that it was an agricultural section; that it had no diversification of industries; that it could not manufac-

ture cannon, powder, shot, guns, or side arms, nor clothing, boots, or shoes for its armies; that it could not build ships or locomotives nor make railway rails; that it could only procure these essentials for successful warfare by exchanging its cotton with England or continental Europe, and for this exchange it must depend upon foreign ships, for the South had few of its own.

When the blockade was successfully established, cotton dethroned as king, and munitions of warfare could neither be manufactured at home nor be brought in from abroad, the end was inevitable and near at hand. How great the contrast with the Northern States, whose mining, manufacturing, commerce, and all the varied industries of that section flourished as never before. The high war tariff stimulated and created new industries and brought population and capital to that section.

Nearly every regiment from the North had its skilled mechanics, who could build or repair a locomotive or other engine, construct boats and railways, or repair and man a telegraph line; but in the South, when rails were worn out, locomotives or engines disabled, boats damaged or destroyed, and telegraph lines cut, few skilled mechanics or engineers could be found to repair or replace these worn-out or damaged instruments so necessary for successful warfare. Superhuman courage, genius, and devotion could not win a fight in which material resources and supplies were wanting against an army well supplied with and capable of renewing these necessary resources and supplies as fast as they were used up, worn out, or destroyed.

Who can tell how long the war would have been prolonged, or its final outcome, if the Southern States, instead of being almost exclusively devoted to agriculture and stock raising, had been blessed with a diversification of industries, with all their magnificent and varied natural resources developed, and their people skilled in all the mechanic arts and occupations? The genius and capabilities of the citizens of the South had been too largely devoted to politics and the defense and propagation of slavery. That they had the capacity for large business enterprises, the genius for the learned occupations as distinguished from the learned professions, has been shown in a thousand ways since the incubus of servile labor has been removed. Rumsey, of Virginia, was the real inventor of the steamboat, and his model, crude and imperfect because the requisite skilled labor to build engine and boat could not be had in the South, was launched upon the waters of the Shenandoah River, in my district, before Fulton, on the Hudson, had made a successful trip. Yet, surrounded by skilled artisans and favoring circumstances, the latter has been acclaimed the first inventor of a water craft propelled by steam, and is likely to go down in history with that credit to his genius.

McCormick, another Virginian, having perfected his reapers and mowers in model and form, was compelled to establish his shops and works in a great northern city, where self-respecting mechanics, machinists, and skilled laborers of all kinds, working at good wages, could be had to carry out his plans to build and ship these creatures of his ingenious brain to every harvest field of the world.

RESOURCES OF THE SOUTHERN STATES.

With coal, timber, and ore, and water power equal to the best in New England, and raw cotton superior to any in the world, the South and not New England should have been the busiest and most prosperous cotton-goods manufacturing section in the world. The whole South, with natural resources equal to any part of the North, with a more genial climate, presents a case of arrested development, because her people were doomed to the simplest occupations by reason of the unskilled labor of the slaves, against which no intelligent, self-respecting white artisan would compete. Slavery was a curse to master and land hardly less great than its injustice to the slave.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STURGISS. I beg the gentleman not to interrupt me. I have no idea I shall be able to enlighten him at all by replying to his questions. If he will follow the line of my argument, he will see the trend of it; and he is welcome to all of it. I represent in part a so-called "Southern State," in which I have seen that arrested development so stimulated until to-day the State of West Virginia, once an integral part of Virginia, whose creation and existence depended upon a party whose pledge was to develop and promote and protect all the great interests of the country, is unsurpassed in progress and prosperity by any other Southern State.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman answered a question which was not asked.

Mr. STURGISS. I shall have to remind the gentleman of the fact that for many weeks the gentlemen upon that side, intoxicated with the exuberance of their own verbosity, have multiplied words without wisdom and have defended every-

thing except the true American policy and the interests of the American workman, and have exercised, as they have exercised for years, the arguments of destructive criticism. They have so long persisted in this—for nearly fifty years—that they have lost the power of constructive statesmanship. They have not brought in here, as the result of these many weeks and months of deliberation, a tariff measure of their own. They have not dared to challenge the attention of the country to a tariff policy of their own creation, but, standing in the position of opposition, have devoted themselves now, as ever in the past, to that policy of destructive criticism—

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. STURGISS. I can not. I have only a limited time, and we are drawing near the conclusion of this debate and discussion.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman ought not to take up so much time, then, to answer questions I did not ask.

Mr. STURGISS. If the gentleman did not want the question which he had in his mind answered, he ought not to have intimated it. The gentleman forgets, possibly, that mental telepathy may have communicated it to me.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman thought I was going to ask a partisan question, which I was not.

Mr. STURGISS. Happily that period in our economical history has passed, and the South may now compete on equal terms with the most favored sections of our common country in the generous rivalry for material development and prosperity.

The greatest drawback and handicap under which that section now labors is the result of her prejudices and adherence to old political ideas and associations. However well free trade might have suited the South when she had little but cotton to trade and wanted to buy in the cheapest markets of the world, that policy should no longer control her statesmen and her people, owners of a rich heritage in natural, but slightly developed, resources and riches.

The South should have the same just measure of protection to her peculiar industries and occupations as New England or any other section of our country. Rice, sugar, lumber, citrus fruits, peanuts, and cotton manufactures, as well as coal, iron, and zinc ores, lead, and manufactures thereof, should receive that share of protection that will secure the work people of the South from the cheap labor of the Tropics, of China, and Japan, as well as the illy paid labor of Europe.

Will any thoughtful student of political economy and industrial conditions show any plausible reason why New England, without coal, iron, or a rich soil and genial climate should have so far outstripped the South Atlantic and Gulf States, the middle Southern and southwest Southern States, which possess by nature all that New England has of natural advantages and, in addition, a fertile soil, genial climate, coal, iron, zinc, lead, sulphur, limestone, cement rock, and other natural and material resources? If the Representatives from those States will permit me, I commend that question to them, to be answered to their own consciences and their constituents.

WAGES.

The policy of a protective tariff does undeniably develop the resources and increases the wealth and prosperity of a nation, making it independent commercially, financially, and politically. It does give better wages and happier conditions to its work people. No one familiar with the wages paid abroad in the mines, furnaces, mills, factories, and on the farms, whether in Europe, the Tropics, China, or Japan, will contend for a moment that the American workman could live, or should be required to live, upon these starvation wages.

Every American voter is a sovereign and carries under his hat a part of the sovereignty of the Nation. He is the source of all political power, and each one of us is profoundly interested that he should be intelligent as well as virtuous; that he should have leisure for reading, studying, and understanding the policies of the Government which he controls. He is, and of right ought to be, the best fed, the best clothed, best housed, and best paid workman in the world. That his condition, even in the periods of panic and utmost depression in the United States, is vastly better than that of the workman in any free-trade nation is shown beyond all question in the fact that the workers of the Old World and of foreign lands are coming to our shores in greater numbers every year, which they would not do if it were not certain that they would thereby better their condition. The small number of work people in the United States who are now the subjects of charity is infinitesimal almost by contrast with the more than 750,000 wage-earners of free-trade Great Britain, who have been out of employment for the last twelve months. The old-age pension sys-

tem of England is but a thinly disguised charity to keep these unfortunates from the poorhouse. Germany was less affected by the late panic and depression than any other European nation, and largely because of the fact that that people, under the leadership of Bismarck, has abandoned the free-trade policy and established a well-arranged system of protection.

THE PAYNE BILL.

Before offering any criticisms upon the bill reported by Mr. PAYNE, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I want to bear testimony to the laborious investigations and conscientious efforts by the chairman and that committee in their endeavor to perfect a bill that would command the support of the House, meet with the approval of the people, provide adequate revenue, and equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States.

No measure of taxation of such a complicated character and touching such a variety of interests can ever be drafted so as to meet with the unanimous approval of Members of Congress and of the people; such a bill must necessarily be in the nature of a compromise, and, in my judgment, it seems to be framed along protection lines and to provide for adequate revenues.

It is calculated to create new industries and to make them profitable here, to give employment to a larger number of our people in these occupations, and to give a better market for our own raw materials. Doubtless clamor will be raised against some of the schedules that have been slightly raised, having for their purpose the encouragement of new industries. A like clamor was raised when the Dingley bill sought by a high rate on tin plate to establish that industry in the United States.

It was asserted by free traders that we never could successfully manufacture tin plate, because we had no tin mines and could produce no metallic tin, losing sight of the fact that more than 90 per cent of the cost of finished tin plate is in the labor, in mining the coal, making coke, raising the iron ore, quarrying the limestone for fluxing purposes, transporting these materials to the furnace, and the various processes that at last result in producing the steel or iron sheet, with finally the very thin coating of metallic tin, the latter of which constitutes less than 5 per cent of the actual cost of labor and material for the finished plate. Under the fostering influences of the Dingley Act tin-plate mills have been established in many parts of the United States, and thousands of skilled workmen find employment at high wages, produce as good a tin sheet and at lower cost to the consumer than was the cost before the passage of the Dingley Act. This industry may be taken as typical of many others that have been established in like manner and by the stimulating influence and the fostering care of the protective system.

The advantages to this country of such an industry are manifold. These employees receive high wages; they own their own homes; they pay the best prices in the market for meats, fruits, and vegetables, thereby directly benefiting the farmer and the stock raiser; they are well housed and well clothed; they pay a large share of the taxes for local and state government; they bear arms in time of war in our army and navy.

If such industries were not established and maintained here we should be sending our money abroad to build up industries that would give employment to men who would support a foreign government by their taxes, by manning foreign ships, and fighting in the armies of our trade rivals, if ever at any time war should exist between those nations and our own country. It seems to me that every consideration of patriotism, of self-interest, of the broadest altruism, should prompt us to support the principle of protection so plainly embodied in the Payne bill, whether that protection relates to the local industries situated in our respective congressional districts or is a part of the general system, the first benefits of which will accrue to some other section or locality.

SCHEDULES.

In the further consideration of the bill I shall direct my attention briefly to some of the schedules in which my home State is most largely interested as a producer of competing articles affected by the tariff rates, and as to others so far as they relate to the wisdom and propriety of subjecting them to any tariff rate.

SUGAR, TEA, AND COFFEE.

These articles of prime necessity, used alike by rich and poor, when subject to a very moderate duty would be great revenue producers, because of such general use and the large quantities consumed.

The rate of 8 cents and 9 cents per pound on tea, proposed by the Payne bill, is, in the opinion of many, excessive, and in this I concur. Under the Dingley law it is on the free list. The proposed rate might well be termed a high protective rate, and would gratify every extreme protectionist, if it could pos-

sibly tend to the growing of tea in our own territory or island possessions; but soil, or climate, and labor conditions hold out little hope that the experiments in the cultivation of the tea plant now being tried can ever result in the production of tea successfully in commercial quantities. The rate of duty can only be defended upon the plea of the necessity to raise revenue, and will always be unpopular and can never be justified except upon the ground of the greatest emergency. I do not believe that such necessity now exists, and therefore believe it would be unwise to levy a duty upon tea.

Coffee stands upon a slightly different footing, for its cultivation may be encouraged and greatly increased in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and elsewhere within the jurisdiction of the United States by a moderate tariff upon imports, and at the same time yield a very considerable revenue; but it is admitted by the framers of the pending bill that the tariff proposed is not intended for revenue, for, while nominally putting coffee upon the free list, the bill provides—

That if any country, dependency, province, or colony shall impose an export duty, or other export tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, directly or indirectly, upon coffee exported to the United States, a duty equal to such export duty, tax, or charge shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon.

Some, or all, the States or Provinces of Brazil which produce coffee impose such an export tax, deriving a large revenue therefrom, and have pledged or mortgaged this revenue to repay the principal and interest of loans or bonds the proceeds of which have been used by these Provinces for various projects or enterprises undertaken by them. These pledges cover periods extending from seven to ten years, and consequently this export tax can not now be repealed. The expectation of the Ways and Means Committee in drafting the proviso was, apparently, that Brazil or her Provinces would be induced to repeal this export tax, if the duty imposed by the bill should not apply, upon condition that the export duty was repealed and the exports of coffee to the United States be free from both export and import tax and that traffic be untrammelled. But, in view of the facts just stated, this condition can not be expected, and the tariff proposed by the bill will be just that much added to the cost of coffee to the consumer. The primary purpose of the proviso was to cheapen the price of coffee—and it probably would have produced that effect, by inducing the repeal of the export tax by Brazil or her Provinces, but for the obligation to her creditors to continue and apply the revenue therefrom to the payments of the debts secured thereby—and not to increase the cost by import duties.

Brazilian Provinces produce about two-thirds of the world's crop, and the United States is the largest consumer. Porto Rico and the Philippines and Hawaii are the only places under the jurisdiction of the United States that successfully cultivate the coffee berry. In 1906 importations from Brazil amounted to over 778,000,000 pounds (out of a total of 982,000,000, of the value of over \$78,000,000), while the exports from Porto Rico and Hawaii amounted to only 39,000,000 pounds, of the value of about \$4,700,000.

Under the conditions relating to tea and coffee, I believe both should remain on the free list and not be subjected to any tariff whatever.

The rate on sugar is a reduction on refined sugar of 5 cents per hundred pounds, while that on raw or unrefined sugar remains unchanged.

The consumption of sugar in the United States amounts to 3,000,000 tons per year, or an average of about 66 pounds per capita. In 1907-8 the United States, including Porto Rico, Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines, produced a little over one-half of that amount. Cuba produced about the same amount. The importation of beet sugar, not above No. 16 Dutch standard, amounted to 177,564 tons, valued at \$8,203,000. The revenues from importations of sugar, molasses, and manufactures thereof amounted to over \$60,000,000, on a valuation at ports of entry of about \$93,000,000.

The estimated revenue under the Payne bill upon the basis of an equal value or amount of imports will be reduced a little over \$500,000.

I believe the rate on refined sugar might have been reduced to 1.75 cents per pound, or a little over 10 per cent reduction on the present rate, instead of 2½ per cent reduction, still leaving a difference of eighty one-hundredths of a cent per pound for cost and profit to the refiners instead of 1 cent per pound.

Under the Dingley Act the refiners have had a margin of 1 cent a pound between the tariff on imported raw and refined sugars, and that the profits have been unjustly large is shown by the following statement of the American Sugar Refining Company, commonly known as the "sugar trust," chartered under the laws of New Jersey with a capital of \$50,000,000. It

has increased it to \$90,000,000. Its preferred stock has paid 7 per cent per annum and its common 10 per cent per annum, and in 1893 12 per cent, and an extra dividend that year of 10 per cent, making 22 per cent. Its assets for 1907 are as follows:

Raw sugar, including sugar to arrive, refined sugar, and sirup, and stock in process of manufacture	\$17,532,226
Cash	5,016,986
Loans	17,666,550
Accounts and bills receivable	5,934,482
Investments in beet sugar and other corporations	22,907,052

Manifestly the margin of profit is unreasonably large, and the duties on raw sugar might have been raised and on refined sugar reduced without loss of revenue to the United States and with a gratifying reduction of the price to the consumer.

Since the committee put hides upon the free list, boots and shoes should have been put at a lower rate than the reduction from 25 per cent ad valorem, present rate, to 15 per cent.

West Virginia stands out as the one political and geographical landmark created or growing out of the civil war. Repressed and ignored by the political leaders of Virginia, except for purposes of taxation, her separation from the mother State was the beginning of a new industrial life as well as of political independence. With a little over 400,000 population when admitted to the Union, June 20, 1863, the State has now over a million and a quarter of people.

With magnificent virgin forests of the best timber, then not unfrequently selling for payment of delinquent taxes, now worth for stumpage alone from \$20 to \$50 per acre; with 16,000 square miles of bituminous coal in workable seams of commercial value, selling within the last twelve or fifteen years at from \$2.50 to \$10 per acre, now bringing \$200 to \$500 per acre; with oil and natural gas in very large quantities, glass sands, limestone and cement rocks, blue-grass lands of the best, herding the choicest of beef cattle and the finest woolled sheep; with superior fruit farms upon the river bottoms and the uplands; with peach and apple orchards of more than a thousand acres each in many instances; with great tanneries, many paper and pulp mills; with furnaces, iron and steel mills, tin-plate plants, pottery and glassware factories, and many of the raw materials entering into these and other manufactured goods, the State may well be said to have been richly dowered by the god of nature. West Virginia was aroused from a semidormant state by the stimulating influences of the Dingley Act, and from the date of its enactment the State became a great workshop of prosperous industry.

The State may truly be described as a tariff-made State—that is to say, by the protective feature of the Dingley Act capital and population were attracted to the State, completely revolutionizing its political complexion, emancipating it from the thralldom of a free-trade Democracy, adding to the value of its forests, its mines and varied resources, and giving employment at good wages to many added thousands in its manufacturing plants, in the forests, mills, and in the mines and quarries.

Some of the provisions in the pending bill hit West Virginia industries a staggering blow, if they shall be enacted into law.

COAL.

Fifty thousand miners and coke workers are employed in our coal and coke operations. A very considerable market is found for our coals in New England. If, as is proposed, coal be placed upon the free list, a concession will be made to New England that it does not need, and I do not believe will demand or insist upon. Nearly all of her manufactured products are and have been liberally protected for many years. Free trade would give a market in New England for Nova Scotia or Cape Breton coal to the amount of about 1,000,000 tons a year, and to that extent drive out the bituminous coals of Maryland and West Virginia, and the latter State would be compelled to seek a market in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys for that much more of her products than now find their way southward, and to that extent displace the coals of Tennessee and other Southern States supplying the Mississippi Valley. In addition, New England, more profoundly interested in shipbuilding and in the construction and maintenance of a great merchant marine than any other section of the country, would be encouraging the importation of Canadian coal in foreign built and owned vessels, which would engage in that traffic, and to that extent deprive American-built vessels engaged in and having exclusive privilege of our coastwise trade of that much freight.

So that the advantages of free coal to New England would be more than offset by the discouragement offered the American shipbuilders and vessels and the encouragement given the foreign vessels to engage in this trade, thus injuriously affecting the shipbuilding industry of New England.

The coal operators in West Virginia would be willing to accept a fixed rate of 45 cents per ton, and would prefer this to either the present rate, which is 67 cents a ton for run-of-mine coal and 15 cents for slack, or to the proposed rate, made dependent upon the rate to be fixed by Canada. Personally, I do not believe it a wise policy to make the rate that we impose on imports depend in any degree upon the pleasure or will of the nation to which we export our products. I understand that the Canadian rate may be quickly changed by order of council or some other executive body, while with us it must depend upon congressional action, which is slow and uncertain. By the enactment of the proposed bill we should be giving an undue advantage to our rivals.

LUMBER.

The State, and my district, is a large producer of both hard and soft wood lumbers and of wood pulp and paper, and the proposed reduction in the tariff on all of these products will work a great hardship to our people. Many of them have bought timber lands at high prices, with the Dingley tariff rates in existence, and now give employment to thousands of sturdy wood choppers and sawmill men and other thousands in the pulp mills.

The reduction or abolition of rates on products of wood from our forests will throw many thousands of people out of employment and make valueless, or greatly reduce in value, property investments. In this connection I desire to read an extract from a letter from one of our pulp makers:

It is now admitted by the paper-trade journals that the Mann committee will recommend the abolition of the duty on wood pulp amounting to \$1.75 a ton. This means a loss to us of \$70 a day if we meet Canadian prices.

There is enough pulp wood in this State to supply all the pulp mills and paper mills within its borders for the next fifty years. The statistics show that the pulp-mill consumption represents 2 per cent of the visible supply.

We have 68 men here dependent on the 2 small mills I represent. The day this tariff change goes into effect we will have to shut down.

I earnestly protest against placing lumber and wood products on the free list.

OIL.

The independent oil producers in West Virginia have indicated their entire satisfaction with the provisions of the bill relating to the countervailing duties, provided that the operation of the section in relation to drawbacks does not give an undue or unreasonable advantage to the Standard Oil Company or other great producing and refining companies.

WOOL.

We are not satisfied with the reduction in the rate on the lower grades of wool. While we produce a small quantity of these lower grades, yet it is believed that if imported in large quantities they will supplant in greater or less degree the fine wools, which constitute the bulk of the wool grown in West Virginia. We think no change should be made in the wool schedule.

TIN PLATE.

Our tin-plate workers are practically unanimous in objection to the drawback provisions in relation to imported tin, manufactured into cans and cases in this country and in which are exported abroad meats and canned goods and the oils of the Standard Oil Company; and while I do not believe that the repeal of this provision would materially benefit the tin-plate worker, yet I am opposed on principle to the drawback system as opening, in many instances, a wide door for fraud.

I think it unwise to reduce the tariff on tin plate in any degree so long as we are importing a very considerable quantity of tin plate from Great Britain.

NO APOLOGY.

I make no apologies for speaking specially in behalf of the interests of my district and of its products that are affected by the tariff. I do this because I am more familiar with them, and because if I did not represent them specially, I should be derelict in my duty to my constituents.

I am willing to extend to the products of every other State to the fullest extent the benefit of a protective policy, and ask only similar treatment for the industries of my State.

DEMOCRATS BREAKING AWAY.

I welcome with much gratification the breaking away from party allegiance of many enlightened and patriotic members of the minority party, and especially among those who come from the Southern States. I believe the time is coming rapidly when, emancipated from the thralldom of party allegiance, the South will declare for a protective policy, and so continue long after New England may have declared for free trade.

It will be better for the country when industrial and economic and not sectional questions divide the great parties of the country, and I hope to live to see the day when greater

prosperity, greater wealth, and greater material development and advantage shall come to the South in common with all other sections of the country, and when, burying all differences growing out of the ancient policies of the past, we shall go forward to greater heights of prosperity and happiness under one economic policy, one destiny, and one flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, several gentlemen from the Republican side have complained that the Democrats have not presented a substitute bill for the one now pending. Every such suggestion has come from a politician who is not satisfied with the Payne bill, and feels that his constituency are less content than he. The Republicans are responsible for this bill, and need not expect to be able to hide their own misdoings by attempting to throw responsibility upon Democrats or by raising any quarrel with them. The promise has been made that the tariff would be revised. In every part of the country this statement was reiterated. The pending bill is supposed to be in response to the demands of the people and framed in accordance with the pre-election pledges of Representatives. It was insisted prior to the election that a genuine tariff revision could only be made by friends of the tariff, and the assertion was repeatedly made that the Republicans were its friends and the Democrats were its enemies. Complaint is now heard that the Democrats are not doing their duty, because they have permitted the Ways and Means Committee without hindrance to present their views in a concrete bill. The Payne bill is not satisfactory to any Member of this body, so far as I have heard. Gentlemen in explaining its imperfections now say no tariff bill can be made which is perfect. Why were not the American people informed last November that it was impossible for any Republican to frame a satisfactory tariff bill? It was then asserted that only the Republican party could make such a bill. At this time it is frankly admitted that the Republican party is unable to frame a satisfactory law; that any bill to secure passage must be a compromise. This could as easily have been asserted six months ago as now.

How ridiculous must this confession appear to those who have relied upon the Republican party for relief, when that party now admits its incapacity and demands that the Democratic party shall present a substitute bill. Evidently such request is made with the vain hope that the Democrats may present an objectionable measure. The Republican party is charged with the responsibility, and it can not shirk it. The people have thrown the burden upon that party to prepare a tariff measure, and it can not avoid the burden of such action. The Democrats were excluded from the consideration and preparation of the bill. From January 1 to March 15, behind closed doors, the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee deliberated on the tariff schedules, and then presented the pending bill to the Democrats. No one outside that committee, so far as the Democrats have knowledge, had the slightest intimation of anything it would contain. When the bill thus prepared in secret was presented to the committee, motion was made to favorably report it without reading, and this motion prevailed. The bill was reported to the House at once, and the discussion began and has continued until this time, beginning at 10 o'clock each morning and concluding at 10.30 at night. When, I wish to know, could the Democrats have presented a bill as a substitute? At what stage in the proceedings was it permissible? Under the existing autocratic rules, when could such a substitute have been presented? At no time; and every gentleman here knows it. Such a suggestion can only be made to mislead an unsuspecting public. But gentlemen may rest assured that the people are informed of what is doing here, and will hold each individual responsible for his action.

It is not my purpose to critically discuss the bill in detail, but I can safely assert that it is no improvement on the Dingley law. When all its mysterious provisions are understood, and its "jokers" have all been exposed, it will be seen that the bill has been drawn by the manufacturers, for the manufacturers, and that protection to special interests and not tariff has been the controlling motive in the preparation of the bill. The professed friends of the tariff for the time being forgot their interests in that subject, and apparently have allowed themselves to be overcome in what may seem to them the larger question of protection to manufacturers. It is not the infant industries that have controlled action, but it is the overmastering power of the mature enterprises which have controlled in the framing of the schedules.

The Government, with its deficiency of \$60,000,000 last year, with \$90,000,000 thus far this year, and the prospect of a deficit next year, makes urgent need for revenue. Will the proposed law furnish it, is the question. The chairman of the committee, in his statement and report, shows a probable shortage of \$10,-

000,000 per year in the revenues under the bill. In explaining the different items of expenditure which must be made, he said, among other things, that the appropriations made from time to time were not wholly expended each year, and intimated that at least 5 per cent of the total amount would not be required. Then, figuring the demands for the fiscal year 1910 at \$900,000,000, he concluded that \$45,000,000 of the appropriations recently made for the coming fiscal year will not be needed, and then deducted that amount from the appropriations. He failed to take into his accounting the fact that appropriations made for a given year may be paid in subsequent years; that in each year there are payments made from the Treasury for items not included in the appropriations for that year. When this has been taken into account, the appropriation is about exhausted.

The records show that on an average much less than 1 per cent is shown to remain of the appropriated balance, so that the reduction of \$45,000,000 from the needed revenues on this account can not be made. This bill can, from no reasonable standpoint, be considered a revenue measure, and other means must be resorted to in taxation to meet the expenditures of the Government. The gentleman from New York shows that between the passage of the Dingley bill, July 25, 1897, and March 16, 1909, there has been \$25,000,000 collected in revenue above disbursements, but he fails to show how much of that sum was produced by the war taxes imposed to meet the expenses of the Spanish war. One thing is evident, the expenses must be greatly curbed. During the calendar year 1908 the increased expenditures over 1907 were \$77,000,000, and this in the midst of the panic. The expenditures in business enterprises decreased, and naturally it would be supposed that the expenditures of the Government would likewise have decreased. Unless an urgent system of economy is inaugurated the pending bill, if enacted into law, must inevitably fail by tens of millions of dollars annually to meet the demands of the Treasury.

The appropriations for next year are \$1,044,014,298.23. Think of it, more than \$12 per capita if distributed to the individual. Now, to meet this it is estimated that \$223,340,712 will be received from postal revenue. It is claimed that \$60,000,000 is for sinking fund on public debt, and need not be paid; that \$35,000,000 is appropriated for the Panama Canal, which can be paid by the sale of bonds under the provisions of this bill. By making these reductions there would be left as a necessary amount to be raised by taxation \$725,673,586.23. To meet this enormous sum the following estimates are made:

From customs duties under the present bill.....	\$305,224,752
From internal revenue.....	251,000,000
From taxes on legacies.....	20,000,000
From miscellaneous sources.....	62,000,000

making in all \$638,224,732.39, which anyone can see will leave a deficiency of over \$87,000,000 per year.

It is claimed for this bill that it will produce \$33,166,748.25 more revenue than existing law. It may be surprising to know that after all that has been said about the revenue features of this bill it proposes only \$11,666,748.25 more than the Dingley law on customs duties. In fact, it produces less by nearly \$3,000,000 than the present law on all schedules excepting agriculture. Agricultural products and provisions are increased \$14,010,392.33. It might be expected naturally that any extra burdens would bear more heavily on agriculture than anything else. But, in this case, this enormous increase in agricultural schedules was ostensibly for the protection and benefit of the farmer. Notice how this is worked out. Tea, which has been on the free list, is taxed 8 cents per pound. This product is all imported so that there is no protection to the American producer or laborer in levying the tax. There was imported for consumption last year 99,420,859 pounds. If there should be the same importation next year, it would yield a revenue under the proposed law of \$7,953,668.70. Pepper, mustard, nutmeg, cloves, cinnamon, and nearly all kinds of spices are taken from the free list and taxed 30 per cent of their value, and this would add one and one-half millions more to the revenue. Not content with these heavy taxes on the American table, cocoa has been added to the dutiable list with a tax of 4 cents per pound, which amounts on the present importations to \$3,200,000 more.

Apparently not satisfied with this burden placed on the farmer under the guise of protection to his industries, but in fact adding directly to his expenses for the necessities of life which go into every-day home consumption, there has been taken from the dutiable list with a tax of 15 cents per pound hides, which are produced by the cattle raisers of the country, that the Boston shoe merchant may secure his leather cheaper. This loss to the western farmer has not been fully compensated. If there was a material reduction on the importation prices of boots and shoes, then there could be little complaint, but in

this particular there is apparently splendid foundation for the charge that this bill is drawn in the interests of the eastern manufacturers. The people generally are favorable to free hides, but they wish free boots and shoes as well.

It is surprising what misleading arguments are sometimes made. For example, the gentleman from Ohio undertook to show that the 1867 tariff of 12½ cents per pound on wool was the cause of the marvelous increase in the wool clip from 160,000,000 pounds in 1867 to 308,000,000 pounds in 1885. Then, I ask, why was there less wool produced in 1872, for the law had been in existence five years, than when it was first enacted? There has been practically the same rate of taxation since the existence of the Dingley law. On the same principle, why were there 62,000,000 sheep in 1902 and only 45,000,000 in 1905? Why were there 64,000,000 sheep in 1903 and never within 10,000,000 of that number since that time? Why was the price of wool to the farmer in 1908 so much reduced from earlier years? Why were sheep worth \$178,000,000 in 1901 and only \$127,000,000 in 1905, a falling off in value of nearly 30 per cent in four years?

I do not controvert the fact that tax on wool increases the price to the woolgrower, because our people are importers of wool and not exporters. The annual production is about 300,000,000 pounds, and there are imported over 200,000,000 pounds; but our market, after all, is largely controlled by the question of supply and demand. The scarcity of wool in the world increases the price here, and a surplus in the world's supply will lessen it. The gentleman from Ohio left the impression that the American horse was valuable only because of the tariff, and that the value increases as the tariff increases. In illustration he shows that horses were worth less in 1897 under the Wilson bill than in 1893 under the McKinley law, and were worth more in 1908 under the Dingley tariff than in 1893. But he fails to explain that horses were worth \$74 per head in 1889, when Mr. Cleveland first went out of office, and that they declined each year and were only worth \$61 per head when he was inaugurated the second time. Why not be fair in these discussions, and admit the truth—that none of the tariffs, high or low, are responsible for the price of horses? When they are in demand, they are high, and when there is an oversupply, horses are cheap.

The gentleman from Washington likewise digressed from the discussion of the merits of the pending bill to make comparison of the prices of farm products. He said:

It is the common knowledge of all men that shortly after 1894, about 1897, that the prices in this connection began to rise and rose very rapidly all the time up to 1904 and past that date.

I ask that the record be examined to ascertain the truth of this statement. Take wheat, the great staple crop of the country. In 1897, the year Mr. Cleveland went out of office, wheat was 80 cents a bushel, and it never reached that price again in any year, with the exception of 1904, until the year 1907. I quote from the Statistical Abstract the price of wheat for the following years:

	Cents.
1897	80.8
1898	58.2
1899	58.4
1900	61.9
1901	62.4
1902	63.0
1903	69.5
1904	92.4
1905	74.8
1906	66.7
1907	87.4

Some gentleman may say your statement begins with the close of the Cleveland administration, and does not show the prices during that time. To be entirely fair, I will give the prices of wheat, commencing in 1890 and ending with 1896, which completes the table:

	Cents.
1890	83.8
1891	83.9
1892	62.4
1893	53.8
1894	49.1
1895	50.9
1896	72.6

It will be observed that from 1890 to 1894, under the McKinley tariff, wheat fell from 83.8 cents to 49.1 cents, and that under the Wilson tariff it rose from 49.1 to 80.8 cents, and that for five years thereafter it was not within 15 cents per bushel of the 1897 prices. Equally surprising facts are found with reference to the price of corn. For example, in 1899, it was worth 30 cents per bushel; in 1901, 60 cents; in 1895, during the Cleveland régime, 45 cents per bushel; and in 1905, under Roosevelt, 41 cents per bushel.

Any comparison which undertakes to charge the low prices of farm products to a low tariff and the high prices of such products to a high tariff are without foundation in fact. The surplus of the staple products of the farm are sold abroad in the open market in competition with the products of the lowest-paid labor in the world.

It is urged that there is a tax on farm products which protects the agriculturalist. How does that help the farmer so long as he is an exporter? Whenever he becomes an importer, or like products are imported, as in the case of the sugar planter, then the tax imposed is a benefit, because the foreign sugar producer or the importer, as the case may be, can not sell here without first paying the duty on sugar. The wheat grower exports annually more than 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and wheat flour. He is dependent wholly upon the export price for his product, which is governed mainly by the supply of wheat in the world. Why was it that wheat was worth less than 50 cents per bushel in 1894? A careful inquiry will develop the fact that it was because there was more wheat produced that year than in any previous year in the world's history. Why did it increase in price to 80 cents per bushel in 1897? Was it because of Grover Cleveland and the Wilson bill? No; but because in that year there was a shortage of 270,000,000 bushels from 1896, and the world production was less by 425,000,000 bushels than in 1894. The world's production in 1891, under the McKinley tariff, was 130,000,000 bushels less than it was in 1893, when it was worth 30 cents per bushel less. If gentlemen were to study the economical conditions and the causes which affect, there would be none of the cheap political cant which charges all of the financial failures to the actions of any political organization. This bill should stand or fall on its merits, and not on any attempt to befog and belittle a great political organization by fallacious declarations, deceptive jugglery of figures, or bitter denunciations. None of these should avail in determining the desirability of the proposed legislation.

There can be no question of the fact that the American people were promised revision of the tariff by both political parties. Notwithstanding this positive pledge to the people, gentlemen wedded to the doctrine of protection have repeatedly asserted that the tariff should be so high as to prevent the importation of any foreign goods in competition with American manufacture. At least three members of the Ways and Means Committee have declared themselves in favor of this position, which is in open violation of platform declarations and in utter disregard of the needs of the people. It is the extreme selfish view in statesmanship, which would have a small part of the people prosper without regard to the well-being of the great mass of mankind whose will should be supreme and whose wishes should be enacted into law. According to the table prepared by the tariff experts who are employed by the Ways and Means Committee to make comparison of the Dingley law and the Payne bill, the present average per cent of customs duties under the several schedules is 44.16 per cent, while under the proposed law the per cent will be 45.72, an increase of 1.56 per cent over the Dingley duties.

COUNTERVAILING DUTIES.

One of the objectionable features of this bill is what is termed "countervailing duties." These are conditional taxes and dependent upon the terms expressed in the provisions of the bill. Petroleum, for illustration, is placed on the free list, but in doing so there is added this proviso:

That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum, or the products of crude petroleum, produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

No one can tell whether there will be any tax on crude petroleum or whether this provision will serve to prohibit importation. It is not known how much the tax may be, because it will depend upon the tax imposed in the country which levies an impost on American products seeking admission there. The interpretation of the law will depend wholly upon the statute of a foreign country. The Standard Oil Company now controls the price of oil in the United States; in fact, it almost controls the world's price. The crude oil is subject to its dictation, whether it owns the oil or buys the product from independent producers. No independent producer can compete with that company, but is completely subject to its monopolistic grasp. If independent competition is attempted, the Standard has the power to crush its competitor. In addition to its enormous holdings in the United States, it owns oil fields wherever oil in paying quantities is found. In every oil-producing country of the world, with the possible exception of Russia, it has possessions. If it is sought in the United States to assert the rights of a competitor, the overmastering power of the Stand-

ard is met at every advanced step. If it is attempted to protect against the foreign competitor, again the Standard is found in the way to progress. How to release its hold, how to meet its control, how to remove its monopolistic power, are the questions which so greatly concern the whole American people. I feel sure that the sentiment in this House is so strongly in favor of the people in this contest that the countervailing duty on petroleum will be removed and it will be placed unconditionally on the free list. The provision now in the law can only benefit the Standard Company, so that no harm can result from removing this barrier to competition from without.

A countervailing provision is attached to the coffee schedule, which makes the law indefinite as to amount of tax and dependent upon the action of the country exporting coffee. It is expressed in this proviso:

That if any country, dependency, province, or colony shall impose an export duty or other export tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, directly or indirectly, upon coffee exported to the United States a duty equal to such export duty, tax, or charge shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon.

Brazil last year sent to the United States three-fourths of the coffee consumed, over 778,000,000 pounds. It furnished over two-thirds of the world's crop. That country has an export tax on coffee of nearly 3 cents per pound. The effect of the passage of this bill would be to levy a tax of 3 cents per pound on all Brazilian coffee. It is claimed that that country would remove this export duty in order to avoid the tax imposed here. It has been plainly shown, however, that Brazil needs the revenue, and, in addition, that its bonded indebtedness is based on the agreement to continue such tax. That country is, therefore, so situated that it can not withdraw the tax. The United States would then impose the 3-cent rate on every pound coming from Brazil. Coffee, therefore, instead of being on the free list, will yield a revenue of many millions of dollars. I feel sure it is safe to predict that this unreasonable and uncertain tax will be removed by placing coffee on the free list without interfering conditions.

Another provisional section will have the effect of preventing the importation of small watches, because it will be impossible to make the engraving required on the case and movements. The prohibitory provision to which I refer is thus expressed:

That all watch movements and cases of foreign manufacture shall have the name of the manufacturer, and of the state, town, or village, and country of manufacture cut, engraved, or die sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the face of the movement and the inside of the case, respectively, and the movements shall also have marked thereon by one of the methods indicated the number of jewels and adjustments, said number to be expressed both in words and in Arabic numerals; and none of the articles shall be delivered to the importer unless marked in exact conformity to this direction.

Why should such a provision be made? Why should the importer, if he pays the customs duties required by law, be excluded? American watches are sold in every market of the world. If the European watch is sent to this country, and the importer is willing to pay the duty here, should the law by its terms have the effect of excluding it? Watches, too, are a commodity which it is admitted are sold away from home much cheaper than in the United States.

The best hidden "joker" found in any schedule in the bill, perhaps, is the countervailing tax on lumber. The conditional clause is splendidly expressed in these words:

That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever upon, or any discrimination against, any forest product exported to the United States, or of any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government forbids or restricts the exportation of any forest product to the United States in any way, there shall be imposed upon all of the forest products of such country when imported into the United States the duties prescribed in section 3 of this act during the continuance of such export duties, charges, embargo, discrimination, or restriction.

This provision is so broad and far-reaching that if any small dependency or division of government in any part of British Columbia should impose an export duty, however slight, upon any product of the forest of any kind, then the Dingley rates are to apply to the products of lumber that may be exported. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], author of this provision, frankly admitted that it would have the effect of retaining the Dingley rate, and was intended to do so. In my judgment, this unfortunate provision will not be in the bill when it goes to the Senate. There will be a reduction of 50 per cent as indicated in the present bill, or a less rate, on lumber, with all conditions removed. The people have a right to know the rate of taxation on anything imported into this country. No law should be so framed as to depend for its construction upon the statutes of another country. Our tariff bills should be so framed that every item in them can be understood at the time of the reading. There are several provisions in the pending bill which no man can understand without reading various other sections in the bill, and in some instances the expres-

sions are so difficult in their meaning that no man can tell in advance what would be the probable construction of a court on the provisions of the bill. Before passing from this phase of the subject I wish to call attention to another proviso. In the schedule fixing the duty on dolls, doll heads, and toys there is named an ad valorem tax of 35 per cent, which is the existing law; then there are added these words:

The toys made in imitation or miniature of, or bearing the same name as, articles that are provided for in the dutiable list of this section by individual or class designation shall pay the same rate of duty as such articles.

Nearly all toys are made in imitation of something real or bearing the name of some article of manufacture. This bill would make the tax on the toy the same as on the object imitated. If a toy is made in imitation of a horse, the duty would be the same as on a horse that might be imported, \$30. On a toy cow the duty would be \$3.75, which is the proposed duty on a cow. Small toy watches, in Europe worth, say, \$1.36 per gross, would, under existing law, pay 49 cents duty, but under the Payne bill there would be required 70 cents for each watch, plus 40 per cent ad valorem on the case, which would amount to \$101.34 per gross, or about 75 cents each. A toy sheep, which would cost less than 10 cents in Europe, would require a duty of \$1.50, because the duty on a sheep is that amount. A toy pistol, which may be imported at 5 cents, would be required to pay a duty of 75 cents and 25 per cent of the value of the pistol, because that is the duty on pistols. These items show the absurdity of this provision. I can not understand on what theory such a suggestion was made, unless it was for the purpose of preventing their importation. The manufacturers of toys, according to the hearings, agreed that 35 per cent ad valorem was a sufficient protection to them. The hearings disclose also a violent protest to the proposed provision, and an urgent demand that it should not be incorporated into law.

DRAWBACKS.

Another scheme provided in this bill is pernicious in its effects. I have reference to what is known as the "drawback" feature; that is, a provision which, in certain specified cases, allows 99 per cent of the duties that have been paid to be refunded to the persons who made payment. For example, where ships are constructed in American shipyards for foreigners, to be used in foreign trade, the duties of all the materials of importation used in building the ship shall be paid back to the shipbuilder. This is a strange provision, in light of present conditions. With the merchant marine of this country fast passing away, with the decline from 65 per cent of the whole carrying trade in 1860 to about 10 per cent of it now, this makes this action the more astounding. Why should ships be built for foreign ownership free from the effects of the tariff, while all duties are imposed in the construction of American ships for American use and ownership?

Section 29 of the bill is so constructed as to make the meaning indefinite. I have conferred with no one who has a fixed idea of what is intended. One of its provisions is—

On the exportation of articles manufactured or produced in the United States either in whole or in part of imported materials, or from domestic materials of equal quantity and protective manufacturing quality and value, such question to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, there shall be allowed a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the imported materials used, or where domestic materials are used, to the duties paid on the equivalent of imported materials less the legal deduction of 1 per cent.

This, whatever else it may accomplish, is intended to have the effect of furnishing free of duty the materials for use in manufacturing articles which may afterwards be exported. It is another forceful illustration of the apparent desire to pave the pathway of the manufacturer with every substantial benefit that a law can give without regard to the rights of the American consumer, who pays the bills.

Another paragraph of the same section relates to the withdrawal of the internal revenue from articles aboard ship and is in these words:

Articles of domestic manufacture and production subject to internal revenue tax may be withdrawn from bonded warehouses free of tax, to be consumed on vessels clearing for foreign countries, and after their departure from the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

There is now a heavy internal revenue tax imposed on all malt and spirituous liquors, tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes, amounting to \$250,000,000 annually. Under the provisions of the pending bill, all articles which pay such taxes can be sold for consumption and use on any vessel clearing for foreign ports entirely exempt from taxation. All revenues are to be remitted. Why should this Government encourage the use and sale of intoxicating beverages and tobacco in every form on the high seas, while it prohibits the American citizen on land from using the same articles unless the revenue duties are fully

paid, and until the individual has first obtained a license to sell and dispose of such commodities?

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, the records showed that over one-half million people took passage from the United States. This gives an idea of the enormous traffic which is encouraged by this unusual concession. The drawbacks under the Dingley law are not nearly so large as those expected under the Payne bill. For the last ten years the drawbacks have averaged more than \$5,000,000 per year. Many think they will be several times that under the Payne bill. In any event, whatever the drawback may be, it is taken from the current revenue and lessens it by the amount thus withdrawn. I ask on principle, Why should the manufacturer be given a royalty to the amount of the customs duties on goods sold for export when the American citizen is required to pay them on goods sold at home? On what economic or ethical basis can such a course be upheld?

MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM RATES.

One of the most radical and serious changes made in existing law is with reference to maximum and minimum rates. Under the Dingley law the maximum rate was charged unless by friendly trade agreement a lower rate was determined upon not below the minimum rate. This had the effect of encouraging trade and was an inducement to fair treatment on peaceful terms. Under the Payne bill the minimum rate is first charged, but all existing treaties as to tariffs are to be annulled in sixty days after the passage of the bill, then the maximum rate is to be charged against every country unless the foreign government shall give the United States as favorable tariff arrangements as are given to any other country.

The minimum rates are the specified rates under the Payne bill. The maximum rates are on an average about 20 per cent higher than the Dingley rates and add 68 paragraphs of the free list to the dutiable list at 20 per cent ad valorem. The purpose of this plan is to coerce trade agreements, to force other nations to make with us the most favorable trade relations. This, in face of the fact that our Government has entered into a treaty with Cuba to favor it in the discrimination of duties beyond all other nations. How can it be expected to drive other nations to terms while this Government is itself favoring Cuba? Leading nations to-day have agreements with one another whereby preferential duties are given in certain instances, and our Government has done likewise. Why should it now seek to annul these treaty stipulations, cause other nations to break up their preferential plans, and drive them if they trade with this Government to readjust their tariff agreements, when our Government would not change its trade relation with Cuba to satisfy any other country?

The strongest plea in favor of the pending bill was made by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINLAY], who insisted that the United States should have a tariff law so high that no goods would ever come into competition with American manufactures, and then the productions of this country should be limited to the needs of our own people. This is the legitimate result of the protective policy, and is the fairest expression of it I ever heard from a Republican. What must become of the American farmer, who has produced more than \$50,000,000 worth of animals each year than is needed for home use and consumption? What will be done with the \$700,000,000 annual surplus of farm products? Where will the market be found for the half billion dollars' worth of manufactured goods that are sold in foreign markets? This country is reaching a point in its development where the vital question is one of the sale of commodities.

The great burning economical proposition is, Where can the products of the American farm, mine, and manufactory find a ready and profitable market? This country is great industrially. Its business thrift and enterprise can not be surpassed. Its natural advantages are the greatest enjoyed by any people. And yet, in direct opposition to the plea of the gentleman from California, is the demand of the American producer for a place where he can dispose of the fruits of his toil at a profit. I can not understand how the American who examines the pending bill in the light of business expansion and economic conditions can indorse the restrictive effect of such a law upon the trade of our country at home and abroad. In the face of a pledge to revise the tariff in the interests of the people, this unequal, unfair, unjust, and grievously burdensome measure can not meet the expectant demands of a generous people. Since the pending bill increases the cost of nearly everything of everyday consumption, from that which makes up the daily bills of fare for the table to the clothes and underwear worn by the inmates of the home, and brings expense and burden rather than relief from the ills already borne, a long-suffering people will certainly condemn it as a measure of oppression, and will see in it a

further yielding to the firm grasp of monopoly rather than the loosening of the bands which now draw the profits of the masses into the coffers of the few. Against this tendency I protest. Legislation should be in the interest of the whole people. They should write the statutes, and as far as I can ascertain their judgment it shall control my action. Believing as I do that the pending bill is not in their interests and will in no way benefit them, I shall cast my vote against it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your kindness and courtesy in extending me recognition at this time, but owing to my physical condition I am not able to proceed. I will avail myself of the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD now or later, in the event I shall be able to address the committee on Monday.

Mr. KORBLY. Mr. Chairman, there is an irreconcilable conflict between two propositions presented by this bill, as indicated in its title. It purports to be a bill to provide revenue and encourage the industries of the United States. This means that the bill is devised primarily for purposes of "protection."

In so far as it tends to "protect" it fails to provide revenue, and in so far as it tends to provide revenue it fails to "protect." It can "protect" only by shutting out imports, and it can provide revenue only by securing imports.

Its proponents are so doubtful of its revenue-producing qualities that they have provided for issuing \$250,000,000 worth of interest-bearing bonds, called "certificates of indebtedness," out of deference to certain critics of a certain Democratic administration. If this inference as to the bond provision is not correct, and if the bill is really expected to produce the needed revenue, then the proponents of the bill certainly must be preparing, not to reduce expenses, but to increase them enormously. There is likewise an irrepressible conflict between the advocates of "protection" and the defenders of man's natural rights. Those who deny to "protection" anything but evil can hardly be expected to discuss the question of how much "protection" is necessary or desirable.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we can achieve "national prosperity" by legislation. Both in and out of Congress many profess to believe this can be done. The proposition that we can tax ourselves rich has been proclaimed so often that the people seem to have a settled conviction that the chief business of Government is to provide prosperity for the Nation. This idea is almost a superstition. If it be true that prosperity flows from legislation, then such prosperity as we have had for the past eighteen months must be the kind to expect from the legislation proposed.

The truth is that legislation can, and often does, interfere with prosperity, but never creates it. We can not make the Nation rich by taxing ourselves, yet that is what the advocates of "protection," as provided in this bill, propose.

"Protection" has been well entrenched since the civil war, and the tariff has, consciously or unconsciously, been surrounded with so much "mystery" that not a few people profess to believe it is not understandable. The debates on the question are not always striking examples of perspicacity, and often are couched in terms which undoubtedly prove that many of the debaters are far from possessing a clear understanding of the question.

The tariff is indeed a vexed question, but it can be understood. To understand it involves merely an accurate description of what takes place in the production and distribution of wealth. The settlement of this question is desirable, and the demand for its settlement is insistent and must be met.

Not a few seem to think it can be settled by taking it out of politics, and many of this class boldly abandon their time-honored claims to greatness on account of tariff legislation in the past and frankly admit that "Congress does not know enough to write a tariff law." "How have the mighty fallen!" Eleven years bring many changes. In this opinion I heartily concur. Congress will never know enough to devise a bill which will successfully provide for both revenue and "protection." Much clamor is now heard for a permanent tariff commission as a means of taking the question out of politics. Somehow the suspicion will not down that these men are trying to let go. It is idle, however, to talk about taking the tariff out of politics. In the very nature of things it must continue a political issue until it is settled, and settled right. Ultimately it will be settled right, as was the slavery question; but, like the slavery question, it will be a long time in the settlement. So tariff reformers ought not to despair.

It is equally idle to talk about settling this question by referring it to a permanent tariff commission. The proposition involved is that a committee of experts will determine the amount of "protection" needed. The defenders of the doctrine that man has natural rights will never subscribe to this propo-

sition. The underlying principle of American institutions is the innate capacity of the people to settle for themselves all questions of government. This principle recognizes the certitude of reason and the natural dignity of man. Consequently this question will have to be settled by the people in the court of reason; and, in my opinion, they will never submit to a "committee of experts" questions which, in the very nature of things, and as a matter of right and duty, they must settle for themselves.

This proposition may draw upon me the scorn of protectionists, who seem to deny the certitude of reason, and cause them to say sneeringly that I learned this out of books. Book learning, it appears, is good in all branches of activity except "national prosperity." The kind of learning that is good in that behalf is evolved from the "inner consciousness" of "statesmen," who do not learn from books.

In this connection it may not be amiss to say that the people are coming to understand clearly that if a Congressman has to depend upon what he learns from the "tariff hearings" to equip him for "statesmanship," he is unfit for that important office.

Tariff reform has gained a tremendous impetus in the past two years. Time was when the people probably believed the story that panics came because the Democrats "tinkered" with the tariff. But we have just had a panic, and it came at a time when protectionists were in power, and had been uninterruptedly in power for more than ten years. It also came in a time of peace, and in the very midst of harvesting one of the most bountiful crops ever recorded in the history of the Nation, and the truth is its shadow is still upon the land.

Many thoughtful men were convinced that this panic would arouse the people on the question of banking and currency reform, which is woefully needed, and it did; but it aroused them more on the tariff question. The people evidently have taken this panic as conclusive proof of the error of the oft-repeated assertion that panics come only after the Democrats "monkey" with the tariff.

The people have a suspicion that the "protective" tariff has caused the "increased cost of living," and accordingly have voted for a revision of the tariff "by its friends." The word "revision" is susceptible of several interpretations, however, and time alone will disclose, Mr. Chairman, whether or not the revision now in process by the friends of a "protective" tariff will be upward or downward, and whether or not it will give relief.

The agitation for relief will not down. If we are to get relief, reform must be along natural lines and in full recognition of the truth that natural laws govern the production and distribution of wealth, and that more human misery flows from ignorance of natural laws than from all the crimes of history.

Protectionists seem to lose sight of the fact that legislative interference with natural laws is inevitably followed by human misery. Nature always provides punishment for violation of her laws, and from nature's decrees there is no appeal. The punishment for our attempts to provide "national prosperity" by act of Congress is the "increased cost of living."

Reforms are accomplished slowly, and tariff reform will be no exception. It will come when the people give a mandate for it, but not before. Perhaps the people will have to endure much increase in the "cost of living" before they will seriously examine "protection" on its merits, but their burdens under "protection" will increase progressively and finally become unbearable. When that time comes, and it is sure to come, "protection" will hear its death knell.

The power to tax is the power to take away from the people the fruits of their toil, their property, their food and clothing and homes. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Taxes, therefore, ought to be sparingly and justly laid and collected, and the measure of justice is the equality of the burden and the needs of government economically administered.

As the tariff is a tax, it is excusable as a revenue producer, but not otherwise. A tariff for purposes other than revenue is unequal and unjust. A tariff for "protection" is a special privilege of the worst kind, and violates the rights of property. The right of the citizen in his property is a natural right of man, a right which government does not give and can not take away, a right which is guaranteed by the Constitution, but denied by act of Congress. Congress has not the right to lay a tax to be collected by private interests, yet that is the effect of "protection."

The tariff is essentially a question of political economy, concerning as it does the production and distribution of wealth.

Economically speaking, the Nation is not a unit. Political lines and national boundaries are not made for economic reasons. If Mr. Jefferson had not bought Louisiana, the "disas-

ters" which would have followed the years of unrestrained commerce between the people of that section and the people of the old Northwest Territory would be dreadful to contemplate. Had Nova Scotia joined in the Revolution it would not now be necessary to "protect" the people of Boston against Nova Scotia coal. Had we conquered Canada in 1812 we would not now have to "protect" ourselves against her lumber. Had Texas maintained her separate sovereignty, we could not now allow our citizens liberty to buy Texas beef.

Inasmuch as Mexico is a separate sovereignty we may not use her petroleum, even though it be so plentiful as to run into the sea, as it does, according to the gentleman from New York [Mr. VREELAND].

In the face of the overwhelming disaster which befell San Francisco recently we forgot to protest against the contributions of food and clothing made by the "pauperized" peoples of Europe. We forget to rejoice over disasters which befall other peoples, and when famine is their lot we divide with them our food and clothing. We forget that we used our navy as an instrument of mercy recently to carry food and clothing to the hungry and the naked in southern Italy.

Yet Congress is full of "statesmen" who regard the exchange of food and clothing, building material, and household furniture as "commercial warfare," and who inveigh against importations as "invasion," and who predict that freedom and liberty in the matter of exchange will result in the "capture" of our markets and the "annihilation" of our industries. These are the men who are now engaged in rehabilitating our "national prosperity."

Protectionists seem to regard money as wealth, but money is not wealth. Wealth consists of goods, broadly classified as food, clothing, and homes. Wealth is produced, not by act of Congress, but by labor. Wealth is produced, not in Congress, but on the farms and in the mines and factories. Wealth is the product of labor coupled with nature. Nature does much; labor does little. The sun and the rain and the wind are not negligible quantities in the scheme. The production of wealth is, however, scarcely more important to mankind than its distribution.

The distribution of wealth involves the machinery of exchange, the machinery for transferring the ownership of property from one person to another, and transportation. But transportation is another question. The machinery for transferring ownership consists of money and banking.

Protectionists do not seem to understand the nature of money and banking. Money is a measure of value. It is also a tool or instrument for transferring the ownership of property. About 5 per cent of the business of the country is done with money. The other 95 per cent is done without the use of money, save as a measure of value, by means of banks.

In this age it is no longer possible for a man to supply all his needs with his own hands. Specialists in all branches of activity produce wealth which is placed in the common fund of commerce. Originally men exchanged or traded their products directly; for instance, a bushel of wheat for a yard of cloth. This was direct barter. Specialization developed variety of products, and then direct barter consumed so much time that it became burdensome, so double barter was invented. Double barter consists of trading general products for one particular product, which particular product by common consent is made the measure of value and the medium of exchange.

For ages this particular product has been the precious metals and has been called "money." Money is to-day the measure of value throughout the civilized world, but it is a very limited medium of exchange. Specialization and the development of labor-saving machinery so increased the quantity and variety of the product of man's labor, and so complicated the process of exchange, that money was no longer adequate to the work of transferring the ownership of products, and banking was devised for the purpose. Hence, among other things, a bank is a machine for the transfer of the ownership of property, and banks and clearing houses to-day are actually engaged in transferring the ownership of property from one person to another and without the use of money, save as a measure of value. In short, one piece of property is traded for another piece of property at an agreed valuation through banks by means of checks and clearing houses.

Overwhelming necessity brought this about, for no civilized country possesses or can possess money enough to effect the transfers of ownership in modern domestic commerce; and the civilized world does not possess enough money to effect even the transfers of the ownership of property between the citizens of the several nations.

International commerce is merely the exchange of products between citizens of the several nations. The citizen trades—no#

the nation. What takes place every day in the clearing house of an American city is exactly what takes place in international commerce. One commodity is traded for another commodity.

Millions of dollars' worth of commodities and property are exchanged every day, and scarcely any money at all is used even in settlement of the balances.

The imports and exports of merchandise by the people of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, were more than \$3,000,000,000 in value, which is more than all the gold and silver coin and bank notes in the United States. Yes; and it is more than all the gold imported by the United States in one hundred and seventeen years.

The imports of merchandise for the year mentioned amounted to more than \$1,194,000,000 worth, and the exports amounted to more than \$1,860,000,000 worth, an excess of exports over imports of more than \$666,000,000 worth of goods.

Our imports of gold and silver for the year mentioned were \$192,975,418 and our exports \$130,354,926, an excess of imports of \$62,620,492. Last year, it will be remembered, bankers, on account of the scarcity of currency due to the panic, imported an unusually large amount of gold.

Our exports of merchandise last year, it appears, exceeded our imports by more than \$600,000,000 worth. Yet our imports of gold and silver exceeded our exports by less than \$63,000,000. This leaves more than \$600,000,000 worth of merchandise exported last year for which, apparently, the American citizens were not paid. I say "apparently," for, in fact, the foreigner pays for this excess of merchandise exports in several ways: By services rendered—such as carrying merchandise across the sea, which will probably account for \$200,000,000—by banking the various transactions, and by feeding, clothing, housing, transporting, and otherwise serving vast numbers of American tourists who roam foreign lands in quest of excitement, pleasure, and knowledge.

Hence we must conclude that our exports certainly are paid for in other things than money. Hence we are driven to the conclusion that for every dollar's worth of commodities or other property sent by an American citizen to a foreign country a dollar's worth of commodities, property, or service must come from some citizen of some foreign country to this country in payment.

Protectionists delight in talking about the "favorable balance of trade," and point with pride to the fact that we "sell more than we buy." Apparently they are superficial enough to believe that because we export more merchandise than we import we therefore sell more than we buy, and that the difference between what we "sell" and what we "buy" is paid to us in money, and that money, after all, is the one desirable thing, and that the receipt of this money is the proof of our prosperity and their wisdom.

The following tables, which are official compilations, conclusively prove the folly of the "balance of trade" doctrine, and the error of the inference drawn by protectionists that we get in money the difference between what we buy and sell:

Gold coin and bullion imported and exported and annual excess of imports or exports from 1864 to 1907.

Year ended June 30—	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of—	
			Exports over imports.	Imports over exports.
	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
1864	100,661,634	11,176,769	89,484,865	—
1865	58,381,033	6,408,228	51,972,805	—
1866	71,197,309	8,196,261	63,001,048	—
1867	39,026,627	17,024,866	22,001,761	—
1868	72,396,344	8,737,443	63,658,901	—
1869	36,008,498	14,132,568	21,875,930	—
1870	33,635,962	12,056,950	21,579,012	—
1871	66,686,208	6,883,561	59,802,647	—
1872	49,548,760	8,717,458	40,831,302	—
1873	44,856,715	8,682,447	36,174,268	—
1874	34,042,420	19,593,137	14,449,283	—
1875	66,980,977	13,696,793	53,284,184	—
1876	31,177,050	7,992,709	23,184,341	—
1877	26,590,374	26,246,234	344,140	—
1878	9,204,455	13,330,215	—	4,125,760
1879	4,587,614	5,024,948	—	1,037,334
1880	3,639,025	80,768,396	—	77,119,371
1881	2,565,132	100,081,259	—	97,466,127
1882	32,587,889	34,377,054	—	1,789,174
1883	11,600,888	17,734,149	—	6,133,261
1884	41,081,957	22,831,317	18,250,640	—
1885	8,477,892	26,661,096	—	18,213,804
1886	42,962,191	20,743,349	22,208,842	—
1887	9,701,187	42,910,601	—	33,209,414
1888	18,376,234	43,984,317	—	25,558,083
1889	59,932,285	10,284,868	49,667,427	—
1890	17,274,491	12,943,342	4,331,149	—

Gold coin and bullion imported and exported and annual excess of imports or exports from 1864 to 1907—Continued.

Year ended June 30—	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of—	
			Exports over imports.	Imports over exports.
	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
1891	86,362,654	18,232,567	68,130,087	—
1892	50,195,327	49,699,454	—	495,873
1893	108,680,844	21,174,381	87,506,463	—
1894	76,978,061	72,449,119	4,528,942	—
1895	66,468,481	36,384,700	30,083,721	—
1896	112,409,947	33,525,065	78,884,882	—
1897	40,361,580	85,014,780	—	44,653,200
1898	15,406,391	120,391,674	—	104,985,283
1899	37,522,066	88,954,603	—	51,432,517
1900	48,266,759	44,573,184	3,693,575	—
1901	53,183,177	66,051,187	—	12,868,010
1902	48,568,950	52,021,254	—	3,452,304
1903	47,090,595	44,982,027	2,108,568	—
1904	81,459,866	99,055,368	—	17,595,502
1905	92,594,024	53,648,961	38,945,063	—
1906	38,573,591	96,221,730	—	57,648,139
1907	51,399,176	114,510,249	—	63,111,073

Silver coin and bullion imported and exported and annual excess of exports over imports from 1864 to 1907.

Year ended June 30—	Exports.	Imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	
			Dollars.	Dollars.
1864	4,734,907	1,938,843	2,796,064	—
1865	9,262,193	3,311,844	5,950,349	—
1866	14,846,762	2,508,831	12,337,931	—
1867	21,841,745	5,045,609	16,796,136	—
1868	21,387,758	5,450,925	15,936,833	—
1869	21,134,882	5,675,308	15,459,574	—
1870	24,519,704	14,362,229	10,157,475	—
1871	31,755,780	14,386,463	17,369,317	—
1872	30,328,774	5,026,231	25,302,543	—
1873	39,751,859	12,798,490	26,953,369	—
1874	32,687,985	8,951,769	23,636,216	—
1875	25,151,165	7,203,924	17,947,241	—
1876	25,329,252	7,943,972	17,385,280	—
1877	29,571,863	14,528,180	15,043,683	—
1878	24,535,670	16,491,090	8,044,571	—
1879	20,409,827	14,671,052	5,738,775	—
1880	13,603,894	12,275,914	1,327,980	—
1881	16,841,715	10,544,238	6,297,477	—
1882	16,829,569	8,095,336	8,734,233	—
1883	20,219,445	10,775,242	9,444,203	—
1884	26,051,426	14,594,945	11,456,481	—
1885	33,758,633	16,550,627	17,208,006	—
1886	29,511,219	17,850,307	11,660,912	—
1887	26,296,504	17,290,191	9,006,313	—
1888	28,037,949	15,408,669	12,629,280	—
1889	36,689,248	18,678,215	18,011,033	—
1890	34,873,929	21,032,984	13,840,945	—
1891	22,590,988	18,026,880	4,564,108	—
1892	32,310,559	19,955,066	12,355,473	—
1893	40,737,319	23,198,252	17,539,067	—
1894	50,451,265	13,286,552	37,164,713	—
1895	47,295,286	20,211,179	27,084,107	—
1896	60,541,670	28,777,186	31,764,484	—
1897	61,946,638	30,533,237	31,413,411	—
1898	55,105,239	30,927,781	24,177,458	—
1899	56,319,055	30,675,056	25,643,999	—
1900	56,712,275	35,256,302	21,455,973	—
1901	64,285,180	36,386,521	27,898,659	—
1902	49,732,390	28,232,254	21,410,136	—
1903	44,250,259	24,163,491	20,086,768	—
1904	49,472,702	27,768,314	21,704,388	—
1905	48,848,312	27,484,895	21,363,417	—
1906	65,869,068	44,442,540	21,426,528	—
1907	56,739,073	42,946,624	13,792,449	—

Merchandise imported and exported, and the annual excess of imports or exports: Specie values, 1864 to 1907.

Year ended June 30—	Exports.	Imports.	Total exports and imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	
				Dollars.	Dollars.
1864	158,837,968	316,447,283	475,285,271	—	157,609,295
1865	166,029,303	238,745,580	404,774,883	—	72,716,277
1866	348,859,522	434,812,066	783,671,588	—	85,932,544
1867	294,506,141	395,761,096	690,267,237	—	101,251,955
1868	281,962,899	357,436,440	639,399,339	—	75,433,541
1869	286,117,697	417,506,379	703,624,076	—	131,388,682
1870	392,771,768	435,958,408	828,730,176	—	43,180,640
1871	442,330,178	520,223,684	962,553,862	—	77,403,506
1872	444,177,580	626,595,077	1,070,772,657	—	182,417,491
1873	522,479,922	642,136,210	1,164,616,132	—	119,656,288
1874	596,288,040	567,406,342	1,163,694,382	18,876,698	—
1875	513,442,711	533,065,430	1,046,508,141	—	19,562,725
1876	540,384,671	400,741,190	1,001,125,861	—	70,643,481
1877	602,475,220	451,323,126	1,053,798,346	—	151,152,094
1878	694,865,760	437,051,532	1,131,917,292	—	257,814,234
1879	710,439,441	445,777,775	1,156,217,216	—	264,617,660

Merchandise imported and exported, and the annual excess of imports or exports: Specie values, 1864 to 1907—Continued.

Year ended June 30—	Exports.	Imports.	Total exports and imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	Excess of imports over exports.
	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
1880.....	835,638,658	667,964,746	1,503,598,404	167,683,912
1881.....	902,377,346	642,664,628	1,545,041,974	259,712,718
1882.....	750,542,257	724,639,574	1,475,181,831	25,902,683
1883.....	823,839,402	723,180,914	1,547,020,316	100,658,488
1884.....	740,513,609	667,697,693	1,408,211,302	72,815,916
1885.....	742,189,755	577,527,329	1,319,717,084	164,662,426
1886.....	679,524,830	635,436,136	1,314,960,966	44,088,694
1887.....	716,183,211	692,319,768	1,408,502,979	23,863,443
1888.....	695,954,507	723,957,114	1,419,911,621	28,002,607
1889.....	742,401,375	745,131,652	1,487,533,027	2,730,277
1890.....	857,828,684	789,310,409	1,647,139,093	68,518,275
1891.....	884,480,810	844,916,196	1,729,397,006	39,564,614
1892.....	1,030,278,148	827,402,462	1,857,680,610	202,875,686
1893.....	847,665,194	866,400,922	1,714,066,116	18,735,728
1894.....	892,140,572	654,994,622	1,547,135,194	237,145,590
1895.....	807,538,165	731,969,965	1,539,508,130	75,568,200
1896.....	882,606,988	779,724,674	1,662,331,612	102,882,264
1897.....	1,050,998,556	764,730,412	1,815,728,968	286,268,144
1898.....	1,231,482,330	616,049,654	1,847,531,984	615,432,676
1899.....	1,227,023,302	607,148,489	1,924,171,791	529,874,813
1900.....	1,394,483,082	849,941,184	2,244,424,266	544,541,898
1901.....	1,487,764,961	823,172,165	2,310,937,126	664,592,826
1902.....	1,381,719,401	908,320,948	2,289,040,349	478,398,453
1903.....	1,420,141,679	1,025,719,237	2,445,860,916	394,422,442
1904.....	1,460,827,271	991,067,371	2,451,914,642	469,739,900
1905.....	1,518,561,666	1,117,513,071	2,636,074,737	401,048,595
1906.....	1,743,864,500	1,226,562,446	2,970,426,946	517,302,054
1907.....	1,880,851,078	1,434,421,425	3,315,272,503	446,429,653

Without exception, since 1864 our exports of silver yearly have exceeded our imports; and our exports of gold have largely exceeded our imports for the period named.

For each of the past thirty-three years, with but four exceptions, our imports of merchandise have largely exceeded in value our exports of merchandise.

So we find from government statistics that for the last forty-three years our exports of merchandise and our exports of money have largely exceeded our imports of merchandise and our imports of money.

The following totals of imports and exports, from 1790 to 1908, inclusive, a period of one hundred and eighteen years, as they appear in the historical table of imports and exports, Annual Review of the Foreign Commerce of the United States, page 30, are illuminating:

Merchandise exports.....	\$46,328,213,301
Merchandise imports.....	40,243,189,615
Excess exports.....	6,085,023,686
Gold and silver exports.....	4,521,866,830
Gold and silver imports.....	3,090,520,768
Excess exports.....	1,431,346,062
Merchandise and gold and silver exports.....	50,850,080,131
Merchandise and gold and silver imports.....	43,333,710,383
Excess combined exports.....	7,516,369,748

In the light of these facts, what becomes of the idea that "money is wealth?" What becomes of the idea that only one party to a transaction can make a profit, and that the one who gets the money? What becomes of our boasted "favorable balance of trade?" What becomes of the claim that the difference between what we "buy" and "sell" comes to us in money? What becomes of the "home market?" What becomes of the "maximum and minimum rates for securing foreign markets?" What becomes of the prediction that a tariff for revenue only will cause our country to be "flooded" with "cheap" products of foreign "pauper" labor? Does not such talk show an ignorance of commerce that is appalling?

Scarcely 10 per cent of any nation's total annual product is exported or can be exported. More than 90 per cent of the products of each nation is consumed at home. War or famine may increase a nation's imports, but if the increase is due to war, the imports as a rule are to be paid for in the future; if the increase is due to famine or other like disaster, the imports are often a gift prompted by humanitarian motives.

The protectionists boldly assert that their policy gives "labor" to the people, from which it might be inferred that they look upon labor as a blessing. But labor is a curse. We read in Genesis that God drove Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden on account of their sins. Therefore they had dominion over the earth and enjoyed whatever they wanted without working for it. But when God drove them from the garden He put a curse upon them, and said to them:

All the days of thy life shalt thou eat thy bread in the sweat of thy brow.

No one works because it is pleasant, but because it is necessary. We do not live to work, but we work to live. We work to overcome obstacles to our well-being, our prosperity. We need food, clothing, and homes; so we toil to secure these things. As soon as we have supplied one want we are confronted with another. We want more than just enough for our subsistence. We are always confronted with desires. We do not need an act of Congress to give us work.

In proof of this, I call as witnesses the countless numbers of men and women in our large cities who tramp from house to house and from factory to factory seeking—what? Not labor, for they are weary now from the labor of their quest. They know full well that no other labor is quite so hard as that of going from place to place seeking a chance to expend time and energy in the production of things which may be exchanged for food and clothing and shelter. They want bread, not work.

Work is a curse, not a blessing; yet "protection" makes us work harder to get what we need and want than we would have to work if we did not have "protection." We want more food, more clothing, more homes, more leisure, but we want less work.

By our unnatural laws we have built up unnatural industries, overcrowded our cities, hampered exchange, and lessened the productive power of our people, and as a consequence we suffer and our highly artificial system periodically breaks down and our sufferings are then accentuated. Then thousands of men and women suddenly are unable to get food for themselves. What must they think of legislation that gives them work, but prevents them from getting food?

When Christ told us how to pray, He bade us ask, not for our daily work, but for our "daily bread." When the multitude followed the gentle Nazarene on the occasion of the Sermon on the Mount, He did not tell them to catch fish and bake bread for themselves, but He took compassion upon them and multiplied the loaves and fishes that they might eat.

Oh, that was "cheap labor!" By eating that bread those poor people "robbed" themselves of the "advantage" of producing it themselves and "threw themselves out of work."

What of a man who refuses to live in a house already built, because, forsooth, by so doing he "robs" himself of the work of building a house, and who builds a new house out of new material to "protect" himself against "cheap labor?"

No doubt had some protectionist been present when God rained manna down from heaven for His chosen people, whilst Moses was leading them from the land of bondage into the land of promise, he would have warned them against the economic error of eating such food, for was it not "from a foreign country?" Was it not the product of "cheap labor?" Did it not literally "flood" the country with a "cheap" product? Was it not "dumped" on their shores? Was not the country "inundated" with it? Did it not "rob" the people of work? Did it not "annihilate" an industry? Did it not "paralyze" commerce?

By their words, protectionists seem to fear abundance and plenty, and by their acts they cause scarcity and want.

The rights of property are loudly proclaimed by the protected interests in their contests with organized labor, but these same interests seem to possess very obscure ideas about the rights of property when it comes to tariff schedules. The tariff is now and for many years has been and will no doubt continue to be laid primarily for the purpose of "protecting" industries. When a tariff is so laid it is an unwarranted interference with the production of wealth as well as a controlling factor in its unequal distribution.

"Protection" diverts capital and labor from natural channels to unnatural channels, from enterprises which are naturally profitable to enterprises which are naturally unprofitable, from industries which add to the stock of the world's wealth to industries which subtract from the stock of the world's wealth. In other words, "protection" constrains men to produce certain things, while without "protection" they could and would produce other things. It causes them to consume more time, more food, and more clothing whilst producing them than they will naturally exchange for after they are produced.

Hence it is these enterprises need "protection." "Protection" simply compels other people to give to the owners of these enterprises food and clothing which the owners of these enterprises could not under freedom get for themselves by exchange. In other words, the owners of these enterprises can not exchange their products for enough food and clothing to sustain life, so they have a law passed, called "protection," which forces the people to supply them with the difference, called "a reasonable profit."

Therefore the effect of "protection" is actually to lessen the production of wealth. This is so, whether the industry can or

can not continue without "protection." It is important to bear in mind, however, that there are not many cases where they can not continue without help. In most cases enterprises are not dependent upon "protection" at all. The owners of most protected industries simply fatten on what the law enables them to take away from other people.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if anyone says that I am in favor of destroying industries, I answer that any industry which can not sustain itself is a stumbling block to the Nation, and the sooner the men engaged in it get into some other enterprise which will make them self-supporting the better it will be for all concerned.

Under "protection," therefore, there is not as much wealth for distribution as there is under freedom. Under "protection" there is scarcity of wealth. This scarcity is felt by the people, but they do not perceive that food and clothing and building material are scarce; they just perceive that these things are "high priced." So scarcity manifests itself by increasing the cost of living. They do not get as much as they used to get and have to work harder to get it.

Under "protection" an inventory of the products of labor discloses less wealth, less food, clothing, building material, and household furniture in the land than under natural conditions, under freedom and liberty.

"Protection," we have seen, gives to some people the right, under the acts of Congress, to levy tribute upon other people; that is to say, our tariff laws enable some to take away from others the products of their labor—their food, clothing, household furniture, and building material—without giving them anything in return.

Perhaps I shall be denounced as a free trader, and this naturally presents for inquiry the meaning of the word "free," as used in this connection. As I understand it, it means that the citizen shall be at liberty to trade with whomsoever he pleases. It means that if a man produces something, he may exchange it for something produced by anybody else on earth. This is the natural condition of trade. If there were no statutes concerning trade and exchange, all men would be at liberty to trade with whomsoever they pleased. If a man is not free, what is his condition? If a man is not free, it is because his liberty has been taken away from him. A man in this condition is forced to do something he does not want to do and would not do if he were free. Why is he deprived of liberty and freedom? Is it that some one may compel him to accept a lot of good things which he desires and needs, or is it that some one may compel him to give up a lot of good things which he has produced by hard work? Man has always been deprived of liberty because some one wanted to rob him. Oppression has always had spoliation for its purpose.

Liberty is the natural right of man. The Declaration of Independence defines liberty as an inalienable right of man given to him by his Creator, and declares that government is instituted for the purpose of securing to him this right. I am old fashioned enough to believe that the Constitution guarantees to me this right. I am bold enough to say that I resent any attempt to deprive me of this right upon any ground whatsoever.

The pretext and refuge of "protectionists" is the "greatest good to the greatest number." This is a damnable doctrine. The natural right of the humblest citizen is far superior to the greatest good of the greatest number.

It is far better that a hundred guilty men go free than that one man should suffer unjustly.

No one will deny that what a man produces with his own labor belongs to him. He may do with it what he pleases—consume it himself, exchange it for his neighbor's product, or give it away. He may take it across the sea and give it away over there and not even a protectionist will complain. He may exchange it over there for some other fellow's product and no one will complain. So long as he does not bring the other fellow's product back to this country there will be no complaint. As soon as that is done, however, complaint is heard. Strange to say, the complaint is not that the foreigner has cheated and given too little, but that he has given too much. The more he gives, the louder the complaint.

If, for instance, an American citizen produces a thousand cigars and takes them to Berlin and exchanges them for 1,000 pencils, no one will complain until the pencils are brought to America. Then the American will be told that he has brought back too many pencils for his own good, as well as too many for the good of the country.

The customs-house officer will tell him that in view of these "facts" and the laws of the land based upon them, it will be necessary to take half the pencils away from him. Inquiry will develop the fact that the Government wants half the pencils for revenue to help support the Government (more or less economically administered), but it will further disclose the

fact that the Government wishes to discourage the American from bringing home "too many" pencils in the future.

In fact, according to protectionists, the more pencils the American brings back, "the worse" for the country; the fewer, "the better." Because, by bringing back "too many" pencils Americans are "deprived of the opportunity of producing pencils by their own labor."

The cigar maker, as a result of his trade, has only 500 pencils left for himself, and he concludes that the effect of the transaction is exactly the same as if the Government had taken one-half his cigars in the first place. In fact, he would be better off if it had, for that would have saved him the expense of his trip to Europe. He consoles himself, however, with the thought that he is helping to support the Government. His experience with the Government, however, results in a determination to trade in the future on this side of the ocean, in compliance with its wishes. He accordingly goes to the home pencil maker the next time and asks how many pencils he will give for 1,000 cigars. The pencil maker looks at his price list and answers:

I will give you 500 pencils for your thousand cigars.
But I can get a thousand pencils in Berlin for a thousand cigars—

Says the cigar maker.

That's true—

Says the pencil maker—

but you can't use them in this country. I have great influence with Congress and have had a law passed which will take half the Berlin pencils away from you if you bring them home. Now, I am not fool enough to give you more pencils than I have to, and as 500 is the best you can do by going to Berlin, it is, under the circumstances, the best I will do for you.

The cigar maker, as a result of his second trade, again has but 500 pencils left for himself.

In the first instance the Government, in effect, took half his cigars away from him and gave him nothing in return but "good government." In the second instance the pencil maker, in effect, took half his cigars away from him and gave him nothing in return at all.

This fairly illustrates not only how "protection" interferes with the distribution of wealth and enables some people to appropriate other people's property, but it gives us an inkling of the manner in which some people grow rich and others grow poor, and it throws a flood of light on the increase in the cost of living due to scarcity.

Note that the American produces 1,000 cigars and exchanges them for 1,000 Berlin pencils. The country needs the pencils, but does not need the cigars, so the country gains by the trade. The other country needs the cigars, but not the pencils, so it is also gainer by the trade. But, on account of "protection," the American loses one-half his product because the Government takes it away from him. Between him and the Government, however, the country gets 1,000 pencils, all that is coming to it. But "protection encourages industries." The American pencil maker produces 500 pencils, which he trades to the cigar maker for 1,000 cigars. The Government gets nothing; the cigar maker gets but half what he could get under freedom; therefore there are in the country on account of "protection" 500 less pencils than there otherwise would be. Therefore the net result of "stimulating" American industries by "protection" is a net shortage of 500 pencils.

The country needs 1,000 pencils, and has but 500; it does not need cigars, and has 1,000 of them. Under freedom the two Americans could have produced by foreign exchange 2,000 pencils; but we have "protection," so must manage to get along without 1,000 cigars and 500 pencils.

By trading with a foreigner under "protection" the citizen alone meets with a loss, but by trading with home producers under "protection" the citizen and the Nation both meet with a loss. The tariff as a revenue producer impoverishes the citizen; the tariff as an "industry stimulator" impoverishes both the citizen and the Nation.

Not only does a tariff for "protection" lessen production and thereby create scarcity, which is only another word for "famine," but it also enables some people to take things away from other people without giving them anything in return.

Therefore, a protective tariff decreases the wealth of the country and causes the decreased wealth to be distributed in such a way that much of it goes to a few and but little of it goes to the many.

By the tariff tax the Government yearly takes away from the people vast quantities of their products for its support. These products are used in government work and by people employed in government work, and includes government supplies of all kinds, and food and clothing for officeholders and public servants. The value of these products in money exceeds

three hundred millions of dollars yearly. But for every dollar's worth of products taken by this tax for government use, there are many dollars' worth taken by the owners of "protected" industries for their use. This is what protectionists describe as "stimulating" industries and "developing" resources. If the owners of these "protected" industries were not permitted to appropriate other people's property they would have to produce property themselves, and if they produced it there would not be a scarcity, and "high prices" would not distress the people.

It is a "great" system. In an almost virgin country, after fifty years of "protection," we have the spectacle of numerous trusts and monopolies in continuous struggle with organized labor over the question of wages.

In Europe there are several hundred people to the square mile, while in the United States there are but 27 people to the square mile. In England and Wales there is enough land to give about 6 acres to the family, whilst in the United States each family may have more than 200 acres. England and Wales have not enough land to support their people—we have more than enough.

Yet we find American cities overcrowded. European cities are overcrowded because land is not available for the people. Such is not the case in this country. Conditions in this respect are so obviously wrong that the President—Mr. Roosevelt—was constrained to appoint a commission to inquire into the conditions of farm life in the United States. The appointment of this commission certainly is in harmony with "prosperity by legislation."

We refuse to take European manufactures, hence they can not take our farm products, for, remember, a dollar's worth of exports means a dollar's worth of imports. If we will not buy, we can not sell. We shut out foreign products by a protective tariff, which also shuts in home products; then we devise a maximum and minimum tariff for the extension of our foreign commerce. Great statesmanship, indeed!

European peoples produce more than twice as much wheat as all the people of North America, who produce but little above their own needs. European peoples work longer and harder to produce this wheat than Americans would have to work to produce it, and can not produce enough to supply the demand.

Americans, who can produce wheat with much less time and effort, are not permitted to do so. It is so much more picturesque to appoint a farm-life commission! Americans, on the contrary, are constrained to produce things at which they must work as long and as hard as Europeans, although, in the very nature of things, Europeans would exchange these very things for our farm products, and the result would be that we would get these things, and more of them, by exchange, for less time and effort than we get them now by producing them ourselves, and Europeans would get more food for the same amount of effort now exerted.

Trade in gold is free the world over, because "statesmen" think gold is wealth. Gold is produced cheaper in some places than others; yet, strange to say, no one has ever asked for "protection" for the American gold miner. He has had to go on competing with "foreign pauper labor," whilst the zinc and lead miner has had to be "protected." Now, a bushel of wheat will exchange for as much gold in America as it will in Europe. An ounce of gold, however, will exchange for twice as much cloth in England as in America. This is but one of many examples of the unnatural, or law-made, ratios of exchange.

The old familiar sophism that "low prices are all right if we only could get the dollar" is not forgotten or overlooked. This sort of reply may satisfy some people that tariff reform is dangerous, but thinking people who know that men do produce and exchange the great bulk of commodities without money will not be alarmed, and they will rest content with the assurance that men, if let alone, will produce the things they need, and will exchange them with each other. They know full well that the dollar is only a tool to make the exchange easy, and that if there is plenty of products in the land it makes no difference whether the valuation of them in dollars is high or low. It is important that there be plenty of food, clothing, and houses to go round; it is not important how these things are measured in dollars. The people want food and clothing and homes, not dollars, and the "statesmen" who argue that an abundance of dollars is the consequence of a protective tariff must believe that "money is wealth," and that a man is well off even if he go hungry, provided his "daily bread" is "high priced" in dollars.

A man who exchanges his daily product for \$2, but who can not exchange his \$2 for enough good things to sustain his family, is not as well off as a man who exchanges his daily product for \$1, but who can exchange his \$1 for enough to sustain his family. Prices are deceptive. The cost of living is measurable

by the amount of work required to produce enough for sustenance and comfort; therefore, abundance and not price is the desirable thing for the Nation. Instead of looking upon abundance as an evil it should be looked upon as a blessing. Instead of shutting out Mexican oil and zinc because it is abundant, in order that we may work longer and harder to get these things in our own country, we should welcome the opportunity to get them elsewhere with less work. We should neither fear abundance nor cause scarcity.

We hear much about the "high wages" in this country and "pauper wages" in Europe. We have "protection" and high wages in this country—therefore "protection" makes wages high. They have "protection" and "pauper wages" in European countries—therefore "protection" makes "pauper wages." Wonderful logic, Mr. Chairman. But despite our "high wages," Mr. Chairman, the increased cost of living is here to plague us.

Yes; wages are high in this country, and so is the cost of living. "Increased cost of living!" That does not mean anything if it does not mean a scarcity of food and clothing and building material and household furniture. It means that too few people are producing these things, and too many are consuming them. It means that a few get too much, and many get too little. There is, in other words, a shortage of good things. The Indianapolis Tariff Commission Convention has said that "protection produces scarcity." In this connection it may not be amiss to emphasize again the fact that a failure of crops also "increases the cost of living."

In this, a virgin country, in a so-called "land of liberty," we have a system which makes multimillionaires and labor unions, idle rich who roam in foreign countries, and little children 4 and 5 years old, by the hundreds of thousands, working in the mines and factories to keep their poor souls and bodies from dissolution.

A protective tariff has a twofold action. It constrains the people to produce less, and then takes their products away from them, a part for the support of the Government and a part for "stimulating" industries.

And this is done partly in the name of labor. "O labor, what crimes are committed in thy name!"

On the one hand, Congress says to the laborer: You may not do with the products of your own labor what you want; you may not exchange them with whomsoever you will; you must content yourself with exchanging them with this man, not with that man. You may not exchange your products for a hat made in England or Germany, but you must exchange them for a "Danbury-made hat," or for some other American-made hat.

On the other hand, the courts say to the laborer: You may not agree among yourselves that you will trade with one American hat maker and not another; you may not agree among yourselves not to trade with the "Danbury hat maker."

Such an agreement is defined as a "secondary boycott," and as a "cruel" violation of property rights, and if you and your associates undertake anything of the kind you will be restrained, and if you disobey, the court will send you to jail.

What is sauce for the goose, it seems, is not always sauce for the gander.

The people groan under the load of taxation and spoliation. When they resist and cry out in protest, "it disturbs business." Business men now not only have to reckon with all the natural conditions under which wealth is produced and distributed, but they must also reckon with the unnatural conditions. They must wait with bated breath the outcome of elections, and then wait until the Committee on Ways and Means takes "evidence," and then wait until a bill is secretly written, and then wait until it is published, and then wait until it is debated, and then wait until it is made into law, and then commence all over again and wait some more. So it will always be until we are enlightened enough to abandon the notion that prosperity flows from legislation and repeal all laws intended to produce "national prosperity" and allow the law of nature, which comes from a superior intelligence and which can neither be modified nor repealed, to have its beneficent sway, and then men will be free in fact as well as in name, and business will be undisturbed by elections and sessions of Congress and peace and justice and equality will prevail. Then wealth will reach its highest production and its distribution or exchange will be unrestrained and equal. Then spoliation in the "name of the law" and under the guise of benevolence will get a setback, and the country will enter upon a long and peaceful period of natural prosperity, checked only by the act of God.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, to our Republican friends, who have boasted so long, so loud, so persistently, and so recently of the wisdom, perfection, and all-sufficiency of the Dingley tariff bill, this extra session is the saddest they ever at-

tended. [Applause.] I wish to assure them, that while I can not mingle my tears with theirs, they have my sympathy. I am so constituted that I can not see a man or set of men in an embarrassing condition without having a compassion for them.

We are at last invited to the funeral obsequies of the Dingley bill. [Applause.] Those whom I have so often heard on this floor praise, yea, even glorify, that bill, come now not to praise but to bury it. [Loud applause.] Its erstwhile friends plaintively say that changed conditions make its repeal necessary. What conditions have changed? Nothing, except that the law has been demonstrated to be a failure. [Applause.] It failed to produce prosperity. The country struggled along well under it for a while, but eventually, notwithstanding our great resources, its burden became too grievous to be borne, and we went down into the most disastrous financial, business, commercial, and industrial collapse this country has ever experienced. [Loud applause.]

It has failed to produce the revenue necessary to conduct the Government, and under its predicted great revenue-producing effects we are now confronted with a deficit of \$150,000,000 at the end of the present fiscal year. So disastrous is its failure that its burial can not be conducted with proper decorum, not even decently and in order. [Applause.] Everybody, from the President down, in wild excitement and almost in delirium is crying, "Bury it, and bury it quick. [Applause.] If not, the stench of its decomposing body will fill the land and nauseate still more the American public." [Applause.]

One more idol of Republicanism is to be dashed to the ground. One more failure of Republican statesmanship is to be written in history by the side of its other follies. [Applause.] One more tombstone is to be erected in the Republican cemetery. [Applause.] The sadness of the Republican heart at this funeral is aggravated, because it feels and knows that the party is burying its idol of protection through prohibitive tariff rates. [Applause.]

The Payne bill is framed in partial recognition of this. Here and there it makes a complete surrender, and adopts the wise and righteous Democratic idea of raising revenue. Through this bill the Republican Ruth is saying unto the Democratic Naomi:

Entreat me not to leave thee or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge.

[Applause.]

The next tariff bill, whether written by Republicans or Democrats, will be framed with a view to providing the necessary revenue to run the Government. [Applause.] The Republicans may not so frame it from choice, or patriotism toward the great body of American consumers, but will be compelled to so frame it from necessity. If that party continues to administer this Government, the expenses of running it will so increase that any other character of tariff bill will be insufficient to raise the revenues to meet these expenses. [Applause.]

If the Democrats come into power, after this wild carnival of Republican extravagance, it will have no other choice and will both from necessity and from a sense of patriotism toward the American people, frame a bill on that principle. [Applause.]

No bill will be framed along free-trade lines. There is no sane man but knows that free trade is absolutely impossible in this country under our constitutional taxing powers. [Applause.] The taxes to raise the bulk of the necessary revenue will always have to be tariff taxes. The governmental expenses have been increasing in almost arithmetical progression, and we have no reason to believe they will ever be reduced below a point where to meet them anything but a comparatively high tariff can be levied.

It is a libel upon the Democratic party to call it a free-trade party. It could not be if it wished. Democrats are sensible and patriotic, and they realize that many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, and that any change of law must at every step be regardful of the labor and capital involved, and that reductions should be made so gradual as not to affect injuriously either capital or labor. [Applause.]

As said before, no party could be free trade if it wished. Any tariff bill will have to be so framed as to produce the necessary revenue, and the amount to be raised is now and will continue to be so great that the rates levied will of necessity have to be so high that in themselves and in spite of everything they will afford sufficient protection to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad. [Applause.] This will be sufficient to put the home producer on an equal footing with his foreign competitor, and it is a sad reflection upon the energy and business capacity of our people to say that they can not then successfully compete. [Applause.]

At first the justification of the protective system was based on the idea that it encouraged the investment of capital in manufacturing enterprises and protected it after it was so invested. Now, the labor vote having become an important factor, our Republican friends claim that protection is necessary to maintain the American wage scale.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact that every legislative measure for the alleviation of the laboring man has been of Democratic initiative, and if passed by a Republican Congress, has been so passed because of constant twitting and goading by Democrats. [Applause.] The Democrats have been the friends of labor in all their just demands; but notwithstanding this, in every election a majority of the labor vote of the East and West has loyally supported the Republican party. They have sorely tried the patience of their Democratic friends, and let me warn them that they may wear out that patience. When they do this, woe is their condition! When the Democratic party ceases to uphold their cause, they will have no advocates in the Halls of Congress. [Applause.]

The only excuse I can find for this seeming ingratitude is that they are misled by the Republican dogma that a perpetuation of Republican ideas is necessary to the perpetuation of their wage scale. I am persuaded that this contention has been overworked. It is strange to me that any man is silly enough to believe that employers pay their employees better wages because their products are protected by prohibitive tariffs.

Do we not know that they get their labor, just as they get everything else, just as cheap as they can? The employees have always been compelled to deal across the counter with the employers, and every advance in wages and every reduction in hours of work has been contended for and accomplished by their own efforts and very often after great sacrifices by them; and they undervalue the importance of their own efforts when they credit to a tariff any increase in wages or reduction in hours of work. The employers pay existing wages because they are compelled to. [Applause.] The fact that our workmen receive better wages than those of other countries is due to many causes, such as organization, by which they can enforce their demands, and a superior capacity of production; the most important cause being that there are so many varied occupations which our people may pursue that they are more independent and the demand sustains a fairer proportion to the supply. When our country becomes as thickly settled as the older countries and all the avenues of employment are filled up, you will then see the same scale of wages, regardless of any tariff scale we may have.

The contention of the Republicans that the wage scale is affected by the tariff is an afterthought as well as fallacious. Admitting for the sake of argument, which we do not, that any wages are affected by the tariff, it should not be forgotten that the great bulk of American laborers are engaged in work which can not either directly, or indirectly, be so affected. That eminent statistician, the late Edward Atkinson, of Boston, in an article styled "Occupations and their relation to the tariff," published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 1903, in a masterly analysis of the different occupations affected by the tariff, demonstrated that according to the census of 1900, there were:

Persons occupied in—	
Agricultural pursuits	10,381,765
Professional pursuits	1,258,739
Domestic and personal service	5,580,657
Trade and transportation	4,766,964
Mechanical and manufacturing pursuits	7,085,992
Total	29,074,117

Mr. Atkinson shows that out of the 29,000,000 persons now at work for gain, not 1,000,000 of them could be seriously or adversely affected if all duties on foreign products of a like kind were at once removed, which no one contemplates doing. If this be true, and it has not, so far as my investigation has extended, been denied or answered, should not the interest of the other 28,000,000 laborers have some consideration, and should they be unreasonably burdened to aid the 1,000,000?

Another class of our fellow-citizens who are very dear to those who wish to build prohibitive tariff walls are the farmers of the Middle West, Western, and Pacific coast States. To quiet a slight restlessness on the part of these worthy fellow-citizens of ours the Dingley tariff levied a small import duty on corn and wheat. The levy of this duty was an insult to the intelligence of every farmer in the United States. Pray tell us how many barrels of corn and bushels of wheat would have been imported into the United States if there had been no tariff?

These misguided farmers do not stop to consider what they pay in the increased prices of the clothing they wear, upon all

the woolen and cotton goods they use, upon the shoes, boots, harness, agricultural implements, tools, sugar, nails, and upon all other articles used by them in their avocations.

Mr. Chairman, in the presidential campaigns of 1900, 1904, and 1908, go where you would in Kansas, you would see miles of farmers in procession dressed in cheap, shoddy clothes, brandishing aloft cornstalk sticks, marching under banners and transparencies containing such miserable legends as "Let us stand pat, my boys," "Protection and prosperity," "We must protect our labor," "We will preserve our home market." The same humiliating spectacle could be seen in Iowa, where thousands of farmers listened to Senator DOLLIVER and Colonel Hepburn sing the glories of the prohibitive tariff. The same asinine exhibition could be seen all over the States of Montana and Wyoming, in both the Dakotas, in Idaho, and in Utah, and all up and down the Pacific coast. "Against stupidity the very gods battle in vain." [Applause.]

I want to utter a warning to Congress and the American people. The Payne bill, to a certain extent, is an abandonment of former Republican contentions, and has partly for its object the production of revenue. I warn you that it may not in any contingency, and certainly will not raise sufficient revenue if we do not begin to economize in our expenses. I do not mean that we should get down to a stingy and niggardly basis. Run the Government as a great Government, such as we have, should be run, but in doing it have some regard to businesslike administrative methods. Every department of our Government swarms with unnecessary and incompetent tax eaters; unnecessary offices and positions have been created until now employees of the Government, in different departments, are in the way of each other, and the duties of different bureaus interlap so as to produce conflict and confusion.

For forty-two years the Republican party has been in full control of one, two, or three of the departments of our Government. It began its career in the mad riot and extravagance of a dreadful civil war. Forty-four years ago the civil war ended. With the exception of eight years of Democratic control in the Executive Department our Government has been conducted on a war footing. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, we paid on pensions, one of the legacies of the civil war, \$153,093,086.27.

This amount of money is greater than Great Britain pays for a standing army of 254,000 men; it is a sum greater in amount than Germany pays for a standing army of 617,000; it is greater in amount than any nation of continental Europe pays for the support and maintenance of a standing army. Pensions are granted to soldiers on the theory that patriotic services were rendered in the crisis of the Government's fate; that they bravely rallied to its defense and bore themselves like heroes in the arduous conflict which preserved the Union. While I am in favor of pensions, I believe they should be paid to the deserving and the needy. Those who are already self-sustaining and independent should be dropped from the rolls, and the money paid to them should be paid to those who need it, thereby increasing the Government's contribution to their unfortunate condition.

For twelve years we have groaned under the so-called "Dingley tariff bill." Even its friends must now admit it was a tariff for the benefit of foreign nations. Under its malign operation our own manufactured products are sold to foreign nations at prices ranging from 30 per cent to 60 per cent less than they are sold to our own citizens.

In Laredo, Tex., a Remington typewriter, or typewriter of any make, is sold at a cost of 50 per cent higher than in Laredo, Mexico, about 200 yards distant on the other side of the Rio Grande. The same typewriter which brings \$100 in Laredo, Tex., can be bought in Laredo, Mexico, for \$50. The same discrimination is made against our own people in the sale of sewing machines, agricultural implements, barbed wire, all kinds of iron, and hardware. It is plain that every article which is sold in a foreign country for a less price than is sold to our own citizens needs no discriminating duty in its favor, and it should be put upon the free list. Steel rails are sold cheaper in Canada and Mexico than in the United States. This fact alone demonstrates that steel needs no protection whatever. Mr. Carnegie, who is perhaps more interested in the manufacture of steel than any man living, says that it needs no protection. Mr. Schwab, in the last few days, has announced that the steel industry of the United States can defy all foreign competition. It seems to me that Congress should take Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Schwab at their word and place steel upon the free list.

As we can not hope to secure sufficient revenue to support the Government, as at present administered, through custom tariff, we are compelled to resort to internal taxation, and right here we encounter another serious difficulty. Nearly every known method of internal taxation is in use in many—in per-

haps a majority—of the States. If the fact that the States levy an inheritance tax forbids the General Government from resorting to this method of raising revenue, then the Government of the United States is helpless along that line. I can see no objection to an inheritance tax levied by the General Government. I favor it for the reason that when it is directly levied and collected those affected by it will most likely stir themselves and demand that an end be put to the mad riot of extravagance in the administration of the Government. Moreover, it is certainly within the power of Congress to levy a tax on the gross receipts of all corporations engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. Speaking for myself, I would favor levying a tax on the gross receipts of corporations engaged in the manufacture of products favored by a discriminating tariff duty.

These spoiled darlings of protection should be made to pay for the favors shown them by the Government. I have seen it stated that President Taft favors an income tax. While it is true that the Supreme Court has decided that the income tax levied by the Wilson-Gorman bill was unconstitutional in certain parts, still the question is an open one. That decision, when rendered, met with the approval only of those who were adversely affected by the law. It has not generally been approved by either the people or the profession. In rendering it a bare majority of the Supreme Court overruled five previous decisions of the Supreme Court sustaining the power of the General Government to levy an income tax. Should the question again come before the Supreme Court, there are strong reasons to believe that the court will again reconsider its former decision and reverse itself.

The power of the Government to issue treasury notes and make them legal tender in the payment of prior debts, in the case of Hepburn v. Griswold, was denied. In a subsequent case this decision was overruled, mainly upon the ground that when the Constitution of the United States was adopted all sovereigns had the power to issue this kind of note and make it legal tender in the payment of all debts, and that the United States, as a sovereign, had the same power. When the Constitution was adopted the governments of every foreign nation had and exercised the right to levy and collect an income tax. By parity of reasoning it seems to me that the United States Government, as a sovereign, has the power to levy an income tax.

At the close of the last Congress the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TAWNEY] gave out to the country a startling exhibit of the frightful waste and extravagance of the public service, but it fell stillborn upon the ears of the public and did not produce even a ripple of reform. During the last seven years the executive branch of our Government has been conducted with a total disregard of expenses. So much time and thought was devoted to spectacular performances intended to glorify the occupant of the White House and to keep him in the limelight that no time or thought was left to the consideration of a businesslike administration of the affairs of the Government.

If a private corporation, as rich, even, as the Standard Oil Company, had conducted its business in the same way, it would long since have been bankrupt. If one of our great business administrators, a J. J. Hill or a Harriman, for instance, had been in charge of our civil establishments, he would have placed them upon business bases and millions of useless expenditure would have been avoided. The Republican party alone is responsible for this seven years of utter disregard of business principles in the administration of the Government, and I hope it will learn, sooner or later, that the people have paid too dearly for Rooseveltism.

I congratulate you, my Republican friends, upon the change you have made, for I see that our present Chief Executive is now taking steps to consolidate bureaus whose duties and work overlap, and generally reforming the departments all down the line, so as to get the greatest results for the least expense, and it is said that thereby an immense amount of money will be annually saved, without any detriment to the public service. [Applause.] It is a great scandal that this has not been done sooner.

In the brief time allotted to me, I have not been able to consider the schedules of the bill under consideration. Suffice it to say in condemnation of the whole bill, that it is generally conceded, except by those interested, that it is sectional and lays tribute upon certain sections of the country in the interest of others.

While I indorse the Democratic position on the tariff, and if we were framing a Democratic tariff bill I would be willing for my section to share its advantages and suffer its disadvantages with other sections, I will not, however, sit idly by and see the interests of my section crucified by a bill which is

framed along sectional lines. If we are forced to have a bill which is protective, then I believe that such protection should be extended equitably to all industries in all sections.

My section is largely interested in the production of lumber and rice and hides. The producers of this lumber and rice and hides are, under this bill, taxed upon everything they consume and upon the implements and machinery with which they labor, and I insist that their products should be placed upon an equal footing with others and should receive the same advantages that are granted to other products. If I am told that the last Democratic platform declared for free lumber, I answer that it also declared for a tariff bill framed along Democratic lines. We are not getting such a bill, and, as we are not, it is the duty of every Member of Congress to do the best he can for his district and section, and it becomes his duty to see that his district and section do not suffer all the disadvantages without getting any of the benefits. In legislation, as in everything else, we ought to apply practical common sense. If a law is being enacted which we can not prevent, it becomes our duty to minimize as much as possible the evil effects of such law upon our own people. If a bill is to be adopted which applies the principles of protection, we should insist that these principles be fairly and impartially applied. To say that those principles should be fairly and impartially applied is not by any means equivalent to saying that those principles are correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have but little hope that any reasonable or just tariff law will be enacted by this Congress. The Senate of the United States is the fortress of the protected interests. While under the Constitution all bills raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills. As a matter of fact, the Senate not only proposes amendments and concurs with amendments, but it also substitutes whole clauses, sections, and paragraphs—the whole bill in short. The House proposes; the Senate disposes. Whatever bill we pass here will be returned to us torn, dismembered, and disfigured beyond recognition, and made more sectional in its effect and operation. Mr. Chairman, I have faith in the honesty and intelligence of the American people. There are signs of an awakening all over our country. A better time is coming. The fight will go on until a just and a reasonable tariff law is enacted, and a fiscal system devised which will grant special favors to none and give equal opportunity to all classes of our fellow-citizens without regard to section, locality, or class. [Applause.]

[Mr. SAUNDERS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted to me I can not, of course, make a speech on the tariff. The things I shall say may more properly be denominated, as they frequently are in the Record, "remarks."

Throughout the country for several years there has been a demand from the people for a revision of the tariff schedules. This demand did not come from the beneficiaries of the tariff system, but rather from the great body of consumers throughout the land.

This bill when it is finally perfected will be the answer of Congress to that demand, and the bill as it leaves this body the response of the House to the consumers of the United States. In the ordinary course of proceedings many gentlemen appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to enlighten that committee upon the conditions affecting the various schedules to be considered, but unfortunately they who came before the committee were not representatives of those who made the demand for tariff revision. The consumers are not represented in this controversy at all, except in so far as the Members in this House see fit to represent them. Glove makers, hose makers, watchmakers, boot and shoe makers, and all other makers of goods protected by the tariff schedules appear by themselves and by their attorneys, but the consumers, the persons who made the complaint, and the persons who ask relief, are not represented.

It is not too much to say that the great majority of the persons who demanded revision looked for downward revision; and when the answer of this body and of the whole Congress is returned they will first of all inquire if their demand has been considered and if an answer such as they are entitled to have returned to them has been given.

First of all they will be told, and they will know it if they examine the recapitulation on the last page of the estimated revenues, that under the present tariff law the average ad valorem tariff rate is 44.16 per cent, but that under the proposed bill, the answer to their demand for reduction, it is 45.72 per cent, an increase of nearly 2 per cent to the duties of which they complain and which they condemn as too high.

True, here and there will be found reductions. There has been a reduction upon cattle hides. There has been a small reduction on refined sugar. There has been a reduction on barley. Have these reductions been made upon the request of the great consuming body of this country? I come from a district producing hides, but I know that we can not expect to have all tariffs adjusted for our benefit; and under certain conditions I would be willing that the hide tariff should be reduced or removed entirely. But one of the conditions I should insist upon would be that if we have duties cut down upon products we send out, then we must have the duties cut down on the things we have to buy.

Under the act of 1897 hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dried, salted, or pickled, bear an import duty of 15 per cent ad valorem, but skins and hides weighing 25 pounds or less if green, and 12 pounds or less if dried, are held to be raw skins and admitted free of duty, and during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, nearly 49,000,000 pounds of calfskins, valued at \$11,163,702.51, were imported into the United States free of duty. Now it is proposed to admit free of duty cattle hides formerly bearing a tax of 15 per cent. In the better grade of shoes, I am informed, leather made from these cattle hides is used for the soles and heels only, but the heavy shoes, the cheaper shoes, used to a large extent by the very men who raise and sell cattle, and for whose benefit this 15 per cent tariff tax on hides has been imposed, are made of leather obtained from cattle hides. Under the proposed bill shoes are protected by a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem. If the man who produces hides and puts them upon the market for sale is to have no protection, why should the shoemaker who makes boots and shoes out of these hides and puts them upon the market for sale be protected by a 15 per cent duty? Of course, labor is expended in the manufacture of shoes, and it is claimed that the wages paid labor are greater in this country than in other countries, and, therefore, the products of the better-paid labor ought to bring better prices in the market; but is the labor expended in the manufacture of shoes better labor, more valuable to the country at large, than the labor of the cattle raiser? If our tariff laws be designed for the raising of revenue, let all our people bear alike the burden of the taxes. If the tariff laws be designed for protection, let all equally share in the protection afforded. If there is to be no tariff duty imposed upon the cattle hides of the farmer, which he sells, then let there be no duty on the shoes made from those hides, which he buys. Until boots and shoes are put upon the free list, I am opposed to the hides of cattle being placed upon the free list. The demand for free hides has come from the manufacturers of boots and shoes, and some of them are willing that the duty be taken off their products, providing it is taken off the raw materials they manufacture; and this is fair.

I present again the letter from the Wolfe Brothers Shoe Company, of Columbus, Ohio. This company declares that, with free hides and with cheap raw material, the American-shoe manufacturer needs no protection.

THE WOLFE BROTHERS SHOE COMPANY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 30, 1909.

HON. W. S. HAMMOND,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the largest manufacturers of shoes in the country, we urge you to lend your influence to place shoes on the free list. The American shoe manufacturer needs no protection. With free hides and cheap raw material the American shoemaker can shoe the world.

Very respectfully,

THE WOLFE BROS. SHOE CO.
R. F. WOLFE, President.

The placing of hides upon the free list and leaving a duty upon boots and shoes will benefit only the manufacturers of boots and shoes. It will decrease the revenue of the country and furnish another instance of a tariff for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many.

Then the duty on barley, which has been 30 cents a bushel since the act of 1890, by this bill is to be reduced to 15 cents a bushel. It is interesting to learn from the published hearings before the Ways and Means Committee from whom the demand for a reduction of this duty comes. The great barley-producing States of the Union are Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and California, and while some barley is used for feed, nearly all of it is converted into barley malt for the brewers. In western New York there are a number of maltsters, and, because their plants are at a distance from the barley-producing areas, they are obliged to pay heavy transportation charges on the barley they manufacture. It seems that the land near their establishments will not produce so good a grade of barley as is raised in the West, but across the line, in Canada, the farmers can raise a most excellent product.

Now, the persons who desire the barley rate reduced and upon whose statements the Ways and Means Committee has acted in making the reduction, are these New York maltsters. There is no claim that the reduction of the duty will give to the country a greater revenue, so this reduction has not been made for revenue purposes. We have been told time and time again that the purpose of tariff legislation is to furnish, first, protection to our own industries, and incidentally to provide a sufficient revenue for the needs of government. This reduction is not a revenue measure. Then it must be defended upon the ground that it protects our American industries. How does it protect them? These New York maltsters say that if the tariff is reduced on barley, then the Canadian farmers near the New York line will raise barley and ship it into this country where it will be made into barley malt. This, then, might appropriately be called a tariff adjustment for the purpose of encouraging Canadian industries, instead of a tariff for the purpose of encouraging American industries. I can not vote to reduce the duty upon barley to aid the farmers of Canada and half a dozen maltsters in western New York at the expense of the barley growers of the United States. In this connection I desire to read a letter from a Canadian malting company addressed to the Electric Malting Company, of Minneapolis, Minn.:

THE EATON BROTHERS MALTING COMPANY,
Owen Sound, March 22, 1909.

MESSRS. ELECTRIC MALTING COMPANY,
Minneapolis, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: We are in receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, asking us for information regarding barley. In reply we beg to say that we are at present paying the farmers 60 cents per bushel for good malting barley. We are having to pay dealers at points of delivery, throughout the Province, 65 to 66 cents per bushel in carloads.

It is almost impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the quantity of barley still in the hands of the farmers. The farmers in this neighborhood are, as a rule, exceedingly well off. Most of them use all of their barley for feed, excepting on occasions when prices rule very high. Then they bring the barley onto the market instead of using it for feed.

In answer to your questions regarding your tariff on barley, we think it should not exceed 10 cents per bushel. If you want Canadian barley you must do something to stimulate its cultivation among the farmers. There is not the least doubt but you could import Canadian barley with greater advantage to yourselves. If your tariff were low enough to justify your starting into buying on this market, it would arouse interest among the farmers, and, no doubt, before many years they would be raising as much barley as they did in the eighties, when such enormous quantities were exported from Ontario into the United States. That was before the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill were enacted.

The requirements for malting barley in this country are small; not enough to make any difference to the cultivation of that cereal. According to the government statistics, the quantity of malt manufactured in Canada does not exceed 3,000,000 bushels per year. You will see by this that there is no encouragement to the home industry of malting to stimulate the cultivation of barley.

We shall be pleased at any time to correspond with you on this matter and to impart to you any information we may possess.

We beg to remain, gentlemen,
Yours, truly,

THE EATON BROS. MALTING COMPANY,
CHRISTIE EATON.

There is a slight reduction in the duty on sugar. Sugar which has gone through a process of refining is now taxed 1.95 cents per pound. The proposed bill reduces it to 1.90 cents a pound. The sugar schedule is both a revenue and a protective tariff. The Government receives from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 a year in sugar duties. Louisiana produces a little less than 350,000 tons of cane sugar, and this year it is estimated we will produce nearly 400,000 tons of beet sugar. The sugar duty affords protection to the producers of about 750,000 tons of sugar, but this amount is less than one-quarter of the sugar we use each year. The average wholesale price of sugar in 1908 in the London wholesale market was 2.70 cents a pound; in the New York wholesale market it was 4.96 cents a pound. We are paying, therefore, nearly twice as much for sugar here as it is sold for in London. A prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee is reported to have said, in reference to the sugar tariff, that—

Investigation into the subject proved very irksome and troublesome; it was impossible to get at the exact facts, as the experts were not inclined to reveal the secrets of their business to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following computation may not be exact, but it is at least interesting: The American importation of 3,726,339,201 pounds at the average New York wholesale market price of 4.96 cents makes a total wholesale cost of \$184,826,424. The same number of pounds at the English wholesale price of 2.70 cents gives a total cost of \$100,611,158. The difference between the two is \$84,215,266.

Now, what becomes of this \$84,215,266 paid by the consumers of sugar in the United States? The sum of \$52,232,041 found its way into the United States Treasury through the duties col-

lected, the balance, over \$30,000,000, went somewhere else. Since the sugar trust practically controls the sugar industry of this country, and is the institution principally interested in maintaining the high protective tariff upon sugar, it is not difficult to guess where over \$30,000,000 paid out by the consumers of sugar in this country found lodgment, nor is it very difficult to understand why the members of the Ways and Means Committee found that an investigation into the subject of sugar "proved very irksome and troublesome," and why it was "difficult to get at the exact facts," and why the sugar experts were "not inclined to reveal the secret of their business." The American consumer of sugar is paying too much for the protection of the comparatively small amount of sugar produced in this country. I think the producers of cane sugar and the producers of beet sugar should receive protection as well as the producers of barley or the producers of wheat, but a tax of 80 per cent upon sugar, and that is practically the duty it bears, is too great, and the reduction instead of being five one-hundredths of 1 cent a pound should be ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 cent a pound, leaving for the present, in view of the great need of the country for revenue, a duty of 1 cent a pound on refined sugar.

The American consumer will be grievously disappointed with some of the items of this bill. It proposed to tax tea at 8 cents and 9 cents a pound—this for purely revenue purposes. Even yet we sometimes hear Democrats called "free traders," and sometimes learned and wise men in attempting to show the differences between Republicans and Democrats upon the tariff question declare that the Republicans are in favor of duties upon articles competing with products of the United States, which is protection, while the Democrats favor duties on articles that do not compete with the things produced in the United States—a revenue tariff.

Here we find a Republican committee, the majority of whom are "standpatters" and extreme protectionists, proposing a duty upon a noncompeting article for the purpose of revenue and revenue alone. As a matter of fact, a tariff bill enacted by either party will furnish protection and a great deal of it to American industries. I do not object to the protection afforded by a tariff bill, but to inequalities in protection. In making a tariff bill to-day we seek to put in it as much protection as possible and to get out of it as much revenue as possible. The needs of the Government are imperative, we must have a sufficient income to meet our necessary expenditures, and the time may come when it will be necessary to tax tea and coffee and other noncompeting products, but it is not necessary to do it now, and the necessities of life are the things that should escape the burden of taxation the longest. When all other means have been exhausted and the income of the Government is insufficient, the necessities of life must be taxed; until then they should not be taxed unless it be for the purpose of equalizing protective duties. The added duty proposed would increase the cost of teas practically 10 cents a pound, an increase of from 30 per cent to 40 per cent upon the present prices. Tea is not a luxury, but a necessity, and it should remain where it is—on the free list.

The Dingley tariff affords the American manufacturers of hosiery an advantage of about 65 per cent over foreign manufacturers. Under this substantial advantage over competitors the production of hosiery in this country has increased. The value of men's half hose manufactured in this country in 1900 was a little over \$11,000,000. In five years it increased to \$17,438,914—about 58 per cent. Ladies', children's, and infants' hosiery manufactured in 1900 were of the value of \$16,205,372; and in the same space of time the amount was increased to \$26,152,043—about 61 per cent. This does not indicate that the hosiery manufacturers of this country are suffering on account of disastrous competition, and the consumers of this country are not complaining because of the low price of stockings.

Yet, in this bill revising the tariff, we find instead of a reduction of duties, large increases. On hosiery valued at \$2.68 a dozen, now taxed 59.78 per cent, the duty is raised to 70.98 per cent, an increase of 11.20 per cent; hosiery valued at \$1.93 a dozen, now taxed at 51.23 per cent, is raised to 66.75 per cent, an increase of 15.52 per cent; hosiery valued at \$1.39 a dozen, now taxed at 58.17 per cent, is raised to 76.16 per cent, an increase of 17.99 per cent; hosiery valued at 93.6 cents a dozen, now taxed at 68.39 per cent, is raised to 89.75 per cent, an increase of 21.36 per cent; and let it be noticed that the cheapest grade of hosiery, of which there is imported more than one-half of all the hosiery imported, is taxed the highest at the present time, and under this bill suffers the greatest percentage of increase of tax. This does not appeal to one as an attempt to put the burden upon the luxuries of life instead of the necessities. This revision has not been made for the benefit of the

consumer at large, but for a limited number of Pennsylvania manufacturers.

The glove manufacturers of Fulton County, N. Y., appeared before the committee and received substantial recognition to the cost, if this bill becomes a law, of the American consumer. The makers of this bill, who would reduce a 15 per cent duty on hides for the benefit of the New England boot and shoe manufacturers, are very kind indeed to the New York glove manufacturers. Gloves valued at \$3.01 a dozen, now protected by a duty of 58.13 per cent, increased to 132.86 per cent; those worth \$3.89 a dozen, now protected by a duty of 55.28 per cent, are to have 113.12 per cent; those worth \$4.42 a dozen have a protective duty raised from 56.60 per cent to 90.56 per cent; those worth \$10.50 a dozen, now protected by a duty of 42.85 per cent, raised to 51.42 per cent; those worth \$16.36, bearing a duty of 31.48 per cent, raised to 35.44 per cent. And, again, observe the method of putting the tax upon luxuries and not on necessities—gloves worth \$3.01 a dozen, taxed at 58.13 per cent, are now to be taxed 132.86 per cent, while the gloves valued at \$16.36 a dozen will have the tax increased from 31.48 per cent to 35.44 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the country, it seems to me, would be better satisfied if the glove revision were downward instead of upward. Possibly the revenues of the Fulton County glove manufacturers might not increase so rapidly, but they would still be sufficient to enable them to keep their automobiles.

Behold the glove maker who has the benefit of a tax of 132 per cent on a cheap glove riding in an automobile bearing a tax of 45 per cent. Are we taxing luxuries or necessities?

Calamine (zinc ore), now admitted free of duty, is given tariff protection to the extent of \$22.40 per ton—100 per cent. In the last campaign Speaker CANNON visited the Joplin (Mo.) zinc district and, in substance, informed the people of that district that if they wanted a tariff on zinc ore they should elect a Republican Congressman in place of the Democrat then representing that district. He put his hand on the shoulder of the man he desired the district to send to Congress. That gentleman was elected, voted for Mr. CANNON for Speaker, supported the so-called "Cannon rules" and, no doubt, supports the present tariff bill. The Joplin district is rewarded by this 100 per cent tariff, while the people of the whole country will pay a little more for the zinc they purchase and for the manufacture of zinc. For years the zinc industry has flourished without any tariff, but there are zinc mines in Mexico producing a 32 per cent ore, while the Joplin mines produce a 60 per cent ore; this, and the fact of the proximity of the smelters to the Joplin mines would indicate that the industry might struggle along without 100 per cent protection.

But, turning from the direct increases granted by this measure, let me call your attention to a few of the indirect methods by which certain industries secure favorable tariff legislation. Paragraph 637 provides that petroleum, crude or refined, shall be admitted free of duty. Then follows this provision:

Provided, That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall in such cases be levied, paid, and collected a duty on said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

Russia and, possibly, Mexico—the only countries from which petroleum or its products might be imported into the United States—levy duties upon imported petroleum, and through this provision petroleum and its by-products enjoy now a tariff duty of about 100 per cent.

In paragraph 424 coal is taxed 67 cents a ton, unless exported from a country, dependency, province, or colony which imposes no tax or duty on it when imported from the United States. Whether or not we shall have free coal in this country—and we ought to have it—depends upon the action of other countries instead of the action of our own Congress.

I believe if we are permitted to vote upon the question lumber will go on the free list. The bill provides for the reduction of the tariff \$1 a thousand feet, but paragraph 197 provides that if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever upon, or any discrimination against, any forest product exported to the United States, and so forth, then the duties prescribed in section 3 of this act shall apply, and section 3 directs that each article mentioned in paragraph 197 shall bear "the same rate of duty as prescribed by the law in force prior to the passage of this act." Such duties are now levied in Canada, from which country lumber, if any at all is imported, will come, and if the proposed law is enacted all lumber imported from Canada will bear, under the terms of the provision to which I have called attention, exactly the same

duty that it bears to-day. So there is absolutely no reduction whatsoever in the lumber duty.

The tariff on cotton goods remains apparently the same in this bill as in the Dingley law, but the duty is fixed largely by the number of threads per square inch. The greater the number of threads to the square inch the higher the tariff duty. Section 318 of this law provides that "each ply of two-or-more-ply thread shall be counted as a thread. Much of the imported cotton goods contains threads which are of two or more ply, and the effect of this provision is to count more threads to the square inch and thus remove cotton cloths from the low-duty schedules and place them in the high-duty schedules. By reason of this provision some cotton goods now bearing a tariff duty of 2½ cents a square yard will carry a duty of 4½ cents a square yard, and in this way the duties on cotton goods are increased. Then, much of the cotton cloth imported is mercerized, at least it is given a luster, and by paragraph 321 of the act "all cotton cloth mercerized or subjected to any similar process" shall pay a tax of 1 cent per square yard in addition to the other duties imposed. So, by these two very innocent provisions, the duties upon cotton cloth are very largely increased; and right here I would read a letter from F. B. Shipley, chairman of a committee representing a large number of wholesale dry goods houses:

NEW YORK, March 27, 1909.

HON. W. S. HAMMOND,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The undersigned, a committee representing 70 wholesale dry-goods houses, respectfully ask your attention to the inclosed press clippings, showing that the effect of the "joker" paragraphs, 318 and 321 of the cotton-goods schedule of the Payne tariff bill, would greatly raise duties, and frequently double them and more.

As the provisions are technical, it is certain that the gentlemen who drafted the bill did not realize that these provisions were prohibitive.

Our special committee of experts is at your disposal to demonstrate this raise.

Cotton-goods statistics show that American mills do not need any protection on the goods they are equipped to produce. In neutral markets they have so well been able to compete that their exports have rapidly grown, and in 1906 equaled \$52,944,033.

The average dividends of the principal Fall River mills affected were, in 1907, a panic year, 25.5 per cent; in New Bedford, 25.2 per cent. A prominent illustration is the Dartmouth Manufacturing Company, which paid 66 per cent last year, and on February 24 last an extra dividend of 100 per cent. This mill makes precisely the class of goods which these paragraphs are designed to prohibit. All of these dividends are in addition to enormous salaries paid to officers.

American mills do not sell their products on an ordinary profit basis, but adroitly fix their prices just below those at which similar goods can be imported.

The net result of these paragraphs, if permitted to become law, will be to greatly reduce revenues by prohibiting importation; to permit a few New England mills to manipulate prices at will, and to repeat their action of 1907, when they arbitrarily raised prices more than 50 per cent, although there was no corresponding increase in cost of production; it will drive many importing houses out of business and work a hardship on 28,000 American retail merchants and add an additional burden to the whole American people by increasing the cost of a primary necessity of life.

No question of politics is involved. The whole people are united in the conviction that the tariff should be reduced rather than raised.

President Taft said, on December 16 last: "I believe that the way to stamp out trusts and monopolies is to avoid excessive rates, which tempt monopolies."

An average tariff of 20 per cent on cotton fabrics is ample to protect American manufacturers from any possible difference in cost of production, and its only effect would be to compel them to run their mills on a fair capitalization and charge reasonable profits.

Respectfully submitted.

F. B. SHIPLEY,
49 Leonard street,
Chairman Committee on Publicity.

Coffee, of course, in paragraph 533 remains on the free list. Then follows the provision that if any country, dependency, province, or colony shall impose an export "duty or other export tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, directly or indirectly, upon coffee exported to the United States, a duty equal to such export duty, tax, or charge shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon." In the year ending June 30, 1907, there were imported into the United States 982,254,832 pounds of coffee, and of this amount 778,600,591 pounds came from Brazil. Brazil does, and has for some time past, imposed charges and taxes upon coffee, at least certain provinces of Brazil have imposed such charges and taxes. Therefore under this provision the coffee coming from Brazil to this country would be subjected to a duty equal to the taxes, imposts, and charges upon it in Brazil. It is claimed that the duty imposed by this country upon such coffee would be less than 1 cent a pound; but from such information as I have been able to obtain, I believe that upon the cheaper grades of coffee a tariff tax equal to all charges, duties, and imposts of the Brazilian Government thereon would be in the neighborhood of 4 cents a pound. The consumer, therefore, would have that much more to pay for each pound of coffee purchased by him. Those who say that in case this duty were imposed the merchants and middlemen would pay it, and not the consumers, will deceive no one. Even if the profits of the merchants and middlemen were so great that they

could afford to pay the duty on the coffee sold by them, they would not pay it. The consumers know from bitter experience that no one is looking for a chance to pay taxes, and they are pretty well satisfied that no one other than themselves will pay taxes upon the things they buy. The profits of the merchants are not so great upon the cheaper grades of coffee that they could afford to pay out of them this tariff tax even if so inclined. I desire to read a letter received from Sprague, Warner & Co., wholesale grocers, of Chicago, Ill.:

SPRAGUE, WARNER & CO., (INCORPORATED),
WHOLESALE GROCERS,
Chicago, March 31, 1909.

HON. WINFIELD S. HAMMOND, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Believing that Members of Congress desire to be informed upon the question of the distribution of coffee in this country, in view of the present discussion of this article in reference to the new tariff bill, we take the liberty of submitting for your consideration the following facts:

The lowest grade of Rio or Santos coffee that is merchantable is now selling in lots of 1,000 bags or more for 8½ cents, New York. The cost of handling and transporting the same to this market costs, approximately, three-eighths of a cent per pound. The shrinkage in roasting is about 16 per cent, or 1½ cents per pound. The cost of roasting and insurance, including expense of handling, but without any charge for storage, amounts to about one-half cent per pound, making the lowest possible cost to us, as distributors of coffee, 10½ cents per pound. We sell this grade of coffee at a very close margin of profit, the average of which would be less than one-half cent per pound. Retailers of coffee sell this grade to consumers at from 12½ cents to 15 cents per pound. The suggestion that is reported to have been made, that this grade of coffee is sold at from 35 cents to 40 cents per pound, is entirely without foundation in fact. We do not believe that this grade of coffee is retailed in any part of our country at a price exceeding 20 cents per pound. We also believe that we should be warranted in affirming that in no instance has there been a pound of this grade of coffee retailed at 35 or 40 cents per pound. If, however, there has been any sale made by any unscrupulous merchant at either of the prices mentioned, we are very sure that for every single pound that has been retailed at such prices there have been 10,000 pounds retailed at 12½ cents per pound or less. The margin of profit to all handlers of this grade of coffee is exceedingly small, and this fact should be borne in mind in giving consideration to this question.

We are roasters and distributors of high-grade coffees that sell for 40 cents and even 50 cents per pound at retail, but these are coffees that are imported from other countries, and their cost to us is in proportion to the increased price to the consumers.

We are, we believe, among the leading distributors of high-grade coffees, but from our experience we feel warranted in saying that fully 75 per cent of all the coffee consumed in this country is purchased by the consumer at from 12½ cents to 25 cents per pound. Very little coffee is sold "green," but when sold it is upon a margin of profit even narrower than that shown for roasted coffee.

So far as we have knowledge, the preparation and the sale of coffee to consumers is upon as reasonable a basis of merchandising as any article now sold by the merchants of this country. It should be borne in mind, however, that entering into the cost of this article are the items of transportation, insurance, labor, packages, and the usual expense items entering into the cost of other manufactured articles.

While the taxing of coffee would undoubtedly create no financial loss to us, still we regard it as a most unwise measure, and believe that nothing Congress could do would tend to destroy public confidence and create dissatisfaction among the greater portion of our citizens more than to place a tax upon tea and coffee, which are now regarded as necessities in the family food supply.

The only object of this letter is to invite you to a careful consideration of this question, and before passing judgment upon it to ascertain the facts.

Very respectfully, yours,

SPRAGUE, WARNER & CO.,
By M. A. DEAN, Treasurer.

I must not occupy more time, but let me say that the duties to which I have called attention are the so-called "minimum duties." Under sections 3 and 4, should any country fail to admit any article imported from the United States on terms as favorable as if it were imported from another country, province, dependency, or colony, the maximum duties would apply to imports from such country into the United States, and those duties are the minimum duties plus an additional duty, generally 20 per cent of the minimum duty. Thus wherever there are trade agreements or trade arrangements between foreign countries where a preferential duty is established more favorable to the contracting parties than to the United States, the maximum duties would be at once established, and the tariff duties upon imports from the countries entering into such trade arrangements be largely increased.

This act is intended to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States. The revenue we must have, and to obtain it there must be importations from other countries. Revenue can not be secured through duties that prohibit importations. We ought to have competition in our markets, and only such protective duties as will enable the American manufacturer or producer to meet competition from abroad under equal conditions. The duties should be equalized. One class of labor is as much entitled to protection as another; one manufacturer should be given as much advantage as another; one producer should receive from tariff legislation as much benefit as another. Our industries should be encouraged, not only to control the American market but to find a place

in other markets. We can well afford to permit importations of manufactured articles from countries where we may ship our products. Our cotton, our grain, our cattle, and our manufactured articles are in demand in many foreign markets, and their export should be encouraged. The domestic market is of great value, but it is not the only market. American industry and American progress seek the markets of the world and are not content to exploit the home market alone.

I favor liberal drawback provisions so that the American producer and American manufacturer may not be handicapped in their effort to find new markets for American products, and to carry around the globe the evidences of American skill and American effort. We are big enough and strong enough to meet competitors here and abroad without burdening the American consumer with heavy taxes and excessive charges. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take part in the general debate upon the pending bill, and I shall do so now only briefly and to uncover a patent wrong against my section, preferring, as I did, to discuss its various schedules under the five-minute rule and when action was being had. The press reports give us to understand, however, that a rule will be brought in by the majority on Monday, or some time during next week, which will cut off the discussion of the bill by item and prevent any amendments to it except such as have been agreed to by the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee. You have thrown away two weeks in a useless, ridiculous, farcical, so-called "discussion" of the bill in what you call "general debate." It has not been a debate at all except in a few instances. You Republicans, divided as you are between those who want no revision of the tariff except a revision upward, and those who would in good faith keep the pledges of their platform and have a bill which gives real revision and relief, are permitting this debate not for the benefit that may come of it, but for the sole purpose of getting time in which to bring together your warring factions. It is not general debate that the country wishes; it is not long-drawn out academic discussion; the country demands and expects a discussion of this bill by item, with the right accorded Democrats and Republicans alike to offer amendments to it by item.

Your rule will prevent this. Your rule means, in fact, that the 12 Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, and not the chosen Representatives of all the people, will make the bill that passes this House and is sent to the Senate, which, when it reaches that body, will be chucked into the waste basket of the Senate Finance Committee, there to sleep the sleep that knows no waking. The Senate Finance Committee will proceed to give the country its next tariff law, and, while it may bear the name of the "Payne law," it will probably have precious little of the handiwork of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House in it. This is the procedure that the country is to witness in the near future, and all this debate and discussion and furor we are now having will go for naught. This is not as it should be. The House of Representatives, under the Constitution, is charged with the responsibility of providing the revenues for the Government; but, under your rules, the rules of the majority, the House of Representatives has become so impotent as a legislative body, so absolutely unresponsive to the wishes of the people, that they have had to turn to the Senate for whatever of real discussion and legislation they seek. Why are we not permitted a discussion of this bill by items? Why are we not allowed to offer amendments to it freely by items? What if it does take a little more time? The country is willing to stand for a reasonable delay if, in return, you will give it a real downward revision of the tariff. Why this haste in putting through this most important piece of legislation that will affect the country in the next ten years? Why are Members—the immediate, direct personal representatives of the people—denied the right of speaking for the people through such amendments as seem wise and just to them?

When the Payne bill was given to the press, it was hailed as a magnificent piece of legislation, in full accord with the Republican platform, and meeting in every respect the demand of the country for revision. Every interest and section of the country were represented as being satisfied with it, rapturously satisfied with it. It is different to-day. Every interest seems to be dissatisfied. The consumers are being heard from. The people at home are using the mails, and you Republican gentlemen who were falling over yourselves at first to support the Payne bill are now falling over yourselves to get out of the way of it. [Applause.]

The more it has been studied the more vicious and obnoxious it appears. It is filled from one end to the other with "jokers," frauds, and deceptions. Its very title, viz, "To provide revenue,

equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is a fraud and deception, for it does not equalize duties; nor is it built upon nonsectional lines. It is an effort to deceive the people by apparently reducing rates in their interests, when, as a matter of fact, the rates have been raised covertly and by hidden paragraphs. This is true of lumber, petroleum, coffee, and commercial fertilizers—these many jokers have already been discovered. No man on earth can tell how many more are in the important sections 3 and 4 of the bill. I dare say there is not a man in this House, not even the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is alleged to be the best posted man in the House on tariff matters, who can give a thorough and comprehensive statement in detail of the duties that are imposed by these two sections. They are a Chinese puzzle, covering up no man knows what and bearing on their face a strong suspicion of deception.

Mr. Chairman, this is strikingly illustrated—yes, demonstrated—in the matter of a duty on commercial fertilizers. Paragraph 576 of the bill puts guano, manures, and all substances used only for manure on the free list, permitting that schedule of the Dingley bill to stand. Paragraph 652 puts potash, sulphate of potash, muriate of potash, and all potash salts upon the free list. This is the way it looks on the face of the bill, but a more careful study of the bill, a closer investigation of it, discloses that a possible duty on potash salts of 20 per cent ad valorem is carried in sections 3 and 4, the sections that carry the so-called "maximum and minimum rates." This is seen by a reference to page 152 of the bill, where section 652, apparently on the free list, is made amenable to the maximum and minimum rates carried in these sections. I think no one can deny that these sections were intended, in the end, to keep in effect the Dingley rate and in some cases to increase it. This is certainly true of sulphate and muriate of potash.

Germany, from which we import the bulk of our muriate of potash, has a tariff on potash salts. But even if this were not the case, section 4 provides that Germany or any province, dependency, or colony must give to the United States the same rate of duty as it gives to every nation of earth, and this is the important language of the section, "upon each and every article imported into said country."

In other words, if Germany, or any other country for that matter, should, to secure some important treaty right, give the least concession upon the least article of trade and to that extent discriminate against the United States, then the maximum duty automatically applies to imports from her; and in the case of commercial fertilizers, muriate of potash would be dutiable at the rate of 20 per cent ad valorem.

Now, what will a 20 per cent duty on muriate of potash mean to the farmers of the South Atlantic States? The Department of Agriculture estimates that the farmers of the country use annually \$110,000,000 of commercial fertilizers, and of this amount \$90,000,000 is consumed by the South Atlantic States—about 87 per cent of the total for the entire country. South Carolina alone, small in area as she is, expends annually \$15,000,000 for commercial fertilizers. Of the total amount of fertilizers consumed in the South Atlantic and Southern States, \$10,000,000, according to the best available information, is expended for muriate of potash, which is one of the necessary constituents of a complete fertilizer, the kind most usually used by the southern farmer. It is the potash of your ordinary 8:2:2 fertilizer and is supposed to give fruit to the crop, although this has not been scientifically demonstrated.

A 20 per cent duty ad valorem on \$10,000,000 worth of muriate of potash consumed in the Southern States annually means a \$2,000,000 annual tax upon the southern farmers. It means to South Carolina alone, to her farmers, an additional burden, for it must be understood that all potash salts are on the free list in the Dingley law, of \$320,000 a year. It is to protest against this flagrant disregard of the rights of the southern people, this outrageous imposition upon them, this surreptitious attempt to saddle an additional load upon them, that causes me to raise my voice on this occasion. This is a covert method of discriminating against them, of making them contribute out of their pockets to the Federal Government this added tax. The southern farmer does not wish, nor has he ever wished, to escape any of the burdens of the Government. He is willing to carry his share of the necessary evils of government, but he does protest against an unjust discrimination against him; he does protest against being made the burden bearer all the while, and getting so little in return for it; he does ask that same treatment for himself that is accorded every section of the country; he does demand that taxation throughout the country shall be levied without regard to sectional lines; and he does protest against the building up of one section of the country at his expense.

The demand for muriate of potash is growing day by day, and hence this new duty upon it means an increasing burden upon the farmer, and the next ten years will in all probability see the use of it doubled, with a consequent doubling of the tax.

The policy in tariff legislation heretofore has been to put guanos and manures upon the free list, and I venture to assert that there can be given no good reason at this time why this important element of all commercial fertilizers should be placed upon the dutiable list. It can not be claimed that it is imposed for the purpose of nurturing and building up some infant American industry—an argument behind which is planted the high-protective system with all of its inherent wrongs and injustice—for every pound of muriate of potash consumed in this country is imported, the largest supply coming from Germany. There can be but one reason for the imposition of this tax upon the southern farmers, and that is that it is a source of revenue. But, in the name of justice, does not the South, which is largely agricultural, already contribute more than her just proportion of federal taxation?

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the farmers, North, East, South, and West, who are the greatest producers and, at the same time, the greatest consumers of the Nation, will, as a class, find no relief in the Payne bill, but on the contrary will, as too usual, find themselves bearing the brunt of providing for the revenues of the Government, and, at the same time, under your theory of high protection, contributing out of their earnings to the upbuilding of certain favored industries. Strange it is that he does not make his voice heard. He is more directly affected by the tariff than any other class, and yet he does not maintain a lobby at Washington; he does not give any elaborate banquets for the entertainment of Members of Congress. He expects his Representatives to give heed to his interests, and how badly he is disappointed in them can never be shown more clearly than in this so-called "revision" of the tariff. You have taxed him upon everything that he eats, wears, and drinks, and uses in his business. You have taxed his farm implements, his bagging and ties, his binding twine, his spices, his oil, his shoes, his harness, his furniture, his tableware, his nails, his wire, his sugar, coffee, and tea, and his wearing apparel.

You have taxed him upon everything of which the imagination can conceive; you have left him nothing free that can be of any use to him; and, not satisfied with the present burdens upon him, you have added this new burden of a tax upon his commercial fertilizer, which he uses in maintaining soil fertility and in stimulating crop growth. You have taxed the very instrumentalities with which he has made your Nation great. Standing as he does between this Nation and international bankruptcy; giving you as he does from year to year, with his brain and brawn, your balance of trade; bringing back to you through the sale of his products in foreign markets a ceaseless stream of foreign gold, you might be expected to give him some consideration in accordance with his deserts. You have not done it. You have taxed him from alpha to omega. You think that you have hoodwinked him, but woe be to you if you have deceived yourselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I desire to read as part of my remarks bearing on the proposition to impose a duty on commercial fertilizers a very carefully written letter of a very valued friend of mine. It illuminates the subject very much, and I am sure will be of value and interest to the House. I read:

M. O. DANTZLER,
HARDWARE AND FURNITURE,
Orangeburg, S. C., April 2, 1909.

Hon. A. F. LEVER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of drawing to your attention some apparent discriminations in the new tariff bill, known in the House of Representatives as "H. R. 1438."

I wish to draw your attention to section 2, articles 592 and 652. Article 592 provides for the free entry of basic slag, certain grades of which are imported only for manurial purposes and can not be used for any other purposes than manurial.

Article 652 provides for the free importation of sulphate of potash, crude or refined, and muriate of potash, which articles are imported more largely for manurial purposes than for any other purposes.

All three of these articles enumerated in the above two paragraphs are imported almost entirely from Germany. Commercially speaking, there is no muriate or sulphate of potash obtained outside of Germany, and the same thing can in justice be said of the basic slag, which is used for manurial purposes.

If the law goes into effect with its provisions intact as they are to-day, the actual result will be that a duty from \$2 to \$3 per ton will be levied upon basic slag and \$7, \$8, or \$9 per ton on potash. Hitherto basic slag has come in free under a recent decision of the Board of Appraisers, classing it where it rightly belongs, as a substance used only for manure, and potash has also come in free by special provision.

I understand that the treatment now accorded to some of our exports by Germany will immediately result in the retention of a 20 per cent ad valorem tax upon all articles which are imported from Germany, with the result to these articles as aforesaid.

Crops require phosphoric acid and potash. They will not grow and mature without them. Basic slag is one of the most important and valuable sources of phosphoric acid available to our farmers; and sulphate and muriate of potash, obtained only in Germany, are the only

sources of potash; consequently, the operation of this bill will be to immediately impose upon agriculture in this country a most severe tax.

In every ton of fertilizer which the farmer buys in this section of the country there is not less than 8 per cent of phosphoric acid nor less than 5 per cent of potash, which would be equivalent approximately to 1,000 pounds of basic slag and 200 pounds of muriate of potash. The additional tax per ton on fertilizer used by the farmer would, therefore, be from \$1.50 to \$2 per ton, or nearly 10 per cent.

I invite you to compare with the two paragraphs above enumerated paragraph No. 576, providing for the free entry of guano, manures, and all substances used only for manure; paragraph 673, providing for the free entry of nitrate of soda; and paragraph 480, providing for the free entry of sulphate of ammonia. I notice that these articles are omitted from the enumeration of the materials upon which the 20 per cent ad valorem duty will be levied in the event contemplated by the provisions of sections 3 and 4 of the act.

I beg respectfully to ask why there should be this discrimination? Basic slag and the potash salts are just as much manures and just as essential to the production of crops in this country as sulphate of ammonia, nitrate of soda, guano, or any other articles used only for manure, and it seems to be strange that there apparently should be a desire to impose a heavy tax upon these articles while the others come in free.

I beg to recommend either that the words "basic slag, ground or unground," be entirely struck out of section 592 and not mentioned anywhere in the tariff, so that, when imported in a form and of a grade which can be used only for manure, it will come in free in any event, or that the words "basic slag fit only for manure" be added to section 576.

I also recommend that the words "sulphate of potash, crude or refined and muriate of potash when used only for manure," be added on to section 576.

Respectfully, yours,

M. O. DANTZLER.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, much has already been said here on this tariff bill. Naturally it has become a theme of comment and discussion throughout the country. Revenue legislation is always of unusual interest and far-reaching in its consequences. We have been called here in extraordinary session to perform the work of tariff revision, and the country waits in suspense and anxiety for the results. The demand of the people is for a genuine revision. Will they get it? We are the properly constituted authority to shape a revenue measure. This question, upon the magnitude of which we all agree, is now for us to answer. What kind of a tariff bill does the country want and what sort of a measure have the people a right to expect? What promises had the country from those who to-day are in position and power to grant this needed legislation? Let us turn for a moment to a little political history. Both platforms of the two great political parties in the last campaign declared for tariff revision. All platform orators and leaders of both political parties who were in authority to speak for their respective parties declared, at least in my State, for revision downward. The people of the first district of the great State of Nebraska, which I have the honor to represent, understood these promises to be for a sincere and honest revision, and they will be satisfied with nothing less.

I come from a State which asks for no legislative favors that are not given to all alike in this great Republic; from a State having the smallest per cent of illiteracy of any in the Union. I represent a district in the heart of a vast empire of wealth; a district with more young men and women in its colleges and universities and more children in its schools than any similar section in our common country; a district with its great fields of waving grain and yellow corn, with herds grazing on its hill-sides and valleys, with homes and groves, schools and churches, cities and villages. These people have carved their fortune from the wilderness and made the State one of the brightest in the galaxy, surpassed by none in its form of state and local self-government, in the character of its laws, and in the desire of its people to obey them. It is not surprising, then, that they should desire and demand through their elected Representative the support of measures which will reflect their will and be in accord with progressive policies everywhere.

I am in accord with their sentiment in demanding a genuine tariff revision. If an honest bill had been presented here, offering real substantial revision, and at the same time a measure calculated to produce revenue sufficient to meet the legitimate expenses of government, I promised the people of my district I would support it, no matter from what source it might emanate or what party might receive its credit. I promised them I would favor legislation for the general good, that patriotism, not partisanship, would be the controlling motive in determining whether I would give or withhold my support on tariff legislation.

A tariff bill is now before this House under the name of the "Payne tariff bill," purporting in language "to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes." Will this bill in its present form produce sufficient revenue? Does it equalize the duties and burdens of indirect taxation, and is it fair to the producer and the consumer? Will it encourage the legitimate industries upon which the masses of the people depend? These are the questions which every Representative must consider in this in-

vestigation and answer to his constituents and to the country for his vote and final action on them.

Let us now take up and examine some of the schedules bearing directly on the ordinary articles of consumption.

LUMBER.

Among the various subjects upon which the consumers of this country have been expecting a reduction of the tariff is lumber. As to this product the sentiment has been overwhelming, not merely for a reduction of the tariff, but that lumber should be placed on the free list. Outside of the great lumber interests, including the holders of large tracts of timber lands, there has been heard no great opposition to free lumber. But those few who have profited in recent years by the exorbitant prices of lumber and who expect to continue to be treated by the Government as the beneficiaries of an unjust and discriminating tariff have been very active in their efforts to keep the tariff on lumber.

Under the present Dingley Act the tariff on lumber is as follows:

Boards, rough, \$2 per thousand; boards, planed and grooved, \$2.50 to \$3.50 per thousand; telegraph poles, ties, etc., 20 per cent ad valorem; fence posts, 10 per cent ad valorem; laths, 25 cents per thousand pieces; shingles, 30 cents per thousand pieces.

Of this schedule the one which affects the consumer the most is that of sawed boards which are planed. It is estimated that at least 90 per cent of the lumber shipped from the mill by rail goes through the planing mill before it is put on the cars, or in other words, 90 per cent of the lumber sold at the yards by the retailer to the consumers is of the finished or partly finished class, on which there is a duty of from \$2.50 to \$3.50 per thousand.

In carrying out the pledge for genuine tariff revision and in the face of a general demand for free lumber, the proposed Payne bill has cut the duty on rough lumber from \$2 per thousand to \$1 per thousand. On the face of it this appears to be a reduction in the duty on lumber of 50 per cent, but the gain is more apparent than substantial. This is very evident when we consider that practically none of this rough lumber is used by the consumer, and even if it could be used the reduction would not benefit the consumer materially, because the duty of even \$1 per thousand is prohibitive in the case of rough lumber for the reason that the high rate of transportation would make it impossible to import this class of lumber. The weight of rough lumber is about one-third more than the weight of the finished lumber and the cost of the transportation alone from the Pacific coast to the retail markets of the United States is estimated to be about \$10 per thousand.

If the Committee on Ways and Means had the desire of benefiting the consumers in the least they should have made a reduction on the finished lumber, because this is the lumber of the market, and this is the lumber for which the consumers have been compelled to pay outrageous prices in the past few years.

It is clear, then, that the Payne bill offers no substantial relief on the lumber schedule. What justification is there for maintaining this lumber tariff in view of all the circumstances, even from the standpoint of a protectionist?

In the first place, the owning of timber lands is not an industry and should not be protected on any theory. As for the manufactured products of lumber, the industry has long since ceased to be in its infancy. The United States to-day is the leading lumber-exporting nation in the world. We are not only exporting lumber abroad, but we are successfully competing in the markets of the world. Such an industry needs no protection at home against foreign competition. Again, the annual drainage on the forests of the United States in about three times the annual growth. It is estimated that in 1907 the consumption, not counting loss by fire, was between 100,000,000,000 and 150,000,000,000 feet. Of this amount, 40,256,154,000 feet were used for lumber alone, based upon the estimate of Mr. R. S. Kellogg, assistant forester in the Department of Agriculture, that there are between 500,000,000 and 700,000,000 acres of timber land producing an average of 60 board feet per acre.

The scarcity of white pine is already giving alarm. This industry reached its maximum eighteen years ago, and now the output is only 50 per cent of what it was then. The supply of hard woods has declined from 8,000,000,000 feet in 1900 to 5,000,000,000 now. Minneapolis was once the lumber center of the world, and within five years more all her sawmills will be gone. Between Minneapolis and St. Louis on the Mississippi River there were once a hundred sawmills, according to ex-Governor Van Sant, of Minnesota, and now there are only two, and these will cease to operate within a year.

In 1880 the lumber product of the United States was 18,000,000,000 feet, and in 1907 it was 40,000,000,000 feet. This enormous drain on the forests of our country has been increasing to such an extent that the end of this natural resource is already in sight. Southern yellow pine and Douglas fir are to-day the

leading kinds of lumber on the market, and of these the yellow pine annual cut equals about one-third the total cut of coniferous timber in the United States and goes on at the destructive rate of 30,000 square miles annually. The Douglas fir, it is estimated, will be exhausted in twenty-five or thirty years. Must we, in the face of all this, have a tariff on lumber and thus put a premium on the further destruction of our rapidly diminishing forest products?

Yet the tariff makers urge that we must have revenue. Apart from the acknowledged fact that our timber as a natural resource is rapidly being exhausted, there might be some weight to the argument for a reasonable tariff on lumber for the purpose of revenue if, in fact, such a tariff would produce any considerable amount of revenue. But the fact is under the present schedule of the Dingley law the imports for 1907 from Canada of finished or partly finished lumber amounted to less than \$300,000, which produced only about \$60,000 in revenue. From the tariff on finished lumber, then, practically no revenue has come to the Government under the Dingley law, and under the Payne bill it is probable that the revenue from the imports of finished lumber will be even less than under the Dingley law, because the rate on finished lumber still remains prohibitive. The revenue from the imports of rough lumber in 1907 was \$1,718,679.33, and under the Payne bill would be only about half this amount. The revenue from the importation of rough lumber would not materially increase by the reduction of the tariff from \$2 to \$1 per thousand, because, in the first place, the consumer does not furnish the market for this unfinished lumber, and, in the second place, lumber imported from Canada in the rough can not pay the high freight rates plus the duty and compete with American lumber. Therefore a tariff, whether on finished or unfinished lumber, can not be justified on the ground of producing revenue.

But the lumber interests and the stumpage owners of the United States insist that they must have the tariff on lumber for protection. If there ever was a time when this argument was good, that time has long since passed. Much stress has been laid upon the argument of protection to American industry and American labor in order to justify a tariff on lumber. For this reason an examination of the facts is not only fair, but necessary to a proper understanding of the situation. Now, what are the facts? In the first place, Canada is practically our only competitor in lumber production. It is contended by those who favor a tariff on lumber that Canadian lumber produced by cheap labor would destroy the American lumber industry, if admitted free of duty. The fact is, as the following table shows, that wages in Canada, both in the mills and in the logging camps, are higher than wages for the same labor in the United States. The table was furnished to the Ways and Means Committee by Theodore M. Knappen, secretary of the National Forest Conservation League:

	Canada.	United States.
Foreman.....per month.....	\$143.33	\$127.50
Band sawyer.....per day.....	6.19	5.20
Filer.....do.....	7.35	6.83
Engineer (chief).....do.....	4.25	3.79
Graders.....do.....	2.99	2.44
Fireman.....do.....	2.54	2.78
Millwright.....do.....	3.99	3.56
Setter.....do.....	3.38	3.12
Edgerman.....do.....	3.62	3.20
Trimmer.....do.....	2.54	2.48
Common laborers (white).....do.....	2.30	2.05

	British Columbia.		Washington.	
	Campbell River.	Fraser mill.	Shelton.	Olympia.
Barker.....	\$2.75	\$3.00-3.25	\$2.50	\$2.50
Blacksmith.....	3.00	75.00	3.00	3.00
Blacksmith helper.....	2.50	2.25	-----	-----
Buckers.....	3.00	3.25	2.75	2.75
Cook.....	75.00	75.00	65.00	-----
Dog-up man.....	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.50
Engineer.....	3.25	65.00	3.00	2.50-3.00
Faller, head.....	3.50-4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00
Faller, second.....	3.00	3.75	2.75	2.75
Fireman.....	2.50	2.50	2.00	-----
Flunkey.....	35.00	35.00	30.00	-----
Hook tender.....	4.00	5.00	3.75	4.00
Line horseman.....	2.50	-----	2.25	2.25
Rigging slinger.....	3.00	3.50	2.75	2.50
Signalman.....	2.50	3.00	2.25	2.25
Skidder, head.....	3.00	-----	3.25	-----
Skid road man.....	2.25	2.25	2.00	2.00
Sniper.....	2.75	3.25	2.50	-----
Swamper.....	2.50-2.75	-----	2.25	2.25-2.75
Undercutter.....	3.50	-----	3.00	-----
Woodcutter, behind donkey.....	-----	3.00	2.00	-----

In estimating the cost of production in Canada as compared with the United States we must consider not only that labor is paid as high or even higher than in this country, but also that the Canadians pay a 25 per cent duty on their mill machinery. The tariff on lumber, therefore, does not give the American labor any advantage. The manufacturer will get his labor, as he does in the South, for \$1.25 per day, and he will pay for skilled labor just what he has to and no more. In respect to the cost of production, then, we can and should compete with the Canadian lumber. As for the competition in the markets of the world, no argument is necessary, because we are actually doing it now. In 1905 the United States exported lumber to the amount of \$40,613,504 and furniture to the amount of \$5,377,768. In 1907 the United States exported timber and logs to the amount of \$4,535,286; also sawed timber and lumber as follows:

Sawed timber.....	\$13,101,178
Boards.....	39,861,352
Joists, etc.....	752,152
Total.....	53,714,682

Our entire forest products exported that year amounted to \$126,000,000, and a large part of this went to Canada. Last year our manufactured lumber product exported to Canada amounted to \$10,000,000. The mills of Washington and Oregon compete successfully with those of British Columbia in the markets of the world where they get no tariff advantage. Then why should we fear competition from Canadian lumber right here at home in our own markets without the aid of a high tariff? The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the lumbermen themselves showed that we can and do compete in the markets of the world in all the higher grades of lumber, and yet on this very class of lumber the tariff is the highest.

A tariff on lumber, therefore, can not be justified as a means of producing revenue, because it produces very little; nor can it be justified on the ground of protection for two reasons: First, the lumber industry has grown so large that it has demonstrated that it does not need protection any longer; and second, American labor has not been getting any benefit from the tariff on lumber.

It seems clear, then, that the only other purpose of the lumber duty is to continue this legislative privilege in favor of the lumber manufacturers and stumpage owners for the sole purpose of enhancing the value of their holdings of timber lands and allow them to continue to dictate prices of a product so essential to the building of American homes. While the consumers of lumber have been paying the tariff on lumber during all these years, they were not aware of the fact that they were victims of the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on any people.

During the last seven years the price of lumber has increased 46 per cent on the average, while other commodities have advanced only from 9 per cent to 26 per cent. The man who built a frame house in 1907 paid twice as much for it as for one built in 1893. The following table shows an average advance of over 100 per cent in fifteen years:

White pine.	1892.	1907.	Per cent increase.
Fencing:			
6-inch, No. 1.....	\$15.00	\$32.00	133.33
4-inch, No. 1.....	12.00	30.00	150
4-inch, No. 2.....	9.00	26.00	188.88
4-inch, No. 3.....	7.00	19.00	171.42
6-inch, No. 2.....	12.00	29.00	141.66
6-inch, No. 3.....	9.00	21.50	138.88
Common boards:			
8-inch, No. 1.....	12.50	30.00	140
8-inch, No. 2.....	11.00	28.00	154.54
8-inch, No. 3.....	10.00	25.00	150
10-inch, No. 1.....	12.50	31.50	160
10-inch, No. 2.....	11.00	28.00	154.54
10-inch, No. 3.....	10.00	25.00	150
12-inch, No. 1.....	14.00	37.00	164.28
12-inch, No. 2.....	12.50	31.00	148
12-inch, No. 3.....	9.50	26.00	173.68
Flooring:			
No. 1 fancy.....	16.50	33.00	100
O fancy.....	25.00	47.00	88
Piece stuff:			
2 by 4, 12, 14, 16.....	11.50	23.00	100
2 by 6, 12, 14, 16.....	10.00	27.50	175
2 by 8, 12, 14, 16.....	11.00	27.50	150
2 by 10, 12, 14, 16.....	10.50	29.00	176.19
2 by 12, 12, 14, 16.....	11.50	30.50	165.21
3 by 12, 12, 14, 16.....	11.50	31.50	173.91
White-pine lath.....	2.00	5.00	150

The following statement shows the increased value of stumpage in the past eight years:

White pine, from \$3.66 per thousand to \$8.09 per thousand.
 Yellow pine, from \$1.12 per thousand to \$3.16 per thousand.
 Douglas fir, from 77 cents per thousand to \$1.44 per thousand.
 Cedar, from \$1.32 per thousand to \$4.63 per thousand.
 Hemlock, from \$2.56 per thousand to \$4.51 per thousand.
 Spruce, from \$2.26 per thousand to \$5.49 per thousand.

This shows an advance of from 100 per cent to 300 per cent in eight years, and values are still going higher. Holders of stumpage lands expect to get even \$10 per thousand for long-leaf pine which they bought at 50 cents per thousand. These values are largely due to the prospect of a continued protective tariff.

The great development of the West and the increase of the rural population will cause an increasing demand for lumber, and at the same time there will be a constantly decreasing supply. These two circumstances together would normally give the lumbermen a valuable and a fortunate opportunity. But they want more than this. They are asking for a subsidy in the form of a tariff. Such a tariff on lumber is not for protection nor for revenue, but instead, if this tariff prevails, it will inevitably operate to encourage the rapid destruction of our forests and it will give to the lumbermen a monopoly of one of our most valuable natural resources.

And a monopoly of our forest resources for the purpose of exploitation and destruction would indeed be a great calamity to our country. Our timber, unlike many other of our natural resources, is a one-crop product and can not be replaced in a generation. Destroy our forests and you strike a blow at the American home. All over the great agricultural stretches of our country millions of cottages are scattered, in which happy families find shelter and comfort. Barns and sheds protect their stock and securely house their crops. Annihilate the forests and you drive our poor people into caves and cliffs. Lumber is of necessity so much a part of the poor man's home that we should have free lumber in order that we may have more free homes.

GLOVES.

Under Schedule N, in the compilation entitled "Estimated revenues, comparison of Payne tariff bill with present tariff law," we find the whole class of gloves, made wholly or in part of leather, raised from 51.89 per cent under the Dingley law to 72.65 per cent under the Payne bill. On men's sheep, "glace" finish, unlined, the duty is raised from \$3 per dozen to \$4 per dozen pairs, or from a dutiable rate of 64.29 per cent to 85.71 per cent. The total imports of this class are practically nothing, amounting in 1907 to only \$1,816, and while the yearly imports from 1895 to 1907 have averaged slightly higher, still there has been a gradual decline.

Under the same class, on ladies' or children's gloves of sheep origin not over 14 inches in length, the duty is increased from \$1.75 per dozen to \$4 per dozen pairs, or a rate of increase on the appraised value from 58.13 per cent to 132.86 per cent. While this class has been a fair revenue producer, still with this increase the rate would become restrictive and disastrous to revenue. Imports have gradually decreased from \$1,166,973 in 1900 to \$438,940 in 1907. This decline does not indicate that American manufacturers are in any growing danger from foreign competition.

The glove classed as "lamb" or "sheep" not over 14 inches in length, has the duty raised from \$2.50 per dozen to \$4 per dozen pairs, or an increase from 56.60 per cent to 90.56 per cent. The goat, kid, or other leather than sheep origin, "glace" finish, unlined, is increased from \$3 per dozen pairs to \$4 per dozen pairs, or from 49.52 per cent to 66.03 per cent. The injustice in the schedule is still further apparent in the higher rate of duty paid, and the still greater increase on the cheaper gloves and those classed as necessities which is seen in the flat instead of the graduated rate on all grades above a certain fixed value.

It is impossible, though, for me to dwell much longer on the injustice of this glove schedule, because my time is limited; but the foregoing observations have been taken as types and examples of the unfair discriminations to the ordinary consumer on a single article of clothing so generally worn by the average man and woman. Examination of the imports and productions shows that the rate on a large number of items in the glove schedule is already restrictive, and it would be greatly to the interest of the Government and the consumer to have a radical reduction. The only advantage in the present law under several classes of gloves is in keeping out healthy competition and giving the manufacturers a monopoly of the business.

The excuse given as a justification for this increase in the rate in the Payne bill by the supporters of this measure is that increased rates will give added protection to manufacturing, will stimulate home industry, and ultimately, through course of time,

will cheapen gloves. But the method is indirect and conjectural, and gives no hope to the present-day consumer. The truth is that the industry in this country has already grown far beyond the infant stage and has taken on monopolistic proportions.

HOSIERY.

Let us now turn our attention to the hosiery schedule. We find stockings, hose, and half hose imported for the year ending June 30, 1906, to the amount of \$6,123,195.69, with an average rate of 60.03 per cent duty, while this bill proposes an increase to 77.16 per cent. But the above figures do not give a correct impression of the radical discrimination in the rate of duty on this class of clothing. Under the cheaper grade, valued at \$1 per dozen pairs, the rate is 68.39 per cent, while in the Payne bill the duty is increased to 89.75 per cent. The class valued more than \$1 and not more than \$1.50 per dozen pairs has a rate of 58.17 per cent, but under the Payne bill the proposed rate of duty is increased to 76.16 per cent. The grade valued at more than \$1.50 and not more than \$2 per dozen pairs is raised from 51.23 per cent to 66.75 per cent. But the unfair discrimination again is most apparent when we examine the higher priced goods valued at more than \$5 per dozen pairs and find that they have been left at the Dingley rate of 55 per cent. For example, a pair of hose valued at 9 cents will have a duty imposed of 89.79 per cent, while expensive kind worn by the rich bears only a 55 per cent rate. On this same pair of hose valued at 9 cents the duty will be 8 cents, while on a pair valued at \$1 the duty is but 55 cents.

In the present age and under our present standards of living hosiery is not a luxury, but an ordinary necessary of life—a common and universal article of consumption. This is a proposition which I think will not be necessary to argue to this body, notwithstanding the statement of the eminent chairman of the committee in reporting this bill, that he was offering a bill with reductions in the necessities of life. When forced to explain, the answer comes that it is for protection to American manufactures. An examination of statistics of the hosiery industry for many years past and of the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee does not reveal a necessity for government aid. The only conclusion to be reached is that the exorbitant increase is wholly unjustifiable and is in the nature of a gift to the hosiery manufacturers. From the examination of the schedules, the amount of imports in the past, the rapid and permanent development of the industry, and from the fact that this article of clothing is of common use and a necessity of life, there is no valid reason why the present rate in the hosiery schedule should not be radically reduced. Let us have this schedule amended and reduced in justice to 90,000,000 consumers.

COTTON MANUFACTURES.

A further examination of the cotton-manufactures schedule shows a total advance from 46.29 per cent to 50.27 per cent. Cotton cloth, coarser weave, is 38.17 per cent and the finer weave 44.35 per cent, with handkerchiefs and mufflers 58.65 per cent, leaving these articles at the Dingley rate. The old rate is also retained in cotton clothing and wearing apparel. The total imports for consumption for the year ending June 30, 1906, in cotton manufactures were \$26,543,211.53, and on this the American consumer paid \$12,286,499.08 import tax. But many of these grades of goods produced practically no revenue, and the rate of duty on them served only for protection purposes to the manufacturers. It was said that we could hope for a reduction in the tariff on the necessities of life. Is there any hope in this schedule, with the total rate raised from 46.20 per cent to 50.27 per cent? In the cotton schedule are found the articles of universal use, common necessities of life.

The schedule reveals an unscientific and unnatural classification, and could be made a greater revenue producer if the authors had framed the schedules from the point of view of the Government and the consumer instead of from that of the manufacturer. The effect of this bill will be to work serious hardships to dry-goods merchants and in removing from their stock, goods that usually sold at popular prices. The provisions seem to be adroitly arranged to prevent the importation of the bulk of cotton goods. The duty now is about twice the cost of the labor in manufacturing. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee shows that the desire of the cotton manufacturers was to retain the rate of duty as it was, and now we find presented here a bill providing for an increase from 46.29 per cent to 50.27 per cent. We certainly are compelled to go to some other schedule before we find any encouragement in this bill for the consumer.

WOOLEN MANUFACTURES.

There is practically no change in the rate of duty in the general schedule of woollen manufactured goods. Woollen or worsted clothes bear a rate of 96.56 per cent. Women's and

children's goods remain very nearly the same, the Dingley rate being 103.33 per cent and in the proposed bill 103.23 per cent. Wearing apparel—clothing, ready-made, such as cloaks and outer garments—now have a rate of 85.35 per cent, with no change in the Payne bill. On the two items of blankets and flannels the rate of duty remains unchanged, with 80.78 per cent on blankets and 107.52 per cent on flannels. But many of the items throughout this schedule bear a rate of duty which is not only exorbitant and unfair, but practically prohibitive. If the classification and rates of duty were made reasonable, this schedule could be made a much greater revenue producer. On this schedule you will not receive any plaudits from the American consumer. The rates are so prohibitive that in a large number of grades of goods but a few hundred dollars of revenue are reported in a year. The Government seems to have gone into partnership with the manufacturers to sustain a price and force the consumer to pay tribute to the manufacturer in the increased price. If the rates were made reasonable, the results would come not only to the Government in revenue and the consumer in a reasonable price, but to the manufacturers in good profits. As the rate now is the consumer pays enormous profits to the manufacturer and the Government suffers seriously from the lack of revenue.

SHOES.

Shoes and leather products going into shoes, while reduced from 25 per cent to 15 per cent, in fairness to the consumer should have been reduced considerably more. This is an article of universal use among rich and poor, a necessary of life in this climate and in our stage of society. Every individual uses from one to several pairs of shoes, making a considerable portion of the total clothing expense, and perhaps no other article of wear amounts to so much in the course of the year to the average man, woman, and child. Had this schedule been revised from the standpoint of the consumer and the Government as a revenue producer, the duty on shoes would have been greatly reduced.

The manufacturers of boots and shoes in the United States need no tariff protection, as appears very clearly from the testimony and the facts before the Ways and Means Committee. The exports of boots and shoes from the United States have increased from \$6,665,017 in 1903 to \$10,666,949 in 1907, while our imports in 1907 were only \$164,509.30. This vast export trade shows that American shoes are now sold in the markets of the world in competition with other shoes. Then why compel the American consumer to pay a tariff tax to the manufacturer to protect him against foreign competition when, as a matter of fact, there is no competition? This industry has grown so large and prosperous that the American shoe manufacturers have not only successfully driven the foreign competition out of our own markets, but have actually gone over and are now driving the foreigner out of his own market to the extent of nearly \$11,000,000 in 1907.

Would it not be in keeping with our duty as Representatives, in behalf of nearly 90,000,000 consumers of shoes, to reduce this duty, instead of swelling the coffers of the shoe manufacturers, who long ago passed from the nursery stage?

WATCHES.

It would seem from this bill that the framers had not forgotten their old friend the watch trust, and that they are determined to bring the support of Congress to aid it in retaining a monopoly of the watch industry. Movements having not more than seven jewels have the rate of duty raised from 62.56 per cent to 75.12 per cent, while on higher-priced movements of more than seventeen jewels, the class of watches not commonly used, the proposed rate is only 36.12 per cent. The cheaper movements pay by far the higher rate of duty. Can anyone discern a revision here in the interest of the poor man?

PINEAPPLES, SALT, LEMONS.

The rate on pineapples in bulk is raised from 24.07 per cent to 27.52 per cent, while the rate on those in packages is raised from 16.06 per cent to 27.54 per cent. Salt in bulk bears the same rate as under the Dingley law, 79.19 per cent, which furnishes the salt trust with ample protection to insure for it a monopoly of prices with nothing to fear from foreign competition. The duty on lemons is also increased from 47.27 per cent to 59.08 per cent, and while the members of the committee have attempted to restrict importation, they may have the home industry sufficiently developed to have lemons handed back to them a hundredfold if this bill goes into operation.

TEA, COFFEE, COCOA.

Cocoa, crude, is taken from the free list and made dutiable at the rate of 36.86 per cent. There can be no justification, nor is any given, for placing this much used article on the dutiable

list, and this illustrates the point to which the supporters of this measure must go in order to raise revenue.

Tea is taken from the free list and made dutiable at the rate of 8 cents and 9 cents per pound. This further exemplifies the extremity to which the advocates of discrimination are forced to obtain revenue to run the Government. Tea has always remained on the free list except in 1898, when a tax was levied to carry on a war.

Coffee is on the free list nominally; but actually, and in the most effective sense, it is on the dutiable list. The proviso, in effect, places an almost unbearable tax on this article of food by providing that if any country or province shall impose an export duty on coffee exported to the United States, then a duty equal to that duty shall be levied and collected thereon. The fact is that Brazil, in a single Province of that country, produces the bulk of the coffee of the world. This Province produces more than 70 per cent of the consumption of the United States, and a general export tax is charged in Brazil and in this Province which is variously estimated from 2½ cents to 8 cents per pound. Under your countervailing proviso a like amount in import tax would be added by our Government, which would make us pay not only the export tax of Brazil, but, in addition, the import tax of our own country. Brazil produces two-thirds of the world's crop of coffee, while the United States is the greatest consumer. On an average, nine or ten hundred millions of pounds are imported each year, and more than 70 per cent of this comes from one Province in Brazil where the export tax prevails.

This "joker" evidently was not intended to be discovered till the bill became a law and interest in it had passed from the public mind. Those who drafted this bill knew full well the facts, and no denial comes from them that this was a secret method to tax an article of food which, almost from time immemorial, has been on the free list.

Why use deception and place coffee on the free list with this innocent-appearing proviso, to be taken advantage of when the export duty of Brazil, as you well know, will place coffee on the dutiable schedule? If revenue is wanted, and you wish to deal fairly with the people, why not reduce trust-made articles from a protective to a revenue basis? In times of profound peace to attempt to levy tribute on the poor man's breakfast table—his tea, coffee, and cocoa—is an example in tariff making that seriously discredits this measure as a possible revenue producer, and is another evidence of the ridiculous position into which you are forced in order to obtain ample revenue. You promised a revision downward on the necessities of life, and you reported a bill purporting to do so, and here you tax the poor man on the articles of food from which he draws his sustenance to give him strength to go forth on his daily toil.

OIL.

I have been not a little surprised at the attempts of some of the men in this House to advocate and attempt to force through 99 per cent protection for the products of the Standard Oil Company in the countervailing provision in paragraph 637 of the free list. This is another of the so-called "jokers." It might be interesting for us to know some of the facts and motives behind the framing of this paragraph, and I am sure the Members would willingly give way at any time for this information. Certainly the Standard Oil Company can not need protection to assist it and its group of interests and high financiers in further exploiting the American people and piling up its ill-gotten wealth. It is pitiable to see free men condoning, but a deplorable spectacle to witness representatives of the people serving such a master. I have confidence enough in the honesty and fairness of the membership of this House, and in their feeling of responsibility and duty to the people they represent, to believe that if those in authority let us get at that provision upon the final passage it will be defeated with an overwhelming vote. You can not vote for a duty on oil and then go back to your district and look an honest man in the face.

BONDS.

We were asked at the outset to believe that this was a bill for a genuine reduction on the necessities of life, but a search through the free and the dutiable lists offers no proof that it is in any proper sense a reduction. If redeeming features are contained in the bill, they certainly are not found in the schedules. Looking, then, at the other provisions we find one that is more conspicuous than all the others, and that is the provision for the issuance of bonds and certificates of indebtedness. This latter term is used with something of a soothing effect instead of the word "bonds," which has the traditional sound of war, but the result of each is the same—the creation of a public debt. At a time when we are at peace with all the

world, section 40 of the Payne bill enlarges the war provision of June 13, 1898, from one hundred millions to two hundred and fifty millions of dollars. This is corroborative evidence of its weakness and forecasts the failure of this measure. This, too, while the earth is yielding abundantly, and in the natural order of things when the wheels of industry should be moving at an unabated speed. The provision for the issuance of bonds has no place in an import-revenue system. The test of a revenue system is crop failures, combined with industrial and commercial depression. If this bill provides now in a testamentary way for its own failure, what could we expect for it in times of depression? Instead of issuing more bonds we ought to be providing for the payment of bonds and indebtedness and for reducing the deficits of the Government by a system of more rigid economy.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

The subject of foreign trade is inseparably connected with our import revenue system. One vital defect of the present bill is not only that it will fail to encourage trade, but that it will have a tendency to destroy trade. The Dingley law failed in this one essential, because its rates of duty are too restrictive. The nations of Europe are cultivating trade relations with the South American republics, and as a result are securing the bulk of the commerce, while we have not availed ourselves of our privileges there. Their political systems are modeled after ours and they naturally would desire to trade with us. Then, too, some of our island possessions and the Isthmian Canal are conveniently reached in that direction, all of which would easily give us control of the commerce of South and Central America. The Payne bill offers no hope along the line of amicable trade encouragement, because the average rate is too high and the reciprocal arrangements are based upon the "big-stick" idea, with trade duty of 45.72 per cent and a penalty from 45.72 per cent upward. On the other hand, there should be such reciprocity between the two Americas in commercial and trade relations that we could turn our attention southward to find new and larger markets for our machinery and our products.

MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM CLAUSE.

The maximum and minimum clause of this bill is disappointing in that it is so constructed as to be an invitation to an endless trade war. It lacks in the essential elements of cultivating reciprocal trade relations with the nations of the earth. The bill interchanges the maximum and minimum features and makes the Dingley maximum the proposed minimum rate. The universal rule in every revenue and taxation system, whether through statutes or constitutions, is that the principle should be maximum instead of minimum in the limitations on administrative power to levy taxes. Permanent international commerce and trade relations must always be on an amicable basis and not enforced by threat. The safe principle of reciprocal trade is to provide a general maximum duty treating all nations on the same terms, and if reciprocal advantages can be gained by trade treaties or agreements between us and other countries, then the favored-nation clause could be invoked to meet favored-trade conditions between the two. With the proposed provision in effect, instead of 44.16 per cent we may have a 65.72 per cent rate in operation, or a rate more than 21 per cent higher than the present law. The Dingley law allows trading on a rate of 44.16 per cent downward, while the Payne bill proposes a rate of 45.72 per cent upward. This is going after trade with a club by retaliation and vengeance; and the clause, if made operative, will result in a trade destroyer and a deficit producer, with possible international complications.

PRODUCER AND CONSUMER.

Little hope is given either the producer or the consumer in this bill. The margin between the two is widened and the consumer comes in for even less favors than the producer. The test to the producer is not alone the price he gets in the market, but the purchasing power of his product in what he must consume. This is likewise true of the wages or salary of the laborer, the artisan, the clerk, and the professional or business man. The framers of this bill either neglected or failed to grasp the mighty industrial, social, moral, and political forces associated with the well-being of this country. They encouraged the interests of the rich, but failed to study the problems of the poor. In the shaping of a tariff measure the schedules ought to be arranged with a view of letting the burdens of indirect taxation fall as lightly as possible on the necessities of life, the articles of consumption by the poor, and the burdens should be borne by the luxuries enjoyed by the wealthy.

RULES.

Much has been heard both in and outside of this House about the rule to be enforced in the passage of this measure. Are we to be given the right to amend, or is this bill to be forced

through and the Members compelled to vote upon it in the manner of dumb animals driven through a chute? We have a measure with 4,000 items, covering every conceivable article of commerce, and are you going to deny 391 Members and 391 districts the right to determine what is to remain in this bill and become a law, or is one man, with his 11 party associates on the committee, to frame the bill, present it to the House, and force it through by gag rule? Shall we be given a chance to amend, or will this bill be forced through en masse? Are we here simply in numbers to make your actions legal? The general debate could have ceased long ago and the Members permitted to take up the bill paragraph by paragraph, with the privilege to debate under the five-minute rule and amend any or all of the 43 sections, including the dutiable and the free lists, and also the administrative features.

The country needs and wants the very best tariff law it can get. We should have free tea, free coffee, free lumber, and free oil; we should have greatly reduced duties from those proposed, on iron and steel, cotton and woolen manufactures, gloves, shoes, and hosiery. In the passage of a tariff bill there ought to be no delay, but I hope the Members will take the time to assert their full rights, demand a scientific classification of schedules, and give us a law under which we can all live and prosper. Grant this much for the millions of wage-earning women and children, for the man at the anvil, at the business counter, and on the farm—for those who developed this vast empire of wealth and established the ideals and institutions of American industry and civilization. I appeal not for the thousands who dwell in the shadow of this Capitol to influence legislation, but for the millions everywhere who have no paid lobby here. [Continued applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I ask permission to take up any of your valuable time, but I deem it advisable to say a few words at least and to enter my protest against any duty on the necessities of life, such as coffee, tea, spices, boots, shoes, gloves, hosiery, clothing, and so forth. Fully appreciating the short time that has been allowed to me this evening and thanking the House for the courtesy, I will dwell chiefly on matters with which I am familiar. I have been for several years connected with manufacturing interests and have employed several hundred people, especially in the manufacture of underwear.

I did not expect to have this privilege accorded me, and only requested time when the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES] failed to answer my question regarding how many people the high tariff on laces and embroideries protected. He argued that laces are a luxury, and I agree with him to a certain extent, and especially do I agree with him on certain grades of laces; but when we have no lace factories, or rather very few lace factories—and, if I am correctly informed, there are less than a thousand operators in lace factories at the present time—would you put a prohibitive tariff on lace, so that it actually prevents the poor laboring man's wife and children from enjoying trimming on their gowns, skirts, dresses, and infants' wear?

The poor man does not just care to exist and have three meals a day, although at the present time, under Republican administration, many would hail with joy one good meal a day, instead of standing in the bread line and partaking of the luxury of soup houses. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It would be a great country in which to live if we could say we had no bread lines or soup houses, and our laboring men not only received good wages, but owned their own homes and had some hours for pleasure seeking.

The laboring man's wife has just as much pride in making a good appearance before her husband and her friends as the rich man's wife, and I again want to enter a protest against a duty on certain grades of laces and embroideries. If certain grades of lace were admitted free of duty, it would allow a poor man's wife to trim her garments, as well as to beautify baby's dress; and what pleases a man more on returning home, weary and worn, from a hard day's work than to find a good meal ready for him, with the smiles of wife and baby to cheer him along? God pity the man who is not blessed in this manner. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I might also say if certain grades of laces were admitted free of duty it would not only remove a great burden from 80,000,000 people, but it would stimulate and cause a demand for the manufacture of such articles as muslin underwear, shirt waists, children's and infants' wear, and give employment to many more thousands of people.

Statistics show that but few men are employed in this country in the manufacture of laces, less than a thousand, I think, despite the fact that this industry has enjoyed an *ad valorem* duty of 60 per cent. In other words, the cost of laces pur-

chased by 80,000,000 people for trimming purposes has been increased 60 per cent, and the net result has been that less than 1,000 men are now employed in manufacturing laces in this country. If this is a fair sample of the protective system, any man can figure out for himself its iniquity.

As I said in the beginning, the lace business is something of which I have personal knowledge. However, my observation has been that in this great country of ours the burden of taxation bears too heavily upon the shoulders of those who can least afford to bear it. I mean the poor man and the man of moderate circumstances. Obviously this state of affairs should not continue longer.

Let us for a moment analyze the effect of a protective tariff on one item. Take, for instance, that of farming implements. It is a fact beyond a doubt that farming implements are manufactured in this country, transported to European and South American countries, and sold there at a lower figure than they are sold to the farmer right at the door of the factory that turns them out.

This, I think, all will agree is a discrimination that works a hardship to one of the largest classes of wage-earners in the United States. It has been the most valuable asset of the Republican party to pose as the friend of labor, and while I am, and have always been, an advocate of giving to every man who works in the factory or the shop the just return of his labor, I am also in favor of giving to the man who digs and delves in the field from cock crow to sunset the same just return. In the last analysis the whole labor and business world is dependent upon the farmer for sustenance.

Without his industry the forge and the shop, the mine and the factory would soon have to suspend operations. Why, then, may I ask, is an unjust and unfair discrimination practiced against him in favor of the alien farmer, whose products come in competition with those raised in our own country? Why should the Arab, or Egyptian, who raises wheat to compete in the markets of the world with American-raised wheat, have the machinery that cuts and prepares that wheat for market sold to him at a vastly lower figure than the farmer in Ohio, Illinois, or Iowa? How comes it that an American company can sell its wares cheaper to the foreign purchaser than to the home consumer? That question is easily answered. By reason of the fostering care of a Republican tariff, American combinations and monopolies are protected from outside competition under the guise of giving them an opportunity to pay higher wages to the factory hand, the traveling salesman, and the general run of employees whose bread and meat come from the coffers of these trust magnates; yet we find that after a consolidation of the many factories that produce this class of goods, the wage of the artisan is reduced, the occupation of the salesman, like that of Othello, is gone, and the farmer of America is more systematically and persistently robbed than before.

The charity of these gentlemen is extended solely to the foreign agriculturist, and that, too, at the expense of one of the largest classes of American laborers. The tariff that gives the agricultural-implement trust a monopoly gives it at the same time power to exact from the farmer a profit that amounts to tribute, just as surely as that exacted by the Black Hand from the man who by his thrift and economy has prospered to an extent that excites cupidity and lawless lust for the fruits of another's labor.

Reduce your tariff and let competition come in, and the American farmer will be able to harvest his crop with improved machinery bought as cheaply as that used by the half-breed on the steppes of Brazil or the banks of the Nile. But, you say, that will allow foreign cheap labor to compete with high-class and highly paid American labor. We want to keep up the wage scale.

Now, was there ever a greater fallacy or a more demagogical argument put forth to sustain a bad cause? Does not every intelligent American know that the price of labor is controlled by the law of supply and demand, as are all other commodities of present-day civilization? Do we for a moment suppose that the head of one of the trust factories would refuse to replace a \$5 a day mechanic with a \$1 a day mechanic who could do the same work and as much of it in a day simply because the one was an American and the other a foreigner? Do we not see every day in the year the cheap labor of Asia coming in and displacing the better-paid American labor in nearly every vocation and in every section of this country? Then, why longer deceive ourselves and seek to deceive the people whose servants we are with false arguments and absurd hypotheses?

A protective tariff inures to the benefit of him who has and takes from him who has not even the little he would like to have. The farmer's boy who rises with the lark and goes forth to

his daily task under the light of the still shining stars and works until the last faint streak of red has faded in the western sky pays tribute to the trusts that have monopolized the implement business.

Every rosy-cheeked maid who sings as she sews the folds of her modest gown in which to appear with becoming decency at the village church, every weary mother who from day to day sews and sews, that the raiment of her offspring may be presentable, or to provide food for the hungry mouths of those she is left by a sad fate to protect, pays her widow's mite to swell the bank account of the multimillionaire who never works, but reaps from the sowings of others, that a pampered darling may dissipate a fortune on the frivolities of fashion and a degenerate son may live in easy indolence. Call you this just or right? That we must have a tariff that will produce a revenue to meet the demands of the Government none will gainsay, but when you place the chief burdens of taxation upon the shoulders of the artisan, the farmer, the sewing woman, and all those who have to provide the daily needs by daily exertions, you have placed upon them an unjust burden, and you have put the ax to the tree of liberty.

In the name of the American workers, in the name of our American civilization, and in the name of common humanity and justice, I bid you pause while there is yet time and before an outraged people arise in their might and strength and by that brute force that is born of hunger and lost hope and shattered ideals make you pause.

I am one of those who believe in the cardinal principle of Democracy—"the greatest good to the greatest number"—and, applying that principle to this Payne tariff bill, I find that either the bill or the principle needs to be changed.

In so far as the tariff bill as originally presented is concerned, my honest and candid opinion is that it is a sham and a mockery, and is a Republican endeavor to blind the millions of consumers. The Democratic party has been preaching revision for years, and Mr. Taft was forced to promise relief.

Now, how will that relief be given? Shall we further rob the wage-earner and the man of moderate circumstances? Shall we add to the already heavy burdens he has to carry? Why should we put a tax on the toiler's breakfast table? If a tax is put upon tea and coffee, I believe it would be one of the most outrageous acts ever perpetrated by Congress.

The Payne bill is supposed to be framed in accordance with pre-election pledges of Representatives and is supposed to be in response to the demands of the masses. It was stated on the stump last fall that only the Republican party could frame a satisfactory bill, and I honestly believe when the bill is finally passed you will hear men of all parties criticize it and claim that little relief, if any, has been given.

There is no question in my mind whatsoever but that the trusts and monopolies which have had the utmost protection in every manner will receive all for which they have asked, and that they will continue to make and distribute their wealth among themselves and spread more harm and discontent among the masses.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me right, Andrew Carnegie made the statement sometime ago that no tariff was needed on steel rails, and yet the Payne bill shows a tariff of \$3.92 per ton on steel rails, which, to my mind, is practically as prohibitive as the Dingley rate of \$7.84, and my candid opinion is Mr. Carnegie was pretty well informed as to what the tariff would be and will continue to be able to make generous gifts in the future as he has done in the past; but in this country of ours charity covers no sins, and the Payne bill is void of charity and full of sin. It seems to me we should return to Democratic principles in the framing of the tariff bill, to the end that the expenses of the Government be more equitably distributed and that each pay in proportion to his ability to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I for one am in favor of a separate record vote on the articles I have mentioned and all other articles in which the people of this great country are interested, so they may know who are representing them and who are representing the trusts and monopolies, such as the Standard Oil, the steel, and the sugar trusts.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call your attention and the attention of this House to the ever-increasing belief that this bill is a particularly heavy burden on the American breakfast table, an institution that neither individuals nor parties can afford to attack with impunity, and I am willing to base my reputation as a prophet on the proposition that if this bill carries the tax on tea, coffee, pepper, sugar, cloves, and so forth, as it now carries them, the party in power will feel the heavy hand of the voter who does not relish the additional cost added to his morning meal.

But it is said that it will be impossible to raise the revenue to pay the expenses of government unless these things are taxed.

I deny this proposition, and I believe that more revenue can be raised by a strictly revenue bill than by a protective bill, especially if the protective bill is so drawn, as it is in many cases, as to make the imports practically impossible by the enormous duty charged. Then there is the income tax, which was constitutional for nearly one hundred years and only pronounced unconstitutional by a divided court in time to defeat the Wilson bill as a revenue producer. There can be no possible question but that the one class other than the laborer who receives the least benefit and is done the greatest injury by the operations of a tariff bill like this is the American farmer. His surplus products are sold in a free market and everything that he uses is taxed to the limit, so that he buys in the highest and least competitive market and sells in a market that competes with the world.

Still the standpatter from the stump tells him that ancient joke, that the tariff on wheat, oats, and corn is his share of protection. Then he tells him of the spirit of brotherly love that should envelop his soul, so that he will help his brother, the manufacturer, to pillage, under the form of protection, his other brother, the workingman.

But to return to the farmer. When Grover Cleveland retired from office at the end of his second term the price of the principal product of the farmer, wheat, was 80 cents per bushel; and it never reached that price again until the year 1907, despite the fact that during the ten years that ensued there was a duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. From 1890 to 1894, under the high protective McKinley bill, wheat fell from 83 to 50 cents per bushel, with the same duty of 25 cents per bushel.

And so it is with other products of the farm, the surplus of which the farmer is compelled to sell in the free market of the world. Corn in 1899 was worth 30 cents per bushel. In the short space of two years, namely, in 1901, it sold at 60 cents per bushel.

Will some one please explain why there is such a vast change in price under the operation of the selfsame bill? If there be any virtue in the claim of the protectionist, why, then, does not this tariff keep it at the high price instead of in such dangerous fluctuations? Every reasonable person knows that there is but one law that makes the price of wheat, corn, and so forth, and that law can neither be repealed, amended, or trifled with by legislators, and that is the law of supply and demand. I reassert the well-known truth that nothing else affects the price of grains except, perhaps, a war or some other dreadful calamity, and these things can be placed under the head of accidents.

However, before I leave this subject I will add just one more agency that affects the price of grains, and that is the manipulations of heartless gamblers who operate on grain exchanges in the great grain centers of this and other countries. They frequently extort great fortunes from the people by devious methods and artificially affect the price of grain. There should be some law framed to prevent these gamblers from so manipulating the price of grain for their selfish ends. My attention has also been called to the fact that in 1895, under the Cleveland administration, corn sold at 45 cents per bushel, and during 1905, under the Roosevelt administration, corn sold at 41 cents per bushel. These examples only serve to show the folly of trying to prove by the prices themselves that the tariff has anything to do with the price of grains; and dull, indeed, is the person who can be convinced that low prices of grain bear any relation to a low tariff or high prices to a high tariff.

The surplus products of the American farmer are sold in the markets of the world in competition with similar products raised by the lowest-priced labor in the world.

But they tell us that the farmer is helped by this duty on farm products. They forget that this can not help the farmer so long as he is an exporter. Particularly does he get no benefit from this sort of legislation because when he becomes an importer—that is, when he purchases necessary articles—he finds that he is buying articles protected by a nearly prohibitive, and in many cases by an absolutely prohibitive tariff.

Let the farmer take in a load of grain to market, and then if he has in mind the erection of a new building on the farm, let him invest the proceeds of the sale of the grain in lumber, nails, glass, and so forth, and he will be compelled to owe a little until he brings in the next load or two. At this time he should begin to speculate on the real meaning and value to a farmer

of this much-vaunted high protective tariff on agricultural products.

It begins to look as though the revision of the tariff by the friends of the tariff is going to be a joke, a delusion, and a snare so far as the great mass of consumers is concerned. The revision will be upward instead of downward, and woe be unto the party that foists this bill on the people, for they will rise in their wrath on election day. Two years thereafter they will replace President Taft with that other great son of Ohio, Governor Judson Harmon. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, it would seem superfluous to further specifically discuss any of the important or even any of the immaterial tariff schedules contained in the bill now under consideration. This has been done so ably and exhaustively that I could not reflect any additional light upon them. I will therefore direct my remarks upon somewhat different lines; and in doing so I wish to say that I have no ambition now or at any time to be heard in this Chamber merely for the transitory honor of making a speech. Neither do I desire to speak and publish for "home consumption," as all of the new Members and some of the old ones are frequently supposed to do. But I do desire to be heard for a short time, lest my silence should be construed as indifference to the important issues involved in the pending debate, which perhaps will prove to be the most celebrated, exhaustive, and instructive discussion ever known to the hackneyed but vital and notable history of the intricate and perplexing problem of tariff legislation, and which debate will perhaps disseminate more educational tariff literature than was ever before given to the American people. Practically all that has been said and published heretofore on this subject has been brought to light in this debate and supplemented with a history of the effects of the operation of existing tariff laws since the enactment of the Dingley bill, and which shows the necessity of revising and amending such laws, from time to time, in order to adjust them to the ever-changing conditions of trade and commerce and the every varying demands of an evolving and advancing civilization.

For more than a century, nay, from the very foundation of this Government, a reasonably satisfactory solution of the tariff problem for any considerable period of time has defied the wisdom and statesmanship of some of the ablest and best men that this country has ever produced or, perhaps, ever will produce. It is no wonder, then, that we should approach this economic enigma "with fear and trembling." And all that we can presume to do is to emphasize the magnitude and sensitiveness of the question involved in this, perhaps, too impassionate and vehement controversy and to supplicate the majority having the issue in their hands to exercise all of their wisdom, justice, and moderation in framing the bill for enactment. Unbecoming, indeed, it may appear in me, a comparative stranger on this floor, to offer a word of advice to any Member of this House, perhaps, the ablest, most practical, and, by their various occupations, vocations, and professions, most fully equipped for their duties of any legislative council in the world. Sensible of this, I offer any advice, something that is oftener given than taken, with hesitancy and diffidence. During my very pleasant association with the membership of this House I have not sought to talk and to teach, but to listen and to learn. And I would now gratefully acknowledge my obligations to gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber for the useful information and valued instruction that I have derived from listening to their learned discourses here, and more especially for that derived during this prolonged and remarkable debate, which, I think, has taught us all that the fundamental difficulty in formulating and adopting a tariff bill resides in the perpetual and irrepressible rivalry of commercial interests. It is so easy for men to think that is right which is to their advantage, but it is not so easy for them to think that is right which is to the advantage of somebody else.

Has not such been the observation of every gentleman in this House in his dealings with men, and has such infirmity not had emphatic expression in the earnestness with which manufacturers generally beg for protection for their manufactured products, but pray that the raw material from which they are made shall be put upon the free list? The iron manufacturers want protection for iron and steel, but want ore upon the free list. Manufacturers of shoes and leather want a tariff on shoes and leather, but want hides on the free list. While cattle raisers want a healthy duty on hides, they would not object to free shoes and other leather products.

The oil trust wants a tariff on the products of petroleum, but the crude oil on the free list. Woolgrowers want a high tariff on imported wool, but would be glad to see woolen goods on the free list; while the manufacturers of woolen goods want a high

duty on imported woolen products, they want wool, the raw material, on the free list. Sugar growers and manufacturers of sugar want protection for sugar and its products, but would like to see barrels and hogsheads and the machinery necessary for their finished products on the free list. The manufacturers of cotton goods want a high-protective duty on the products of cotton, as they have heretofore had, and which they have been given again in the pending bill; yet they want free cotton, which they have heretofore had and will continue to have, because our country has a practical monopoly in the production of cotton, and it therefore has little or no competition with foreign-grown cotton; while the people, not only in the cotton-producing areas, but in every other section of the country, would rejoice to have a material reduction of the duty on cotton goods, as they ought to have.

In those States wherein timber, suitable for lumber, is practically exhausted and wherein lumber has heretofore been protected, and in those prairie States and Territories wherein there is little or no timber or lumber, the people want free lumber; but in those States wherein there is yet a supply of timber and lumber, the timber owners, lumber dealers, and manufacturers want the present or a higher duty than is now imposed upon lumber. And so we could continue these antithetic illustrations indefinitely, but we have cited enough to show that the fundamental difficulty in framing and adopting a tariff law that will be reasonably satisfactory to all classes and communities of our people, resides in the great diversity of local, sectional, or specific interests and in the rivalries of commercial enterprise, and hence the diversity of views and contentions heard upon this floor in the pending discussion. Members naturally sympathize with the wishes and wants of their constituents. This is right, with this qualification, that each will not demand more for his constituents than he is willing to concede to the constituents of others under like or similar conditions. My constituents are willing to pay their just proportion of a tariff tax—for it is nothing more nor less than a tax indirectly paid—to support the Government honestly and economically administered, but not a dollar for protection per se—that is, for the sake of protection. Our once "infant industries" have become full grown and independent giants, that need no protection, though a tariff for revenue only does incidentally protect them.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who said in his able speech before this committee a few days since that the best Democratic tariff law we have ever had was what is known as the "Walker bill," of 1846, which levied import duties on competitive products, such as wool, cotton, iron, and steel, but placed sugar and coffee, noncompetitive articles, on the free list. And we would so graduate the duties on competitive products as to levy the highest rate, not prohibitory, on the luxuries and elegancies of life, such as wines, liquors, jewels, ornaments, silks, works of art, and so forth, and so forth, and the next highest upon the comforts and the lowest on the necessities of life. I believe that all classes of the people should bear their just proportion of the tax necessary to the support of the Government that protects them, the rich paying the highest rate, the well to do the next highest, and the poor the very lowest—that is, in proportion to their ability to pay.

While my constituents want a reduction of the tariff on shoes, cotton and woolen goods, oil, coal, farming implements and machinery, wheat, flour, meat, bacon, and some other necessities, they are not complaining unreasonably, nor are they demanding such radical reduction in the existing tariff schedules as will destroy or seriously damage any useful industry, but they do insist upon an equitable tariff tax and the lowest consistent with revenue purposes.

The timber owners and lumber dealers and manufacturers of the district that I have the honor to represent are asking that the present duty be retained on lumber; the consumers naturally want free lumber. Now, as I do not think that the reduced rate proposed in the bill would be burdensome to consumers or unfair to any interests, and as we are compelled to raise revenue for the support of the Government, and as the duty now on imported lumber brings into the Treasury nearly \$2,000,000, and as the decrease of that duty to about one-half, as provided in the pending bill, may increase that amount by increased quantities of foreign lumber coming into the country, I will, for the purpose of revenue, vote for the reduced rate of tariff on imported lumber as provided in the bill, believing that each industry ought to bear its just proportion of a tax to support the Government. As shown in this debate, this industry gives employment to 800,000 laboring men. I have said that one chief difficulty in coming to an agreement in framing a tariff law resides in the diversity of the interests involved and in the ever active conflicts of commercial enterprises. I repeat that declara-

tion to show the necessity of mutual concession and compromise. It is hard to reason with the run-mad commercialism of the day. It sometimes looks as if that spirit would soon become a national monomania, if it has not already done so. Fifty years ago a millionaire was a novelty and a wonder. To-day he is common as colonels in Kentucky or majors in Tennessee. The pauper of to-day is the millionaire of to-morrow, and we do not know how he became so except by devious methods that robbed somebody else. We admire and applaud commercial enterprise and success when directed and achieved on legitimate lines and by honest methods.

There is, or ought to be, a limit to individual, corporate, monopolistic, and even national aggrandizement. A nation, as well as individuals and combinations of individuals, can become too powerful to be just. The exactions of wealth and the extortions of monopoly, with the power that accompanies great riches, have been prolific sources of social disturbance and political revolution in all past ages, and may become so in this if not restrained and controlled by law.

That a high protective and discriminating tariff has aided in the creation of trusts and monopolies will hardly be questioned, and the time has come to enforce the Democratic doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." That New England has grown rich and powerful at the expense of other sections of the country will hardly be denied. She was the first to get tariff protection and she wants to be the last. The high protection that she has so long enjoyed on cotton and woolen fabrics, shoes, and other products of prime necessity should be greatly reduced and to a revenue basis. And here may I historically remind you that it was this long favored section—New England—that made the first threat to dissolve the Union, because she said her commerce was being injured by the then existing war with Great Britain. May I also remind you that what were deemed unjust tariff laws caused another State in a different part of the country to threaten nullification and secession in 1832, but the objectionable law was modified and further trouble for the time was averted. Also that the tariff question was later a material factor in the inauguration and prosecution of one of the most sanguinary and destructive internecine wars of which human history has given an account. May I further remind you that tariff taxation was the leading cause of our Revolutionary war. And although it is a hundred and thirty years since one of these wars and nearly fifty since the other in which the tariff question was a material factor, it is not yet settled, but is still a source of discord and dissension as shown in this protracted and vehement debate. It is still a bombshell filled with explosives, and needs to be carefully handled. It is not—at least, it ought not to be—any party's question, but the country's question. The eyes of restless, anxious, watching millions are upon this Congress, called together for the special purpose of revising and changing an unsatisfactory tariff law and making it more equitable and satisfactory to the people by doing equal and impartial justice to all classes and all sections of the country. Justice is the essence of all good and stable government, and without that all forms of human rule, whether democratic, monarchic, oligarchic, autocratic, or what you will, are alike tyrannies and will eventually be overthrown. If, then, we would have continued peace and tranquillity, let us give the people justice. No Member can fairly claim a concession for his particular constituency that he is not willing to accord to those of all other Members. And in the final framing of this bill, imposing a tariff tax for revenue to support the Government, frugally and honestly administered, let us endeavor to put the lightest burdens upon the labor producers and toiling consumers and the highest on those who can most easily bear them.

AN INCOME TAX.

We are compelled to raise enough revenue to maintain the Government and to prevent a continuation of the deficit now in the Treasury and estimated to be from \$100,000,000 to \$140,000,000. This is the great purpose for which we have been convened in extraordinary session, and this must be done by levying duties on foreign products coming into this country until some better and more satisfactory system of raising revenue to support the Government can be devised.

In this connection I desire to say that I emphatically favor an income tax for raising a portion of the revenue to support the Government, and would heartily support a bill for that purpose, such as was proposed by my colleague, Mr. HULL, in his able speech on yesterday. The bill he proposes provides that all incomes above \$4,000 per annum be taxed 2 per cent for the purpose of raising revenue for the support of the Government. The passage of such a bill would bring large sums into the Treasury, without being oppressive to anyone. The man

who is fortunate enough to have such an income ought not to object to paying a tax of 2 per cent on all the income he has above that amount, because it enables him to pay the tax without a hardship. Is it not a sound principle that all citizens should contribute to the support of their Government in proportion to their ability to do so? Such an income tax as this would not only be moderate and fair, but would be such an ample source of revenue to the Government as to enable it to reduce the tax now imposed upon the comforts and necessities of life, and that is what I favor. I am for revising the tariff downward on all articles that are indispensable to the great body of the people and of raising it, if necessary for revenue, on those articles that are not indispensable.

Concluding, I once more appeal to the majority, having the power to pass the bill under consideration, to be fair and just—giving to all classes of the people and all sections of the country an equal hearing and a "square deal."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, in speaking for a short time on the tariff question I shall not attempt to make a partisan speech. I wish to talk from the standpoint of a farmer and not that of a politician, nor do I have the same advantage as the gentleman from New York, who is a merchant in New York and a farmer when in Pennsylvania. I know nothing about any other business than farming, and came direct from the farm to the floor of this House; theories may sustain arguments for campaign purposes, but the business of this country deals only with facts, and the American farmer is the great business man of our Nation.

I wish to speak of two phases only of this great tariff question—its relation to the cattle industry and the maximum and minimum features of this bill. The value of our meat industry is not seemingly understood by some of the Members of this House. I was much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] when speaking in the interest of the shoemakers of his State. We are aware of the importance of the busy workshops and the value of their output, but, sir, Mr. Chairman, if all the property of the New England States was sold at its estimated value the proceeds would not be sufficient to equal the amount of capital now invested in the production of the meat supply of the United States. And I call the attention of the Members of this House to Table 3, page 4, Bulletin 155, United States Department of Agriculture, published in 1907. I insert that table in full in my remarks, and now call attention only to the comparisons I have given, namely, the total capital engaged in the meat industry and that invested in the New England States; the capital directly related to meat productions for export is \$10,625,059.283; and the estimated true value of the New England States is \$8,823,325.592.

And now, Mr. Chairman, the value of our cattle is three-fourths that of all our domestic meat animals; and so we may say the capital directly related to the cattle industry in the United States is equal to the true value of all the property of the New England States. The people who own this vast amount of property are interested in every phase of the cattle question. We are interested more in the price of the meat than we are in the price of the hide, simply because there are more pounds of beef in the steer than there are pounds in the hide; but, sir, when I was a boy and attended the old-time rifle matches, where a beef was the prize, the hide and tallow always made one choice out of five, and the hide is more valuable to-day than it was thirty years ago. And I state here that no industry in the United States with an equal investment pays so small a margin of profit as the cattle industry as it stands to-day, and, if the committee will follow me a few moments, I will give some of the reasons why this is true, and I wish it understood that I am speaking from the standpoint of a corn-belt cattle grower and feeder.

I desire to call particular attention to the fact that export cattle to-day under our present tariff are lower than they were under the Wilson law in 1896. I shall insert in full in my remarks a table prepared for me by the statistician of the Agricultural Department showing the number, value, and average value per head of all cattle exported from the United States from 1890 to 1908, both inclusive. I call attention now only to the years 1896 and 1908—the last year of the Cleveland administration and the last year of the Roosevelt administration. In 1896 we exported to all countries 372,461 head of cattle; in 1908 we exported 349,210 head, or a decrease of 23,251 head. The cattle exported in 1896 brought the American farmer \$34,560,672, while those exports in 1908 realized but \$29,339,134, or a decrease of \$5,221,538 in total value. In 1896 the average price per head of export cattle was \$92.79. In 1908 the average was only \$84.02 per head, or a decrease of \$8.77 per head. Under the Wilson bill, taking the years 1893–1897, inclusive, a period of five years, the average price of export

cattle was \$92.31 per head; and under the Dingley law, taking the years 1898 to 1908, inclusive, a period of eleven years, the average price of export cattle was \$77.65, or a decrease of \$14.66. To make this comparison the more striking, let us compare the average price of export cattle under the McKinley Act, the Wilson law, and the Dingley bill. For the years 1890 to 1892, inclusive, the average export price of cattle was \$82.46. So we have the averages as follows:

The last years of the McKinley law the average price of export cattle was \$82.46 per head; the Wilson law, \$92.31 per head; the Dingley law, \$77.65 per head. These facts are not mentioned as a defense of the Wilson bill or an indictment of the Dingley law; they are quoted to prove the assertion that the cattle industry pays a very small margin of profit at the present time, and whatever may have been the degree of prosperity of the whole country, the cattle industry has not been favored by the high prices which are said to constitute that prosperity.

Cattle from the corn belt, when fattened for the market and sent to Chicago, are separated into grades, and each grade seeks its own market. There is no more competition between the different grades of fat cattle from our farms than there is between the fine shoes and the brogans from the Massachusetts factories. There are three principal grades of beef cattle. The shipping grades are the very choicest and the highest priced. These go to our eastern cities for high-grade hotel, restaurant, and retail trade. This trade demands the best beef and pays the highest price. The second grade is export cattle, or those which are shipped abroad alive; then comes the packing grades, or those purchased by the Chicago packers, which compose the great bulk of our beef cattle. The only practical competition at the Chicago yards is that between the shippers, packers, and exporters, and this competition is only present when the packers are bidding for the higher grades of cattle, and thus conflict with the interests of the buyers for the shipping and export trade. As the great bulk of cattle are of grades below shipping and exports, they fall into the packers' hands without competition. This gives rise to the charge of a cattle trust. I shall not argue the question of the existence of a cattle trust; but if there is a cattle trust, it is a trust which can not be broken up by the penal laws of our country, and will be dissolved only when you broaden the foreign market for our cattle and make it possible for competition to enter into the grades of cattle now handled exclusively by the packers. Men will always buy as cheaply as is possible under existing conditions. That is the first law of trade, and it will manifest itself in the cattle trade just as surely as in any other branch of business. One of the chief advantages which broader foreign markets will bring to the American farmer is the competition in buying for the grades of cattle now handled exclusively by the packers. I can make this clear if you will follow me in an examination of our export cattle trade.

I can not better illustrate the present condition of our present foreign markets for cattle than to take a most striking example from our fat-stock show at Chicago. In this great international fat-stock show, in 1908, my own State, Indiana, captured the highest honors open to any cattle feeder in the world, producing the grand champion fat steer, Fyvie King. No other beef animal, sir, in the world was the equal of this fine animal, which was bred and fed in the great cattle State of Indiana; but when that animal was offered for sale to go upon the block it was denied admission into the markets of every country of continental Europe, except Belgium.

The traveler from continental Europe speaks about meeting American citizens and American products, but he never sees an American steer or tastes American beef.

There has been but 1,179 head of American cattle sold in France, Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary since 1895, a period of thirteen years. There has not been a single steer sold in either country since 1902, a period of six years. Their market is not friendly to fresh beef slaughtered in America and sent to their markets.

From the years 1896 to 1907, inclusive, not a pound of American fresh beef has found a market in Austria-Hungary, but 19,000 pounds in France, 1,419,760 pounds in Germany, and but 156,350 pounds in Italy. I place in the Record Table 7, Bulletin 55, showing our table exports of meat products, by countries, from 1890 to 1906, inclusive, and I will only call your attention now to the totals.

Taking the years 1899–1908, inclusive, a period of ten years, we exported to the four great countries of continental Europe, viz, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, only 1,146 head of live cattle, valued at \$101,220. During this same period we exported to the United Kingdom 3,371,382 head, valued at \$315,023,115, or in round numbers 3,000 times in number and value was sold to the United Kingdom as to the four great

countries on the Continent. Practically the same results are true in our fresh-beef trade. During this same period our total exports of fresh beef to the four great countries of Europe were 2,390,163, having a value of \$209,683. As small as this amount is, it was wholly sent out during the last five years under reciprocal trade agreements which have been made between the United States and these countries, and which the Payne bill in its present form will abrogate and set aside. During this same ten-year period we exported and sold to the United Kingdom 2,775,684,413 pounds fresh beef, valued at \$266,401,965, or 1,250 times the volume and value to Great Britain as to the four great countries of continental Europe. The combined population of France and Germany exceeds 100,000,000 people; transportation facilities are as ample to Havre and Bremen as to Liverpool, nor are freight rates materially different. The people of continental Europe are a meat-eating population, and their markets are poorly supplied with this prime necessity of life. I can not explain this situation better than to quote from a signed article by Alvin H. Saunders, editor of the *Breeders' Gazette*, and published in that great farm paper, April 22, 1908, page 9441:

I spent a few hours the other day in the great Smithfield market, London, where beef, pork, and mutton in quantity fairly paralyzing is daily exposed for sale from Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, and the United States; but across the English Channel, scarce six hours' distant, are other toiling millions gnawing at hard crusts, horse meat and sausages of dubious origin. A glut at Chicago and London and comparative famine, so far as good nourishing meats are concerned, from Naples to Copenhagen. Why? Because the iron hand of the law stands between the American feed lot and the European kitchen, that is all.

The United Kingdom has always been a friendly market to us, but it is also a friendly market to other countries. South America and Australia are now underselling us in the British markets on the cheaper grades of beef, and we are gradually losing our export trade on cattle and their products. I will place Table 6 in full in my remarks, and now simply call attention to the fact that for the year ending June 30, 1907, a period free from financial disturbance, we did not export, in round numbers, but 7,000 head more cattle than we did for the average of five years extending from 1898 to 1902, inclusive, and 113,857 head below the average for the five-year period from 1903 to 1906. If we take the year 1908 for comparison, we exported in that year fewer cattle and the American farmers received a smaller total sum of money from this item than for any year since 1893. Comparing 1908 with 1896, the total number exported in 1906 was greater and the average price was \$8.72 per head higher in price. Our canned beef has fallen from 50,000,000 to 15,000,000 pounds for the five years ending in 1907, and in this same period our exports of fresh beef fell from 300,000,000 to 291,000,000 pounds. In this connection I quote from a statement made by Clay, Robinson & Co., of Chicago, one of the largest cattle commission firms in the Central West, published in the *Live Stock Report*, March 5, 1909:

Exports of beef from this country are on the wane, and a great deal of damage has resulted to the price range thereby. The latest statistics sent the imports into the United Kingdom during 1908, as compared with the previous year, indicate a big decrease. Last year the United Kingdom bought from our country live stock for food purposes to the value of \$31,782,168, a decrease of \$7,570,800 from the previous twelve months, while a total of \$50,165,828 of fresh beef was imported by that country, a decrease of \$432,145. And this total decrease in import trade in fresh beef indicates that a considerably increased volume of cheaper beef was received against the year previous, and it came from countries other than the United States.

United States exports of dressed beef in the United Kingdom during 1908 in value were approximately \$15,906,641, a decrease of \$9,256,000 from the year before; while in exports of live meat animals a total volume of business of \$21,704,590 was noted, indicating a decrease of \$7,610,323 from the year before. A great portion of the decrease in the United States live-cattle and dressed-beef exports was due to the increased trade with the Argentine Republic enjoyed with England and also the favor with which the Canadian beef found sale.

Our total exports of fresh beef are shown to have been 201,154,105 pounds for 1908, against 281,651,502 pounds in 1907. The significance of these figures can best be shown by quoting the following statement, taken from *Meat Supply and Surplus*, published by the Department of Agriculture in 1907. I quote the first sentence written in that bulletin:

With a meat export in 1900 amounting to one-eighth of the production, the growing of meat animals and the manufacture of the products derived from their slaughter are largely dependent upon the export trade, and the foreign marketing is essential to the maintenance of the present magnitude of the meat industry and of prices profitable to the farmer. If such an immense quantity of surplus meat food was to be confined within this country by the refusal of foreign countries to buy it, there would follow consequences to farmers, range men, slaughterers, and packers which would be financially disastrous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust these figures will convince the gentlemen of this House that the cattle industry deserves careful consideration in the pending tariff measure.

I shall speak of free hides in this connection; but before leaving the subject of foreign markets I want to ask the question,

What relief will the pending measure give from unfriendly foreign restrictions on our meat industry if it becomes a law as it now stands? I am going to ask the same question regarding this measure which Mr. Blaine asked in regard to the McKinley bill: Does it make a foreign market for our beef and pork?

The farmers and live-stock men are in favor of a maximum and minimum tariff, because they have understood that such an arrangement means an extension of our reciprocal trade agreements. I have called attention to the fact that the only fresh beef we are now sending to the Continent is the result of these trade treaties, and that these agreements will be abrogated by the pending bill; but I undertake to say that as the present bill is drawn, however well it may serve the American manufacturer, it will not open foreign markets to American meats and meat animals, and therefore will disappoint the just expectations of our farmers and stockmen. This opinion is not based upon a spirit of hostility to any constructive work by the majority, but is based upon a study of the cause which has driven us from the world's live-stock markets. The Payne bill assumes that American products have been discriminated against by foreign tariffs, and the trade advantages it offers will go to countries which give to our products the most-favored-nation clause. The present live-stock situation has not been created by hostile tariffs.

The Secretary of Agriculture uses these words in describing the tariff situation in Europe as applied to our meats:

As a rule, the tariff rates imposed do not discriminate against the United States. At present no country of Europe, except France, imposes on the United States products higher rates than those applicable to the products of its most highly favored competitor. Even in the case of France, the benefit of the lowest tariff rate is accorded to the United States on several of its leading packing-house products.

The Payne bill abrogates our present special trade agreements which have partly opened European trade to certain classes of our meats, and then, under the automatic maximum and minimum features, prevent the American farmer from securing any concession at all. It takes away what little special privileges we have, and absolutely offers nothing in return. This being true, then in what manner will the Payne bill, if enacted into law, open the markets which are now closed to us? This important feature of our trade relations does not seem to have been understood by the distinguished gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Our cattle and meat products are shut out of their markets by unjust regulations under the right to protect the public health, and not under the operation of a tariff charge. The American farmer produces the best meat in the world at the lowest price. On all grades of grain-fed cattle they can meet the competition of the world. No one objects to the principle that a nation should have the power to exclude or restrict the importation of food products to protect the public health, or to avoid contagious diseases among stock. Our own country exercises this power, and but recently it prohibited shipments to avoid diseases; but as soon as the danger is past, the arbitrary regulations are suspended. We can not reasonably object to other countries exercising the same power to protect their interests which we reserve to protect ours. It is not the principle to which we object, but the unfair regulations to enforce the principle. It is an instance in which the spirit rather than the letter killeth, and that is exactly why this automatic provision of the Payne bill must fail to meet the situation.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] in defending the countervailing duties on forest products, used these words:

Canada has discriminated against American citizens; and, by the heavens above me, I contend that we have the right to strike back at Canada when she strikes at us.

This sentiment was applauded on the Republican side of this Chamber; and yet, Mr. Chairman, in section 482 of the Payne bill I find this provision: "Any animal imported specially for breeding purposes shall be admitted free;" and under this section France, in 1907, sent to the United States 1,582 horses and mares, which brought the farmers of France more than \$1,000,000, and during that period not an American steer was admitted into their markets. The same thing is true of Germany; they send their horses and mares into the United States at a high price and not a single American steer could gain entry into their country. Our farmers want to know why it is that they can send sound animals into our markets and we can not send sound animals into theirs. If you are going to strike at the Canadian lumberman, why not strike at the French and German farmers? We give them markets for their horses and they deny us a market for our cattle. This section of this bill should be amended, and I call attention that, if given the opportunity, I will offer the following substitute for this section:

SEC. 482. Any animal imported by a citizen of the United States specially for breeding purposes, whether intended to be so used by the

Importer himself or for sale for such purpose, \$100: *Provided*, That all such animals shall be admitted free of duty if imported from any country which admits American live animals under conditions and regulations satisfactory to the President: *And provided further*, That no such animal shall be admitted free unless pure bred of a recognized breed and duly registered in the book of record established for that breed: *And provided further*, That certificate of such record and of the pedigree of such animal shall be produced and submitted to the customs officer, duly authenticated by the proper custodian of such book of record, together with the affidavit of the owner, agent, or importer that such animal is the identical animal described in said certificate of record and pedigree: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what are recognized breeds and pure-bred animals under the provisions of this paragraph. The Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe such additional regulations as may be required for the strict enforcement of this provision. Cattle, horses, sheep, or other domestic animals straying across the boundary line into any foreign country, or driven across such boundary line by the owner for temporary pasturage purposes only, together with their offspring, may be brought back to the United States within six months free of duty, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply to all such animals as have been imported and are in quarantine, or otherwise in the custody of customs or other officers of the United States, at the date of the passage of this act.

If this section were amended, taking away the right of free entry from those countries which prohibit the entrance of our live stock into their markets, we would have a most powerful weapon with which to secure the American farmer a fair fight for foreign trade.

And now, Mr. Chairman, the question of free hides is raised by the Payne bill. My position is mighty plain on that proposition. I am for free hides if you put leather and shoes on the free list. I am opposed to free hides and taxed shoes. The working people of this country are entitled to cheaper shoes; the farmer should have cheaper harness; and I am willing to spread this gospel of reduction in the cost of production to include free hides. I place in my remarks a letter from a manufacturer of shoes asking for free hides and offering free shoes. I commend the spirit of fairness contained in that letter, and I am willing to strike the bargain on his own terms. This means a concession from both parties who produce the shoe—the man who raises the hide and the man who makes the shoe—in favor of the man who buys the shoe, for you can not make a shoe without the hide; and when we are to determine the cost of that shoe, why take all the concession from one man? Free raw materials with a taxed finished manufactured product made from that raw material means, simply, that the advantage which goes in some degree at least with any tariff duty is to be given to the manufacturing States as against the agricultural and mining States; for raw materials are produced largely by the farmer and the miner.

I am willing to take off both duties at the same time; but, sir, the wayfaring man, though a fool, knows that if the farmer consents to free hides in advance the shoe manufacturer will get cheaper hides, but the farmer will not receive cheaper harness and cheaper shoes. The Treasury will lose the revenue derived from a just revenue duty on hides, the farmer will lose \$1 per head on all beef cattle, and the people will pay the same price for shoes. It will be the same old story of the sugar trust, with the old duty on refined sugar maintained and raw sugar admitted at a lower rate. The duty on raw sugar from Cuba was lowered 20 per cent, without any reduction in the duty on refined sugar. This was done to give the people cheaper sugar. Last year we imported from Cuba 1,618,233 tons of raw sugar, and the price of the refined sugar was not lowered one penny. The Treasury of the United States lost a vast amount of revenue, the treasury of the sugar trust gained an equal amount, and our people paid the old price, which is 2 cents per pound more for sugar than the people of the United Kingdom have to pay.

Why should there be protection on shoes? All our shoes are made in the United States and we are selling vast quantities abroad. Last year we imported only \$164,509 worth of shoes, paying a duty of only \$41,000, while we exported \$10,600,000 in value, or nearly 6,000,000 pairs of shoes. The manufacturers lose nothing by lowering the rate on shoes from 25 per cent to 15 per cent; one rate is just as prohibitive as the other. Harness is reduced from 45 per cent to 35 per cent. In the year 1907 we imported but \$160,632 worth of harness, and in the same year we exported five times the value in harness that we imported. The rates on shoes and harness are absolutely prohibitive. They yield practically no revenue, so that the Treasury is not benefited. If the purpose of a tariff is to raise revenue, I call attention to the fact that a tariff on hides of 15 per cent will yield more revenue in one year than a tariff of 25 per cent on boots and shoes would do in fifty years. Why, then, repeal the one and leave the other?

The present tariff on hides is 15 per cent ad valorem. This

is a just and fair revenue duty and places in the Treasury a revenue of \$2,789,300 per annum. We are told that at present our revenues are not sufficient to meet our expenses, and that the Government must raise more money. Under these circumstances, I ask why this revenue is thrown away and hides are placed on the free list? I am determined to adhere to my resolution to discuss this question from a farmer's view point and not as a political consideration. I may remind my Democratic colleagues, however, that this is purely a tariff for revenue, and therefore accords with our time-honored political principles; and I may say to my Republican brethren that if you recognize the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to the American farmer, that the present duty is too low, and, while I do not claim the right to direct your policy, to make the interpretation of your platform, I can see no reason why an American farmer is not as fairly included within that promise as an American manufacturer.

The question has been asked, "Who gets the benefit of the tariff on hides?" The answer is very plain. The same man gets the advantage of the tariff on hides who gets the benefit from the tariff on every other article in the tariff schedule—the man who makes them for sale; and that, in this instance, is the American cattleman. I insert in my remarks a table of the prices of domestic hides for the years from 1892 to 1908, inclusive. This table was compiled for me by the Bureau of Statistics under date of March 29, 1909. I now call attention to the prices for 1897 and 1898: For 1897, the price for domestic green salted hides was \$9.96 per 100 pounds; in 1898, the price was \$11.50, an increase of nearly 15 per cent. The tariff on hides went into effect in 1898, and this ought to answer who got the extra price. I wish to say that no market is more sensitive than the fat beef market. Even the appearance of a steer adds to his value. Cattlemen feed special feeds to add to the glossiness of the hair; they bed carefully to add to the appearance, for the cattle are purchased by the eye, and every factor adds to their value. Even the presence of horns detract from their sale because of liability to damage or actual damage to the hides and flesh by bruising; and anyone familiar with market reports knows that if a high-priced bunch of cattle contains any cattle with horns, that fact is always noted in the market report, so that buyers and sellers in the country will fully understand the sale.

The present bill carries a duty of 11 cents a pound on raw wool—a tax equal to a rate of 46.88 per cent ad valorem. This tax increases to 44 cents on scoured wool which produces 1 pound of woolen cloth; on yarns made wholly or in part of wool a tax equivalent to a rate of 121.09 per cent ad valorem; on woolen cloths, 136.75 per cent ad valorem; on knit fabrics, 133 per cent; blankets, 99.9 per cent; flannels, 107.52 per cent; women's and children's dress goods, 107.53 per cent—an average rate on all wearing materials made wholly or in part of wool of 94.54 per cent. These taxes are not only oppressive but they are prohibitive. Only 6.2 per cent of all our woolen manufactured goods are imported into the country; we get practically no revenue from these importations.

I have given these figures to contrast the wool schedules with the hide schedules in the same bill. Now, the value of all the cattle in the United States, according to the census of 1900, was \$1,500,000,000; and the value of all sheep was \$171,000,000; or that our cattle are worth practically nine times the value of our sheep. Now, why should wool bear so high a duty and cattle hides no duty at all? The answer is very plain to me. Farmers shear their sheep and sell their own wool. If you own but one sheep you can see at a glance the difference which the tax on wool makes in its market value, and the vote of the farmer is feared at the ballot box. The beef animal is usually sold on foot, and beef cattle vary widely in price—often from 3 to 6 or 7 cents a pound in the same market.

A butcher, when he slaughters a beef, divides it into three parts, the hide, the quarters, and the offal. From the hide and the quarters he must get the value of the animal. The more meat it dresses, the higher value he can pay, so that a very fat animal is worth more than a poor one, both on account of the quantity and the quality of the beef. So the price varies widely, because the percentage of dressed beef to live weight varies widely. The hide does not vary so much in weight or price, so that the hide is a larger factor in fixing the price of plain cattle than it is in fixing the price of the very high-priced cattle. But to show that the price of the hide does have an effect on the selling price of cattle, I insert the following telegram from Clay, Robinson & Co., cattle salesmen at Chicago and every other great cattle market in the United States. These men have no interest on either side of this controversy

and simply state the effect the change will have on cattle shipped for sale to any of the great markets:

UNION STOCK YARDS,
Chicago, March 31, 1909.

RALPH W. MOSS,
Washington, D. C.:

If hides put on free list, affect selling value of cattle 5 to 10 cents hundred.

CLAY, ROBINSON & Co.

If every cattle grower in the United States slaughtered his own cattle and sold the hides as he now sells his wool, so that the effect of the tariff duty would appear to him as plain on hides as it does on wool, there would be doubt as to the disposition of this schedule. Every protectionist would be eager to vote for a high rate on hides, and every tariff-for-revenue advocate would favor a revenue duty with its incidental protection, and we would have the hide and the leather schedules closely modeled after the wool and woolen schedules.

I rejoice, Mr. Chairman, that this result can not be brought about. Leather and its products are a necessity among civilized people. Everybody wears shoes, and the demand for leather and its products exceed our ability to produce the hides to supply it. I believe the necessities of life should be lightly taxed, but the necessity for good shoes is no greater than it is for warm clothing. I insert in my remarks an editorial which Mr. CLARK of Missouri took from the Kansas City Star, the leading Republican newspaper of the West, and made a part of his speech on the Payne bill. Mr. CLARK of Missouri said:

That there was any connection between the tariff and tuberculosis I never dreamed, but here it is, and when you hear it, it is as clear as day. This article is as follows:

TUBERCULOSIS AND THE TARIFF.

Probably few persons have ever given the matter a thought, but there is an intimate relation between the high protective tariff and the high mortality resulting from tuberculosis. The ravages of this disease are greater in the United States than in any other similarly enlightened country. And the cost of warm clothing is greater in this country than in others. There is where the relation between an unnecessary tariff and a largely preventable malady comes in.

It has been shown that tuberculosis is very largely a disease of poverty. Particularly is the spread of the disease, the miscellaneous infection from it, mainly traceable to poverty. And, next to good food and fresh air, the most important thing in the prevention or the cure of tuberculosis is warm, woolen clothing. But the cost of this kind of clothing, whether for wearing apparel or for bedding, is directly increased about 100 per cent by the heavy import duty on wool and woolsens. This excess cost is raised to about 150 per cent by the duty on machinery and other articles affecting the manufacture of woolsens. These duties were imposed to promote sheep raising and the manufacture of woolsens. But the increased cost of raw material has made the general tariff disadvantageous to the manufacturer, and it has not greatly benefited the woolgrower. At least, such benefits as have accrued to the limited class engaged in growing wool is as nothing compared to the benefits that would come to the masses in general through cheap clothing; or to the cruelties, hardships, sickness, and death resulting from an insufficiency of warm clothing. It is better that the Nation should be comfortably and cheaply clothed, warmed, and saved from preventable disease than that the woolgrowers should increase their profits at the cost of these advantages to the whole people. It is claimed by scientists that cheap wool clothing would do more to suppress tuberculosis than all the sanitariums and other agencies now maintained for that purpose.

But in order to make an equitable adjustment of this question, the tariff should be taken off both raw and manufactured wool, and from all machinery or other articles affecting the cost of manufactured wool.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The men who vote to levy these exorbitant rates on the woolen manufactures will have visited upon them the curse that is pronounced in the Bible against those who "grind the faces of the poor." [Applause.]

I not only indorse this sentiment, but I mean to vote for free hides and free leather and free shoes; but I protest against the discrimination between wool and hides. It would be vastly better to lower the tariff on wool and woolen goods and retain a low tariff revenue on hides and leather products. The woolen schedules are the worst in the bill. It is not possible that they could be written in any tariff bill if it were not for the supposed effect on the farmer vote. Yet there are vastly greater farm values on cattle than on sheep, and the effect of the tariff on hides is just as positive as on wool. The tariff table which I insert in this connection will show this to be true. No industry ought to prosper at the expense of the whole country. The burdens of government ought to be equally distributed by lower duties levied on many articles instead of high duties on manufactured articles. We would then distribute the benefits as well as the burdens of taxation. The needs of the people and not the political advantages should be considered in levying taxes to support our Government.

James J. Hill stated in a public address that there must be a revolt against the worship of manufacture and trade as the

only forms of progressive activity. I venture to predict that if the farmers of our country thoroughly understood the provisions of this tariff bill the revolt would come in this Congress.

Farmers do not enjoy the leisure nor the income of the manufacturing and commercial classes. They live an isolated life and have not had access to current literature as other classes have. I rejoice that this condition is fast passing away. Rural delivery and cheap daily papers are working wonders among our rural population. If their influence is not felt in this body to-day, it will be felt in the near future. I need not remind the majority of this House that the agricultural interests look to them to make this revision a fair one to their interests. We hear much on the floor of this House about the conservation of our resources. Gentlemen, the greatest natural resource this country or any other country has is the fertility of its soil. Lord Bacon more than three centuries ago said that "there be three things which make a nation great and prosperous—a fertile soil, busy workshops, and easy mode of conveyance for men and commodities from one place to another." You can not maintain a fertile soil without general live-stock farming, and you can not promote the live-stock industry of this country by placing hides on the free list and shutting our beef from the markets of the world. [Loud applause.]

APPENDIX.

[United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Statistics Bulletin No. 55. Victor H. Olmsted, Chief of Bureau.]

Meat capital compared with other capital and classes of wealth.

Item.	Value.
Capital directly related to meat production for export.....	\$10,625,059,283
Capital invested in manufacturing, 1904.....	12,688,265,673
Capitalization of net earnings of steam railroads, June 1, 1904.....	11,244,752,000
Value of real estate (1905, autumn) and of implements and machinery (1900) of farms devoted chiefly to producing cotton, hay, and grain.....	9,074,168,745
Value of real estate (1905, autumn) and of implements and machinery (1900) of farms devoted chiefly to producing cotton, fruit, rice, sugar, tobacco, vegetables, and to general farming (including small specialties).....	5,792,314,927
Estimated true value of street railways, shipping, water-works, telegraph and telephone systems, electric light and power stations, Pullman and private cars, and canals (1904).....	4,840,546,909
Estimated true value of entire real estate of South Atlantic and South Central divisions, 1904.....	9,505,995,304
Estimated true value of all property situated in New England, 1904.....	8,823,325,592
Estimated true value of all property situated in the South Central division, 1904.....	10,032,467,528
Estimated true value of all property situated in the Western division (Rocky Mountain and Pacific regions), 1904.....	9,992,581,271

Domestic exports of meat animals, 1890-1908.

Year ending June 30—	Total value of cattle, sheep, and swine.	Meat animals.					
		Cattle.		Sheep.		Swine.	
		Num-ber.	Value.	Num-ber.	Value.	Num-ber.	Value.
1830.....	\$32,413,259	304,836	\$31,261,131	67,521	\$243,077	91,148	\$909,042
1831.....	31,852,088	374,679	30,445,249	60,947	261,109	95,654	1,146,630
1832.....	35,624,281	394,607	35,069,065	46,960	161,105	31,963	364,081
1833.....	26,555,981	287,094	26,032,428	37,260	126,394	27,375	397,162
1834.....	34,309,438	359,278	33,461,922	132,370	832,763	1,553	14,753
1835.....	33,306,906	331,722	30,603,796	405,748	2,630,686	7,130	72,424
1836.....	37,834,353	372,461	34,590,672	491,565	3,076,384	21,049	227,297
1837.....	38,185,094	392,190	36,357,451	244,120	1,531,645	28,751	295,998
1838.....	39,151,873	439,255	37,827,500	199,690	1,213,886	14,411	110,487
1839.....	31,597,629	389,490	30,516,833	143,286	853,555	33,031	227,241
1840.....	31,763,443	397,283	30,635,153	125,772	733,477	51,180	394,813
1841.....	39,738,445	459,218	37,598,930	297,925	1,933,000	22,318	238,465
1842.....	31,960,602	392,834	29,902,212	358,720	1,940,000	8,398	88,330
1843.....	30,957,719	402,178	29,818,936	176,961	1,067,890	4,081	40,923
1844.....	44,264,675	593,400	42,256,291	301,313	1,954,604	6,345	53,790
1845.....	42,702,061	567,806	40,598,048	208,355	1,687,321	44,496	416,692
1846.....	43,516,258	584,289	42,081,170	142,690	804,090	59,170	630,998
1847.....	35,637,074	423,051	34,577,392	135,344	750,242	24,262	309,440
1848.....		349,210	29,339,134				

Average export prices of cattle, 1890-1908.

1890.....	\$79. 17
1891.....	82. 26
1892.....	88. 95
1893.....	90. 68

1894	\$93.14
1895	92.26
1896	92.79
1897	92.70
1898	86.12
1899	78.35
1900	77.11
1901	81.81
1902	76.11
1903	74.22
1904	71.21
1905	71.50
1906	72.03
1907	81.73
1908	84.02

Exports beef from United States to all countries, years 1890-1908.

Country and year ending June 30—	Beef, canned.		Beef, cured: Salted or pickled.		Beef, fresh.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Total, all countries:						
1890	82,638,507	\$3,787,193	97,508,419	\$5,250,068	173,237,599	\$12,862,884
1891	100,585,727	9,068,906	90,286,970	5,048,788	194,045,638	15,322,054
1892	87,028,084	7,876,451	70,204,736	3,987,829	220,554,617	18,053,732
1893	70,089,493	7,222,824	58,423,963	3,185,321	206,294,724	17,754,041
1894	55,974,910	5,120,851	62,682,667	3,572,054	193,801,821	16,700,163
1895	64,102,233	5,720,935	62,478,325	3,558,230	191,338,487	16,832,800
1896	63,698,180	5,636,953	70,709,200	3,975,113	224,783,225	18,974,107
1897	54,019,772	4,676,308	67,712,940	3,514,126	230,395,930	22,653,742
1898	87,109,570	3,279,657	44,814,479	2,368,467	274,768,074	22,963,556
1899	38,385,472	3,503,293	46,594,876	2,525,784	282,139,974	23,545,185
1900	55,553,745	5,233,982	47,306,513	2,697,340	329,078,609	29,643,830
1901	53,445,521	5,307,591	55,312,632	3,145,219	351,748,333	31,851,361
1902	66,645,838	6,646,130	48,632,727	3,031,027	301,824,473	29,045,056
1903	76,307,114	7,916,928	52,801,220	3,814,671	251,795,963	25,013,323
1904	57,468,338	5,888,838	57,584,716	3,260,475	239,579,671	26,841,536
1905	66,688,598	6,588,958	55,934,707	3,095,301	236,483,568	22,138,365
1906	64,523,359	6,430,446	81,068,008	4,697,742	268,054,227	24,310,038
1907	15,809,826	1,615,808	62,645,281	3,740,212	281,651,502	23,367,287
1908	23,376,447	2,467,875	46,958,367	3,213,480	301,154,106	20,339,377

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. MOSS: The table concerning hides, beef, etc., sent to you Saturday were, it is hoped, useful for your speech of to-morrow. There was some expectation that further information might be provided, and an overhauling of material in this office discovers the following mean wholesale price of domestic packers' green-salted cattle hides at Chicago, the annual mean being adopted. The hides are those of heavy native steers, and the prices are computed from the Shoe and Leather Reporter market reports.

Year	Price (Cents)
1892	8.79
1893	7.31
1894	6.38
1895	10.20
1896	8.14
1897	9.96
1898	11.50
1899	12.34
1900	11.94
1901	12.37
1902	13.38
1903	11.69
1904	11.63
1905	14.30
1906	15.43
1907	14.55
1908	13.19

You will observe that from 1897 to 1898 the price increased almost exactly 15 per cent, the ad valorem rate of the Dingley tariff. Very truly, yours,

NAT. C. MURRAY,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

Hon. RALPH W. MOSS,
Room 134, Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Hides and skins—Number produced in 1900.
NATIONAL CONSUMPTION OF BEEF HIDES.

Naturally following from Table 23, which presents the results of this investigation with regard to the number of cattle, sheep, and swine slaughtered in 1900, a mere copying of numbers establishes the number of calfskins, cattle hides, and lamb and sheep skins produced in 1900. The calfskins numbered for that year 5,831,000; the beef hides (exported live cattle not being included), 12,738,000; lambskins, 12,765,000; and the sheepskins 11,783,000. The total skins produced by cattle, including calves, is 18,569,000; by sheep, including lambs, 24,548,000.

Upon combining the production of beef hides with the net imports the approximate consumption of beef hides during one year at about 1900 can be determined. This is presented in detail in table 61, wherein it appears that to the cattle-hide production of this country should be added imports of 3,130,000 hides, and from them should be subtracted domestic exports of 130,000 hides, leaving as a net result of the operation a consumption of 15,738,000 cattle hides.

For the year represented by Table 61 the gross imports were about 20 per cent of the consumption, and the net imports remaining after deducting the domestic exports were about 19 per cent.

TABLE 60.—Number of hides and skins produced, 1900.

Class of animals.	Number of hides and skins.
CATTLE.	
Calves under 1 year	5,831,000
Steers:	
1 and under 2 years	1,687,000
2 and under 3 years	2,336,000
3 years and over	1,966,000
Total steers	5,989,000
Bulls 1 year and over	649,000
Heifers 1 and under 2 years	1,687,000
Cows 2 years and over	4,413,000
Total cattle, except calves	12,738,000
Total cattle	18,569,000
SHEEP.	
Lambs under 1 year	12,765,000
Sheep, except lambs	11,783,000
Total sheep	24,548,000

TABLE 61.—Consumption of beef hides, 1900.

Item.	Number of hides.
Cattle slaughtered (calves not included)	12,738,000
Imported hides, computed from dry weight, average of 1899-1901	3,130,000
Total	15,868,000
Deduct:	
Domestic exports, hides and skins, all kinds except furs, average of 1899-1901	130,000
Foreign exports (reexports) of "hides and skins" not deducted, partly because the above deduction necessarily includes skins, and also hides other than those of cattle, and partly because the statistics of foreign exports do not separate cattle hides	0
Consumption	15,738,000

THE WOLFE BROS. SHOE COMPANY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 30, 1909.

Hon. RALPH W. MOSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the largest manufacturers of shoes in the country, we urge you to lend your influence to place shoes on the free list.

The American shoe manufacturer needs no protection. With free hides and cheap raw material, the American shoemaker can shoe the world.

Very respectfully,

THE WOLFE BROS. SHOE CO.,
R. F. WOLFE, President.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the old adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread, and of the unwritten rule that it is advisable for a new Member to refrain from discussing public questions. It had been my intention to adhere to a strict observance thereof, but within the past week or so I have received numerous petitions from residents of my district protesting against the tax on tea, and in order to give expression to their views I am compelled to transgress that well-considered rule.

Few complaints have reached me in regard to the other schedules of the bill. From the foundation of the Government no general tariff bill has received universal indorsement for all its schedules. Human ingenuity could not successfully master that problem. The history of the general tariff bills that have been enacted into law is that with scarcely an exception have they received the full vote of the dominant party in both branches of Congress.

The Payne bill is a fulfillment of the pledges of the Republican party, and carries out the views of its candidate for the Presidency. To my mind the plank in our platform was not equivocal, but was intended to mean and meant a real revision, and not as has been claimed by some a revision upward. I would have been loath to have enunciated any other view during the campaign.

Complaints have come from the other side of the House that the minority members of the committee were excluded from the counsels of the committee until the bill was ready to be reported. Such has been the course pursued in framing all general tariff bills in the last quarter of a century. It was done by the Democratic members of the committee in framing

the Mills bill in 1888 (see Stanwood's American Tariff Controversies in Nineteenth Century, vol. 2, p. 231), and also with the Wilson bill, and no other method can, for the general welfare, be safely pursued.

I shall not dwell upon the danger of importations of tea being rushed in during the discussion of the bill, and the very object of this particular tax, namely, raising of revenues, being defeated. The general theory of tariff legislation in this country for half a century or more is that luxuries rather than necessities should be taxed. Tea was subject to a tax prior to the tariff of 1832. The Walker tariff of 1846 continued it on the free list, qualifying, however, provided that it was imported in American vessels or in vessels of countries entitled to reciprocal privileges direct from the country where it was produced. The tariff of 1857 left it on the free list. During the civil war, owing to the dire necessity of raising revenue, both tea and coffee were subjected to a tax by the tariff act of July, 1861.

In 1872 both tea and coffee were taken off the dutiable list, so that from 1832 to the present time, a period of seventy-seven years, with the exception of eleven years (1861 to 1872) during the civil war and for a few years after, tea has not been taxed. The people have come to look on it as not a proper subject of taxation. The person most vitally affected by the proposed tax is the wife or daughter who looks after the household and endeavors to keep down the expenses, while the husband, father, or brother is at work earning a livelihood for the family. This proposed tax, being a specific tax of 8 or 9 cents per pound, bears heaviest upon the people in moderate circumstances, who buy the cheaper grades of tea. It is an additional burden of from 20 to 25 per cent upon those who can least afford it. This tax is not only unsound and unjust, but it is lacking in political expediency. Should it be imposed, it will be the subject of daily discussion in every household, and the party which imposes it will justly be held responsible. The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world.

I listened to the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] as to the benefits of woman suffrage. To my mind, woman has a higher and nobler sphere than in the domain of politics, and that is the management of the household, and therefore I am unwilling to increase her burden in this matter of domestic economy. There are other proposed duties which affect her which, personally, I should prefer to see left out of the bill.

The revenue to be derived from the tax on tea is \$8,000,000. As one of the objects of this bill is to raise revenues, the question naturally arises how to supply its place. I would with all deference suggest a stamp tax or an additional tax on beer, one or both, preferably the former. As to the former, it produces in Great Britain an annual revenue of about £8,000,000, or almost \$40,000,000, and France of over 200,000,000 francs, or \$40,000,000; but it is fair to say that it is more comprehensive and embracing than would be acceptable in our country. The tax on affiches or advertisements, posters, and so forth, in France brings an annual revenue of \$800,000.

The annual revenue derived by the British Government from tax on beer is upward of £13,000,000, or about \$65,000,000. Here it is somewhat less. The tax on beer in the United States is \$1 less per barrel than it was a few years ago.

The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1908, shows that tax was paid on 58,747,680 barrels of fermented liquor.

Mr. Chairman, I would be the last to tax any particular industry unduly, but from what I have seen of brewers in the metropolitan district of our State, the large fortunes they have amassed, I am not willing to concede that they are unable to bear their fair share of the burdens that must be imposed to raise the necessary revenue. While I would not wish to re-establish the war rate, an additional tax of 30 or 40 cents per barrel would in nowise be burdensome and would produce an annual revenue of from eighteen to twenty million dollars. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in his clear exposition of the features of the bill, alluded to the fact that the license fee in some portions of our State was \$1,000 or over per annum. While this is true, it is only true of cities of the first class, and the license has in nowise been changed for five and fifty to twelve hundred dollars. The imposition of a stamp tax and a moderate additional tax on fermented liquors will allay any fear as to the lack of sufficient revenue arising from the enactment of the Payne bill.

Whether or not the Treasury Department was consulted by or six years; it varies in different localities from one hundred the Committee on Ways and Means as to the advisability of imposing a stamp tax and raising the tax on fermented liquors the Members of this House have no means of judging, but I

venture the opinion that were the question of taxing tea and coffee or the imposition of a stamp tax, or the additional tax on fermented liquors, one or both, left to the vote of the House, the majority would be in favor of the latter.

The leaders on the other side of the House criticize the provisions of the bill and declare themselves in favor of a large reduction in the duties imposed, while individual Members demand protective rates for the products of their particular districts.

It is not to be wondered at that under these circumstances the distinguished and courteous leader of the minority should refrain from introducing a tariff bill. How could he bring these divergent opinions and interests together? Upon what given proposition could they agree? They are vociferous in their denunciations of the extravagance of the dominant party, and yet when called upon to specify in what particulars the expenditures of the Government could be reduced they are dumb. The largest annual expenditures are for the army, navy, pensions, and the Panama Canal, besides the post-office expenditures. They are unwilling to demand a reduction in these items. Their national platform calls for an adequate navy, for a generous pension policy, and for the completion of the Panama Canal.

Their platform goes further and calls for liberal and comprehensive plans for the improvement of waterways and for federal aid to state and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post-roads; but they fail to suggest how this vast increase of expenditure is to be provided for. Such is the constructive genius of the Democratic party.

Mr. Chairman, we have a great and growing country which under the wise administration of a protective tariff has prospered as no other land. We can not stand still; we have new problems to face, and shall be prepared to meet them with the enactment of the tariff bill.

The fathers of our country favored a protective tariff, and the greatest minds of both parties have advocated it, as did Missouri's greatest son, Thomas H. Benton, who has been referred to in this debate, and who stood in the Senate in favor of protection to the products of his State. Silas Wright and James Buchanan did likewise, as well as many other leading Democrats, and yet we have heard men of the same faith in this House denounced for following in their footsteps.

In fifty years the Democratic party has had but one man, Grover Cleveland, who will go down into history as one of the great statesmen of the country. He has been far more criticised and denounced by his own party than by his opponents. He made an earnest and honorable attempt to carry out the pledges of his party.

How beset he was with difficulties, and how the sugar trust succeeded in gaining control of the Wilson tariff bill is shown by the extracts below from Chairman Wilson's speech and the letter from President Cleveland to Chairman Wilson under date of July 2, 1894.

Mr. Wilson, on July 19, 1894, referring to the difference in conference committee on said bill, spoke as follows:

But the great difficulty in the pathway of an agreement has been a proper adjustment of the sugar schedule. The Senate has reintroduced into the proposed tariff bill a sugar schedule which, whether truly or not, has been accepted by the committee and by the press of the country as unduly favorable to the great sugar trust. It proposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on all grades of sugar, a differential of one-eighth per cent upon refined sugar, in addition to a differential of one-tenth of a cent on sugar imported from countries that pay an

In the same speech he read a letter from President Cleveland to himself, of which the following is an extract:

Under our party platform and in accord with our declared party purposes sugar is a legitimate and logical article of revenue taxation.

Extracts from letter of President Cleveland addressed to Chairman Wilson, of Ways and Means Committee, dated July 2, 1894, when the Wilson bill was in the hands of the committee of conference and read in the House of Representatives on July 19, 1894:

Every true Democrat and every sincere tariff reformer knows that this bill in its present form and as it will be submitted to the conference falls far short of the consummation for which we have long labored, for which we have suffered defeat without discouragement, which in its anticipation gave us a rallying cry in our day of triumph and which in its promise of accomplishment is so interwoven with Democratic pledges and Democratic success that abandonment of the case or the principles upon which it rests means party perfidy and party dishonor.

With such an indictment of the outcome of the last Democratic tariff legislation by its own President, is it not natural that the people of the United States have been unwilling to intrust further tariff legislation to that party?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the manner in which the country had prospered and advanced under a pro-

tective tariff is best summed up in the words of the last Republican national platform:

In this the great era of American advancement the Republican party has reached its highest service under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt. His administration is an epoch in American history. In no other period since national sovereignty was won under Washington or preserved under Lincoln has there been such mighty progress in those ideals of government which make for justice, equality, and fair dealing among men.

The highest aspirations of the American people have found a voice. Their most exalted servant represents the best aims and worthiest purposes of all his countrymen. American manhood has been lifted to a nobler sense of duty and obligation. Conscience and courage in public station and higher standards of right and wrong in private life have become cardinal principles of political faith; capital and labor have been brought into closer relations of confidence and interdependence; and the abuse of wealth, the tyranny of power, and all the evils of privilege and favoritism have been put to scorn by the simple, manly virtues of justice and fair play.

The great accomplishments of President Roosevelt have been, first and foremost, a brave and impartial enforcement of the law, the prosecution of illegal trusts and monopolies, the exposure and punishment of evildoers in the public service, the more effective regulation of the rates and service of the great transportation lines, the complete overthrow of preferences, rebates, and discriminations, the arbitration of labor disputes, the amelioration of the condition of wage-workers everywhere, the conservation of the natural resources of the country, the forward step in the improvement of the inland waterways, and always the earnest support and defense of every wholesome safeguard which has made more secure the guaranties of life, liberty, and property.

These are the achievements that will make for Theodore Roosevelt his place in history, but more than all else the great things he has done will be an inspiration to those who have yet greater things to do. We declare our unflinching adherence to the policies thus inaugurated and pledge their continuance under a Republican administration of the Government.

Let us speedily enact the tariff bill, and thereby produce revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, so that we may enter anew upon a field of unbounded prosperity, and in these days of universal good will, with the last vestige of sectionalism happily vanished, afford the broad-minded and splendidly equipped President of the United States an opportunity to develop his progressive policies, which are to redound to the welfare of the whole people.

Mr. THISTLEWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. OLCOTT, Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. OLMSTED, at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until Monday, April 5, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 6278) providing special postage rate on third-class and fourth-class matter on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6279) making an appropriation for extending the breakwater at the harbor at Marquette, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ishpeming, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at Munising, Mich.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY: A bill (H. R. 6282) granting pensions to army locomotive engineers, and providing pensions to widows and minor children of army locomotive engineers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6283) providing for the recognition of the men who served as locomotive engineers during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) to provide for clean paper money—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) to provide for the further purification of the water supply of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) for universal transfers over the street railway lines in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at East Orange, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) providing for an examination and survey of the Kill von Kull and Newark Bay, New Jersey, with a view to securing increased depth and width—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 6289) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Clinch River at or near Kingston, Tenn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6290) amending act of June 27, 1898, permitting payment of pensions to officers and men of Indian wars and their widows, between 1849 and 1854—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 8, 1901—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6293) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) providing for the exchange and payment by the United States of certain railroad-aid bonds issued by the counties of Grant and Sante Fe, Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) to establish a Soldiers' Home at Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) to authorize the issue of bridge bonds by the county of Valencia, in the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6297) donating the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 1 south, range 34 east, New Mexico principal base and meridian, in New Mexico, to Bedford Forrest Camp, No. 1606, United Confederate Veterans—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6298) to authorize grants of land in national forests for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6299) to quiet title to certain lands in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) granting to the Women's Missionary Union, of El Paso, Tex., certain unappropriated land for a public sanatorium—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6301) to provide for the establishment of an annex to all National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to allot agricultural lands in the Mescalero Apache Indian Reservation to the Indians resident therein, and setting aside the remainder of said reservation as a national park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories, to limit territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the New Mexico and Arizona volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona against Mexican marauders and Indian depredations from 1855 to 1890, inclusive, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) to establish a fish-culture station at Trout Springs, Gallinas Canyon, San Miguel County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) for the purchase of a site and erection of a federal building at Las Vegas, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the civil war and the war with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6308) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey the unappropriated nonmineral desert lands of the United States—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6309) to amend section 2139 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of 1878—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6310) to validate a certain act of the legislative assembly of New Mexico with reference to issuance of certain bonds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) granting to the Women's Missionary Union, of El Paso, Tex., certain unappropriated land of the public domain for a public sanatorium—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6312) providing for the allowance of compensation to the members of the United States Land Commission to the Territory of New Mexico, created under the act of Congress of June 21, 1898—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) appropriating \$10,000 for the construction of a reservoir in the Manzano Mountains, Torrance County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) donating the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 1 south, range 34 east, New Mexico principal base and meridian, in New Mexico, to Bedford Forrest Camp, No. 1606, United Confederate Veterans—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6316) appropriating \$10,000 for the construction of reservoir in Sandoval County, Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6317) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 6318) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Water Valley, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6433) granting to the town of Gallup, McKinley County, Territory of New Mexico, 160 acres of land—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6434) creating the national battle ground at Glorietta, Sante Fe County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY: Resolution (H. Res. 50) concerning rates charged for telephone service in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution (H. Res. 51) providing additional compensation for the two messengers in the disbursing clerk's office of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WILEY: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 14) for survey of a ship canal in New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Memorial of the legislature of Utah, in favor of a law prohibiting the shipment of alcoholic beverages to prohibition States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Utah, praying for the retention of the present tariff on lead, wool, and hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of the legislature of Wyoming, in opposition to any reduction in the present tariff on wool or hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 6319) granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6320) for the relief of Louis Kahn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) for the relief of Capt. H. C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6322) for the relief of W. J. Goodwin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) for the relief of Alfred Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) for the relief of Juan Estevan Vigil—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) for the relief of Jose Antonio Barreiras—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) for the relief of W. A. Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) for the relief of John S. Bowie—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of Pedro Salazar y Garcia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) for the relief of Rayes Salas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) for the relief of Jose Antonio Barreiras—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6331) for the relief of Nathan Bibb, sr.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6332) for the relief of E. H. Biernbaum—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6333) for the relief of F. Nerio Gomez—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6334) for the relief of Rebecca J. Miller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6335) for the relief of Eduardo Martinez—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6336) for the relief of Ventura Maestas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) for the relief of Theophilus L. Keen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) for the relief of Jose Salazar y Ortiz—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) for the relief of Pablo Ciriaco Baca—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) for the relief of Manuel Madril—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6341) for the relief of A. W. Cleland—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) granting a pension to Presciana F. Valdez—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) granting a pension to George A. Rigdon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6344) granting a pension to Lou Butler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) granting a pension to Doroteo Duran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) granting a pension to George Leihy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) granting a pension to W. H. Gooden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) granting a pension to Bernard Higgins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) granting a pension to William Sweeney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) granting a pension to Joseph B. Watrous—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6351) granting a pension to John W. McSparron—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to William C. Stanford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6353) granting a pension to Julian Lujan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting a pension to Nicanor Quintana—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting a pension to Antonio Rendón—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) granting a pension to F. Salazar y Jimines—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6357) granting a pension to Miguel Romero—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) granting a pension to John H. Young—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6359) granting a pension to Theodor Reimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) granting a pension to Guadalupe G. Martinez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6361) granting a pension to Ignacio Salazar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6362) granting a pension to John Lilly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) granting a pension to Edwin Kraemer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) granting a pension to Antonio Salazar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) granting a pension to Nemeo Valencio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) granting a pension to Juan Bautista Duran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) granting a pension to Charles W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) granting a pension to Clara W. Griego—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) granting a pension to William C. Stanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) granting a pension to Alexander May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) granting a pension to Juan Deciderio Valdez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Leonisco Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) granting a pension to Peter Miner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) granting a pension to Alvina McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) granting a pension to Juanita Leyva de Sanchez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) granting a pension to H. C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) granting a pension to John J. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) granting a pension to George W. Mossman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Eli Newsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) granting a pension to Sarah A. Geck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting a pension to C. B. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting a pension to Simon Arias—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6383) granting a pension to Carey C. Seemuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting a pension to John W. Irvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) granting a pension to Francisco Perea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6386) granting a pension to Harris B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting a pension to Samuel Barbeau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) granting a pension to George R. Watt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting a pension to Frank A. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting a pension to Quincy Adams Stiteler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting a pension to Juan Antonio Griego—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Metzger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Crary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting an increase of pension to William S. Smock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting an increase of pension to Annie J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Eckel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting an increase of pension to Maria C. Lopez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6398) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia A. Sturges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6399) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Longstreet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6400) granting an increase of pension to Irene Schormoyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Dalton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) granting an increase of pension to E. W. Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McQuillin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) granting an increase of pension to James E. Chadwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) granting an increase of pension to Juan Baca y Sais, alias Juan Baca No. 2—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) granting an increase of pension to George W. Read—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to James T. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) granting an increase of pension to Pascualita J. G. de Anaya—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Shont—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Paxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6411) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) granting an increase of pension to Philip L. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6413) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius J. Demorest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Shield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to John C. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) granting an increase of pension to William Mueller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) granting an increase of pension to Maria Soledad Montoya de Trujillo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) granting an increase of pension to C. H. Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Belle Forsha—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to H. A. Van Epps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6423) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. A. J. Fountain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Honzaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to Maria S. B. Sanchez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6428) granting an increase of pension to A. E. Chaffee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6429) granting an increase of pension to Roque Candelaria—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) granting an increase of pension to Leverett Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) granting an increase of pension to D. M. Sutherland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6432) granting an increase of pension to James E. Chadwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6435) confirming title to the Canoncito de Nuñez grant—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6436) for the relief of certain persons residing at Monticello, Sierra County, Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6437) for the relief of the estate of Justino Castillo—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6438) for the relief of the estate of Martin Vigil, deceased, and the administrator of said estate, Eslavio Vigil, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6439) for the relief of the estate of Francisco Montoya—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) for the relief of the estate of Matias Baca, deceased, and his son, Juan Rey Baca—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6441) for the relief of the estate of William Le Blanc, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) giving the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate two claims for Indian depredations of the estate of Blas Lucero, late of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) to authorize the payment of \$5,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanera against Luna—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6444) giving the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate two claims for Indian depredations of the estate of Blas Lucero, late of Albuquerque, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6445) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in the case of Manuelita Swope—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6446) for the relief of Serapio Romero, late postmaster at Las Vegas, N. Mex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6447) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Maxwell and Hugh H. Maxwell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6448) for the relief of the heir and legal representative of R. W. Daniels, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6449) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William Bishop, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ramon Tafoya—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6451) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Juan Sanchez—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6452) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph D. Depue—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6453) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francisco Medina—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of the late Lieut. Robert C. Hoggins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) to place Austin J. Chapman on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Isidro Talamante—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John D. Hopper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 6458) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6459) for the relief of Robert Allcorn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 6460) granting an increase of pension to David F. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 6461) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Traylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 6462) for the relief of F. J. McCarthy, administrator of the estate of Martin F. McCarthy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6463) granting an increase of pension to Romulus C. Ramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 6464) for the relief of L. A. Whitehead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6465) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Grant, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Champion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6467) for the relief of Henry L. Blake and others, complaining that their lands and other property have been taken, damaged, and destroyed in the execution of the works of the United States for the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6468) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Julia L. Watson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6469) for the relief of the heirs, devisees, and legatees of the estate of Willis Lowe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6470) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Bettie B. Willis, administratrix of Joel H. Willis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6471) granting an increase of pension to Eli Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 6472) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6473) granting an increase of pension to Walter Pruett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUDREY: A bill (H. R. 6474) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 6475) granting an increase of pension to John Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 6476) granting an increase of pension to James P. Holsclaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELVINS: A bill (H. R. 6477) granting an increase of pension to Israel L. Hahn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) granting an increase of pension to Noah A. Sapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6479) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McGhee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6480) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah F. Berryman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) granting an increase of pension to Elihu L. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Harral—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6483) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin M. Lanham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6484) granting an increase of pension to Childers W. Lanham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Edmond R. Haywood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6487) granting an increase of pension to Willis Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. G. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting an increase of pension to James Mosier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting an increase of pension to David Farquhar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to Falkland H. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6492) granting a pension to John George Schacht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6493) granting a pension to Samuel S. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) granting a pension to Alexander J. Souden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) for the relief of William Nevin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6496) to correct the military service record of John Schwab—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 6497) for the relief of the estate of E. A. Mays, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to Edmond S. Norris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Haylett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6500) granting an increase of pension to Noah E. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) granting a pension to Mollie A. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 6504) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Konicka—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY: A bill (H. R. 6506) granting permission to Frank W. Clarke to accept the decoration of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, conferred upon him by the French Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6507) to authorize John A. Ockerson to accept decorations tendered him by the Government of the French Republic, the King of Italy, the King of Sweden, the King of Belgium, the Emperor of Germany, and the Emperor of China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to George L. Steward, alias George Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6509) granting a pension to Emma C. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6510) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Helmka—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) for the relief of James E. Saunders—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) to correct the military record of Edward Joseph Carey, alias Edward Joseph Fitzharris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6513) providing for salary and allowances of the postmaster at Mackinac Island, State of Michigan—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of F. J. McCarthy, administrator of the estate of Martin F. McCarthy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of New York against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, favoring 5 cents per pound on coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against any reduction of duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of New York, favoring increase of duty on post cards, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Kissell, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring reduction of duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many importers of paper, favoring decrease of duty on various paper products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring a very low duty on Guinness's stout—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pittsburg Marble Mosaic Company and D. J. Kennedy Company, against increase of duty on Keene's cement—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Charles E. Thorne, of Wooster, Ohio, favoring the placing of all fertilizing material on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of grocers of Hamilton, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Thresher-Varnish Company, against a duty on China nut oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of General Assembly of Ohio, favoring repeal of duty on all forms of lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stomps & Burkhardt Company, against a duty on rattan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hamilton Iron and Steel Company, Hamilton, Ohio, against a duty of 50 cents on scrap iron—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Holbrock Brothers Company and the Elder & Johnston Company, against increase of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Third Congressional District of Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Traverse City, Mich., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: Petitions of sundry citizens of West Ghent, of sundry citizens of Hudson, and of sundry citizens of Kinderhook, N. Y., against a duty on tea, coffee, cocoa, or spices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Prattsville, favoring a duty on lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Casein Manufacturing Company, of New York, favoring a duty on casein and lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wolf Brothers' Shoe Company, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring placing shoes on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of importers and jobbers of tea in the city of Boston, Mass., against a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Gehring, general president of the Lithographic International Protective and Beneficial Association of the United States and Canada, favoring increase of duty on post cards and lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Endres, N. Dak., against reduction of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of employees of Joseph Black & Sons Company, of York, Pa., against any change in schedule on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of Indiana and Reynoldsville (Pa.) Lodges, Nos. 931 and 519, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of A. F. Allemand, of Nebraska, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY W. PALMER: Petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Tim J. Pettit, Ernest Gibbs, and others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of H. Brown and others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Mr. W. M. Cole, Samuel Garner, and many others, of Columbus, Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petitions of Frank Plestinger, of Greenville, and T. D. and G. E. Leist, of Kempton, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ohio, against a tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 15 ladies of Bluffton, Ohio, against increase of duty on gloves, hosiery, cotton goods, woolen goods, ribbons, tea, and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Chalkley Styer, of Narcissa, and 30 other residents of Montgomery County; of 50 residents of Schwenksville; of John L. Kulp, of Bedminster, and 75 other residents of Bucks County, all of the State of Pennsylvania, for an amendment to the tariff bill removing casein and lactarene from the free list and imposing a duty of 2½ cents per pound on unground casein or lactarene, and 2½ cents per pound on ground casein or lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: Petition of citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Munising, Mich., and citizens of Marinette, Wis., favoring retention of tariff on wood pulp, pulp, and paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 5, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

The Vice-President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

Mr. SAMUEL D. McENERY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States is about to consider the revision of the law relating to the tariff on imports; and

Whereas the country is committed to the principle of a protective tariff, which shall also produce a large proportion of the necessary revenues of the Government: *Be it*

Resolved, That the following facts be laid before Congress for consideration by it in connection with said proposed revision of the tariff law, viz:

1. At the time the present tariff law was enacted the United States owned no coffee-producing territory, necessitating no duty on coffee as a protective measure, and the current revenue was sufficient without imposing a tariff on coffee for revenue only; consequently coffee is now on the free list.