By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: Petition of A. Black, president of the Acme Brewing Company, of Macon, Ga., asking removal of the duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Georgia, favoring retention of the present tariff duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition of citizens of Boonville, Ind., against reduction of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of trustees of the Providence (R. I.) Public Library, against increasing the duty on books and printed matter—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Humes Manufacturing Company, of East Providence, R. I., favoring retention of duty on sal soda—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Woman's Christian Union of Pawtucket; Ann Gordon Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Providence; First Free Baptist Church of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring bill regulating shipment of liquor into prohibition territory—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Alfred C. Schmidt, Annie A. Dillon, Thomas F. McGrath, Perry Smith, and James C. Davis, of Peace Dale; Newport Paper and Grocery Company, George W. Perry, James F. Dunbar, Joseph C. Condon, and R. T. Lennon, of Pawtucket, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Joseph C. Condon, George M. Perry, and James F. Dunbar, of Pawtucket, R. I., against duty on teas and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Providence (R. I.) Brewing Company, for the removal of duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of Zincer & Debendorfer, of Monroe; M. Munson, of Blanchardville; Posler Illifrit, of Leslie; and Fred Blackbourn, of Dunbarton, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of D. C. Hamlin and others, of Gorham, N. H., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Halbrook Grocery Company, of Woodsville, and George E. Halbrook & Co., of Keene, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac R. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of G. A. Dubois and others, against reduction of the duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petitions of W. C. Smith, R. C. Marchand, and Preston & Sons, of Fairhaven, Vt., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of C. G. Robertson, of Baltimore, Md., for reduction of duty on aluminum and alumina—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Box Company, of Chicago, Ill., against reduction of tariff on lumber and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the legislature of the State of Illinois, against increase of duty on imported manufactured moving-picture films, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against increase of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Mantie Hills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Concurrent resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, against a federal inheritance tax; also petitions of C. M. Newland and 15 others, of the second district of Minnesota, against a reduction on duty on barley; Northern Granite Manufacturers' Association, of St. Cloud, against reduction of duty on granite; Allyn Brothers, of Madison Lake, against duty on tea and coffee; and Olaf L. Peterson, of Fairmount; Allyn Brothers, of Madison Lake; F. T. Winkler, of Currie; and H. A. Alleman, of Mankato, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. C. Schmid and 16 others, of Springfield, Minn., against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John D. Tidrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of R. B. Ullom, N. B. Mercer, W. D. Hobbs, W. H. Hobbs, Will E. Seal, and Fred Mantz, of Barnesville, Ohio, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Wilkins, of Hendrysburg, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of citizens of Salt Lake City, Utah, against duty on coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of William Hervey, of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of George W. Caswell and 30 prominent hotels, individuals, clubs, and restaurants of San Francisco, Cal., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of Rock Island Lodge, No. 980, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Rantoul, Ill., against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of residents of Republican City and Holdridge, both in the State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POINDEXTER: Petition of Mayview Farmers' Union, against the parcels post and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of senators and representatives of the State of Illinois, against a duty on manufactured moving-picture films—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of senate of the State of Minnesota, against a national inheritance tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of legislature of Minnesota, against the $20 tax on worms for individual stills in the manufacture of denatured alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of National Commercial Company, of Martinsburg, W. Va., against duty on coffee or tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of farmers of Michigan, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Thomas Mendenhall & Son, of Osgood, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Albert K. Comly, of Philadelphia; Frank W. Calvert and W. W. Williamson, of Narberth, Montgomery County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for the removal of the duty from raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *March 24, 1909.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 12.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That during the present session of Congress there shall be printed and allotted for distribution to each Member of the House of Representatives 40 copies and to each Senator 60 copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in addition to the number now provided by law, but no portion of said additional quota shall be reserved for binding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask what this is?

Mr. MANN. It provides that during this session of Congress 40 additional copies of the daily RECORD shall be allotted to Members of the House and 60 additional copies to Members of the Senate.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I withdraw the objection.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

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

The question was put.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is it not necessary under paragraph 4 of Rule XXIV that the House first by a two-thirds vote dispense with proceedings under that rule before we can proceed to consider public business? It is the new rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will look at the rule. The recollection of the Chair is that it is necessary.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, there must be a calendar of that kind before it is necessary, it seems to me.

The SPEAKER. How is that?

Mr. PAYNE. There must be a calendar and bills upon that calendar which can be considered. However, I will ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is true. Let us look at that rule a minute.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with that order to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to refresh his recollection about the rule. The rule is:

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of Rule XXIV, unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed five minutes for and against.

The Clerk will report paragraph 4 of Rule XXIV.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order, and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consideration: *Provided*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on two days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the second part of the new rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

This rule shall not apply during the last two weeks of the session.

It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion for a recess on any Wednesday except during the last two weeks of the session.

The SPEAKER. In answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts the Chair must take notice not only of the rules but what there is for consideration under the rules, if anything. The Chair has inquired, and that inquiry, in the opinion of the Chair, has required him to state to the House that there are no bills on any calendar of the House, save alone the bill known as the "tariff bill," which bill would not be in order on a calendar Wednesday. In that condition, answering the parliamentary inquiry, in the opinion of the Chair, it is not necessary to move to dispense with calendar Wednesday.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the Chair hear me only one minute?

The SPEAKER. With pleasure.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The rule says, first, that no business shall be in order except what appears in the definite rule, to wit, the Rule XXIV for the call of committees. Now, then, this tariff bill is on the Union Calendar. If the committees were called and the Committee on Ways and Means were reached and they tried to call up the tariff bill it would not be permissible to go to the Union Calendar for that bill.

The SPEAKER. Correct.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite within the bounds of possibility that whereas a majority of this House might wish to proceed with the tariff bill or the census bill, or any other bill that happened to be on the calendar not privileged, two-thirds of the House might not wish to do so. I have brought this up, not in any captious spirit, but because I can see possible situations arising where there is only one bill on the calendar and that bill a privileged bill, and yet where over one-third of the House did not wish to consider that bill. It seems to me that the rule is as plain as daylight. I simply say that, not that I care which way the Chair rules, but because I want the thing definitely settled. But before the Chair rules I should like to have him read the rule once more and see whether it does not in its express terms forbid the consideration of any business except such as comes in under that rule for the call of committees.

The SPEAKER. In answer to parliamentary inquiries, the Chair can only rule upon the present status, and state the opinion of the Chair upon it, without regard to any future question that might arise under the rule. The Chair states again——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair states again that there are no bills upon any calendar of the House save alone the tariff bill, and it would not be in order on calendar Wednesday to proceed to consider that bill at this stage. The Chair could conceive conditions where, there being no business to transact under the rules of the House on calendar Wednesday, after committees were called the regular order would perhaps naturally be taken up; and even to-day it might be that the committees on Ways and Means, Mileage, and Accounts might be called, they being the only committees that have been appointed.

But they have no business upon the calendars except as indicated. After all, in the consideration of the rules it must always be remembered that they must be construed together, and the Chair, as one Member of the House, must recollect that he must take notice of the condition of the calendars; and in the opinion of the Chair we must all recollect that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in order to crystallize the opinion of the Chair into a ruling, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is not in order. I expect the Chair to overrule me at once, but I want to crystallize the opinion in the form of a ruling.

Mr. SIMS. In regard to the remark of the Chair about the letter and spirit controlling, I think it very proper; but does not the rule requiring two-thirds simply make all other business out of order except that provided, and is not the statement of the Chair in the nature of an argument for a vote of two-thirds rather than a reason for dispensing with it? Then, again, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who is the author of the amendment requiring the two-thirds vote to change rule as to calendar Wednesday, not being present, might not the Chair be mistaken as to the real intention of the gentleman from New York as to this rule; therefore had we not better have a vote?

The SPEAKER. There is much contention from time to time that the rules and their construction should be observed so as to satisfy misconceptions as to what the rules are; or in other words, to throw a tub to the whale, counting public sentiment and misrepresentation as the whale, rather than to construe the rules as they are, and from the standpoint of common sense and practicability. The Chair states again, if there was a bill on the calendar of any kind that could possibly be in order to-day, the Chair would refuse to entertain the motion of the gentleman from New York under the rule; but——

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. One moment. But the Chair again states that these committees might be called, and then it might be contended with equal strength and more plausibility that the House should twirl its fingers and thumbs one over the other for the remainder of the day unless two-thirds of the House concluded that they would do something rather than nothing, when there is nothing to do. [Laughter.] The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The motion was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

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, the tariff bill, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before I begin the remarks I have to make on the subject of the tariff, there are two or three preliminary statements I want to make which give me a great deal of pleasure. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate you on the auspicious event that happened at your home within the last forty-eight hours. [Applause.] The coincidences in this life are sometimes quite amusing. Yesterday, toward the close of the speech of my distinguished friend Mr. Chairman PAYNE, I injected the remark that the production of babies in this country is playing out.

I have the very highest authority for making that statement—the distinguished hunter now on his way to Africa. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DE ARMOND. I would like to suggest a reason for that—because it is the spring and good weather. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I accept the gentleman's suggestion. I regret to say, after a good deal of investigation and observation, that the particular branch of the Caucasian race to which most of us belong is dying out in the United States. Just after I sat down, after making that remark to Mr. Chairman PAYNE, Judge PALMER, of Pennsylvania, came over with a telegram announcing that a daughter had been born in the family of the gentleman presiding to-day [Mr. OLMSTED], on which I heartily congratulate him. [Applause.] He makes a most excellent presiding officer, and I have no doubt in the world that he is a most tender and excellent father. [Applause.]

In the second place, I wish to thank my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for making the motion to let me proceed without limit. I really may get through quicker than I would if I proceeded on a limit. These are pleasant experiences here.

I also desire to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE]. I do it from the bottom of my heart. He has now become a great historical personage. The history of the United States can not be written now and leave out the name of SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York. [Applause.] He takes his place in the company of Henry Clay, Robert J. Walker, Justin S. Morrill, William McKinley, William L. Wilson, and Nelson Dingley, as father of a great tariff bill, which must be referred to as long as men discuss the tariff in the United States, which, judging the future by the past, will be until Gabriel blows his trumpet. [Laughter and applause.]

There is another thing on which I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I do it as honestly as I did the other, that during the course of these hearings, and by his nine and one-half hours' speech, he has knocked higher than a kite the idiotic theory of Doctor Osler. [Laughter.]

Be it understood that I am not complaining in any degree whatever because he spoke nine and a half hours; it was a superb vindication of his physical and mental strength, and under the circumstances of the case and the character of the speech he was making, explanatory and defensive, answering a good many questions from this side, and carrying on an extended debate with his political confrères on that side, I do not see how it could have been shorter; and what is more, I am not dead sure but that it was the wisest thing he could have done from a political standpoint, because a good many Republican gentlemen, having fired their shots, will not want to make speeches on the bill.

While I am making these preliminary statements, and I do not think I am wasting time in making them, I want to say a word about the Committee on Ways and Means. I say now that no 18 men—because there were only 18, Mr. Granger being sick with the disease which finally proved fatal to him—no 18 men, Democrats and Republicans both, in the history of this country ever did harder, more tedious, or more fatiguing work than the 18 members of the Ways and Means Committee did in these hearings. [Applause.]

Think of it! We began at half past 9 in the morning and worked until 1 o'clock, took an hour for lunch, then worked until 7 o'clock, taking an hour for dinner, as we call it in the city, and supper in the country, and worked until 11 and 12 o'clock at night; keyed up, on edge, tussling with intellectual men who had facts in their possession about the tariff which they were determined not to give up, while we were determined that they should stand and deliver.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], is nearly old enough to be my father. [Laughter.] I have always been credited with having an iron constitution, but I believe that he came out of that exhausting work fresher than I did, which was an absolute marvel to me.

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. REEDER. I think it is generally conceded that the impression was that the gentleman from Missouri is the older of the two.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be, but that is a very wrong impression. I am in the flower of my years. One other thing about that committee. In my time I have done many things to earn a living, among them every species of farm work, clerking in a country store, teaching in all sorts of schools, from a log-cabin schoolhouse in Kentucky to the presidency of a college in West Virginia; editing a newspaper, and practicing law. For three days I was a sort of special deputy sheriff in Cincinnati, guarding a defaulter. I have tried a multitude of cases in court, including betwixt 1,000 and 2,000 criminal cases, ranging from murder and highway robbery to assault and battery and petty larceny; but nowhere, at no time, under no circumstances have I ever performed any other labor so exhaustive of nervous energy as I performed at these tariff hearings. I am not complaining. We simply did our duty; but I have no doubt that it shortened all our lives.

We not only worked like galley slaves while other people were taking their ease, but we tried to ascertain the truth. I will tell you how it worked—it is no violation of confidence, because it was done in public. For four or five days after these hearings began men came in there with such an insolent swagger and such an assumption of superiority that it was offensive to every man on the committee. They would read the Republican platform and declare that that meant revision to the sky, practically, and if you asked them a decent question you were liable to be insulted. The newspapers orated all around over the land that the committee bullyragged people, maltreated witnesses, and insulted them. That criticism was leveled more at the chairman and myself than anybody else, because we happened to have the strongest voices in the crowd; but I say now, in justification of it all, that while some witnesses were grilled, some were operated on with rapiers, and some were hit in the head with a big club, no witness received a harsh word in that committee unless he provoked it by his own action. They went out and growled about the chairman; they went out and cursed me. Well, I do not care anything about that. I did stick some of them as deep as I could. I did crack their heads with a maul, but I was justified in it and have no apologies to offer.

Of course it is extremely difficult under any circumstances whatever to discuss a tariff bill, and the trouble about it is that it is so immense—containing about 4,000 articles of everyday consumption. Nobody can blame people for wanting to take care of themselves. I will make a confession, and it is said that "an open confession is good for the soul." The study of the tariff has been the favorite study of my life. I have studied it much. I thought when these hearings began that I knew practically all about it. When we got through, I felt like Sir Isaac Newton said he felt after making those great scientific discoveries which placed his name at the top of the scanty list of the immortals—"like a boy walking upon the seashore, picking up shells." For the benefit of all concerned, as this debate in all human probability will run in one shape and another for a good while, and as you all ought to be posted on both sides, I will give you my opinion about certain documents. There are four great documents on the subject of the tariff which are invaluable, and you can get them all now. I intended to ask leave of Congress to print them as public documents, as they are out of print, but I find that Professor Taussig has reprinted them in a book, which is easy of access and which does not cost much.

The title of that book is State Papers and Speeches on the Tariff. The four documents that are absolutely invaluable—and there has been a vast amount of literature on the subject, thousands of speeches and hundreds of books—and without which a man can hardly be informed on the tariff question, are Alexander Hamilton's great report on manufactures in 1790; Robert J. Walker's great tariff report on his bill in 1845—and, by the way, he is the only man who ever had ingenuity enough to fasten his name onto a tariff bill, except a chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; John Quincy Adams's great report in 1831, because any report which that remarkable man ever made is exhaustive; and Albert Gallatin's great free-trade memorial in 1832. Those are the documents that are invaluable. In addition there are four books which are almost invaluable—Professor Taussig's History of the Tariff in the United States; Professor Taussig's book, State Papers and Speeches on the Tariff; Franklin Pierce, on The Tariff and The Trusts, and a book printed by Cicero W. Harris, with the strange title, The Sectional Struggle. In addition to that I recommend to every man in this House to immediately lay hold of this book I have in my hands, Imports and Duties. I believe it was prepared by Mr. Evans, was it not, Mr. PAYNE?

Mr. PAYNE. By Mr. Evans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Evans's book is the most illuminating volume ever printed on the subject of the tariff. It is a public document. It is strange to look at it and see how much arithmetic there is in it. Our report had to be brief, and we had to steer clear of details in it, simply because we did not have time to make the mathematical calculations, such as compose Mr. Evans's book.

Here is the chief difficulty about understanding the tariff. It is because nearly all of these rates are compound rates, spe-

cific and ad valorem; they are all mixed up, and to the average citizen—even to the intelligent average citizen—they are riddles.

Let us take a sample from the Dingley tariff bill by way of illustration. On chemicals valued above 35 cents per pound the compound rates are as follows: Specific, 15 cents per pound; ad valorem, 20 per cent. To the average reader that is precisely clear as mud.

An ad valorem duty is easy to understand. The only objection to an ad valorem duty that can be urged honestly is that it seems to be easier to swindle under it. If it were not for that feature of it, I would be against any specific duty whatsoever—certainly against all compound duties.

This is no time for an academic discussion of the tariff. Every tariff theory ever hatched in the brain of man has been discussed repeatedly in this country with thoroughness and splendid ability. Since John G. Carlisle made his first masterful tariff speech in the House, some thirty years ago, it is not much exaggeration to say that we have had a continuous tariff debate in this country—sometimes in general and sometimes in particular localities. Most of the men on the Committee on Ways and Means have participated here and elsewhere in the academic discussion of the subject, and it may well be doubted whether any member of the committee could make a better academic speech on the subject now than he has made in the past. So firmly am I convinced of this that I told Mr. Chairman PAYNE last Friday that, so far as I am concerned, I would cheerfully waive all general debate if we could be assured that we would have ample time for amendment and debate, under the five-minute rule, of the entire bill, section by section.

I now repeat what I said here last night that there is no Democrat I know of who wants to consume one hour unnecessarily in the discussion of this bill—not one. [Applause.] As tired as I was, because really it is a greater mental strain on the nervous system to sit and listen to a speech which you have to answer than to get up and make a speech—and I suspect that last night I was nearly as weary as the chairman of Committee on Ways and Means—I would have been perfectly willing even under those circumstances to go on in order to expedite matters.

While the minority members of the committee have no desire whatever to waste one moment, we do desire a thorough consideration of the bill and a chance to amend it wherever we think it would be improved by amendment, and my judgment is that it could be greatly improved by amendment in many respects.

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. Most of the witnesses wanted an increase of the Dingley rates or wanted those held in statu quo. It seems from an examination of the hearings on the tariff bills of the past that the witnesses were usually the beneficiaries of the tariff, struggling to keep what they had and to secure any increase they could. Only a few manufacturers asked for a reduction of rates on articles which they manufactured. One admitted that the tariff on tin plate should be reduced from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent per pound, and Mr. Claus Spreckels, one of the largest independent refiners, said that the tariff on all sugars should be removed. Mr. Miles advocated reductions.

The Massachusetts boot and shoe men were all for free hides and said that if they could not secure that great boon for themselves any other way they were willing to have leather and all products of leather put on the free list. When that declaration was made almost every member of the committee gave a sigh of relief, thinking that one knotty problem had been solved. Individually I publicly and heartily complimented the gentleman who said that as a candid, intelligent, and patriotic citizen. But within a fortnight he returned and took back all he had said about taking the tariff off leather and the products of leather, but he stuck to free hides for dear life. I think almost every member of the committee felt the disgust which I voiced by withdrawing my previous compliment as publicly as I had bestowed it. The modern reading of the old saying, "Put not your faith in princes," should be "Put not your faith in Massachusetts Republican manufacturers of shoes."

I am not complaining about the nonappearance before the committee of what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] felicitously denominates "the ultimate consumer." The reasons why he did not appear are: (1) In the beginning the public looked upon the hearings as a stupendous confidence game; (2) while that feeling wore off to some extent after Mr. Chairman PAYNE publicly extended an invitation to all who had opinions to express to come forward, scarcely one representative of the great body of ultimate consumers appeared, because each one felt that the possibility of having his tariff burden substantially reduced were so remote that he did not think it worth traveling expenses, hotel bills, neglect of business, and loss of time. That applies to the fairly well-to-do ultimate consumer. It goes without saying that millions of ultimate consumers had not the wherewithal to foot the bills for a trip to Washington, and other millions who could scrape together the expense money could not afford to use it in that way, so that the ultimate consumer really speaks in these hearings only through questions propounded by members of the committee in an honest endeavor to ascertain the truth. Most of the cross firing among witnesses was where one set of protected manufacturers fell afoul of another, growing out of two facts: (1) That the tariff pie was not evenly distributed and each one wanted the biggest piece. Not more than half a dozen of them suggested that things be evened up by reducing their own tariff, but almost every one that saw anybody else more highly protected than himself wanted the leveling process to consist of raising his tariff to the maximum; (2) that what is one man's finished product is another man's raw material, which produced clashes among some of the protected classes. For instance, neither Richard Cobden, Sir Robert Peel, John Bright, Henry George, nor Tom Johnson could yell more lustily for free trade on raw materials than the New England Republican tariff reformers, while, on the other hand, neither Benjamin Disraeli, Horace Greeley, Henry C. Cary, "Pig Iron" Kelley, Joseph Chamberlain, nor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] could yell louder for a prohibitive tariff on their manufactured products.

The situation in which the Ways and Means Committee found itself was unprecedented. Both parties claimed in platforms, in the public press, and on the stump during the late canvass to be in favor of reducing the tariff rates of the Dingley bill. Of course the Republican platform was equivocal and might be construed to mean either revision up or revision down. Judge Taft in his speeches construed it to mean revision down; but nevertheless many benighted Republicans did not believe he was candid, for they boldly came before the committee after the election asserting that the platform declared in favor of raising the tariff rates, and that they were here to demand their pound of flesh. It is no part of my duty to defend standpatters, but as their platform was equivocal I submit that they had as much right and as great a license to construe it to mean revision up as the President had to construe it to mean revision down. In fact, during the campaign it was conveniently construed one way in one portion of the country and the other way in another, owing to the exigencies of the occasion.

But as most of the Republican members of the committee came at last to construe it into revision downward, and as the Democratic members so construed it, the statement is true that both the majority and minority members, always excepting the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], were more or less in favor of a downward revision, with many differences, of course, as to how far downward we should go in the revision. That being the case, the part of wisdom and of patriotism would have been for all the members to have collaborated in the work of preparing the bill after the hearings closed. We are all American citizens, equally interested in the prosperity, glory, and happiness of a mighty people. Not one of us had the slightest desire to injure in any way or to any extent whatsoever any legitimate American industry. He would be an idiot if he did.

In addition to the peculiar coincidence of both parties being under orders to revise the tariff downward, we all were stared in the face by a large and increasing deficiency in the revenues, a deficiency which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations in the last two Congresses, and no doubt destined for that high position in this Congress, has declared might reach $150,000,000 at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909. That is the sad predicament to which the much-vaunted Dingley bill has brought us. There are only three ways known among men by which a deficiency may be cured: (1) Cut down expenses, (2) increase taxes, and (3) issue bonds. Really the issue of bonds is no remedy at all. That simply postpones the evil day, for they must be paid, principal and interest, at last. Taxes should never be increased where it is possible to avoid it. Cutting down appropriations, where it can be done without stinting the Government in any of its proper functions, is the most proper remedy for a deficiency; but our Republican brethren seem utterly incapable of cutting down appropriations. We favor that remedy on the old Jeffersonian principle of "Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened." So, as the Republicans can not economize and as they are in the majority, the Committee on Ways and Means was under compulsion to somehow increase the revenues by about $150,000,000 per annum. Now, taking the whole situation into account,

when the tariff hearings closed, the wise and patriotic thing for the Republican members to have done would have been to invite the Democrats to join in preparing the bill. I feel absolutely certain that I am right about that. We would gladly have aided them in their investigations, meditations, and conclusions. We are all American citizens. We are interested in the public weal fully as much as they are. This is our country as much as theirs. It is the country—God be praised!—where our children and our children's children will dwell with their descendants to the last syllable of recorded time.

In such joint work no man could have gotten into the bill or out of it all that he desired. I will go bond for the proposition that no reputable man, not even Mr. Chairman PAYNE, will stand up in the light of day and assert that this bill contains everything he desired or that it does not contain certain undesirable things. There was no danger of our outvoting them, for they had 12 members to our 6, our seventh Democratic member, Mr. Granger, of Rhode Island, being absent by reason of the sickness of which he died. But we might by mutual concessions have agreed on all the items, or at least a large part of them, for let it not be forgotten that the tariff bill of 1857 was passed by the consent of all parties and practically without opposition. Had we agreed in whole, or even in part, it would have greatly expedited the passage of the bill, thereby shortening the business suspense now pervading the land.

But the idea of collaboration did not appeal to our brethren. On the contrary, they concluded to segregate themselves and to go it alone—as they had a perfect right to do—but I can not refrain from philosophizing a little on what might have been, and perhaps before the moon waxes and wanes again others will philosophize about it also. After nearly three months of hard labor, for I know it was hard, exhausting labor, they introduced their bill into the House shortly after 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, March 17, up to which time no Democratic member had set eyes on it or had the remotest idea of what it contained except by merest guesswork. At noon Thursday, March 18, the whole committee, Democrats and Republicans, were called together and, in precisely twelve minutes, without a moment's discussion and without even reading the title, it was reported back to the House just as it was introduced by Mr. Chairman PAYNE the day before.

If a prolonged debate ensues, if the business agony is continued for weeks or even months, it is well to remember that the blame should rest upon the Republican members of the committee and not upon the Democratic members.

The Payne bill contains divers things which should have been omitted and omits divers things which it should have contained. As confessedly its chief purpose is to increase the revenues, it would appear to have been the part of wisdom to have made both the increases and the decreases in rates to that end, and to that end alone. There is absolutely no question of free trade involved in this revision. It is, or should be, wholly a question of raising a certain amount of revenue from customs duties in a manner the most equitable which the combined wisdom and patriotism of Congress could devise.

In the present posture of affairs every approximately prohibitive rate ought to be cut to a revenue basis. There are many of them in the Dingley bill, a large portion of which are retained in the Payne bill. For example, in the Dingley bill the rate on steel rails is $7.84 per ton, which everybody knows is practically prohibitive. The Payne bill cuts that rate in two, in the middle, and its authors can say: "Behold, we are genuine tariff reformers. See how much we reduced the tariff on steel rails!" But the truth is that in practice the Payne rate of $3.92 per ton on steel rails will prove just as prohibitive as the Dingley rate of $7.84. The greatest ironmaster that ever lived, who made more money out of iron and steel than any other of the multitudinous sons of Adam, Andrew Carnegie, speaking as a protectionist—as a protectionist, mark you—says that there is no tariff needed on steel rails, even from a protectionist's view point, and on the steel-rail question I pin my faith to the "Laird of Skibo."

Every man has a theory as to how tariff bills should be built, and yet nobody ever has adhered strictly to a theory in framing one, and what is more, nobody ever will.

A purely revenue tariff is one levied on articles which we do not produce at all; but even Robert J. Walker, who was an exceedingly able and brilliant man, the chief proponent of a tariff for revenue in America, in preparing his tariff bill did not stick to his own theory absolutely, for he put coffee and tea on the free list. That is my recollection about it. Many makers of tariff bills are high protectionists, yet they place good revenue producers on the free list. Even the framers of the Payne bill do that, just as their predecessors did in the McKinley and Dingley bills. If I had carte blanche to make a tariff bill, and there was not any tariff bill on the statute books at all, and I was confronted with the necessity of raising $250,000,000 out of a tariff, I would get up a revenue bill scientific in every respect. But habit has something to do with it. People get used to a thing and they prefer it that way. Men quarrel about a revenue tariff and a protective tariff frequently when the quarrel really is a disagreement about terms. One man will say that he is in favor of a protective tariff, and perhaps he does not know anything about what he is talking about; and another man will say, "No; I am not in favor of a protective tariff; I am in favor of a revenue tariff;" and perhaps he, too, does not know anything about what he is talking about.

I will tell you the truth about revenue tariff and protective tariff very briefly. Up to a certain point on any article that is made in the United States, as well as abroad, a tariff rate is both a revenue rate and a protective rate, and no human being ever had or can have the ingenuity to separate them. It is an impossibility in nature. For instance, I might say that I am in favor of putting a 25-cent rate on a certain article for the purposes of revenue, and my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] might say that he is in favor of putting a 25-cent rate on the same thing as protection. The upshot of it would be that I would get my revenue and the gentleman from Michigan would get his protection, whether I wanted him to have it or not.

Revenue rates and protection rates run side by side up to the point where the tariff rate begins to be prohibitive in its nature; then I go down one pathway and the gentleman from Michigan goes down another.

Of course I am not the official adviser of the Republican party. It may be very unfortunate that I am not, but I am not. [Laughter.] I believe that the Republicans made two tactical mistakes about the tariff very lately.

I know and you know, and there is no concealment about that, that about two-thirds of all the Republicans are in favor of a prohibitive tariff. They are very close to it, anyway. About one-third of them are tariff reformers down, varying all the way from somebody that would agree with me in the Republican party to a man that would come mighty near agreeing with the gentleman from Michigan. "One star differeth from another in glory," so with advocates of tariff reform.

Here are the Republican tactical mistakes. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee let us scare him last year into making on the floor of this House in the last Congress the declaration that he did make—that he violated no confidence in saying that they were going to revise the tariff and that he was in favor of a maximum and a minimum. I say that we absolutely scared him into it.

The second mistake, tactically, that the Republicans made was putting those two propositions into their platform. They put them in there because we had scared them out of their wits. The reason that I say that they made tactical mistakes is that I believe recent events show you could have beaten us anyhow at the general election. [Laughter.] I will tell you what would have done it: The immense and widespread popularity of Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.] I never had any delusions about that man and about his influence. But he has gone. Some of you Republicans wish he would never come back. [Laughter and applause.] All that I regret is that he left at all [applause], because if he had stayed here, you would have been in such a row in less than ninety days that you would not have known whether you were Republicans or Democrats. [Laughter.]

The historian of our times will record as Mr. Roosevelt's highest honor that he refused a third term when he had it in his grasp. These hints are made in the friendliest way.

I stated what happened the first five or six days in that committee. But after we commenced swatting these witnesses we did swat them, and several Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee came over and helped us. I want to be fair. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee knows more about the tariff schedules than any man on top of the ground. [Applause on the Republican side.] I think his conclusions are frequently erroneous; his theory bad; but he knows more about exports and imports, and he knows more about what the tariff rates have been, and I sat here yesterday and listened to him saying that he had been here twenty years making tariff bills on this committee. Good heavens! What a set of lies that man must have heard in those twenty years! [Laughter.] If he would make himself up an Ananias Club [laughter] from the witnesses that he has heard testify on the subject of the tariff as to four great tariff bills, no building in the United States, not even the great convention hall in Kansas City, would hold them. [Laughter.]

When they commenced the hearings, men came in here and, in

order to make out a case to get another grab, would commence lying as to the imports and as to what the general production was. Every time a man did that, he rubbed the hair the wrong way on the hide of the chairman, and he went after him without gloves, and he roared at him like a Numidian lion. [Laughter.]

One other word about the chairman that I did not say at the place I wanted to say it. I advise all new Members here, on both sides, that he is not as bad tempered a man as he seems to be. [Laughter and applause.] I thought for several years he was one of the worst-tempered men I ever knew; and to be perfectly plain about it, I made up my mind that if I ever got him into exactly the right situation I proposed to go after him in the most approved style I could command. [Laughter.] After I had been put on the Ways and Means Committee, however, I had been up in New England lecturing, and when I got into the car in New York the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was there, and he talked to me all the way down to Washington. He did most of the talking, and I was glad he did. No man ever treated me more kindly and there is no kinder-hearted man in the world than he. [Applause.] By the way, he is one of the best story tellers in Washington. [Laughter.] I never had a more delightful four or five hours, because it was a stream of reminiscences of William M. Evarts, Roscoe Conkling, Governor Morgan, Horace Greeley, William H. Seward, Thurlow Weed, and other great worthies whom he knew in his youth. Some would think he was a regular fire eater from the headwaters of Bitter Creek. [Laughter.] But he can hardly make me mad by sawing me off at the knees, as he frequently has, because I know him. [Laughter.] My judgment is that if he was provoked, he would saw the Twelve Apostles off at the knees. I say this much to clear up the ill feeling there has been.

Now, every Republican on that committee I can say this much truthfully of, and that is, that they helped us out in the direction of asking questions looking to lowering the tariff, except the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Laughter.] They did it in varying degrees. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] took precious little interest in that kind of thing. [Laughter.] The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GAINES], I think, was second in rank as to being a stand-patter with the gentleman from Michigan, but Mr. HILL of Connecticut, Mr. MCCALL of Massachusetts, Mr. CRUMPACKER, Mr. LONGWORTH, and Judge CALDERHEAD, when you would keep off hides and wools [laughter], and nearly all the rest helped us some. That much ought to be said in truth. It did not make any difference what they were trying to get, whether they were in favor of a high tariff or getting it higher, the gentleman from Michigan helped them out. I take off my hat to him. [Laughter.] There is no concealment about him. He was always on hand with "first aids to the wounded." [Laughter.] Whenever we pounded one of these prohibitive tariff advocates into a hole, the gentleman from Michigan immediately set about prizing him out, on the theory, no doubt, that every man has the right to prize his own ox out of a ditch and every man has the right to take care of his own donkey. [Laughter.] As a fighter he beats the game cock. [Laughter.] Neither Leonidas at the pass nor Horatius at the bridge is a marker to him. [Laughter.] The only counterpart for him was that glorious band which ascended to immortal glory from the Alamo. If consistency is a virtue, my brother FORDNEY is the most virtuous of men, for he never lowered his crest or furled his colors.

If the gentleman from Michigan had the great privilege of writing a tariff bill, it would be short if not sweet. It would contain just one sentence and be this: "Where any article can be produced in the United States, its like shall not be imported into the United States." [Great laughter.]

President Taft had declared in favor of a revision of the tariff downward. Your platform, while it was equivocal, as was the chairman's statement here last year, was construed in agricultural districts to mean a tariff revision downward, and the truth is the Republican party played both ends against the middle in that campaign, a remark that some of you can understand. [Laughter.]

The Globe-Democrat and the Kansas City Star, great Republican papers, day after day and week after week, said: "Why, there is no difference between the Democrats and the Republicans on the tariff question. Both sides want it revised down, so what is the use in quarreling about that?"

Here is the thing that surprises me most about this bill: Judging from the hearings—and it will be very illuminating for any man to read those hearings—judging from the hearings, especially in the last days of them, I believed that they would bring in a tariff bill that would revise downward sure enough, but they did not do it.

The most easily understood portion of this bill is the authorization to issue $250,000,000 of 3 per cent bonds during any one year, to run for one year. That process can be kept up perpetually, which means really a permanent increase of the bonded debt by $250,000,000. This in a time of profound peace. The framers of the Payne bill do not use the unpopular word "bond;" they use the more euphonious word "certificate." But they are precisely the same. This bond provision proves beyond doubt that the Republican managers do not believe this bill will produce sufficient revenues and are fixing to issue bonds to supply the deficiency.

I want to read you just one fact to begin with. Here is a government publication stating the estimated revenues. It seemed to me that the chairman of the committee got mad at somebody in one of the days of his speech, because somebody called his attention to a fact stated on the last page of this document. Now, recollect that this is prepared by William W. Evans, assistant clerk, with the assistance of government experts. They figured it out that the average rates under the Dingley bill are 44.16 per cent, while under the Payne bill—and I am afraid that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has attained "the bad eminence," to use Milton's phrase, of introducing into the House the very worst tariff bill that ever was introduced into it—the average rates are 45.72 per cent; that is, on an average 1.56 per cent worse than the Dingley bill. Now, this is a government publication. I want to restate the figures, so that you can carry them in your head until your dying day. The average rates on the Dingley bill, about which people were complaining and from which they wanted relief, were 44.16 per cent, and the average rates under the Payne bill are 45.72 per cent, making the average rates of the Payne bill 1.56 per cent higher than the average rates of the Dingley bill. That one fact alone is enough to damn the Payne bill.

No amount of bad temper, no amount of bluster, will conceal that concrete fact from the attention of the American people. The other day the chairman criticised the report that we had gotten up. We only had four days to get up the report, and we would have died of apoplexy or vertigo or something else if we had tried to figure out these new rates.

It used to be said of James Buchanan, who carried his head on one side, that he did so because he was longsighted in one eye and nearsighted in the other. I do not know as to the truth of that, but the optical apparatus of the chairman is regulated on even a stranger plan. He could see a small screw or a horseshoe nail in that report, or any mistake about it, as far as a hawk could see a chicken, but when he came to read the sentence where we declared unequivocally that we are in favor of repealing the countervailing duty on petroleum he was as blind as a belfry full of bats. [Laughter and applause.]

We say in the report—and I say here, and I dare any man to contradict it—that while there are many reductions in this bill the most of them are more apparent than real. They do not amount to anything. Take certain articles and they cut the tariff half in two, and yet there is as much protection on that article as there ever was, because the rate which they retain in the Payne bill is still absolutely prohibitive.

The chairman made a very strange statement here yesterday. Somebody asked him what they put hides on the free list for. I have not had time to read his speech in the RECORD, but the Washington Post says that his answer to the question was that hides were put on the free list because hides are raw material and that there ought not to be a tariff on raw material.

I do not know whether he said it that way or not, but that is the way it is quoted. I beg leave to ask a question or two. There is no doubt about hides being raw material for the tanner, but what about wool? Is not wool as much of a raw material for the first man that gets hold of it in the manufacture as hides, and yet the tariff on wool is not changed at all in this bill, except carpet wool, and there is not a pound of carpet wool produced in the United States.

I want to say a few words about raw material. Bear in mind that what is one man's raw material is another man's finished product, just as truly as what is one man's meat is another man's poison.

I will illustrate it: Wool in the grease is the finished product of the man who owns the sheep, but it is raw material to the man who is going to make scoured wool.

Now, I want to state, because I am going to talk mostly about wool and woolen goods, there is wool in the grease, which means wool clipped off the sheep without doing anything to it. Then there is washed wool, which means wool washed while still on the sheep's back. Then there is scoured wool, which is the first step in the manufacture; then tops is the second step in manufacturing the raw material of the yarn spinner. Then there is yarn, a still higher step, which is the raw material of the cloth weaver, and then the finished cloth, which is the raw material of the tailor and the manufacturer of ready-made clothing, the final step.

The wool in the grease is the sheepman's finished product, but it is the raw material of the scoured-wool man. The scoured wool is the raw material of the man that makes the tops, but it is the finished product of the scoured-wool man. The tops are the raw material of the man that spins the yarn, but it is the finished product of the man that makes the tops. Yarn is the raw material of the man that makes the cloth, but it is the finished product of the man that makes the yarn, and the finished cloth is the raw material of the tailor, the dressmaker, and the manufacturer of ready-made clothing for men, women, and children. It is like the story of the "House that Jack Built."

I am not engaged at this time in making a tariff bill; I have not been commissioned to do so, but that is a fair illustration of it.

A political remark about free raw material may be apropos. There has been a great hullabaloo in later days about free raw material being the Democratic doctrine. It is not true at all. I will tell you what it was. Henry Clay said, in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective tariff system—and, by the way, if he and Alexander Hamilton could get hold of these schedules of woolen manufactures, or hear of them, they would turn over in their graves and curse the day on which they ever advocated the system. [Applause.] But, in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective tariff system Henry Clay put down free raw materials as one of the four means of working protection. That statement can not be denied. There is no sort of objection to any man's advocating free raw material if he desires, but he ought to give the correct reason for so doing.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee offer a great boon to the American people in the sugar schedule by cutting the tariff on refined sugar from 1.95 cents per pound down to 1.90 cents, a cut down of five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound. That is represented as a great blessing to the American consumer; and, by the way, one thing that happened in these hearings is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] added a new phrase to the American vernacular, and that is "the ultimate consumer." That phrase will live. Happy is the phrase maker! Half of Grover Cleveland's success in the world depended on the fact that he could turn a good phrase.

The newspapers say that one of the members of the committee described that reduction of five one-hundredths of 1 cent on a pound of refined sugar as a blow between the eyes of the sugar trust. It seems to me it was a love lick. When the sugar trust received that tremendous blow between the eyes, instead of seeing stars, which is the usual result of a blow between the eyes, it saw a stream of gold like unto the river Pactolus, flowing into its coffers every year during the life of the Payne tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is what it saw—enabling it to pile up more millions of ill-gotten gains which it does not need. The average consumption of sugar in the United States is about 80 pounds per capita per annum, so that a man must eat sugar at the top of his speed for fifteen months in order to find an additional nickel in his pocket at the end of that time, and if he loses a day out of the whole fifteen months he will not be able to get the nickel. Why this remarkable tenderness for the sugar trust? It receives a rake-off of 26 cents on every hundred pounds of refined sugar. It is not only a trust, but it is a criminal. Two or three weeks ago the United States Government recovered against it a judgment for a little more than $134,000 for swindling in false weights, and the Government has lawsuits pending against it now for the same thing amounting to over $3,000,000, and every man engaged in that swindling transaction ought to be in the penitentiary [applause on the Democratic side], unless, as some people assert and more believe, there is one punishment for a small thief and a more lenient punishment for a big thief.

The same old "joker" on petroleum is in the Payne bill—ostensibly on the free list but in reality a protective tariff of between 150 and 250 per cent. I do not know whether we are going to get a chance to amend this bill or not. I hope we will; and if we do, I will risk my head on the proposition that that countervailing duty on petroleum goes out. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You can not discuss everything in one speech. I am not going to undertake to go over the whole tariff bill like my friend the chairman did, and I repeat, I am not criticising him for that at all. Let us now take the question of boots and shoes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman passes from the countervailing duty on petroleum, I will ask him if he will permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. Those of us who represent districts in which there are large independent petroleum-producing interests have received a great many letters and publications urging us to insist upon the countervailing duty on petroleum on the ground that the very life of the independent petroleum-producing interests depends upon it. The argument is that the Standard Oil Company is a refining industry; that it is a purchaser of raw petroleum; that it produces only about 20 per cent of the petroleum it uses and buys 80 per cent; that it would really be to the advantage of the Standard Oil Company to be able to buy raw petroleum and import it into this country without any duty; and I should like the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri upon the soundness of that argument from the standpoint of the independent petroleum producer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is all a humbug; that is what I think. I do not want to stop with that answer, however. The situation about the production of petroleum in the United Sates is this: The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] stated it substantially, although I will state it in another way. He says the Standard Oil Company produces only 20 per cent of the crude oil it uses and buys the other 80 per cent. I take it that that is about right, and for the purpose of this argument I am willing to accept those figures.

I will tell you what the Standard Oil Company does. Year by year it produces less and less crude oil. I think that is true. It develops very few fields. It has too much sense. It has learned a great deal. What it does not know about making money out of petroleum would not make one page of a primer. It permits the gentleman from Kansas and myself and the rest of us to go out hunting for oil fields, boring holes in the ground at our own expense, and when we have discovered a rich field it comes in and takes possession of it at its own figure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It does not waste any money boring dry holes in the ground. I was fool enough to sink some money out in Utah in a mining venture; but understand what this company does, it does not risk its money very largely in developing fields or in discovery work, but it sits back in its lair and waits for you and me and the rest of us to go and spend our money in boring holes in the ground, and then when we have done that and discovered the finest oil wells in the world it says, "You take our price or we will put you out of business." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you have to take it. The risk is ours, but the profits are grabbed by Standard Oil.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption right there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand it, the Standard Oil Company does not purchase 80 per cent of its petroleum in the sense that it buys that amount at so much a gallon, but it forces the discoverer of an oil well to pipe his oil into its refineries and then arbitrarily fixes the price which it pays for that oil. The producer does not sell his oil in the open market, with the Standard Oil Company buying against any other competitor. The Standard Oil Company takes the oil and pays such sum as it pleases.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; that is absolutely true. The Standard Oil Company fixes the price that it pays for the crude oil. But there is a good deal more of it. It absolutely fixes the price at which kerosene shall be sold to the consumer, Mr. BOUTELL's ultimate consumer.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would be glad to do so.

Mr. HARDY. Is it not a fact that in the hope of enabling some independent production the State of Kansas has passed a general law by which the Standard Oil Company, if it reduces the price in one community of their oil product, is required to reduce it likewise all over the State, and that under the operation of that law Kansas has some independent refineries, while the balance of the country without such a law has and can have no independent refineries?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from Missouri allow me to answer?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will.

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to have the opportunity of saying that under the legislation which the gentleman from Texas has very accurately defined there are now some 9 or 10 independent oil refineries—18, my colleague corrects me—in Kansas that are doing a good business and succeeding with it. And while I am interrupting the gentleman I should like to press my former question upon him, because I am anxious, not from a controversial standpoint, but because I have great respect for his judgment, to get his opinion upon it. The understanding which is brought to us from our independent oil producers is that the Standard Oil Company is just as much interested in free raw petroleum as the sugar company is in the introduction into this country of free sugar.

The only interest the sugar trust has is in refined sugar, and therefore the only tariff in which it is interested is a tariff upon refined sugar. It is argued similarly that the only interest the Standard Oil Company has, or at least its chief interest, is refined oil, and therefore the only way in which it is interested is in the duty upon refined oil. It is that argument on which I should like to have the judgment of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will answer——

Mr. HARDY. I am glad this matter has been injected so we will get a presentation of the entire matter. The suggestion has been made that if the Kansas law were extended by congressional law to interstate transactions then there would be an opportunity for independent production of refined oil, but that without that national law, or the same law in each State, the Standard Oil Company taxes us what it will, buys our product of crude oil at what it proposes to give, and sells the finished product at what price it fixes regardless of free importation, unless under that importation a strong firm from the outside world may enter into competition in selling to the home consumer and sell the finished product a little cheaper than the Standard Oil Company is willing to do. And should we not have an interstate, congressional law like the Kansas law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These questions are all right. I will state what I think in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT]. I know Kansas has had a great deal of trouble with the Standard Oil Company. I remember that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] introduced all sorts of resolutions here about it. If the Standard Oil Company, in my judgment, was not the greatest beneficiary of this business, if I did not believe that it was practically the only beneficiary, I would not object to the crude-oil producers getting a revenue tariff as far as it goes. I repeat, this bill fixes a prohibitive rate on petroleum. I am not opposed to a revenue tariff or a high revenue tariff upon any article. There is one article that I always insist on being on the free list, and that is salt, because it is a hereditary Missouri doctrine. One of the greatest men that ever sat in the Senate of the United States was Thomas H. Benton. I believe he was the greatest constructive statesman of that age. He fought for twenty-six years to have salt put on the free list. He succeeded, and President Roosevelt said he deserved the greatest credit for doing it. When Benton got salt on the free list, he said in his pompous way that he imagined he could hear the flocks and herds on a thousand hills bellowing out their love and gratitude to him for it, and they would have done it if they had known what he had done for them. Outside of salt and a few other prime necessaries of life I would agree with anybody about a revenue tariff, except, as I say, habit ought to be taken into consideration when you are simply patching up a tariff bill.

People have become used to one thing being on the free list that might as well be on the tariff list, and because they have been in the habit of having it there they want to keep it there. For instance, there is not a bit more sense from a revenue standpoint in keeping coffee off of the tariff list—and I am coming to coffee directly—than there is in keeping any other necessary of life off. But it has been on the free list so long that people have become used to it. If I could be convinced that the revenue tariff on crude petroleum would help the producers of crude petroleum—that is, if they would get the benefit of it, at the same time raising revenue for the Government, and the Standard Oil Company would not get the benefit—I would vote for it. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit another question now?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not object to a question that is pertinent.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman is very kind. I should like the gentleman to give us his reasons for believing that the Standard Oil Company is the chief beneficiary of this duty, or even of a revenue duty that might be laid directly on crude oil, remembering what seems to be admitted as substantially the fact, that the Standard Oil Company produces 80 per cent of the refined oil in this country, and that it buys 80 per cent of the raw petroleum that it uses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, the trouble about the gentleman's situation and statement is that the Standard Oil Company compels the producer to take its price, and then it compels the consumer of oil to pay its price; and I give it without any fear whatever, that the Standard Oil Company is the greatest marauder that the sun ever looked down upon in six thousand years. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Would that condition be changed by eliminating this countervailing duty?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it would.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman show us how?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly. If they put up the price of refined oil too high, somebody else would ship refined oil in here. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me a question right there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all right. I am not objecting.

Mr. SIMS. As a choice between evils, would it not be better to repeal all countervailing duty and to put a straight ad valorem duty on petroleum oil of 20 or 25 per cent rather than to pass this bill as it is?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, eminently better. I thank the gentleman for asking me that question. A straight revenue tariff of 15, 20, or 25 per cent, whatever the wisdom of the Congress thought, on petroleum would be an honest performance. But this countervailing duty is simply a dodge. [Applause.]

Now, one other thing while I am at it. I have no disposition to abuse the Standard Oil Company or anybody else. It is best taken care of of anything in this bill [applause], not only by that countervailing duty, but there is another thing that takes care of it; and while I am not going to discuss drawbacks much, I am going to tell you what that contains.

Under this drawback provision, a man that manufactures stuff out of foreign material gets back 99 per cent of the tariff he has paid on that stuff when it is shipped out. The biggest user of tin plate in the United States, or in the world, is the Standard Oil Company. It does not use American tin plate. It uses foreign tin plate to make its cans for the foreign trade, and then gets 99 per cent of the tariff on that tin plate returned. [Loud applause.] Now, here you are in this bill giving it from 150 to 250 per cent on oil, and then giving to it tin plate practically free. [Renewed applause.] I will not stand for any such performance. Remember that while Standard Oil gets in its foreign tin plate for foreign export practically duty free, the rest of us have to pay a stiff tariff on all the tin plate which we use.

While I am at it, I want to make one remark here, as I may forget it if I do not make it at this time.

I understand perfectly well that any man who stands here for a revision of the tariff downward will be lambasted all over the country as a free trader. If they think anybody is going to be scared about that, they may just as well haul in their horns. I can take the hearings and prove that my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], of whom I am very fond, is a free trader in spots. [Laughter.] I can prove the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is. I can prove that practically all of them are, except the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Laughter.] Why, even the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] was opposed to raising the tariff on peanuts. [Laughter.] Here is the strange thing about it: The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee can put hides on the free list, losing $3,000,000 of revenue, without being jumped on as being free traders, except by one paper.

The American Economist is just as certain to dance a jig on them about that as anything in the world. It put the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in a list of free traders about the Cuban reciprocity bill. Now, only think of that. It clapped President Taft and ex-President Roosevelt both in the list of free traders because they advocated buying ships where they could buy them cheapest to keep our manufacturers from gouging about Panama supplies.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] stood up in one breath and boasted on the floor of the House and in his report about things that he put upon the free list, and yet he expects to escape the condemnation of being branded as a "free trader."

I repeat the statement that I made to the gentleman from Kansas a while ago. I do not object to a good, stiff revenue tariff on anything except salt and a few other prime necessaries of life.

Of course, everybody stands around and asks what I think about zinc. I think the very same thing about zinc that I do about every other article of common consumption in the United States. If it turns out on investigation that a cent a pound is a good revenue tariff on zinc, I am going to vote for it; and if it turns out that it is a prohibitive tariff, or anywhere in the neighborhood of that, I am going to vote against it. [Applause.] I am in favor of a revenue tariff, and dead against a prohibitive tariff or anything approximating thereto.

I want to announce a general principle, and that is that I will not help any living human being oppress the great masses of the people of this country. [Loud applause.] I do not care a straw whether they come from Maine or from Missouri, all public plunderers look alike to me. [Loud applause.]

I may go out of public life on account of my conduct about this tariff bill. Of course I would like very well to stay in this

House, and prefer it to any appointive position whatsoever; but whenever I do go out, I intend that it shall be with my own mental integrity unimpaired and my own self-respect intact. [Loud applause.] There are many things worse than being defeated for Congress, and one of them is a cowardly surrender to "the interests," as they are called. I have done honestly and courageously what I thought would benefit the great body of the people, and I have no apology to offer for so doing.

Now, I will tell you about this zinc tariff business. During the campaign my friend the Speaker—and notwithstanding what has been happening and what may happen, and a good deal may happen, I am his personal friend, and barring some little irritation and subirritation I suppose he is mine—during the campaign he went down through Missouri and made three or four speeches in the extreme southeastern part of my district from the tail end of a sleeper. I was glad he did. But his objective point was Joplin.

His speech was reported in full in the columns of his personal and political friend, the Globe-Democrat. I could not find the paper, but I can repeat part of that speech nearly verbatim, because I will never forget it as long as I live; and if I do not state it correctly, he can correct me, as he is doing me the honor to listen to me now. He was speaking at Joplin. He said:

My fellow-citizens, here is the situation: If a Republican House is elected, I will be Speaker.

That much of his prophecy was true.

If the Democrats elect the House, Mr. CLARK will be Speaker.

I do not know whether that was true or not, but I think if we had had a Democratic House and the election had been held twenty days ago, I would have been. Maybe I may be yet. [Laughter and applause.] Then the Speaker proceeded to pay me a very high compliment, for which I am his debtor, and I have paid him many. He said that I had every qualification for Speaker except my politics. [Laughter.] I think he said my political system was about as bad as that of any man he knew. Then he said:

A vote for Mr. MORGAN is a vote for me.

Mr. MORGAN was the Republican candidate for Congress in that district. He said that a vote for Mr. Hackney is a vote for Mr. CLARK; a vote for Mr. MORGAN means a tariff on zinc; a vote for Mr. Hackney means none. As nearly as I can recollect, that is the substance of what he said. I do not object to his having made that speech. I am not criticising it. Some people have a fool notion——

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. As the gentleman referred to me and my trip to Joplin and three other districts in that State, I did not know a great deal about zinc——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You do not know a great deal about it yet, do you?

Mr. CANNON. I know some things about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No doubt.

Mr. CANNON. There is a zinc-reduction plant newly established near my city, and I got some information—not from a zinc producer, but a zinc purchaser—that I think was reliable. On that trip, especially at Joplin and Springfield, I met men who professed to be, and I believe were, of the same faith politically as the gentleman [Mr. CLARK of Missouri], and I met Republicans. They said to me that the deep-zinc mining had gone out of business; that the rich ore only was being mined——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will allow me to interrupt you about a question of fact, you have got it turned around wrong. The rich surface ores have all been worked out, and they complain about having to go so deep to get them.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and they said that that deep mining was giving them smokeless chimneys and idle workmen. They stated further that since the Dingley bill was enacted there had come to be a large production of zinc in Mexico, which I have reason to believe is true. Being on the free list, they said it was coming into our markets, and they believed that it affected their industry. I saw the smokeless chimneys and what purported to be the idle men. If the gentleman will allow me one thing further——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I was met with the statement there in print, and I believe it has not been denied, that Representative Hackney (then Representative but not now Representative) was stating to his people that he stood upon the Denver platform, but that as to zinc he had the assurance of Representative PAYNE and Representative DALZELL that on the revision of the tariff zinc would be properly protected. They said that the Representatives mentioned had denied that statement. It was an exceedingly interesting audience. We had great audiences on that two days' trip across the State and back. I stated further that words were cheap, that they knew in the Joplin district and elsewhere in Missouri whether a duty on zinc that came in competition with their production was necessary. I told them that action was louder than words; that they being experts, I being a Member of Congress, if I should be reelected, their action would control my vote; that if they sent the message by Representative MORGAN (and I laid my hand on his shoulder), that they being experts believed that zinc ore ought to go upon the protected list, I would take their action and vote accordingly; and if they sent Mr. Hackney, I would take their action and vote accordingly, and that it was up to them. [Laughter and applause.] Now, that in substance was my speech, and in substance it was my speech in the district of Mr. RUSSELL and his near-by Democratic Representative, passing through the zinc and the lead and the glass districts. Now, those people seemed to think that glass, lead, and zinc needed protection. I will take their judgment, after full inquiry, and shall vote for that protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Speaker has made a very interesting statement, but there is no essential difference between his statement and mine about what he said in Joplin. I have no doubt he clapped his hand on Mr. MORGAN's shoulder, and he would have clapped it on his head if he had had an opportunity. [Laughter.] What I do say is that the people of the United States are paying a very high price that we may have the society of my friend CHARLEY MORGAN in this House. I like the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. MORGAN. Everybody calls him "CHARLEY" MORGAN, and no man yet was ever called "Charley" that was not a good fellow. [Laughter.]

The situation as to zinc was this: There was no tariff on zinc jack, which is the ore, but there was a tariff of a cent and a half on spelter, which is the finished product. I will tell you what I believe. If the zinc people down there had sent some sensible and truthful men up here to testify before the committee and tell the truth, and had come with the proposition to cut that tariff on spelter of a cent and a half a pound in two and put three-quarters of a cent on ore and three-quarters of a cent on spelter, it would have been accepted by the committee without a dissenting voice. They complained that I grilled them in the Committee on Ways and Means. I did, and I had a right to.

About two days after the grilling I met them accidentally in the corridor, and told him that if they had made that proposition there would not have been a dissenting voice, and both would have been revenue rates and both would have been in this bill; but they wanted the spelter men to hold the 1½ cents per pound on spelter and, in addition, wanted 1½ cents per pound on ore, notwithstanding they claim that the spelter men fix the price of zinc ore and that the zinc trust of New Jersey grinds them down. I promised to inform the Attorney-General about the zinc trust of New Jersey, and I am going to do it.

Let us see what these men testified to—and I say now if we had had the power to swear witnesses before Congress met and some of the men had sworn the way they testified before we got to swearing witnesses, I would go before the grand jury in the District of Columbia and have them indicted for perjury.

I want to tell you some of the testimony of Ihlseng, from New York, and Mitchell, from Pennsylvania, domiciled temporarily in the Joplin district for the purpose of revenue only. They testified that zinc jack was selling for $35 a ton on the very day that it sold for $43 a ton. How can you believe men like that? They undertook to show that zinc ore could be produced in Mexico and gotten to the smelter in Kansas and Missouri cheaper than the Joplin zinc could be produced. It is a curious story to tell, but Ihlsing had the colossal cheek to testify that four Mexican steers, which are not bigger than your fist and will not weigh over 700 pounds each, could pull a bigger load up the mountains and down the mountains and through the sand than two of the biggest and best mules in the State of Missouri could pull on a gravel road as level as a floor. [Laughter.]

The chairman [Mr. PAYNE] referred to that yesterday, and it was just such monumental lying as that that disgusted everybody with these two men and with a good many others who appeared before this committee. Now, if there is anything on earth that I do know about, it is mules. [Laughter and applause.] I represent the greatest mule-producing district on the face of the earth. Mules are not celebrated for grace or

beauty, but they are exceedingly useful in peace and absolutely indispensable in war.

There is another thing I know about, and that is good roads. The finest roads in America are in my district. There is a stretch of 22 miles of gravel road in my district on which the national bicycle races were run for years, and I know what two of the best mules can do on a level road. Down in Joplin they do not have gravel roads, but they have as fine roads as are made in the world—made out of the slag of furnaces, and as smooth as a table.

Another strange thing Ihlsing testified to—and they would testify to anything to get out of a hole. We asked him about the expense of four steers pulling a load 40 miles one way and then back with the empty wagon 40 miles the other. He said it did not cost anything except the driver's wages. [Laughter.] I can prove that by every man on the committee and by the hearings. We asked him how that thing could happen, if they did not have to pay for the feed or take it with them, and he said no; they lived on cactus along the road. I asked him if a new crop grew up along the road every night. [Laughter.] Do you wonder that anybody was disgusted with that kind of testimony?

Then a lot of preachers got together at Joplin and prayed to Almighty God for a high tariff, when they ought to have prayed to "Uncle Joe." [Laughter and applause.]

I have as much respect for a minister of the gospel as any man living, and I do not care a straw what church he belongs to, either. My house is the stopping place for all sorts of preachers, Catholic priests and every species of Protestant preacher indigenous to that soil; and if there were any Jewish rabbis around there, I would have them as guests. I like to talk to preachers. The truth is that I have observed this, and acted on it all my life, that there is not any kind of a man out of whom you can not get information if you talk to him about what he knows about. I like to talk to preachers, for after all a man's soul salvation is the most important subject to which he can turn his thoughts or upon which he can gather information. There is not a man in this House who has more preacher friends than I have, but I have a supreme contempt for a preacher anywhere that commits sacrilege, and that is exactly what that bunch of preachers did down at Joplin. [Applause on the Democratic side.] One witness before the committee volunteered the suggestion that I better look out and not get into a row with the preachers. I am not going to get into any row with the preachers, because nine-tenths of all the preachers in America condemned that bunch down there; and while I am not a theologian, I will debate with that set, the whole of them togethers, as to the proprieties of their performance.

I want to repeat, and we might as well settle it and be through with it, I am not going to help any man plunder the American people because he happens to live in Missouri. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will go out of public life before I will do it. I do not have to have a Congressman's salary to make a living, bless your soul.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Well, then, I will put it in the form of a question. I want to ask the gentleman this question: If before the Ways and Means Committee anything was offered on behalf of the zinc miners of southwest Missouri which was not absolutely reliable and true? We could not prevent, you will see at once, the filing of briefs from this man and that man, and the gentleman has suggested that the gentleman from New York, Mr. Ihlseng, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Mitchell, had attempted to deceive the Committee on Ways and Means. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the testimony of the miners from southwest Missouri, from that part representing us and representing the zinc tariff club—if their testimony was not true, and based upon public report, consular reports, and reports of the Government, and if it was not such testimony as you could rely upon on the Ways and Means Committee? There was no attempt on our part to deceive anyone. We simply attempted to show the price of zinc and the cost of production. Is not that about the fact?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, sit down and I will tell you what the facts are.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. I would not interrupt the gentleman——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I am not complaining, but I can not yield for a speech at this time. I stated what Ihlsing and Mitchell did. I say that they prejudiced the whole case. I will tell you what else I will say, that that Budd Robinson, Maury, Judge Hoag, and Caulkins filed, when they came up here, what seemed to me to be absolutely a truthful statement, and if Ihlsing and Mitchell had stayed away from here with their ridiculous tales I do not believe there would ever have been any trouble about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to this fact, that the original witness who came before the committee from Joplin made a comparison of the Joplin ore with the Mexican ore, without drawing any distinction between the grade of ore or the amount of metal contained in it, and when the subsequent briefs were filed it was clearly pointed out that the Mexican ore was a 32 per cent, and they were comparing it with a 60 per cent ore from Joplin; that the cost of ore in Mexico was $9 at the mine, with $6.50 added to the smelter in Missouri, with a 32 per cent ore, as compared to $20 at the Joplin mines, with $1 added to the smelter, for a 60 per cent ore, clearly demonstrating that the subsequent briefs were correct; that the Joplin man, on account of his high-grade ore, had in the beginning before this tariff duty was added the balance or differential in his favor.

Where the original Joplin men attempted to mislead the committee or did mislead them, probably, was in that they did not call the attention of the committee to the different grades of ore—that one was a 32 per cent ore as compared with a 60 per cent ore in Missouri. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield till I reply to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I can not yield for a speech. I will say this: I believe if Mr. MORGAN had come up here individually and left Ihlsing and Mitchell at home the chances are we could have agreed about it. I repeat that I do not object to a tariff on zinc jack if it is a revenue tariff, but if that 1 cent a pound is a prohibitive tariff or approximates a prohibitive tariff I will go out of Congress before I will vote for it. That is all there is to it, one way or the other.

Mr. MORGAN of Missouri. It is not a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, you come to me after I have finished this speech with the facts and figures and convince me of that; I am not prejudiced on this subject or any other. I have had no time to find out whether it is simply a revenue tariff or a prohibitive tariff. Now, another thing: We are all tariff reformers. A few days ago there was a meeting at the White House, a conjunction, so the papers stated, of four stellar bodies of the first magnitude. Perhaps I ought to say one solar body and three stellar bodies—the President of the United States, Senator ALDRICH, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. MacVeagh, and "my prophetic soul, my uncle," the Speaker of the House. [Laughter.] They met together as tariff reformers, so the papers said, to discuss what should be the Payne bill. When these four tariff reformers got together, if the angels did not weep it is because they were so completely dumfounded that they had completely lost all emotion whatsoever. [Laughter.] Now, so much for those things.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire that I should rise at this point? Much is contained in the papers. I did go to the White House, the Executive Office, on the invitation of the President. Senator ALDRICH, the President, and the new Secretary of the Treasury were there. The President stated that the object of asking us to come there was that we might become acquainted with the Secretary of the Treasury. Although from my State, my acquaintance was only nominal, as one would touch and go once in a lifetime——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No doubt.

Mr. CANNON. So far as the tariff was concerned, I do not recollect that one word was said about it. If there was anything said about it that contradicted my own individual opinion, with the Republican platform for the minimum protection and the maximum penalization—the Republican platform plainly speaking and making the declaration for the enactment of legislation in pursuance of that platform—I would have contradicted any other proposition. I say again, I do not recollect that the tariff was referred to or anything else except the general condition of the Treasury, the desire for good administration, and so far as possible an organization and an administration of that great department that would tend to bring the expenditures of the Government within the revenues. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was stating what I saw in the papers.

Mr. CANNON. And for that reason, if the gentleman will pardon me, as I sit by I rarely correct any misapprehension that may be uttered on the floor, but it seemed to me in this instance that I could with propriety do so, although in former years I have sat in the chair and sat upon the floor and heard misrepresentations abounding in absolute falsehoods that have been taken for truths by the muck-raking newspapers and even written into the Denver platform. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I hope the Speaker did not mean I misrepresented him intentionally.

Mr. CANNON. Not at all. The gentleman is a good fighter, and, so far as I know, I believe when he talks and speaks of facts, speaks the truth as he understands it. I sometimes think, if the gentleman will allow me, that perhaps he is not as clear—his intention as to the matter of differences between a suggestion of that which is an error and the letting alone of that which is the truth—as he might be in discussing public questions, touching especially the revenues. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There are others. [Laughter and applause.] That was about all I was going to say about that newspaper statement. I have myself been misrepresented by newspapers, sometimes inadvertently, sometimes maliciously; hence I can sympathize with the Speaker if he has been misrepresented in this instance or in any other. I have no objection to the Speaker dipping into this debate; I rather feel honored than otherwise. In days gone by frequently the Speaker used to get down from his high perch every once and a while to make speeches. Henry Clay did it repeatedly. I saw Speaker Crisp do it once.

I do not propose to talk about all the schedules. There are one or two that I want to refer to somewhat. I can not pass to the larger schedules, however, without remarking that the increase of 30 per cent in the rates on hosiery is a cruel outrage on men, women, and children, for no man in his senses will claim that hosiery is a luxury in this day and in this climate. These remarks apply with equal force to the increase of 75 per cent on women's, misses', and children's gloves. In this connection it is well to remember that the women had much to do with overthrowing the Republican party on account of the extortions in the McKinley bill. It is to be hoped that history will repeat itself in this instance. There has been more agitation in this House and out of it, I think, on the hide, leather, harness, boot, and shoe question than on any other. Some years ago there was a crusade started in Massachusetts—in New England generally, but in Massachusetts particularly—for free hides. About three years ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asked me during a long speech which I made if I was in favor of putting hides on the free list. I countered by asking him if he was in favor of putting leather and all products of leather, including boots and shoes, on the free list. He said he was not certain but that he was. I said then, and I say now, we could make a trade on that basis so quick it would make his head swim.

This bill puts hides on the free list on the ground, it seems, that it is a by-product of raising these cattle. My brilliant and amiable friend from the State of Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] propounded to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee yesterday this conundrum, namely, that if they put hides on the free list because they are a by-product of producing beef, what was the reason they did not put milk on the free list inasmuch as it was a by-product from the cow, too. I will illuminate the mind of the gentleman from Washington very suddenly as to why that difference was made. Beef is produced chiefly in the West and South. Milk is liable to come into the State of New York and into New England from Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is one explanation that is as clear as crystal.

Here is what happened to boots and shoes, and there is a thing that surprised me amazingly. Yesterday morning, when I was getting ready to make some remarks, as I thought I would have to make them yesterday, I undertook to hunt up the testimony of Mr. C. H. Jones, of Boston, Mass., one of the most intelligent men that appeared before the committee. He was on the witness stand nearly all day. I can prove this by every man on the committee. We cross-examined him at length. Lo and behold! nearly every word of that cross-examination is left out of these hearings.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman is laboring under a mistake in regard to that. The hearings as published on the question of leather and hides are precisely as the stenographer took them and as the notes were furnished by the stenographer for the Printing Office the morning after the testimony was given.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman stated that yesterday.

Mr. PAYNE. It is a fact. I have been examining into it, and they were not corrected by anybody; and this print published here—this bound print that the gentleman has—is simply those same notes republished without any correction. Since that time the clerk has been at work, and the witnesses have had an opportunity of correcting those printed copies; but they have not reached for publication the last schedule under which the hides come in, so that they are exactly as they were furnished by the stenographer, without any correction. There is some mistake about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is almost immaterial anyway, except that the hearings do not seem to carry out what I am going to say. I got this volume and looked to see, and it was not in here. Then I sent over to the Ways and Means Committee room and got No. 20 of the hearings, first print, and they are just exactly like the hearings in the bound copy.

We did examine Jones at length. He gave a great deal of information. I will tell you what happened, and I can prove it by members of the committee, whether it is in that book or not. He was insisting on free hides. He was giving facts and figures to justify free hides. Finally, I got hold of him and asked him if, in order to get free hides, he was willing for leather, boots, and shoes, and all of the products of leather to be put on the free list. I will tell you what he said, as nearly as I can recollect it, because I can not find it in the hearings.

Mr. MANN. Is that what the gentleman thinks is left out of the hearings?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; that and the answer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas had it here yesterday.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will state the whole thing. I do not care whether it is in the hearings or not, except I do not want to be put in the attitude of misquoting it. Mr. Jones hesitated a minute, and then said that they would rather retain 5 or 10 per cent on boots and shoes, but if they could not get this great boon of free hides in any other way, they were willing for the entire tariff to be taken off of boots and shoes.

That is what he said. I said then, and I say now, that I believe that every member of that committee breathed a sigh of relief when he answered that question in that way, and that we thought we had one knotty problem settled. I went so far as to compliment Mr. Jones in the presence of the entire committee and of everybody there as being the most candid and intelligent witness that had appeared before us. A few days after that I was very much surprised. I got back a little after 8 o'clock at night, and the hearings had started. There was Jones standing up there taking back practically everything that he had said that would do us any good out West. I looked at him a half dozen times before I could make up my mind that it was the same man that had been talking about a week before. Finally I asked him this question: If he did not tell the truth when he was down there before; and then, when he went back home, if the brogan-shoe makers, under the lead of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] did not get hold of him and terrorize him so that he could not have any peace of mind and stay in Massachusetts until he came back here and retracted? Then I announced just as publicly as I had conferred the compliment that I wanted to retract the compliment that I paid him before.

Here is a copy of a letter put in his testimony in chief from the Sorosis Shoe Company, declaring that they could furnish shoes in competition with the world; and I will read it to you now. I suppose it is a reliable firm:

LYNN, MASS., *November 24.*

Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman of Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.

As probably the largest manufacturers of women's fine shoes in the world, the Sorosis Shoe Company desires to go on record as declaring the present tariff on such shoes as we manufacture wholly unnecessary to our success and a distinct injustice to the consuming public. We favor the complete abolition of this tariff, welcoming the competition of the world. We should be glad, at the convenience of the Ways and Means Committee, to present arguments for the removal of the duty on boots and shoes like those of our own manufacture.

A. E. LITTLE & CO.

Now, what did the Committee on Ways and Means do? If there ever was a proposition proved beyond all controversy to any set of men on earth, that boot and shoe hearing proved that they did not need one particle of protection, according to their own theory.

Mr. TIRRELL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; if you will ask it and quit.

Mr. TIRRELL. Now, did Rice & Hutchins, the largest manufacturers of boots and shoes in Massachusetts, take any such position before the committee?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know whether they did or not. I do not know.

Mr. TIRRELL. Are you not aware that, though connected with your party, they are utterly opposed to the position taken by the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. TIRRELL. Did George E. Keith and other manufacturers express the same opinion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know. There were 8,000 pages of hearings.

Mr. TIRRELL. Why, then, does the gentleman say that these people he has quoted represent the sentiment of all the boot and shoe manufacturers of Massachusetts?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is the plainest thing you ever heard, because Jones and others came before the committee and testified. I do not know what is the feeling up in Massachusetts, but they came before the committee and testified.

Mr. TIRRELL. Both of them are opposed to that view expressed before the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not care whether they are or not. I am talking about the witnesses testifying; the evidence in the case. I think a good many people ought to be hanged, but that is not evidence.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if it is a fact that these manufacturers of boots and shoes, with perhaps one or two exceptions, did not demand in the same breath untaxed hides and taxed products of the manufactured sort that competed with theirs?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; a great many of them did.

The boot and shoe industry, as I understand it, is divided into two great classes; that is, what you may call "fine" shoes, the light-weight shoes, "brogans" and other heavy shoes. Of course a brogan shoe weighs a great deal more than the shoes that we wear or most of the women wear. Now, I intend to be perfectly fair about this, as I try to be fair about everything. The brogan-shoe makers, and makers of other heavy shoes, claim that the makers of the fine shoes can stand without any tariff and get along first rate, and that the brogan and heavy shoe makers can not.

It is well to state this further fact: No foreign shoes hardly are brought into the United States. There is no question that we have the best shoemakers on the face of the globe, and I rejoice at it. They are so much better than the other shoemakers that foreigners can not compete with our shoemakers, and I rejoice at that.

I have a bill here from one of the biggest shoe houses in St. Louis—the Roberts, Johnson & Rand Shoe Company—to stamp on a shoe the ingredients of that shoe, and I am going to offer it to this bill as an amendment, if I get an opportunity, and I do it for two reasons—at the solicitation of the shoemaker and for the benefit of the consumer. They say, and it is true, that by using inferior material that you can not see in the shoe you can make a shoe look just as good as a shoe that is twice as good. That ought to be stopped, because it is dishonest.

But what did the Ways and Means Committee do about shoes and hides? They placed hides absolutely on the free list, and they cut the tariff on shoes from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem only, and that left 5 per cent more ad valorem tariff on shoes, with the hides free, than Mr. Jones wanted to leave on.

I am in favor of free hides, free leather, harness, free boots and shoes, but they all ought to go on the free list together. If I get an opportunity, I am going to move to put boots and shoes, harness, and all other products of leather on the free list [applause], and they can bellow about free trade as much as they please. I want to serve notice on everybody concerned, you are never going to get the tariff off boots and shoes and other products of leather unless you take it off when you take it off of hides, and in this case the hide should go with the tail. [Laughter.]

Now, here is a curious fact: You take the average citizen, or the working girl getting eight or ten dollars a week, and, strange as it may seem and very much to my surprise, shoes constitute more than a fourth—from about a fourth to a third—of the cost of her clothing for twelve months. It is astonishing. If anybody wants to know how much boots and shoes cost in proportion to other things, let him get Ida M. Tarbell's article in the March number of the American Magazine. These men do not need this tariff to take the markets of the world. What is the sense in greasing a fat hog? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEISSE. In regard to the price of hides, I wish to state that the hides that were on the dutiable list, which constitute about 20 per cent of what are taken off by the farmer, during the panic of last year declined about 70 per cent. Calfskins that are on the free list, which also go into the making of leather, only declined about 20 per cent. If we had free trade in all raw materials and the markets should stay the same as they are in hides and calfskins, the market would be much higher than it would be if they were on the dutiable list.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No doubt that is true. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] complained yesterday at the statement, as I understood it (anyhow he criticised the statement), that a great many rates in this bill, while they are cut down from the Dingley bill, are still prohibitive. I put that statement into that report. I did not write the entire report. Of course nearly any report is a composite production. But that statement is literally true. I am going to give you an example. I am making a speech now. This is my performance. There is nobody else on earth responsible for it. This is not a composite arrangement. You take the iron and steel schedules. What did they put ore on the free list for? I will tell you. It was to give an advantage to this fringe of iron makers on the Atlantic seaboard, bless your hearts. That was what it was done for. That was the only reason it was done. The price of iron and steel is fixed at Pittsburg, and putting iron ore on the free list will not cheapen it at all, except to the man who makes his iron out of imported ores.

They cut pig iron from $4 a ton to $2.50. I am not going to discuss iron and steel. I am going to leave that to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. You cut steel rails one-half. The tariff on steel rails, under the Dingley bill, was $7.84 a ton. Half of that is $3.92 a ton. The $3.92 a ton is just as prohibitive as the $7.94 a ton; that is the truth about it. That is demonstrated by the incontrovertible fact, which is not even denied, that year after year they ship rails to the ends of the earth and sell them at from $8 to half a dollar a ton cheaper than they sell them to American consumers here at home. Now, what is the sense in giving protection to a man or a firm that is doing that?

One gentleman volunteered the information before the committee, when I asked if Carnegie did not know all about steel and had not made a great fortune out of it, that "He made a great fortune by selling out." But the trouble about that answer is that he was worth two or three or four hundred million dollars before he sold out. I said earlier that politics makes strange bedfellows. If a man had told me ten years ago that Andrew Carnegie and I would ever agree about anything as to the tariff, I would have thought he was either a fool or a liar, or both, but it has come true that we do agree about steel rails, at least.

I am going to drop all the rest of these schedules except one; and while it will be a little tedious, when I get through with it some people will know a great deal more about it than they do now. That is the portion of Schedule K, which applies to manufactures of wool. I am rather inclined to the opinion that among the multitude of bad things the woolen-manufactures schedule is the most monstrous thing in this bill.

Judge GRIGGS says that I am mistaken about that; that the cotton-manufactures schedule is still worse. If that is true, and I suppose it is, the cotton-manufactures schedule is a cruel and heartless imposition on the masses of the people, and I do not see how any man with bowels of compassion can vote for it. I did not have time to study that schedule, but I am going to talk about this one. It is the most complicated of all the schedules, and that is the trouble about it. It has more involved sections in it than any other, and it is a monstrous oppression of the poor.

Let us begin at the beginning. If I do not explain everything correctly I hope somebody will interrupt me and correct me. In the first place, all wool—that is, all wool that is used to make clothes—is divided into two classes, class 1 and class 2. There is not a pound of carpet wool produced in the United States. I learned a good deal about wool in these hearings, and I knew a good deal about it before we began. I state, without fear of successful contradiction, that you can not raise sheep either for wool or for mutton, or both, on high-priced land to advantage except for breeding purposes. We raise a great many sheep in Missouri, but we ship a large percentage of them out to the Northwest and the West and down to Texas

for breeding purposes. We get $50, $75, and $100 for a young ram. We import a vast number of sheep from the West and South into my district for feeding purposes, then ship them on to the market.

Barring carpet wools, other wools are divided into two classes. It will be an arithmetical test of your head to undertake to follow this, but all wools are divided into two classes except carpet wools; the wool of the first class, which is of the merino variety, and the other, the second class, the Shropshire and sheep of that kind. The tariff on wool of the first class in the grease is 11 cents a pound, and on the second class in the grease 12 cents a pound. Then it is differentiated in unwashed wool, which is wool cut off the sheep's back in the grease, while another is washed wool, and that is where you wash the wool on the sheep's back. Then you have scoured wool, and then the tops and yarns, and then the finished cloth.

They levy 11 and 12 cents a pound, as the case may be, on the wool in the grease. They pay 11 cents, a flat tariff on wools of the first class, or 12 cents, a flat tariff on wools of the second class, per pound on wool in the grease. It turns out that some wools lose as much as 80 per cent in weight in cleaning and some lose only 16 per cent. If one man gets hold of a batch of wool and loses 80 per cent and the other man gets hold of a batch that loses only 16 per cent, the first is paying five times as much tariff as the second one is. If you have not studied on it, I will explain how it comes that one package will wash out so much more than another. You take Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and the Central West, where we have blue-grass sod and timothy sod and good sod on all the land, and the wool is comparatively clean when it comes off the sheep's back; but if you get out into the dry, sandy country, like parts of Oregon, Idaho, and Utah, where it never rains, hardly, the winds and sand fill up the sheep's coat as full as it can stick with sand.

I was utterly amazed and did not at first believe it, and I am not dead sure that I believe it yet, but I am rather persuaded to believe it, that wool raised in southeast Ohio, the north end of West Virginia, and the southwest corner of Pennsylvania, on account of some peculiar climatic condition, is the finest raised in the United States.

I disputed it at first, but am almost forced to accept it from facts and figures. The truth about it is, the wool industry does not seem to be suitable to the most of our country. You have had a high tariff on wool for twelve years, practically, and yet, while there were 38,000,000 sheep in the United States when the Dingley bill went into effect, there are only fifty millions now. That is only a gain of 12,000,000 sheep in twelve years under the highest kind of a tariff rate. How many people are there in the United States? Practically one hundred millions. How many sheep are there in the United States? Fifty millions. How much would that be? One-half a sheep to a person. You pay more for the cheapest suit of clothes you ever had on your back than your share of the wool tariff would be. We consume 500,000,000 pounds of wool in the United States every year—300,000,000 of domestic wool and 200,000,000 of foreign import. As a matter of fact, we can not produce, as a general rule, the particular kinds of wool that we import, and we need these foreign wools to mix with our domestic wools to manufacture to the best advantage.

I have got you started on the wool business, and I want to show you how it doubles up. There is one man in this House whom I want to thank—a rampant Republican, Mr. BOUTELL, of Illinois. I think I see his fine Italian hand in this. The tariff on tops was higher in the Dingley bill than on yarn, which was an outrage, as yarn represents a more advanced stage in manufacturing than tops, and should therefore have had the higher rate, even according to the Republican theory. I am going to tell you directly how it got in.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] jumped on a witness over there, and dragged out of him on cross-examination facts which evidently led to putting tops at a lower rate than they are now under the Dingley bill.

Here is the cross-examination of Mr. Whitman by Mr. BOUTELL, which reduced the tariff on tops, a most righteous act:

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Whitman, how long have you been in business?

Mr. WHITMAN. In what business do you mean?

Mr. BOUTELL. The manufacturing business.

Mr. WHITMAN. Forty-three years.

Mr. BOUTELL. You were then in active business when the wool tariff of 1867 was framed?

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir; I was.

Mr. BOUTELL. Did you take an interested part in the framing of that tariff?

Mr. WHITMAN. I did not.

Mr. BOUTELL. On what tariff since then have you taken an interested active part in framing?

Mr. WHITMAN. Pretty much every one.

Mr. BOUTELL. Which one of these tariffs has been the most acceptable to you?

Mr. WHITMAN. The present tariff.

Mr. BOUTELL. I notice in looking over these tariffs that the classification founded in 1867 has been carried down to the present time, and that the framework of the schedule adopted in 1883 has been continued through the McKinley and Dingley bills, and you say you had an active part in all those laws?

Mr. WHITMAN. I can not say that I had any part in framing the laws.

Mr. BOUTELL. I mean a part similar to the one you are taking now, or taking an active part in presenting.

Mr. WHITMAN. Oh, yes, sir; a far more active part than now, because in the earlier days I was asked to give information about our industry, both by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee, and I think they found they could depend upon what I told them—they always sought information from me.

Mr. BOUTELL. I notice in the law of 1897, in section 364, something that does not appear in any of the other laws, and one which naturally suggests some question as to why it was adopted.

Mr. WHITMAN. Which one is that?

Mr. BOUTELL. It is paragraph 364 of the present law, under which on the wool in which any rudimentary manufacture takes place, even to tying up the bundles, the duty is fixed at treble or quadruple what it is on raw wool, with an added duty of 50 per cent ad valorem to the one outside of the wool industry. That seems to be a most extraordinary provision. Can you give any explanation of it?

Mr. WHITMAN. I am sure that you will find that that is almost an exact transcript of the McKinley law. When the Gorman-Wilson law came into operation it abolished all that. It is in the new law. When this was framed it was framed for the purpose of preventing covering any loopholes. Now, I had nothing to do with the framing of that paragraph; I was sick at home. I should judge possibly from the question that the gentleman perhaps had been told that I had had something to do with the framing of that paragraph.

Mr. BOUTELL. I assure you not, Mr. Whitman. I have never heard your name mentioned in connection with it, and notwithstanding your distinguished position in the wool trade I never heard your name mentioned before to-day.

Mr. WHITMAN. I am very glad of it.

Mr. BOUTELL. But that is a paragraph which naturally attracts the attention of any economic student. It is substantially the same in the McKinley law, but did not appear in the law of 1883.

Mr. WHITMAN. No, sir; because wool was free.

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes; or in the law of 1867. But leaving outside the question of the law, it seems that how it appeared in the law requires explanation. What explanation do you give of this extraordinary duty of treble and quadruple the duty on plain wool, with that added duty of 50 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. WHITMAN. I think it was put in as a sort of catch-all to prevent anything that did not happen to be enumerated coming in at a ruinous rate. That is my recollection, so far as I am cognizant of its origin. I think the chairman remembers that fact.

Mr. BOUTELL. It may appear in some of the detailed hearings on the Dingley law, but to the ordinary reader, and comparing the two laws, it would seem to be a paragraph that needed explanation. You are here to stand by the present law?

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOUTELL. And I am here to know what the reasons for it are. That is a paragraph that puzzles me more than any other in the whole schedule. It is an extraordinary thing to say that a raw material which goes simply beyond that stage which would be tying it up into a bundle would stand three times and four times the duty on the raw material, with 50 per cent ad valorem added. That is enough, I admit, to excite the curiosity of any ordinary intelligent citizen.

Mr. WHITMAN. Well, it was undoubtedly put there for the purpose of catching anything that was not enumerated in the law.

Mr. BOUTELL. It seems to me it is a good deal like constructing a whale net to catch a mosquito with, if that was the only intention of it. There must be some explanation for it.

Mr. WHITMAN. I will try to give you all that I know.

Mr. POU. What section is that?

Mr. BOUTELL. Three hundred and sixty-four.

Mr. WHITMAN. In the framing of tariff bills, my experience has been that it is almost impossible to enumerate specific articles; that the law is almost always evaded in some way; and while this does appear on its surface to be extraneous I have no doubt that it was put in for that purpose, and I beg to assure you that it does no harm.

Mr. BOUTELL. That is your idea, is it, that it was put in in that intricate and involved language, and using another paragraph by way of reference, as a merely prohibitive duty on something that might possibly creep in?

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOUTELL. That certainly was a very involved and labarynthian way to accomplish a very small purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. It looks very much like a blanket clause.

Mr. WHITMAN. That is exactly what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. To catch anything that the other parties may have omitted or that the courts might construe.

Mr. BOUTELL. That blanket clause is in 366, and it would not have taken but two words to have included the raw wool. Three hundred and sixty-four is a separate clause and refers to 366.

Mr. WHITMAN. The chairman has answered the question far better than I am able to answer it.

Mr. BOUTELL. I admit that.

Mr. WHITMAN. In my judgment, it is all right.

The change in the rate on tops is the only substantial change made in this schedule. Listen to how it climbs up:

The duty on wools of the first class, which shall be imported washed, shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed; and the duty on wools of the first and second classes, which shall be imported scoured, shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed. The duty on wools of the third class, if imported in condition for use in carding or spinning into yarn, or which shall not contain more than 8 per cent of dirt or other foreign substance, shall be three times the duty to which they would otherwise be subjected.

Unwashed wools shall be considered such as shall have been shorn from the sheep without any cleansing; that is, in their natural condition. Washed wools shall be considered such as have been washed with

water only, on the sheep's back, or on the skin. Wools of the first and second classes washed in any other manner than on the sheep's back or on the skin will be considered as scoured wool.

Having laid the foundation, I want to talk about the tariff on woolen manufactures. On blankets valued at not more than 40 cents a pound, 22 cents and 30 per cent ad valorem per pound. That is the same as 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class. When both of these rates are reduced to ad valorem, it amounts to 107.60 per cent. It may surprise you to know, when you run this out into the ad valorem, that it varies from year to year, but that is on account of the variation in the value of the wool. In 1907 there were imported only 1,116 pounds of that sort of blanket. If that is not prohibitive, I do not understand the use of the English language. When you strike blankets and flannels valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents a pound, when reduced to ad valorem, the rate amounts to 106.12 per cent. There was imported of that sort of blankets in 1907 only 472 pounds. Valued at more than 50 cents a pound, 33 cents tariff specific and 40 per cent ad valorem, when reduced to ad valorem, amounts to 71.31 per cent. Blankets more than 3 yards long, 33 cents and 40 per cent ad valorem, when reduced to ad valorem, amounts to 165.42. That was in 1907. Three years before it amounted to 182 per cent and over.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. How much of that comes in?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Those are the cheapest blankets—importations, 142 pounds.

Mr. NORRIS. These are under the present law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These are under the Dingley law, and they are not changed in the Payne bill. Flannels valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents per pound, 22 cents a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem, and when reduced to ad valorem that amounts to 143.67 per cent. Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50, 33 cents a pound and 35 per cent ad valorem, when reduced to ad valorem amounts to 102.26 per cent. The importation in 1907 of that was 257 pounds. Valued more than 50 cents and not more than 70 cents per pound, when reduced to ad valorem, 105.49 per cent, and so on to the end of the list. When the specific rates and the ad valorem rates are reduced to ad valorem on women's and children's dress goods, cotton warp, the tariff is 105.92 per cent. Values not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, and above 70 cents a pound, ad valorem, 106.37 per cent; valued above 15 cents per square yard and not above 70, when reduced to ad valorem, 96.87 per cent. Women's and children's dress goods, in paragraph 369, valued not above 70 cents per pound, specific and ad valorem rates, when reduced to ad valorem, amount to 104.19 per cent. One thing that so completely mystifies the public as to the rates they are really paying is that the rates are stated on the pound, while nearly everyone thinks of woolen goods by yards.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Can the gentleman state whether or not under the provisions of the Payne bill the tax on woolen goods has been decreased or increased?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It stands nearly precisely where it was.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman also publish with his statement of the respective ad valorems on the woolen goods the statement of the importations under the respective items?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Because if he does he will find that in the last item to which he referred during the Dingley bill, the increase on women's dress goods, valued above 70 cents a pound, is from 4,000,000 yards to 18,000,000 yards, a multiplication under that tariff of more than 500 per cent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I will try to publish it all; I do not want to weary the House.

Mr. HILL. Put it all in together; it will look better.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In answer to the question of my friend from New York—I do not see Mr. BOUTELL here who was engineering this thing—I will state it as I understand it. This is the only material change I have found in these rates. Tops, you understand, take the place somewhat of the old-fashioned rolls; I do not know whether the gentleman from New York knows what that is, he being a city man.

Mr. SULZER. I do; I have been in woolen mills.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Here is the way it was fixed in the Dingley bill. It was a concealed performance. They fixed it in this way—that if wool that had been advanced by any degree of manufacture not specified in this bill should come in, it should come in under certain other sections. This included tops, the first step in manufacture after scoured wool, and made tops pay an enormous per cent, when we consider their place in the scheme of manufacture. Here is what the tariff was on tops in the Dingley bill:

Where they were worth not more than 40 cents a pound the tariff on tops—now, that is wool that is barely started in the manufacturing process—was three times the tariff on 1 pound of wool of the first class; that is, 33 cents plus 50 per cent ad valorem. Now, in the Payne bill it is the same as on scoured wool, and scoured wool is three times instead of four, the same as on scoured wool, and 6 cents per pound. Now, the tariff on scoured wool of the first class is three times the tariff on unwashed wool of the first class, which is 11 cents, and three times that is 33 cents. That is what it is on tops under the new bill, 33 cents plus 6 cents per pound; that makes 39 cents. Anybody can understand that that understands anything about wool. In the other case it was three times the tariff on 1 pound of wool of the first class, 33 cents plus 50 per cent ad valorem. Now the only difference is in 6 cents and 50 per cent ad valorem. If wool of the first class in the grease was worth 18 cents per pound under the old law, the 50 per cent ad valorem would be 9 cents. If it were worth 12, it would be 6, which added to the specific duty of 33 cents would be 45 cents in the one case and 39 in the other. I want to give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] credit for doing that, and I will give you his cross-examination of William Whitman, to show you how he did it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman state whether or not the schedule about which there were some newspaper statements about a gentleman named Whitman, whether or not that schedule is substantially the same in this bill as in the last bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was just explaining that point. I will explain it over again. The making of "tops" is the first step in the manufacture of woolens, after scouring the wool, and amounts to what were the old-fashioned rolls. Then when you get to yarns it ought to be a higher tariff, and when you get to cloth it ought to be a still higher tariff, a compensatory duty, it is called. Now, here is the way it stood in the old law, and it seems to have been worked in by indirection by referring it to another class. I know it is very hard to understand, and that is precisely the reason the enormities stay in these bills. In the Dingley bill the rate on tops was switched way around and put into another section. It said that on wool advanced by any step of manufacture not specifically fixed in this bill the rate, which meant on tops, should be the same as fixed on woolen goods under a certain section in which the rate is very high. Well, now, here is what it was in the Dingley bill: On tops not more than 40 cents per pound (of course that took it all in), three times the tariff on 1 pound of wool of the first class; that is, 33 cents plus 50 per cent ad valorem. Now, if the wool was worth 12 cents per pound, that amounted to 39 cents; if it was worth 18 cents, it amounted to 42 cents, and so on. Now, here is the way it is in the new bill:

It is the same as on scoured wool and 6 cents per pound additional. Now, that means 33 cents plus that 6 cents. So it is changed for the better. That is the one instance I know of in the woolen schedule that is changed for the better. While that was a laudable performance, and was brought about by reason of the utter disgust that every member of the committee felt for one man that testified, as long as you let these enormous rates stay on manufactured cloth it is simply a squabble between the top makers and the yarn spinners, and the ultimate consumer gets no benefit at all. Just listen to one or two of these and see how complicated they are. If you would undertake to listen to all of them you would have a swimming in the head:

On cloths, knit fabrics, and all manufactures of every description, made wholly or in part of wool, not specifically provided for in this section valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound of cloth shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on a pound of unwashed wool of the first class.

And then there is an ad valorem duty of 55 per cent.

It is very interesting to know about these wool schedules and how they got in here, anyhow. When the civil war began the tariff on wool and woolens was very low, and of all the calamities brought about by the civil war, the tariff bill that grew out of that war has cost the American people the most. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The money value of all the slaves and the loss financially by the destruction of property during the civil war does not amount to a tithe of what these exorbitant rates have cost the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Any man can vote for a tariff that charges the poor in this country

165 per cent or 182 per cent on blankets that wants to do so, but I will not do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I will not vote for any such exorbitant rates on woolen clothes.

I want to read you a few extracts from these hearings. I have never been afraid to do justice to any man, and I want to read you a few questions that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] pumped into a distinguished citizen.

There was a man, by the name of William Whitman, who came before that committee from the city of Boston, Mass. I hate no man, but I have a more supreme contempt for him than any other human being that I ever clapped my eyes upon. But before I go to that, because that will be a long story, I want to tell you something about wool.

Most of them came in there and testified that they were not making anything at all. The truth is that the men who were getting prohibitive rates and rolling in wealth came in there and testified so frequently that they were not asking anything that at last the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS], who has a very rich sense of humor, did more good than any of us. He would stop the witness when he began and say, "I want to ask you if you are making any money?"

The first time he asked it, it sounded very funny, but by the time he had asked that of a dozen men, the other men, when they went to testify, would voluntarily preface their statement by saying they were making money. They never began to admit that they were making money until the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] caught onto that scheme. But these wool men came in from Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Mexico, Utah, and from the Lord knows where, and stood up there with faces as straight as a yardstick and testified that they were not making anything. Finally, there was a tall, slender, sinewy man, with a hawkbill nose and a clear, gray eye, a fine sample of a pioneer, that came in from Wyoming to elucidate the situation. What he wanted was for the rates on wool to be doubled, and that is what they all wanted. The chairman had learned a good deal about the wool business from me in those examinations. I cross-examined these men in extenso simply because I was raised in the wool country and knew a great deal about it, and when this man from Wyoming—and I never have been able to find his evidence in the hearings, although it is in there somewhere—got on the witness stand and made his statement, the chairman took him all around Robin Hood's barn. He asked him every question I had asked twenty-five or thirty witnesses. I think he was trying to knock me out of cross-examining him. I did not care if he did. While the man was being cross-examined by the chairman, I came to the conclusion that he was an unusually good-natured citizen.

When the chairman got through with him and he started to leave, I said, "Hold on. I want to ask about three questions." I said: "How long have you been in the sheep business?" Now, recollect that he was asking for these wool rates to be doubled. Instead of getting 11 cents a pound and 12 cents, he wanted to get 22 cents and 24 cents. I asked: "How long have you been in the sheep business?" He replied: "Fourteen years." "How much did you have when you went in? How much money did you put in?" He said: "Nine hundred and sixty dollars." "Are you worth a hundred thousand dollars now?" He said: "Yes, I am." I have always since been sorry that I did not ask him $150,000. I just accidentally hit on $100,000 as a round number. "Now," I said to him, "Mr. Witness, the truth of the whole thing is that you started fourteen years ago with $960 in the sheep business and you made $100,000, and you come here to ask to have the tariff doubled so that you can make some more?" And he said: "That's about the size of it." Then he started in and told me how dangerous it was to raise sheep in Wyoming [laughter], and how brave the pioneers were. [Laughter]. "Why," I said to him, "you need not pass any eulogy on western men so far as I am concerned, for I am one of them." It is the vigorous, ambitious, and venturesome who go out to the West and the drones who stay at home. I said to him: "Where did you live before you went to Wyoming and went into the sheep business?" He said: "In western Kansas." I said: "What did you do in that delectable region?" He said he was a farmer. "Now," I said, "tell me the truth; is it any more dangerous to raise sheep in Wyoming than to drive four mules to a gang plow or a wagon in Kansas?" And he says: "No; it is not." [Laughter.]

I do not pretend to say that everybody has made that enormous profit. I have not figured it out, but it must be 1,000 per cent, or more than that. I do not pretend to say that everybody makes that profit. But I tell you what I do know. I have a good Republican friend in my district, a gentleman who came from Ohio, that makes lots of money this way, and he is as clever and good a man as ever lived. He does not own any farms; he farms out sheep to small farmers. He gets half of the wool and half of the increase. He has been trying for the last ten years to persuade me to go into the business with him, and the only reason I did not do it is because I did not have time to talk the plan out with him. He told me repeatedly that he made 40 and 50 per cent on his money one year with another.

Now, let us see about this sheep increase. There has been only 12,000,000 of sheep increase since 1896. Now, one ewe in that length of time would come up in 1909 with seven ewe daughters and with granddaughters. Sheep reproduce everywhere from a year to eighteen months. They double the flock when well taken care of every year. Witnesses swore they did not, but I know that a flock doubles itself every year if well taken care of. Half of them are ram lambs and half of them ewe lambs. That is about the proportion. The proportion of boys and girls born into the world is 21 boys to every 20 girls. It runs about the same with ram lambs and ewe lambs. Start with a ewe in 1896, and, taking it for granted the product is half rams and half ewes, in 1907 she would come up with at least seven of her female descendants by her side.

Now, if this wool tariff is such a blessing to the people, what is the reason, instead of having fifty millions we have not seven times the thirty-eight millions when they started in 1896? I want to tell you about this man Whitman, William Whitman, of Boston. In all the critiques written on Charles Dickens, of blessed memory, it is said that all his characters are caricatures; but I am as certain as I am living this day that if Charles Dickens could have come back to the earth and walked into the room of the Committee on Ways and Means when Whitman was testifying, he would have walked up and said to him: "How do you do, Mr. Pecksniff?" [Great laughter and applause.] I think that every man on that committee will testify that I was the only man on the committee that ever forced that man to answer questions directly, although he testified nearly all day, and I did it by hard pounding. The chairman would ask him a polite question and he would fence with the chairman for ten minutes. Mr. HILL would ask him a question and he would fence with him. Mr. COCKRAN would ask him a polite question and he would fence with him; and all the rest of them. So, finally, when I tackled him he commenced the fencing game with me. So I said to him "I do not want any more fencing done here to-day. I am going to ask you plain questions and you have got to answer."

But before I got hold of him Judge CRUMPACKER took a turn at him. Now, Judge CRUMPACKER wanted him to answer questions, and I will show you how long it took him to make his answer. I do not know whether Judge CRUMPACKER is here or not. It does not make any difference. This is mighty rich stuff. This is on pages 3322 and 3324 of the first print of the tariff hearings, and on pages 5356 and 5357 of the last print:

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to ask a question or two about a particular schedule—cheap blankets, for instance, valued at not more than 40 cents a pound. Last year there was imported 142 pounds only of the value of 40.60. They paid a duty of 67.16, equal to an ad valorem rate of 165.42 per cent. That duty is practically prohibitive, is it not—165 per cent?

Mr. WHITMAN. On that particular character of blankets; yes, sir.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Upon that cheap blanket?

Mr. WHITMAN. I do not know that.

He could not tell a thing and stick to it to save his soul.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Blankets valued at not more than 40 cents a pound; blankets that are used by the poorer classes of people in this country. That is a prohibitive duty, is it not? The records show that.

Judge CRUMPACKER was reading from this report of Mr. Evans, an official document. Now, see how he fences:

Mr. WHITMAN. The records show that they could be bought so much cheaper here.

Whether that was false or true nobody knew, but he would not answer a question directly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The American manufacturer of blankets does not need 165 per cent protection, does he, to control his own market?

Mr. WHITMAN. That particular article?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That particular article; yes.

Mr. WHITMAN. Well, I should think not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, then, Mr. Whitman, in relation to cloths, woolens, and worsted goods which you manufacture, valued at not more than 40 cents a pound—that is a cheaper grade, is it not?

Instead of answering the question, he said:

Mr. WHITMAN. I am manufacturing dress goods, women and children's dress goods.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Cloths, woolens, and worsteds is the caption—valued at not more than 40 cents a pound; last year, 1907, the ad valorem rate was 134.97 per cent. Is that large duty necessary in order to protect you against foreign manufacturers in the production of the cheap class of worsteds?

Mr. WHITMAN. Worsteds?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, sir; 71,308 pounds valued at $23,963; duty, $37,378; 134.97 per cent?

Mr. WHITMAN. I do not know where you find that.

And yet Mr. CRUMPACKER was sitting right there within 10 feet of him, reading from this voluminous report of Mr. Evans, which is a government document.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have the record that was prepared—I do not know where it came from. This is an official document, however.

The CHAIRMAN. That was prepared for the use of the committee.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, sir; from the official records.

The CHAIRMAN. It is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Valued at not more than 40 cents per pound—cloths, woolens, and worsteds.

Mr. WHITMAN. What page is that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Eight hundred and ninety-seven. This is dress goods, women's and children's coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar description, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard and not above 70 cents per pound—the rate last year, 1907, was 109 per cent. You are engaged in that line of manufacture, are you not—women's and children's dress goods?

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir.

He got one answer at least.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I notice a number of schedules here where the rate is above 100 per cent. Do you believe that more than 100 per cent is necessary for the protection of any American manufacturer of woolen fabrics?

Now, remember that Mr. CRUMPACKER is a Republican. If there is any free-trade talk in this extract, he is guilty of it, and I am not:

Do you not believe that we could reduce it down to 100 or below 100 per cent with entire safety to our own industries?

Mr. WHITMAN. In that schedule to which you refer the importations increased in 1898 from 3,319,000 square yards to 20,270,892 yards in 1905.

Not at all responsive to the question asked.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let us adjust this. Now, taking them all together, this is a cheaper class. The scale is graduated according to value. Where the values are below 40 cents, the rate is 134, and as the value increases the rate decreases naturally.

Mr. WHITMAN. That is natural.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Of course; so that the higher class of woolen goods pay just about one-half the ad valorem rate of duty as the cheap class that are worn and used by the poor people of the country.

Mr. WHITMAN. I do not think that is so.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is what the record shows—that the importation in the cheap class of goods is practically nothing.

That closes the dialogue between Mr. CRUMPACKER and Mr. Whitman.

I will read you another part of the examination by the Hon. William Bourke Cockran. As time goes by, and I come to know men better, I change my mind about many men here, some for the better and some for the worse. When Mr. Cockran came back to Congress, I had an intense prejudice against him growing out of political events beginning in 1896. I always had a great admiration for his splendid genius. I think he has one of the most exquisite intellects ever housed in a human skull. He has the most copious vocabulary of all the men that ever served in the Congress of the United States, with perhaps a single exception, that of Henry A. Wise, of Virginia. Not only is his vocabulary comprehensive and copious, but he is as precise in the use of words as was John J. Ingalls, from Kansas, or as is Judge DE ARMOND, of Missouri; and finally he rendered such valuable service in these hearings and was so true to his convictions that my admiration for him grew into personal affection. I think that much ought to be stated. I am certain every man in the House regrets his departure. [Applause.]

It was a delight to hear him examine a witness when he was in fine fettle. He possesses all the politeness of a Frenchman and all the blarney of an Irishman. [Laughter.] He would get hold of a witness and ask him a question, then ask him the same question over 10 or 15 times, changing it a little, and the first thing the witness knew he was in the soup. [Laughter.] He got hold of Mr. Whitman in this fashion:

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Whitman, in answer to Judge CRUMPACKER, you made one or two statements that I think perhaps ought to be a little further elucidated. You are engaged, as I understand you, in the production of yarns, woolens, and worsteds, and in the dress goods—women's and children's goods?

Mr. WHITMAN. In the whole business; yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, so far as yarns are concerned, made wholly or in part of wool, I find that they are divided into two classes, some valued at less than 30 cents a pound and some over 30 cents a pound. On the cheaper yarns the duty ranges from 143 to 177 per cent, in different years, and the importation was almost nil—that is, the cheaper class of yarns.

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRAN. Do you think 170 or 177 per cent, which was the average in 1899, and 143 per cent, which was the average in 1897, are fair rates of duty on those articles?

With a great deal of sweetness, Mr. Whitman replied:

Yes, sir; if you will deduct the wool duty from it, you will find the percentage is not far out of the way.

He always had a hole to try to get out of.

Mr. COCKRAN. But if you import yarns, you only pay one duty.

Mr. WHITMAN. But you pay a compensatory duty equal to three and one-half times; I think it is the duty on wool.

Mr. COCKRAN. As far as the difficulty on yarns is concerned, I do not care where the difficulty may lie; but do you think the rate of duty, ranging from 143 to 177 per cent on yarns, the cheaper quality of yarns, is a fair rate of duty?

Mr. WHITMAN. I think it is in this case.

Now, I want to explain how the high duty got on woolen cloths. As I said, there is a vast literature on the subject of wool and woolen cloths. During the civil war, when they were taxing everything which they could lay hands on, they put a high rate on wool. Then they put a compensatory duty on manufactures of wool. That was the first step. Being in sore need of money, our Government placed an internal-revenue tax on woolen goods on top of the compensatory tariff duty. Then it gave the woolen-goods manufacturers an increased duty to compensate them for paying the internal-revenue duty. After the war closed they took off the internal-revenue tax, but never reduced the compensatory duty on woolen cloths. The duties on woolen cloths are higher to-day than they were at the close of the war, and they are nearly exactly the same in the Dingley and Payne bills.

Now, somehow or other, somebody persuaded Congress to believe that it takes 4 pounds of wool to make a pound of cloth, so that is in here yet. As a matter of fact, it does not do any such thing. Let us see how that stood. I will tell you what they did; they gave them a specific duty of 44 cents a pound; that is four times the duty on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class; and to that duty they have added 25 per cent ad valorem. The 44 cents was the compensatory duty, and the 25 per cent ad valorem was supposed to be a protective duty.

They kept going on and on until the ad valorem duty was raised to 55 per cent. Professor Taussig, in his history of the tariff of the United States, figured it out and gives the figures, and on an average it only takes 3½ pounds of unwashed wool to make a pound of cloth. I know it is common to sneer at college professors when they talk or write about economics; but Professor Taussig, of Harvard, stands high, and here are his discussion and his figures:

The compensating duties, as we have seen, were based on two assumptions; first, that the price of wool, whether foreign or domestic, was increased by the full extent of the duty; second, that 4 pounds of wool were used in making a pound of cloth. The first assumption, however, holds good only to a very limited extent. A protective duty does not necessarily cause the price of the protected article to rise by the full extent of the duty. It may be prohibitory; the importation of the foreign article may entirely cease; and the domestic article, while its price is raised to some extent, may yet be dearer by an amount less than the duty. This is what has happened with regard to most grades of wool. The commoner grades of wool are raised in this country with comparative ease. The duty on them is prohibitory, and their importation has ceased. Their price, though higher than that of similar wools abroad, is not higher by the full extent of the duty. It is true that the importation of finer grades of clothing and combing wool continues; and it is possible that the wools of Ohio, Michigan, and other States east of the Mississippi are higher in price, by the full amount of the duty, than similar wools abroad. Even this is not certain; for the wools which continue to be imported are not of precisely the same class as the Ohio and Michigan wools. As a rule, the importations are for exceptional and peculiar purposes, and do not replace or compete with domestic wools. At all events, it is certain that the great mass of wools grown in this country are entirely shielded from foreign competition. Their price is raised above the foreign price of similar material; but raised only by some amount less than the duty.

The manufacturer, however, gets a compensating duty on all cases as if his material were dearer by the full extent of the duty than that of his foreign competitor. The bulk of the wool used by American manufacturers does not show the full effect of the tariff, and the manufacturers clearly obtain, in the specific duty, more compensation than the higher price of their wool calls for. The result is that this duty, instead of merely preventing the domestic producer from being put at a disadvantage, yields him in most cases a considerable degree of protection over and above that given by the ad valorem duty.

There is another way in which the compensating duty is excessive. A very large quantity of woolen goods are not made entirely of wool. Cotton, shoddy, and other substitutes are in no inconsiderable part the materials of the clothes worn by the mass of the people. In these goods very much less than 4 pounds of wool is used in making a pound of cloth, and the specific duty again yields to the manufacturer a large degree of protection.

The second assumption of the compensating system, that 4 pounds of wool are used in making a pound of cloth, is also open to criticism. The goods in which cotton and shoddy are used clearly do not require so much wool. But it is probable that even with goods made entirely of wool the calculation of 4 pounds of unwashed wool for each pound of cloth is very liberal. Wool, unwashed, shrinks very much in the cleaning and scouring which it must receive before it is fit for use, and the loss by wear and waste in the processes of manufacture is also considerable. The shrinkage in scouring is subject to no definite rule. In some cases wool loses only 40 per cent of its weight in the process, in others as much as 75 per cent. The shrinkage in scouring on American wools is rarely more than 60 per cent; and if to this is added a further loss of 25 per cent in manufacture, there will be needed for a pound of cloth no more than 3½ pounds of wool. With the great majority of goods made in this country the shrinkage and the loss in manufacture do not amount to more than this. The calculation of 4 for 1 is for most American goods a liberal one; and it is evident that the compensating duty, based on this liberal calculation, yields a degree of protection in the same way that it does on goods that contain cotton or shoddy.

On the other hand, there are some grades of imported wool on which the shrinkage and loss in manufacture are so great that the compen-

sating duty is not excessive. Some grades of Australian wool which are imported for manufacturing fine goods and worsteds are subject to exceptional shrinkage and to exceptional waste in the process of manufacture. Of this class of wool 4 pounds, and sometimes a little more, are apt to be used for a pound of cloth. In such cases the compensating duty evidently may fail to counterbalance entirely the disadvantage under which the manufacturer labors in the higher price of his raw material, for the wool, being imported into this country, and paying the duty, must be higher in price by the full amount of the duty than the same wool used by the foreign producer. In other words, there are cases where the specific duty is not sufficient to offset the duty on the raw material. It is probable that this fact explains, in part at least, the regular importation of certain dress goods and finer grades of cloths which continue to come into the country from abroad in face of the very heavy duty. But such cases are exceptional. For most goods made in the United States the compensating duty on the four-to-one basis is excessive.

And in a footnote in his book he makes the following calculation:

See, as to the loss of wool in scouring, Quarterly Report, Bureau of Statistics, for quarter ending June 30, 1884 (pp. 563–565); Harris, Memorial (p. 11); Schoenhof, Wool and Woolens (p. 10); bulletin, Wool Manufacture (vol. 13, p. 8). The least loss I have found mentioned is 25 per cent (coarse Ohio) and the highest 70 per cent (Buenos Aires wool). Ordinary American wool loses between 50 and 60 per cent in scouring. The loss in weight in manufacturing varies much with the processes, but with care will not exceed 25 per cent. With most goods it is less.

If the loss in scouring 100 pounds of wool is 60 per cent, there remain 40 pounds of scoured wool; deduct 25 per cent for loss in manufacture, 10 pounds, which leaves 30 pounds of cloth, or 1 pound of cloth for 3⅓ pounds of wool.

If the loss in scouring 100 pounds of wool is 65 per cent, there remain 35 pounds scoured wool; deduct 25 per cent for loss in manufacture, 8¾ pounds, leaves 26¼ pounds of cloth, or 1 pound of cloth for not quite 4 pounds of wool.

See the instances given by Mr. Hayes in Wool Manufacturers' Bulletin, volume 12, pages 4–9. These all refer to Australian wool, which, as Mr. Hayes says elsewhere (ibid. p. 107), is imported in comparatively small quantities for exceptional purposes.

Mr. HILL. Will not the gentleman admit that it is entirely dependent upon the shrinkage of the wool?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly it is.

Mr. HILL. And that the shrinkage of domestic territory wool is far in excess of 4 pounds to 1.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you what I will do about that. I will set out the long tables about wool shrinkages. They are very interesting, if anybody wants to read them. But I say that he proves beyond all controversy in his book that on the average it takes only 3⅓ pounds of wool in the grease to make a pound of cloth. What is the result of that? That these woolen manufacturers get the 36⅔ cents specific duty on a pound of cloth which Congress intended to give them, and then the ad valorem, whatever it is, and then, in addition to that, they get two-thirds of 11 cents—that is, 7⅓ cents—per pound, which Congress never intended they should have and only gave to them by reason of its ignorance. That is the truth about that. I asked Mr. Whitman this question, If the price of woolen goods had not gone up so high that no man could get a suit of all-wool goods unless he paid an exorbitant price for it at a tailor's shop and was a good judge himself of whether a thing was all wool or part cotton?

He said no; that that was not so. I told him I knew that it was so, and the way I knew it was so is that a year or two ago I took my boy into a clothing store downtown. He was 17 or 18 years old then. I got him a nice overcoat—that is, had it laid out on the counter—a very handsome coat for a boy, and it fitted him well. I also had laid out a whole suit of clothes. Then I asked the clerk, who is a very nice gentleman, to tell me whether this suit of clothes and the overcoat were all wool. He said:

Why, Mr. CLARK, you can not get a suit of all wool or an overcoat of all wool unless you first go to a high-class tailor and pay twice as much as you pay for this, and you had better look out mighty close then or you will not get it all wool.

Then somebody else asked Mr. Whitman if the manufacturers did not make up for all this tariff on wool by making an inferior grade of woolen cloths. He disputed that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said these Republicans helped us out frequently. I want to be fair to everybody. And, by the way, it turned out, very much to my surprise, that my friend who sits here, the gentleman from Connecticut, used to be a lumber merchant. I supposed that he had been a lawyer all his life.

Mr. SULZER. I supposed that he had been a banker all his life.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And you ought to have been over there when he got hold of the lumber barons. It was the case of a man talking about what he knew. Well, Mr. Whitman was testifying that they did not make inferior cloths, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] got hold of him, and he rendered a very valuable piece of service at that time. I read:

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to ask you a question which will not involve any political theory, and I will put it in the form of reading to you a few sentences from a letter that I received this morning from a constituent of mine. I will say that he is a Republican—I know it because I served with him in the legislature—and therefore he would not be biased by free-trade theories in asking for a reduction in the tariff on woolens. He makes this statement:

"As a manufacturer of clothing for a period of almost fifty years, I can truthfully state that I never handled cloth of so inferior a quality for the price as I do now. The masses, consisting of laborers, mechanics, and farmers, the real users of ready-made clothing, are receiving practically no value for their money. The qualities and colorings are so poor that in many instances the colorings fade and cockle, and in the manufacture of garments give positively no satisfaction to the wearer."

Here is a letter which I received the other day from an old lady in Pennsylvania. I am not going to give her name or address. I have got her letter in my pocket, and if any gentleman wants to see it under the seal of confidence I will show it to him, but I am not going to subject her to the persecutions of people who differ from her. I read her letter:

MARCH 17, 1909.

To the Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am the mother of 5 children, all married, and have 6 grandchildren. In my own and their behalf I write to make this petition for a reduction in duties upon articles necessary in our homes.

We are small oil producers, but have refused to sign the papers protesting against the removal of duties upon oil (our own product), which are being circulated here, because we want, we need, and are entitled to cheaper lumber and steel products, which we use in our oil plants; cheaper clothing, so that we can wear woolens in the cold of this climate. We also wish to give President Taft a chance to redeem his pledge for "revisions mainly downward."

There is a concluding sentence which is complimentary to me, and my innate modesty forbids my reading it. [Laughter.]

I will now read an editorial from the Kansas City Star on this subject of warmer clothing for the people, and that the force of it may be understood I will state what the Kansas City Star is: It is the largest evening newspaper published west of the Mississippi River. The editor of it is independent in politics, though he supported Taft for President and Hadley for governor. He has made an independent fortune out of that paper. They say that it has more circulation in Kansas City than there are adult human beings resident in Kansas City. [Laughter.] He is a friend to me. He runs an independent paper. Now, here is what he says about warmer clothing for the people. "Tuberculosis and the tariff." I have had many surprises in my life, but this was another to find that the tariff had anything to do with tuberculosis. I knew that Jim McKenzie, of Kentucky, did help the health of the American people by getting quinine put on the free list.

He has been called "Quinine Jim" ever since, a very honorable title, too. And as one of those pleasantries of legislative life I will tell you how he did it: One morning he rose to a question of the highest personal privilege. Speaker Randall requested him to state it, and he called up his bill putting quinine on the free list. That made Speaker Randall mad, and he said it was not a question of privilege at all. Mr. McKenzie said, "Good God, Mr. Speaker, if I do not get this bill passed I will never get back, and some other fellow will have my seat." [Laughter.] That put the Speaker and the House in a good humor, and he had his bill passed. 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 woolens. This excess cost is raised to about 150 per cent by the duty on machinery and other articles affecting the manufacture of woolens. These duties were imposed to promote sheep raising and the manufacture of woolens. 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 now call attention to another remarkable joker in this bill. This countervailing duty on coffee means that the American consumer shall be made to pay both the export duty of the country that it comes from and the import duty in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is what it means. Let us suppose a case. I have not had time to find out how much these export duties are, but suppose these countries all go and make an agreement and they levy an export tax of 5 cents a pound on coffee. Under our law, then, we would levy an import duty of 5 cents per pound on coffee, and the American consumer, on his green coffee, would pay 10 cents per pound and on roasted coffee 15 cents per pound tariff tax. Now, so much for the coffee joker.

Probably the worst "joker" in this bill is the one on lumber; it is hard to dig it out of the involved mass of verbiage, and the seeker after the real tariff on lumber has to read in conjunction several different sections of the bill, widely separated. First, let us start with the paragraphs numbered 196 and 197 under Schedule D; these paragraphs pretend to reduce the rates on ordinary building lumber, rough and dressed. I say they pretend to do it, because by reason of a proviso added to section 197 the apparent reduction becomes inoperative and the present high rates of the Dingley law become applicable. The Payne bill "keeps the word of promise to the ear and breaks it to the hope." Now, let us read the proviso; here it is:

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 foreign 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 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 import duties, charges, embargo, discrimination, or restriction.

Now, in order to understand just what rates lumber will really carry under this bill, we have to turn away over from page 55 of the first print of the bill, where the above language is found, to page 169, where section 3, above referred to, begins thus:

That on and after sixty days after the passage of this act, unless otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles mentioned in this section, and imported into the United States and into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), from any foreign country, province, dependency, or colony, whenever any such foreign country, province, dependency, or colony, respectively, shall not be entitled under the provisions of section 4 of this act to the rates of duty in sections 1 and 2 provided, the rates of duty which are in this section prescribed, namely.

Then we will turn over two pages further, and on page 171 we find these words:

Upon each article enumerated in paragraphs 196, 197 * * * the same rate of duty as prescribed by the law in force prior to the passage of this act.

Now, in plain language, the situation is this: If any province, state, or dependency of any foreign country shall place any tariff rate or restriction on the exportation of any forest product, then the old Dingley rates go into effect against all the forest products of that entire country. It happens to be a fact that Ontario has a restriction as to the exportation of forest products cut (by government permission) from her forest reserves. Being a Province of Canada and a dependency of Great Britain, then, under the involved provisions of the Payne bill, all the forest products of Great Britain and her dependencies and provinces, on entering this country, have to pay the rates in the Dingley law, the very rates that are so odious to the users of lumber in this country at this time. To go further, under this bill, if Prince Edward Island has a forest reserve of 1,000 acres and should place an export tariff of 25 cents per thousand on shingles cut from that little reserve, then the Dingley rates would apply to all the lumber coming from Canada, British Honduras, New Zealand, and the other British dependencies. That is a very pernicious provision and very carefully concealed.

I will tell you about this maximum and minimum business. I said more than a year ago that the chairman's statement was equivocal, and I say it now. I say that the section he has put in here about maximum and minimum tariff does not provide that in any instance whatsoever any particular tariff rate can be cut down to the extent of a hair. They must all go up. They go up 20 per cent. I undertake to say, without fear of successful contradiction, while the rates of the Payne bill as it stands are on the average only 1.56 per cent higher than the Dingley rates, by the time the maximum and minimum tariff is gotten through with the rates will be at least 21.56 per cent higher than the rates in the Dingley bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is an open declaration of trade war with every commercial nation under the sun. I am not opposed to a shindy once in a while myself, but when I am cool and collected I have too much sense to believe in waging a perpetual war against all mankind. That is what that amounts to—going out in the world to seek trade with a club and a meat ax. There is an old saying that "molasses catches more flies than vinegar," and it is absolutely true. I am in favor of a maximum and minimum tariff, but I say that the rates as published in our statutes ought to be the maximum. Give us a chance to trade down and to increase our trade that way. Why not?

There is another provision in this bill which I would be very much in favor of if they would turn it around other end foremost. There is a provision that levies 10 per cent higher duties than the rates of the Payne bill on goods imported in foreign bottoms than when imported in American bottoms. That is the good old Democratic doctrine that built up our merchant marine, turned wrong end foremost. That is what built up our merchant marine largely. In that case the goods imported in American bottoms were 10 per cent lower than those imported in foreign bottoms.

There is not a reformatory item really in this bill, even if you would pass it as it stands. Everybody knows you are not allowed to talk much about the Senate here, but I will take one shot at it, anyhow.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Before the gentleman leaves the lumber schedule, will the gentleman state that, if the duty is taken off lumber, the consumer will get the benefit? If so, why?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Simply because if you give a man $2 he has got $2 more than he had before. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If that is not an elaborate answer enough I will tell you what happened in the committee.

One of the fairest men that came before the committee was Mr. White, of Kansas City—a Republican. I never had seen him before. Of course I knew about him. He is quite a prominent lumberman in Kansas City. He knew me. Before he started to testify he took a shot at me at point-blank range. I did not object to it. He said that the revision of the tariff ought not to be a political question. He said that there was a great Missouri Senator who was a free trader, as he called him, although that was not exactly correct, on every subject except lead, and that that great Senator voted for a tariff on lead. Lead is a Missouri product. I said, "Yes, that is true; but he regretted it until the day of his death, because high-protection tariff organs never got through throwing it up to him." He said, "He died very much regretted." I said, "Yes; he did; but he was not regretted by reason of that vote."

I will tell you what he testified to about lumber, and I think his testimony on that subject is the best given there—the fairest and most candid. Finally, I asked him how much cheaper a man could build a 6-room cottage, considering simply the lumber in it, if we took the tariff off of lumber, and he said, "Sixty dollars." At least, that is my recollection of what he said.

I do not want to talk all day, and I am not going to do so. But this bill raises rates, gentlemen, as sure as you are living, in its operation. If I did not believe that, I would not say it. But what I started to say is that even if you pass it as it stands, or if you amend it in here and improve it in here, when it gets to the other end of the Capitol it will be cut and carved until the chairman [Mr. PAYNE] will not know his own child when he meets it in the big road. Every time they change it it will be in an upward direction. This is three tariff bills I have been present at the making of; the chairman has been present at the making of four. Here is what happened with the others. We passed a fairly good revenue measure in the Wilson bill. It never was a perfect bill, but when it got over to the Senate they added about 700 amendments to it.

The Republicans have always been guying us about hat, and they had a right to until 1897. But Governor Dingley and the Republican party in 1897 passed a bill, with an overwhelming Republican majority here, and they sent it over to the Senate, and it came back with 801 amendments to it. The House swallowed the Senate bill in both cases. Of Course, little changes were made in the conference reports, which changes were generally for the worse.

I will tell you what is going to happen: Certain wise and sapient seniors over there are engaged right now in making a tariff bill of their own. I suppose I am really precluded from telling who they are, but one of them does not live a thousand miles from Providence, R. I. [Laughter.] When this bill goes

over there, it will be a mild free-trade measure beside the one they will send back to us. They will strike out every word of this bill after the enacting clause. They will send their stake-and-rider bill to us. Then we will have a conference report, and then the "dog days" will come, and it will be so disagreeable in this city that Members will vote any kind of a bill to get out of town, and it will be 15 per cent, on an average, higher than this bill is now.

Gentlemen, I have concluded what I have to say.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not have the pleasure of listening to the first twenty minutes of your speech. If you did not say anything about the inheritance tax, for one I would be glad to have your views upon it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I said nothing about it because I am muddled on the subject of whether the inheritance tax is as good as an income tax or whether it is better than an income tax, or whether the income tax is better than an inheritance tax; and so I do not like to venture an opinion until I have had a chance to study the whole subject.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. It is whether or not, under section 23 of the bill as reported, all material going into the construction and building of ships for foreign trade or foreign owners is free?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is in truth. It means this, and it runs through several sections: The general proposition is that wherever an American company builds a ship from foreign material it gets a drawback of 99 per cent of the tariff paid on the foreign material so used, provided the ship is used in the foreign trade.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, just one more question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Indiana. And that is whether or not in the support of the necessity for a ship subsidy one of the arguments upon which they insist has not always been the cost of the material in the ship is so much higher to the shipowner that he can not compete with the foreign ship?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. COX of Indiana. And whether or not under this drawback, either section 23 or section 29, in the last and final analysis of the situation that the shipbuilder in this country will practically get his material free?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; that is true. He gets 99 per cent on the tariff back.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I listened to the gentleman's speech, but I was at the back end of the hall when he commenced his discussion of the wool schedule. I would like to ask the gentleman if there was a good deal of contention before the committee between the manufacturers of woolens and worsteds?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Was the Dingley tariff in the gentleman's opinion much more favorable to the worsted manufacturers than to the wool manufacturers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. How about the proposed Payne bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is just precisely the same.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman explain why it is so?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you. What they call "woolen goods" is made out of short-staple wool, and what they call "worsted goods" is made out of long-staple wool. I will tell you what I think about it.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. That is what I want.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The reason that the worsted men got a better deal in the Dingley bill is on account of the machinations of this man William Whitman, of Boston. I am glad you asked that question. I had nearly forgotten him.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under section 29, commonly known as the "drawback section," even intoxicating liquors of all kinds, such as beer, wine, whisky, and so forth, that are used upon vessels going to foreign countries, are withdrawn free of duty?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does it not relieve them, in other words, even from paying the internal-revenue tax?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well that is this way. They are in bond. They do not actually pay the internal-revenue tax. They get out without paying it. I want to show this as a curious illustration of what happened: During those hearings, one day I asked somebody if he would not like to have his tariff crowded up to 300 per cent, the highest that there was on the list. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] asked me if I could name one 300 per cent duty. Well, right off the reel I could not, but I had my secretary go through, and there are a dozen or two more than 300 per cent.

I had him do another thing. I had him go through to see how many were above 100 per cent; and I have a list of them, and there are more than 300. Here is another strange fact, and if I wanted to be unfair I would leave it with one sentence. There is one article on which the tariff is 1,120 per cent. But it would not be fair to leave it that way. That tariff was put on there to compensate for the internal-revenue duty. A good many of these high tariffs, especially in the chemical schedule, were put in there because there is alcohol used in the various articles; and, of course, you know, there is a good stiff internal-revenue tax on it. So, on them the high-tariff rates are put on to compensate for the internal-revenue taxes.

I suggest to you a puzzle. Read section 29 of the Payne bill. There is not a man on top of ground that can pronounce with anything approximating a certainty what it means, and it is going into history as the "Payne Puzzle." The Republicans used to make fun of us when we were offering an income-tax proposition, because they said we were inviting a lawsuit. The other day the chairman himself suggested that certain matters in his bill would have to be settled by the courts; so he is estopped from making fun of us any more. I want to suggest to him that section 29 contains the germ of a fine, fat, juicy lawsuit. Now listen:

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 productive 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.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What does it mean?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It means one of two things, and I do not know which. I will tell you what the law is now. I have stated it once before, that where an American manufacturer uses foreign materials in the manufacture of an article which he ships out, he gets back 99 per cent of the tariff. Whether section 29 means, as it is printed in the document form, that in addition to that privilege, if he imports 100 tons, for instance, of pig iron and makes it into steel and ships the steel out, he shall get the drawback; or if he uses that foreign 100 tons in manufacturing articles for domestic use, and then uses a hundred tons of American pig and ships it out, that he shall get the drawback; that is one construction. The other construction is this: If an American manufacturer uses American materials in manufacturing for export, even where he imported no foreign materials, he can go to the Treasury and collect a bounty equal to 99 per cent of the tariff he would have paid on the same quantity and quality of foreign material.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it not the gentleman's opinion that the language in this section will bear that construction?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. BORLAND. Before the gentleman leaves this section, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. If we permit the American manufacturer to go to the Treasury at any time within three years and draw back duties there on either American or foreign raw material used in manufactured goods which he sends abroad equal to the amount of foreign raw material which he has imported, is not that a club in the hands of an American manufacturer to pound down the price of the American producer of raw material by enabling him to buy raw material abroad until he can buy cheap enough at home, and then, in time, go back to the other price?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true; and I will tell you what else is true. The plain meaning of that section is that we are sanctioning a proposition that the American manufactured articles are to be sold in foreign countries cheaper than they are at home. It used to be said that the tariff was for the benefit of the American as against the foreigner, but now it is being turned around so that it is for the benefit of the foreigner as against the American.

I want to state another thing which I might not have mentioned had not the gentleman from Missouri asked me the question. In numerous instances the tariff on articles is greater than the entire cost of the labor production. That is true in numerous instances in this bill. I have always contended, and contend now, that if a tariff is levied in the name of labor, labor ought to get all of that tariff. But a whole lot of these rates fix it so that the entire cost of labor is paid and then it leaves a large share of the tariff over to the manufacturer.

Here is the way Whitman worked the game.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Apropos of Mr. Whitman, I think that possibly the estimate of the gentleman from Missouri and mine agree, but my attention has been called to the fact that the gentleman from Missouri failed to give Mr. Whitman's answer to my question, and I think, in justice to Mr. Whitman, it ought to be given.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman know what he did say? It was left off from the manuscript that I had.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Whitman's answer was that he denied the truth of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am much obliged to the gentleman; I do not want to do Mr. Whitman an injustice. I thought it was on my manuscript, but when I came to read it I found it had been inadvertently left off. This is how he worked it. I am estopped from criticising the Senate, but among other things I asked Mr. Whitman this, or something like it. I said to Mr. Whitman: "This is not the usual place where you get your work in on the tariff bill, is it?" He became indignant and said, "What do you mean?" I said, "Your appearance before the Ways and Means Committee is a pro forma performance; you had a little rather we should fix the bill to suit you." By the way, he said the Dingley bill was the best bill that ever passed. I said, "Really, you do not care very much what we do about this bill or what the House does about it, do you?" He gave one of his evasive answers and said he did not understand that. I said, "I will make it plain. The place you get your work in on the tariff bill is before the Finance Committee of the Senate." Well, he denied that. I did not believe he was telling the truth. I knew he was not, because in less than thirty minutes I proved that he was not. He denied that he had much to do with making that.

I will tell you what he did. The present Director of the Census, Mr. North, was the secretary of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association, of which Mr. Whitman is the president and—as I asked him if he was not—almost "it." It seems that Mr. Whitman was sick in Boston with a carbuncle on his neck during the most of the work on the Dingley bill. Mr. Whitman began making tariff bills way back in 1867. He was very active in 1883 and in 1890, and the only reason why he was not active in 1897 was by reason of the carbuncle, and so he sent Mr. North down here. Mr. North got into that Finance Committee without being a government employee at all. I am not reflecting on Mr. North, unless the plain truth reflects upon him. He did not draw any salary from the Government, but he stayed in that committee all of the time, and was constantly at the ear of Senator ALDRICH and Governor Dingley. They got a higher rate on tops than they did on yarn, although yarn is a further step in the manufacture than tops, which was a gross—the grossest—sort of an outrage.

Why did they do it? Because the Arlington mills, of which Mr. Whitman is practically the owner, are the largest top mills in the world.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Does not the gentleman think that it is only justice to Mr. Whitman and to Mr. North to say that Mr. Whitman has sent a pamphlet to us which, unless it is a forgery, would seem to exonerate him from the charge that the gentleman from Missouri is now making? Unless Mr. Whitman has forged a letter from his own files, it seems that within two or three days after the Dingley bill was reported from the House Mr. Whitman wrote a letter to Governor Dingley protesting that the tariff upon tops was too high, and he himself called attention to the fact that the Arlington mills, of which he was the manager, or in which he was largely interested, was being constructed for the purpose of manufacturing tops, and saying that he would be put in the very unenviable light of having misled the committee into placing a higher duty on tops than ought to have been placed.

Now, I submit if that letter is true, if Mr. Whitman did at that time send to Governor Dingley any such letter, then Mr. Whitman can not be criticised because there went into the tariff bill in his favor something which he was protesting against, nor can Mr. North be charged with having secured in the interests of Mr. Whitman that which Mr. Whitman was himself protesting against.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question—wait a minute; stand up.

Mr. GAINES. Oh, there will be lots of time, and the gentleman will stand up; but I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri forgets the amenities of debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, you will not ask any more questions if you perform in that way. I say this, that Mr. Whitman was cross-examined completely by the committee, and he never mentioned that letter which the gentleman from West Virginia talked about, never mentioned it, and I do not believe that he ever wrote any such letter. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GAINES. Now, if the gentleman will permit me——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I do not dispute that he put it in a pamphlet.

Mr. GAINES. I know nothing in the world about the proof, whether he did or did not write such a letter, but I think it ought to go into the RECORD in this connection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman can put it into his speech. I shall not put it into mine.

Mr. GAINES. I do not want to put the letter in the speech, but in justice to Mr. Whitman it ought to be stated that he has made that assertion, and has given us a copy of the letter, so that unless he is guilty of the forgery of a letter from his own files there would seem to be a defense against the very serious charge made against him and Mr. North. I know nothing about the truth as to whether he did or did not write such a letter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never saw any such letter. He may have sent it. If I had seen it I would not have believed it was written at the time it purports to have been written, unless there was corroboratory evidence from Mr. Whitman. I do not know whether I had finished about Mr. North or not.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman had not. He said that he was squatting in there like a toad.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, he was there as Mr. Whitman's friend. Now, here are some letters about which there is no dispute, because I called the letters out and called Mr. Whitman's attention to them, and printed them in the hearings, and they are in the hearings, and he did not deny them.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, was this copy of a letter to Mr. Dingley by Mr. Whitman given to the public before or after Mr. Dingley's death?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I never heard of that letter until—well, it seems to me in a sort of hazy way I have a recollection of a pamphlet coming from Mr. Whitman, but I did not read it, and I never heard of that letter that the gentleman from West Virginia is talking about until to-day.

Mr. GAINES. There was a pamphlet with it in, and it was pretty generally circulated.

Mr. JAMES. I would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that to allow the statements of the letter of Mr. Whitman to go in setting Mr. Whitman right would be a reflection upon the memory of Mr. Dingley, who is not here and able to speak for himself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It might. I do not think I will put it in. Here are some letters that passed between Mr. Whitman and Mr. North in 1897 that there is no dispute about. I want you to listen to them and recollect that Mr. North was not a public official; that he was drawing no salary; that Mr. Whitman worked him in over there as a clerk without salary from the Government. This is a letter from Mr. North to Mr. Whitman:

WASHINGTON, *June 20, 1897.*

It is lucky I was here, and just in the position I am—

I most thoroughly agree with him; that is, as far as Mr. Whitman is concerned—

It has given me a whole day to work on the matter and put it right, and with ALDRICH away there is no one on the committee who knows anything about it.

There you are exactly. The only man inside the committee room who knew anything about what he was doing or who had any information on the subject was this man North himself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is when he got in the excessive duty on tops?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

But Allison and Platt trust me—

[Laughter.]

Now, that is how he was getting in his work—

And I expect they will both agree to what I have asked—

And they did agree to it—

I went all over the matter with them last evening.

S. N. D. NORTH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1897.*

I am the only person whom the committee allows at its meetings—

Now, think of that! The President himself could not have got inside that room—

If I find that it is desirable that you shall come on here, I will telegraph you that the situation requires attention, and you will doubtless have no trouble in finding out what is the matter.

There is no dispute about these letters.

Mr. GAINES. Is the gentleman asking me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. None whatever, and the gentleman will understand that I am not defending Mr. Whitman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

Mr. GAINES. But it seems to me that when in this House we make that sort of an attack on individuals who can not here respond, the entire record should be put in.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I am giving the record as far as I have ever seen it or had it. I think I did see a pamphlet that Whitman sent, but I confess I have had so many pamphlets sent me, just as the gentleman from West Virginia has, that I have never read one-tenth, and I have enough to keep me reading for the next five years. He goes on to say:

And you will doubtless have no trouble in finding out what is the matter.

S. N. D. NORTH.

The next letter is dated:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 10, 1897.*

I will do the best I can with Mr. Allison when the time comes, but he knows nothing about the understanding I have with Aldrich on the worsted-yarn schedule.

S. N. D. NORTH.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the worsted-yarn schedule, that is the very identical thing that brother Whitman is attending to.

Now, here comes Mr. Whitman, the apostle of sweetness and light:

78 CHAUNCY STREET, BOSTON, *July 10, 1897.*

MY DEAR MR. NORTH: I am unable to go to Washington, and have no one to look out for my interests there but yourself, and I depend upon you. Of course Messrs. ALDRICH and Dingley will do all they can, but I depend upon your letting them know what I need. I depend upon you. Dress goods, yarns, and tops.

Yours, very truly, WILLIAM WHITMAN.

The next letter is:

BOSTON, *June 2, 1897.*

We all depend upon you to watch closely our interests, to see that nothing is overlooked or neglected by our friends on the committee. I have no doubt they will do all they can do, but with so many interests to look after, our special representative must see to it that our interest receives proper attention.

WILLIAM WHITMAN.

BOSTON, *June 9, 1897.*

Bear in mind that I am depending upon you wholly to look after my interests.

WILLIAM WHITMAN.

Now, let us see what happened. Two and two are supposed to make four. After the valuable services which North rendered Whitman and these other men in connection with him, they presented North with $5,000 in cash. Why did they give it to him? Because he was acting for the public good? No; because he was acting in their interests. Now, that is the whole Whitman tale. Now, gentlemen, I have discussed as fully——

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I asked a question and the gentleman switched off on the discussion of Whitman and North, which I did not inquire about. I would like to have him explain why the schedule in the Dingley bill and in the Payne bill in its actual operation favors the manufacture of worsteds as against the manufacture of woolens in this country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that I have never been able to understand.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Well, does the gentleman believe that the duties on these goods ought to be ad valorem instead of specific?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes——

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. In order that the woolen manufacturers may have an even chance with the worsted manufacturers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. That is what I wanted explained; I did not care about the other matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the gentleman called my attention to it I tried to get it, and so did several members of the committee; I was not the only one—Democrats and Republicans alike hammered at it. In the first instance, what is the reason we could not have a simple ad valorem duty on wool? If the wool scourers washed out 80 per cent, they should pay tariff on only 20 per cent, and if they washed out 20 they should pay on 80 per cent. That is the way the tariff is arranged on iron ore, and I can not understand what is the reason that that is not fair.

I am not criticising the majority at all for refusing a proposition that I think is feasible, although there is a good deal of doubt about it, and that is that instead of levying an ad valorem duty on the rate fixed in foreign countries of the article that it should be levied on the wholesale price in the United States. As I stated yesterday in a very brief way, because I did not want to worry the chairman, the way it is now one party to the swindle in undervaluation is in Europe or somewhere else out of this country and the other party is here, and our writs do not run and our statutes do not prevail in foreign countries. Now, gentlemen, I have finished as far as I can the discussion of this wool tariff, except this: I want to say that with the exorbitant rates in this bill I do not understand how any man with a drop of the milk of human kindness left in him can vote for the woolen manufactures schedule of this bill. How many people would freeze, how many people would suffer, that this man Whitman and men like him should make an unjust and unfair profit of 165 or 182 per cent on cheap blankets and things of that kind and rates almost as high on all woolen clothing, no mortal man can tell. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I repeat that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] said that the rates on articles manufactured from cotton are worse than they are on woolen manufactures. If his statement is correct then the situation is simply awful. These rates on woolen cloths are nearly prohibitive in every case.

This bill takes three millions of revenue off of hides. It puts seven millions, or about that, on tea. They lose three in one case and put on seven, leaving a net gain of four millions. They could have made a revenue of twice seven millions, thrice seven millions, quadruple seven millions, by cutting these prohibitive rates in this woolen goods schedule down to a competitive basis. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By so doing they would not have taken from any man anything he is entitled to; they would have prevented much sickness and would have saved many lives.

Now, in conclusion. The entire campaign last year was run on the proposition of a revision of the tariff, and the people thought that it meant downward. Even what the chairman claims for his bill does not come up to their expectations.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption before he concludes?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Has the free list in this bill been increased any by placing any of the necessities of life upon it that were not upon it before?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suppose in a few cases. Hides are put on the free list.

Mr. HAMLIN. Anything else?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; but I have not had time to go through and find out all additions to the free list or their effect.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I did not interrupt the gentleman this morning for the reason that I disliked to do so, but since the gentleman discussed the matter of the oil schedule—the countervailing duties—I want to say to the gentleman, if he will allow me just half a minute, that in the gallery of the House was seated one of his own personal admirers, Lewis Emery, jr., the champion of the independent producers of the United States, who ran for governor of Pennsylvania on the Democratic ticket, on a platform that was aimed principally, as he claimed, against the Standard Oil Company. He also ran for Congress on the same platform. He has requested me to state before the gentleman from Missouri had concluded that the effect of taking off the countervailing duty on oil would in no sense affect the Standard Oil Company, but it would be absolutely fatal to the independent producers of this country, for the reason that 89 per cent of the oil produced in America today is produced by the independent producers of the country. And I thought, in justice to this gentleman and in justice to the oil producers of this country, that that statement should go out on the same evening of his very excellent speech.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to its going out, but it does not change the situation a particle. And I state it over again. The Standard Oil Company does not produce much crude oil, but everybody knows that it screws the producers of crude oil down to the very lowest cent that they will produce it for. That is the situation about that.

I wish to say, gentlemen, one other thing, and then I am going to quit, and I do not wish anybody to interrupt me until I finish.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Before the gentleman closes, I would like to ask him with regard to the wool schedule. I listened quite attentively, and I remember that on several oc-

casions he referred to the wool schedule as positively prohibitive.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The wool schedule?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never did anything of the sort. The gentleman is mistaken. I referred to the tariff on manufactures of wool.

Mr. HILL. Absolutely dependent on the wool schedule, is it not?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not care if it is. You are talking about one thing, and I am talking about another.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman was talking about producing revenue, and I understood him to say that the tariff was practically prohibitive as to wool.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; I never said anything like that. I said this, that the consumption of wool in the United States is 500,000,000 pounds. Of that, we produce 300,000,000 pounds, and they ship in 200,000,000 pounds.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman was laying such great stress upon the statement of William Whitman that I thought it unfair to the rest of the trade of the United States—the producers and manufacturers of wool—and I find upon looking at the Book of Estimates which has been prepared by the committee that the revenue derived from Schedule K under the Dingley law was $17,783,646.05, and that the estimated revenue under the Payne bill is the same.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to say that there are other manufacturers of woolens and there are other dealers of wool in the United States besides Mr. Whitman; and I do want to say further, if the gentleman will permit, that there are farmers in the United States who are intensely interested in this Schedule K, the protection under which starts at the farm.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that perfectly well, and no threat of that sort has any more effect on me than water on a duck's back. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MACON. I would like to ask the gentleman, as the working minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the minority leader of the House, his opinion as to the tariff on lumber when viewed by the light of the Democratic declaration upon the subject in its last platform?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, and I am speaking for myself and not binding anybody, I am in favor of clapping lumber on the free list. [Loud applause.]

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we produce 200,000,000 pounds of wool a year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I made that statement and somebody corrected me.

Mr. COLE. It is 311,000,000 pounds.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I first stated 300,000,000; do you think it is worth while to interrupt a speech by talking about 11,000,000 out of 300,000,000?

Mr. COLE. I understood the gentleman to say 200,000,000. Is it not a fact that the duty on manufactures of wool, which is over 100 per cent, is because of the inferiority of the wool which goes to the American wool manufacturer?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it is not true. They count 4 pounds of wool to a pound of cloth, yet it only takes 3 pounds and a quarter to do it.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, if you get through with it.

Mr. COLE. Is it not a fact that 75 per cent of the wool produced in the world to-day shrinks 66⅔ per cent on scoured wool over the wool in the grease, and is it not a fact that 75 per cent of it takes 4 pounds of wool in the grease to produce a pound of cloth?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not true.

Mr. COLE. It is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yielded to you, and I do not propose to dispute with you. It is not true; there is not a syllable of truth in it. This 4 pounds of wool in the grease to 1 pound of cloth has been a lie from the beginning. [Laughter and applause.] Of course I do not mean that the gentleman lies; he is simply deceived by others; that is all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, if you will ask the question and try not to inject a speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will ask a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do not ask so long a one as you did before. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the recapitulation of the estimated revenues which was prepared by the Ways and Means Committee shows that the revenues derived under the Dingley bill last year from wool and manufactures of wool was $37,973,891.34, and that the estimated revenue under the new law is the same?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, it has not been ten minutes since the gentleman asked me if it was $17,000,000. You had better go out and hold a convention with yourself and find out what you do believe. [Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I simply wanted to state the facts which are stated here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You just stated that before.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to give you the facts as to the revenue derived from the woolen industry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will go out and study a little, you might not ask any questions at all.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The facts speak for themselves, and I also wanted to get you away from Mr. Whitman, because there are other manufacturers of woolen goods in the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have settled with Whitman, and I humbly pray Almighty God I will never clap my eyes on him again or hear from him again.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. The gentleman has stated that he is in favor of free lumber. I would like to get information from him that I failed to get from the chairman of the committee yesterday and the day before. I would like to know whether he is in favor of free lumber for the purpose of conserving our forests or in order to reduce the price to the consumer; and then I would like to know, in all seriousness, whether his investigation of this matter has developed the fact satisfactorily to his mind that there is a lumber trust in the manufacture of lumber in the United States which rules the prices.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is your question, is it? Understand, I am not trying to bind anybody. If I had not consumed so much time, I might have gone into the lumber question on my own motion, but I was drawn into it by a question. I am in favor of free lumber for two reasons: First, that the people of the United States may have cheaper homes [loud applause]; that is the first thing. It is to the interest of the Republic that every man own his own home, even if it consists of only two rooms. [Applause.] The man that owns his home is an independent man, and nobody has strings on him; the man who is a renter certainly is not as independent as the man that owns his home.

The home is the unit of American civilization. [Applause.]

O fortunate, O happy day,
When a new household finds its place
Among the myriad homes of earth,
Like a new star just sprung to birth,
And rolled on its harmonious way
Into the boundless realms of space.

I remember, when I was quite a youth, attending the Cincinnati Law School, that I heard Carl Schurz, the most illustrious German that ever settled in America, deliver a lecture in the Grand Opera House, and he declared that boarding houses and hotels were the bane of American life.

Mr. STANLEY. Especially in Washington. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Anywhere. I do not suppose they had flat houses or apartment houses then. I would put them in the same category with hotels and boarding houses. I want to encourage home building, because I want to encourage marriage, which is the happy condition of man, and woman, too. These people who go around yelling at the top of their voices "Is marriage a failure?" are a job lot of idiots; that is all that is the matter with them. [Applause.]

There is not one family out of ten where the husband and wife do not get along reasonably well. Of course, they quarrel if they are properly constituted. [Laughter.] We used to have a circuit judge out in Missouri, who afterwards was a supreme judge for twenty years, Theodore Brace, a fine Christian gentleman. One day there was a good-looking young woman prosecuting a divorce suit before him, and a big fat widower sitting down in the recorder's office waiting for her to get the divorce, so that he could marry her that evening. There was nobody defending the divorce suit. I suppose her husband was glad to be rid of her. Finally Judge Brace concluded he would defend it himself, and he went to work and cross-ex-

amined the woman. When he got through with the case it resolved itself into the pitiable conclusion that she and her husband quarreled once in a while. He said:

Yes, my good wife and I quarrel once in a while, but we kiss and make up. You can do the same, and your bill is refused.

[Applause.]

I wish to heaven that the United States did not have a circuit judge in it that would not act as Judge Brace did. May his tribe increase! [Applause.] A sweet baby is the greatest luxury in nature.

Now, on the other branch of the gentleman's question, on the second branch of this discussion——

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait until I answer the other one.

Mr. MACON. This is right in line with the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask the gentleman to wait until I answer the other question. As far as conserving the forests is concerned, I am in favor of free lumber for that reason, too. [Applause.] Fifteen hundred years ago Mesopotamia was the most fertile part of the globe. To-day it is a desert. The thing that made it a desert was cutting off the forests at the head of the streams. When the Moors conquered Spain, it was the most fertile country in Europe. The forests had been scarcely touched in the mountains, but the Moors drove the Spaniards to the mountains and kept them there four hundred years. The Spaniards cut off the forests. At the end of four hundred years Ferdinand and Isabella drove the Moors out of Spain, but the incurable evil had been done by cutting off the trees, and Spain has been drying up ever since. Everybody that has any sense knows that if we go on cutting off the timber at the head of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers the Mississippi Valley, the most fertile portion of the globe to-day, is going to dry up in the same way that Mesopotamia and Spain dried up. Yet, in order to give a handful of timber barons, who are already so rich that they can not count their money, an opportunity to make some more, we are asked to deprive the poor people of this country of the chance of building cheap homes and entailing on our descendants the curse of living in a desert instead of a garden. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CUSHMAN. Will my colleague yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Is not Mr. Gifford Pinchot the greatest expert in this country on questions of forest conservation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. CUSHMAN. His testimony has been quoted a great many times on this subject. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he had read just this one sentence from Mr. Gifford Pinchot:

If the tariff on lumber were to be removed, it would be done, I take it, for one or both of two purposes; either to reduce the price to the consumer, or to preserve our forests. In my judgment it would accomplish neither.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the date of that document?

Mr. CUSHMAN. March 10, 1909. That is signed by Gifford Pinchot, and is his letter addressed to Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you are through with your question, my answer is this, that no man in America did as much to build up the sentiment in favor of free lumber as that same man, Gifford Pinchot. [Applause.] Wait a minute now. These smart lumber kings and their attorneys got hold of him down here and pumped into his head their ideas and he was converted. As a conservator of forests he seems to have fallen from grace.

I do not charge any corrupt motives in the case. I believe he has been deceived.

Mr. CUSHMAN. It seems to me that that is a remarkable statement to go into the RECORD about a man that has furnished a good deal of information about forest preservation; and as long as he was on the gentleman's side he was quoted, but now that he has honestly changed his mind, not from any corrupt motive, but because he was absolutely overwhelmed with the truth, it comes with ill grace from the gentleman to seek to discredit him now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I stated the plain matter of fact. I did not comment upon it at all. There was no reflection upon Mr. Pinchot. I stated that he converted me on this idea of forest conservation, and then when I was converted and thought we ought to have free lumber for that reason, in addition to free homes, lo and behold, he turned a somersault. I refuse to flip-flop because he does.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Does not the gentleman think he ought to have more confidence in his savior than that? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir; I do not. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. EDWARDS] asked me if I thought there was a trust. I think there is a trust, and Mr. Weyerhauser is at the head of it.

I did not intend to speak on this lumber business. There was a man who came before the committee—I think his name was Walker. There are tricks in all trades. I showed up on the lumber business in this examination for ten times as much as I was worth. There were certain gentlemen that wanted lumber on the free list, and I did not care a straw what they wanted it there for. I wanted it on the free list, too. One of them came to me and said they would like to see me. I was suspicious of the transaction at first, but finally I agreed to see them and they told me a great many things. I found they were honest. Among other things they told me what many gentlemen were going to swear to, and finally one night about 9 or 10 o'clock this old chap came in there, and, as I said, his name was Walker. He had on a longtail black coat, a low-cut vest, a white choker, and whiskers all over his face, and I thought he was a preacher. That was my first impression. One of these men who wanted lumber on the free list slipped out into the anteroom and wrote me a note, saying that that man owned 650,000 acres of sugar-pine land in California which he paid $4,000,000 for, at the rate of 15 cents a thousand for stumpage, and is now selling it at $3.50 a thousand as stumpage, and is trying to get $4 a thousand; and that his investment of four millions seven years ago is now worth one hundred millions.

Well, he got up and told his tale, and to listen to it you would have thought that he was pleading the cause of labor. Tears gathered in his eyes when he talked about labor. I was loaded for him by that time, and I sat back and waited for him to finish his tale. Finally he got through. I said: "Do you own 650,000 acres of sugar-pine land in California?" He said: "That is none of your business. [Laughter.] That is a private matter." The gentleman from Pennsylvania flared up and said: "What do you want to ask him that question for? It has nothing to do with it." I said: "If you want to know the bald truth about it, I asked the question to test his credibility as a witness and to see whether he is telling the truth," and I said, "You answer my question." I said: "Do you own 650,000 acres of sugar-pine land in California that you paid $4,000,000 for seven years ago at the rate of 15 cents per thousand stumpage, and are now selling it for $3.50 and trying to get more, and which is worth $100,000,000?" He said: "I don't know whether I own 630,000 acres or not." I said: "How much have you got?" He said: "I don't know." I said: "Have you got 100,000 acres?" He said: "Yes." I said: "Two hundred thousand acres?" "Yes." "Three hundred thousand acres?" "Yes." "Four hundred thousand acres?" "Yes." "Five hundred thousand acres?" "Yes." "Six hundred thousand acres?" "I don't know whether I have or not." I said: "You come here now in that kind of a condition and with that sort of a lay out and try to make this committee believe that the only interest you have in the matter is that of the wages of labor?"

A few days after that I saw a statement in a newspaper where the same man and Mr. Weyerhauser had formed a lumber trust.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I am as strongly in favor of free lumber as is the gentleman from Missouri, but Mr. Weyerhauser is one of my constituents, and I know him very well, and I know he is not a member of any trust, but is doing a legitimate business of his own. I do not agree with Mr. Weyerhauser in his views upon the tariff. He believes in a tariff on lumber, and I do not. I want to state these things that I know to be facts, because I know the gentleman from Missouri does not desire to do Mr. Weyerhauser an injustice.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would not do him an injustice. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. If there is not any trust, how do you reconcile the fact, as stated by the chairman of the committee yesterday, that lumber has advanced more rapidly on the average—that is, stumpage, than any other thing on top of ground?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I did not say there was no trust. I said that Mr. Weyerhauser was not a member of the trust.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I may be mistaken about who is and who is not a member of the trust.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman from Minnesota is not conducting Mr. Weyerhauser's business, is he?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Not at all.

Mr. JAMES. That is what I thought. You only know what Mr. Weyerhauser said about it?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Weyerhauser can take care of his own business and of himself, and he is one of the most honorable men I know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] was asking me a question about Gifford Pinchot. I will tell you a more remarkable tale than that. I did not accuse Pinchot of corruption. I accused him of ignorance in the second instance. I will tell you what happened over there. There was a bushy-whiskered man who came in there one night, that looked like Secretary Stanton. That was my first observation of him. He was a lumberman by the name of McCormick. Is he one of your constituents, too?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. No; he came from Wisconsin.

Mr. CUSHMAN. He is one of my constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I congratulate the gentleman. A man named McCormick came in there, and he was testifying in this way. He said it was all nonsense, absolutely nonsense, to be talking about the conservation of the forests, and, by the way, he said that the whole Northwest would have gone Democratic last year if it had not been that they thought the Republicans were going to keep this $2 on lumber. Does the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. CUSHMAN. There is some truth in that. [Prolonged laughter.] We thought our industry was entitled to protection in a bill that claims to be a protection bill and framed by a protective party. In that connection, if the gentleman will yield just a moment, in this matter of the tariff on lumber, I am absolutely consistent when I ask for a tariff on the products of my State. I am willing to concede that same thing in respect to a tariff on the products of other States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does that mean?

Mr. CUSHMAN. It means, to a certain extent, that the gentleman from Missouri is consistent when he is in favor of free trade all along the line, but for the man who advocates a tariff on the products in his own district and free trade on the other fellow's products I have not any sympathy whatever. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not in favor of free trade all along the line in the condition in which we find ourselves. We have got to raise about $300,000,000 out of this bill, whether we want to or not. So a man would be very unwise to be jabbering about free trade under those conditions. But I agree with the gentleman from Washington, although it deflects me from what I was going to say about McCormick—I do not know whether he was trying to do that or not—I agree with him that a man ought to be somewhat consistent about these things. I announced here this morning that I am in favor of a revenue tariff. I did not care a straw where the thing was—in Maine or in Missouri—but that I am opposed to a prohibitive tariff or anything approaching it, and I do not care a straw whether that is in Maine or Missouri.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Does the gentleman think that when we are importing about five and a half——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I am not talking about the gentleman's particular case. I want to tell about McCormick. McCormick came in there and said that it was nonsense to be talking about conserving the forests; that the best way to conserve the forests was to go on and cut out the lumber and let the fellows clear the brush up, and they would leave the saplings, but which, by the way, they do not do.

I have driven 20 miles at a clip in Minnesota. It used to be the finest white-pine country on earth, and there is nothing left now in many stretches of miles and miles to remind you that it ever was a timber country, except occasionally a sapling and the roots of the trees, which they have pulled up to use in making fences. So this friend of mine came out of the front room and slipped around into the anteroom and sent me a speech that McCormick had made three years ago on an occasion when President Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot spoke. I opened up this speech and I saw his name. I said: "Is your name R. L. McCormick?" I think those are the initials. He said: "Yes." I said: "Did you ever say in a speech that the end of the present supply of lumber in the United States is now clearly in sight?" He said: "What is the date of that speech?" [Laughter.] So I read him the date. Well, he hummed and he hawed and he bucked and he balked and he did not want to answer at all. But I made him answer. I read him the speech sentence by sentence, some of the most remarkable stuff in favor of the conservation of the forests, to keep the country from drying up, that you ever saw in your lifetime, and having located him in between Roosevelt and Pinchot and given him the date of the speech he could not wriggle out of it.

But I tried to make him tell whether he was or was not in favor of those things which were stated in that speech, but he would not do it. I read it to him and asked if he recanted what he said, and he would not tell us. One statement in that speech was just what I told you, that the end of the lumber supply was in sight. I asked him if he did say that. Listen to his answer: He said that there was more timber in the United States standing now than when Columbus discovered America! The fewer constituents the gentleman from Washington has like that the better.

Mr. STANLEY. Gifford Pinchot has prepared an elaborate map which he displayed to the Committee on Agriculture showing that the end of the lumber supply is within thirty years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was before he was converted. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON].

Mr. MACON. I desired to ask the gentleman a question directly upon the branch of the question that he was answering at the time he declined to yield to me, and that was why I wanted to ask the question at that point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course I would be glad——

Mr. MACON. Now, I do not see that I have any question to ask, because the gentleman has left that branch of the subject. I was simply going to ask him this: If he did not think, in addition to what he had said about the American home, that it was also one of the greatest antidotes for socialistic germs and tendencies of which he had knowledge?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. MACON. I think so; and I believed the gentleman would think so, and that is why I wanted to ask him the question.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the gentleman's attention to this phase of the lumber question: Whatever cheapens lumber tends to leave a larger portion of the tree in the forest, because no man will manufacture lumber which costs more to manufacture than he can sell it for when it is made; therefore the man who cries aloud for cheap lumber and cries for the conservation of the forests is the same man crying aloud for two diametrically different things at the same time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That all may be.

Mr. CUSHMAN. One other question. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago a certain California man who had a certain timber acreage in California that increased in value from $4,000,000 to $100,000,000 in a period of seven years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what my understanding was.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Now, we have other products, other properties in my State that have increased far greater than that——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I congratulate the gentleman if it is an honest increase.

Mr. CUSHMAN. There are agricultural lands in my State, in the Yakima Valley and Wenatchee Valley, which I could have purchased for $50 an acre when I went into that State that are worth $10,000 per acre now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Laid out in town lots?

Mr. CUSHMAN. No; they are fruit lands on which their annual income is $1,200 per acre.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not yield for a speech; I want to get through with this.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I want to ask this question: If we are going to legislate to take the value out of the stumpage and timber that men buy, are we also going to legislate to take the value out of farm lands?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me tell you something. We can not legislate to take the value out of stumpage. It is already there. They have got it, and we can not take it away from them, however ill gotten it was, but it will prevent them making more ill-gotten gains by putting up the price of stumpage.

Mr. CUSHMAN. My judgment is if timber for lumber is placed on the free list that the value of the timber would go down with the cost of lumber, and therefore the value of the stumpage would go down.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then the trees would be saved to the next generation.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Yes; that is true about a great many other things. If we do not use up a thing, we will have it left.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly it, precisely, and the coming generations ought to have a chance to live comfortably.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I want to ask the gentleman one more question. He stated he was in favor of free lumber for the purpose of encouraging the building of homes. Now, I want to ask him if he will not agree with me that the men living in his State, in my State, and in the State represented

by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] hundreds of thousands of men who work in the lumber woods and who work under the mill sheds, live in the poorest homes, work the longest hours, and have the cheapest wages of any other class of laboring men in the United States to-day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is dead easy. They live in temporary shacks that are put up to last only until the trees are skinned off of that particular piece of ground.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. Many of them never owned a home of their own in their lives.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They will own them if you make cheaper the lumber they themselves saw. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They will own cheaper homes along with the rest of us.

Mr. WEISSE. I want to ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] if he will explain why hemlock logs for lumber that a year or so ago were $18 a thousand, were down to $6 and $8 a thousand last year, and if it was not on account of the panic?

Mr. CUSHMAN. There was a general depression of prices that affected lumber, as everything else.

Mr. WEISSE. Would it have made any difference if we had had a tariff three times as high?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Not at that particular time. I fail to catch the significance of the gentleman's question.

Mr. WEISSE. Have not hemlock logs for lumber declined in Washington and Wisconsin from $18 to about $6, and I would like to ask if the tariff had anything to do with the decline, or whether or not it was the Republican panic?

Mr. CUSHMAN. It was a temporary depression and passed away. I don't think the tariff had anything to do with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to read a short argument here. I did not expect to get in a controversy on the lumber business, because I tried to quit two hours ago. Here is an article from the Northwestern Agriculturist. The title of it is, "The lumberman no fool." It is as follows:

Another interesting phase of the situation is that many, perhaps most, of the Americans who own timber in British Columbia and also in the States are opposed to the repeal of the American tariff. One of these men explained his position the other day in the following language:

"The way I figure it out is that the best policy for those of us who own timber on both sides of the line is to do our best to keep up the American tariff at the present time. That will help us to get top prices for the products of our American timber as long as it lasts. The faster we cut that timber the more valuable the Canadian timber will be when the time comes for us to use it.

"If the tariff were to come off now our Canadian timber would increase a little in value and our American timber would decline a little, consequently we would gain nothing; but by keeping up the tariff as long as there is any timber left in the United States we win heavily both ways—first, on our American timber; and, second, eventually on our Canadian timber—and the chances are that the American people, with their delusions about a high protective tariff, will 'fall' to this idea."

It is believed here that this view is one that influences the Weyerhaeuser-Hines interests, which directly or indirectly control a large quantity of Canadian timber, in the strenuous fight they are putting up against the repeal of the tariff. Timber brokers here expect that if the American tariff remains as it is British Columbia will be flooded with buyers of those and allied interests for the purpose of picking up all the choice timber they can get, preparatory to staging the second act in the great economic drama of milking the timber wealth of both countries.

I want to say to my southern friends here who are interested in yellow pine that the tariff on lumber never raised the price of yellow-pine lumber one single cent since the world began. It would not lower it now to take the tariff off. You are shipping yellow pine into Canada this very minute. Now, here is a remarkable fact: The Canadian Lumber Association has sent out a letter begging the Canadian government not to take off its export duty, and so forth, on lumber, because they think if they do that we will take the tariff off of lumber; and those Canadians up there fear an invasion of their lumber market from the United States. They say we will dump our cheap lumber on them and drive them out of their own market. The truth about it is that they are scared just as badly as our people. They invade us, and we invade them.

Now, in conclusion. I have talked a great deal longer than I wanted to or set out to do, and if I had not been asked so many questions I would have confined myself more closely to the woolen manufactures and have finished two hours ago. I want to give it as my deliberate opinion, with what study I have been able to devote to it, that this bill raises the Dingley rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not believe that the American people voted to do that. I believe that when we get that maximum and minimum into operation that will place the tariff rates more than 20 per cent higher than they are in the Dingley bill. I believe that the speech that the chairman quoted yesterday from President McKinley, at Buffalo, which may be taken as his farewell address to the American people, was the thing that set in operation this widespread movement for the reduction of the tariff. It is a revolution, and revolutions do not move backward. No matter what happens, the men who are in favor of a tariff revision downward this year will be in favor of tariff revision downward next year, especially if you make the tariff bill higher than it is now. Revolutions do not move backward; they move forward.

Though beaten back in many a fray,
Yet freshening strength we'll borrow,
And where the vanguard halts to-day,
The rear will camp to-morrow.

[Loud and long-continued applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

EXHIBIT A.

Schedule K, by paragraphs and items.

Item and rate.	Value.	Duty.	Per cent ad valorem.
CLASS 1. WOOL.			
Paragraph 357. Unwashed on the skin:			
No. 3495, 10 cents per pound	$305,162.50	$144,930.35	47.46
Cuba, 20 per cent off	33.00	13.04	39.52
Unwashed, not on the skin—			
No. 3496, 11 cents per pound	22,249,572.25	9,904,985.85	44.52
Washed wool—			
No. 3498, 22 cents per pound	601.00	368.56	61.32
No. 3499, scoured, 33 cents	7,146.00	2,679.41	37.50
CLASS 2. WOOL.			
Paragraph 357. Washed and unwashed on the skin:			
No. 3509, 11 cents per pound	21,908.10	8,646.44	39.47
No. 3510, not on skin, 12 cents	2,863,081.75	1,176,887.36	41.11
No. 3515, Angora, etc., 12 cents	738,540.00	262,985.64	35.61
CLASS 3. WOOL.			
Paragraph 358. Value less than 12 cents:			
No. 3528, on skin, 3 cents per pound	206,159.70	55,104.14	26.73
No. 3529, not on skin, 4 cents per pound	4,891,660.60	1,756,994.15	35.92
No. 3530, scoured, 12 cents	115.00	80.04	69.60
No. 3531, camel's hair, etc., 4 cents	67,050.00	25,136.96	37.49
Paragraph 359. Value over 12 cents:			
No. 3533, on skin, 6 cents	5,208.00	2,378.82	45.68
No. 3534, not on skin, 7 cents	8,843,857.00	3,110,858.03	35.18
No. 3536, camel's hair, 7 cents	261,612.00	110,779.30	42.34
Paragraph 364. Wool and hair advanced, n. s. p. f.:			
No. 3538, 33 cents and 50 per cent	1.00	1.49	149
No. 3540	962.92	902.29	93.70
Paragraph 363. Rags, mungo, and flocks: [a]			
No. 3547, 10 cents per pound	46,454.00	15,129.05	32.57
Paragraph 362. Noils, shoddy, and wastes:			
No. 3549, noils, 20 cents	175,335.00	88,722.20	50.60
No. 3552, shoddy, 25 cents	14.00	13.75	98.21
In 1905 the ad valorem rate on shoddy was			250
In 1906 the ad valorem rate on shoddy was			174.56
Paragraph 361. Top, slubbing, and roving wastes:			
No. 3556, top wastes, 30 cents	5,224.00	3,284.40	62.87
No. 3557, slubbing, 30 cents	19.00	22.50	118.42
No. 3558, n. s. p. f., 20 cents	61,134.00	28,426.00	46.50
Paragraph 365. Yarns:			
No. 3562, 27½ cents and 40 per cent	21.80	31.18	143.02
No. 3563, 38½ cents and 40 per cent	133,916.06	116,843.59	87.25
Paragraph 367. Blankets and flannels:			
No. 3565, blankets, 22 cents and 30 per cent	316.00	340.32	107.60
No. 3567, 33 cents and 35 per cent	219.00	232.41	106.12
No. 3568, 33 cents and 40 per cent	29,737.95	21,204.53	71.30
Blankets more than 3 yards in length—			
No. 3571, 33 cents and 50 per cent	40.60	67.16	165.42
No. 3572, 44 cents and 50 per cent	3,668.00	4,437.70	120.98
No. 3573, 44 cents and 55 per cent	8,217.60	8,591.35	104.55
Americans have no chance for variety in blankets. The rates prohibit competition.			
No. 3623, flannels, 22 cents and 30 per cent	24.00	34.48	143.67
No. 3625, 33 cents and 35 per cent	128.00	129.61	101.26
No. 3626, 11 cents square yard and 50 per cent	111.00	117.10	105.49
No. 3627, 11 cents square yard and 55 per cent	6,039.13	5,217.29	86.39
Flannels weighing over 4 ounces per square yard—			
No. 3630, 44 cents and 50 per cent	4,356.00	5,480.64	125.80

[a] No mungo in 1907. In 1903 the ad valorem rate on mungo was 121.15 per cent.

Schedule K, by paragraphs and items—Continued.

Item and rate.	Value.	Duty.	Per cent ad valorem.
CLASS 3. WOOL—Continued.			
Paragraph 367. Blankets and flannels—Continued:			
No. 3631, 44 cents and 55 per cent	$49,890.00	$53,168.50	106.57
This flannel schedule delivers the whole market to American manufacturers.			
Paragraph 368. Women's and children's dress goods:[a]			
No. 3603, 7 cents square yard and 50 per cent	1,392,913.00	1,475,421.77	105.92
No. 3604, 7 cents square yard and 55 per cent	138,489.00	147,314.18	106.37
No. 3605, 8 cents square yard and 50 per cent	33,131.50	32,092.63	96.87
No. 3606, 8 cents square yard and 55 per cent	1,373,974.45	1,293,387.28	94.13
Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, no importations in 1907.			
In 1905 the ad valorem rate on 40-cent goods was			165.11
No. 3608, 44 cents and 50 per cent	225.00	249.59	115.53
The ad valorem on these 70-cent goods in 1901 was			132.15
No. 3609, 44 cents and 55 per cent	11,358.40	10,519.31	92.61
The ad valorem rate on these more than 70-cent goods in 1906 was			99.14
No. 3610, 11 cents square yard and 50 per cent	6,556.50	6,831.10	104.19
The rate has gone as high in 1901 as			130.77
No. 3611, 11 cents and 55 per cent	4,109,310.49	4,253,859.17	103.52
In 1901 it was			120.30
No. 3612, 33 cents and 50 per cent	2.00	1.41	70.50
The average ad valorem rate on this item for ten years was			140.00
No. 3613, 44 cents and 50 per cent	162,760.00	192,498.92	118.27
No. 3614, 44 cents and 55 per cent	2,297,821.93	2,311,453.93	100.59
Paragraph 370. Felts:			
No. 3615, 44 cents and 60 per cent	111,465.73	106,935.20	95.98
Paragraph 366. Knit fabrics:			
No. 3635, 33 cents and 50 per cent	1.00	1.41	141.00
No. 3636, 44 cents and 50 per cent	539.00	641.74	119.06
No. 3637, 44 cents and 55 per cent	9,676.00	9,255.23	95.67
No. 3650, 44 cents and 60 per cent	617,267.00	568,967.47	92.17
Paragraph 366. Plushes and pile fabrics:			
No. 3641, 33 cents and 50 per cent	32.00	45.37	141.78
No. 3642, 44 cents and 50 per cent	1,434.00	1,642.32	114.37
No. 3643, 44 cents and 55 per cent	18,082.50	17,237.94	95.33
Paragraph 370. Cloaks, etc., n. s. p. f.:			
No. 3644, 44 cents and 60 per cent	141,740.60	113,860.52	80.32
Higher ad valorem rate for this kind of cloak than ever before under Dingley schedule.			
Hats of wool—			
No. 3648, 44 cents and 60 per cent	15,900.00	13,771.32	86.61
Paragraph 370. Shawls, knit or woven:			
No. 3654, 44 cents and 60 per cent	61,283.75	57,812.67	92.70
Paragraph 370. Ready-made clothing:			
No. 3655	1,016,250.38	778,384.02	70.50
Philippines, 25 per cent off	38.00	20.85	54.87
Cuba, 20 per cent off	81.00	53.75	66.36
Paragraph 371. Webbings, gorings, bandings, beltings, laces, ribbons, etc.:			
No. 3659, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent	12,522.50	10,122.59	80.83
Philippines, 25 per cent off	4.00	2.20	55
Paragraph 366. Cloths:			
No. 3593, 33 cents and 50 per cent	27,693.25	37,378.42	137.97
No. 3594, 44 cents and 50 per cent	188,917.50	224,596.07	118.89
No. 3595, 44 cents and 55 per cent	5,369,487.80	5,064,787.62	94.32
Cuba	3.00	1.67	55.67
Paragraph 372. Aubusson, Axminster, Moquette, and Chenille carpets:			
No. 3575, 60 cents and 40 per cent	48,146.55	31,939.89	66.34
Paragraph 379. Same carpets woven for rooms:			
No. 3576, 90 cents a square yard and 40 per cent	4,172,734.79	2,503,869.47	60.01
Paragraph 373. Saxony, Welton, and Tournay velvet carpets:			
No. 3580, 60 cents a square yard and 40 per cent	58,263.00	43,340.05	72.67
Paragraph 374. Brussels carpets:			
No. 3577, 44 cents a square yard and 40 per cent	11,403.33	8,645.08	75.81
Paragraph 375. Velvet and tapestry velvet:			
No. 3583, 40 cents and 40 per cent	49,383.00	29,067.23	58.80
Paragraph 376. Tapestry Brussels:			
No. 3581, 28 cents and 40 per cent	316.00	191.9	60.73
Paragraph 377. Treble ingrain carpets:			
No. 3582, 22 cents and 40 per cent	19,036.00	12,700.9	66.72

[a] Women who choose to have foreign goods must pay [illegible]er 140 per cent or 118.27 per cent or 100.59 per cent more, plus ret[illegible] profits, or do without. This destroys the world idea—the real idea—[illegible]nd substitutes the provincial. One has the right to buy his ideal an[illegible] govern-ment has no right to interfere beyond the legitimate demand[illegible]f revenue. The women of America are paying to American manufac[illegible]ers an unwarranted profit on woolen goods.

Schedule K, by paragraphs and items—Continued.

Item and rate.	Value.	Duty.	Per cent ad valorem.
CLASS 3. WOOL—Continued.			
Paragraph 378. Two-ply and Dutch wool carpets:			
No. 3584, 18 cents and 40 per cent	$1,693.00	$993.65	58.63
Paragraph 379. Wool carpets, n. s. p. f., mats, etc.:			
No. 3585, 50 per cent	51,690.00	25,845.00	50
No. 3579, 50 per cent	5.00	2.50	50
No. 3587, mats, 50 per cent	124.00	62.00	50
Paragraph 380. Druggets, etc.:			
No. 3578, 22 cents and 40 per cent	7,321.00	5,183.84	70.81

EXHIBIT B.

Paragraph 366. On cloths, knit fabrics, etc.

1. Woolen or worsted cloths:
   A. Valued at not more than 40 cents, 33 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.
   Valued at not more than 30 cents, 33 cents and 40 per cent—McKinley.
   Valued more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents, 38½ and 40 per cent—McKinley; not more than 50 cents, 40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	71,308.45
Value		$27,093.25
Duty		$37,378.42
Unit value		$0.388
Ad valorem	per cent	134.97

The revenue under the McKinley bill for 1894 and 1895 was $142,600, or $71,300 a year; during the Wilson period, $4,127,500, or more than a million a year; during ten years of the Dingley period $181,800, or about $18,000 a year.

   B. Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 70 cents, 44 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.
   Valued above 40 cents, 44 cents and 50 per cent—McKinley.
   Valued more than 50 cents, 40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	295,766.58
Value		$188,917.50
Duty		$224,596.07
Unit value		$0.639
Ad valorem	per cent	118.89

   C. Valued above 70 cents per pound, 44 cents and 55 per cent—Dingley.
   Valued above 70 cents per pound, 44 cents and 50 per cent—McKinley.
   Valued above 70 cents per pound, 40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	4,799,020
Value		$5,369,487.80
Duty		$5,064,787.62
Unit value		$1.12
Ad valorem	per cent	94.32

The Wilson and Dingley schedules are not exactly comparable—one being above 50 cents and the other above 70 cents—still, in four years the Wilson schedule produced about $22,300,000, or about $5,560,000 per annum; the Dingley produced in ten years about $37,000,000, or about $3,700,000 a year. During four years the Wilson schedule produced on all grades of cloth about $26,581,000, or per annum about $6,645,500.

The Dingley produced from its three divisions in ten years about $41,856,800, or about $4,185,680 a year. The ad valorem rate produced more than 50 per cent more revenue on cloth.

2. Knit fabrics, not wearing apparel (duty, see below):
   A. Valued not more than 40 cents per pound—

Importations, 1907	pounds	2.75
Value		$1.00
Duty		$1.41
Unit value		$0.364
Ad valorem	per cent	141

   B. More than 40 cents and not more than 70 cents per pound—

Importations, 1907	pounds	846
Value		$641.00
Duty		$641.74
Unit value		$0.637
Ad valorem	per cent	119.06

   C. Valued above 70 cents—

Importations	pounds	8,939
Value		$9,676.00
Duty		$9,255.25
Unit value		$1.07
Ad valorem	per cent	95.67

Duty on A, B, and C the same as on cloths, except that Wilson had 35 per cent on goods valued at more than 30 cents and less than 40 cents per pound.

The Wilson schedule brought in more than $404,600 revenue in four years; the Dingley schedule brought in but little more than $65,000 in ten years.

3. Plushes and other pile fabrics of wool:
   Duty same as on cloth—Dingley. On all values, McKinley, 49½ cents and 60 per cent. Up to 50 cents per pound, 40 per cent; above 50 cents, 50 per cent—Wilson.
   A. Not more than 40 cents—

Importations, 1907	pounds	89
Duty		$45.37
Value		$32.00
Unit value		$0.359
Ad valorem	per cent	141.78

3. Plushes and other pile fabrics of wool—Continued.
B. More than 40 cents and not less than 50 cents—

Importations	pounds	2,103
Value		$1,434.00
Duty		$1,642.32
Unit value		$0.682
Ad valorem	per cent	114.37

C. More than 70 cents—

Importations	pounds	16,574
Value		$18,082.50
Duty		$17,237.94
Unit value		$1.09
Ad valorem	per cent	95.33

The Wilson schedule in 1894 and 1895 brought in $75,300 revenue, or $37,650 a year. The Wilson schedule in four years brought in $155,000, or $38,750 a year; the Dingley, $112,000 in ten years, or $11,200 a year.

4. All other n. s. p. f.:

Importations, 1907	pounds	213,449.15
Value		$292,296.92
Duty		$249,615.66
Ad valorem	per cent	83.50

Census statistics, 1905, woolen goods.

[Establishments, 792, as against 1,035 in 1900.]

EXPENSES.

Salaries, clerks, officials, etc		$3,430,855
Wages, 72,747 employees		28,827,556
Men over 16	44,452	
Women over 16	24,552	
Children under 16	3,743	
Miscellaneous expenses		8,218,766
Cost of materials		87,830,825
Total		128,308,002
Value of product		142,196,658
Profit		13,888,656
Capital, or about 10 per cent		140,302,488

HEARINGS.

Page 5037.—Cincinnati Clothiers' Association corroborates a letter from Max Silbirberg to Hon. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, which said: "Never before in the history of the country had woolens from the mills been so rank and costly to the clothing manufacturers as now." Mr. Whitman denied this, and the Cincinnati Clothiers' Association affirms its truth.

Page 5038.—American Hosiery Company think there should be no material change in Schedule K, and that woolen knit underwear should remain in the wool-clothing schedule.

The American Wool and Cotton Reporter (January 3, 1907) quotes J. Clifford Woodhull, of the American Woolen Company, as saying in reference to the claims of the National Association of Clothiers, that woolens were rank and high. "It is impossible to produce a fabric of equal quality for the same price as has been done in former years; hence the result that buyers who refuse to pay above a certain price are compelled to sacrifice quality."

Page 6280.—Perseverence Worsted Company asks that the ad valorem duty on cloth be changed to a specific rate; do not ask for a higher rate; really a less rate; we use worsted yarns as our raw material; the present tariff shuts no one out, as in many things; they have the market to-day despite all we can do; some of our customers buy the Drummond fabrics; in fact, this firm has sold thousands of pieces; if they can do so, the tariff is not too high; make the rate specific entirely; the least labor goes into the wool and first process of manufacturing, as top making; then comes the yarn at a higher labor cost, and lastly the manufacturing of the cloth.

Page 6269.—Suttons Mills, North Andover, manufacturers of broadcloths, say that any reduction of duty will force them to close down.

Page 5034.—Max Lowenthal, of Rochester, a manufacturer of thirty-six years, says that the McKinley and Dingley tariffs have both worked injuries to the woolgrowers and the manufacturers of woolens, but most of all to the consuming public; the people wear less of woolen and more of shoddy by reason of these schedules; not a fraction more duty should be put on wool than the difference of raising it here and abroad.

EXHIBIT C.

Paragraph 367. Blankets.

a. Valued at not more than 40 cents a pound:
Dingley, 22 cents and 30 per cent ad valorem.
McKinley, not more than 30 cents, 16½ cents and 30 per cent.
Wilson, not more than 30 cents, 25 per cent.
McKinley, more than 30 cents, but not more than 40 cents, 22 cents and 35 per cent.
Wilson, more than 30 cents, but not more than 40 cents, 30 per cent.

Importations, 1907	pounds	1,116
Value		$316.00
Duty		$340.00
Unit rate		$0.283
Ad valorem	per cent	107.60

Wilson revenues, 4 years, $18,900, or $4,725 per year.
Dingley revenues, 10 years, $15,300, or $1,530 per year.

b. More than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents:
Dingley, 33 cents and 35 per cent.
McKinley, 33 cents and 35 per cent.
Wilson, 35 per cent.

Importations	pounds	472
Value		$219.00
Duty		$232.41
Unit rate		$0.464
Ad valorem	per cent	106.12

c. More than 50 cents:
Dingley, 33 cents and 40 per cent.
McKinley, 38½ cents and 40 per cent.
Wilson, 35 per cent.

Importations	pounds	28,210.09
Value		$29,737.95
Duty		$21,204.53
Unit rate		$1.05
Ad valorem	per cent	71.30

Wilson revenue, 4 years, $14,000, or $3,500 per year.
Dingley revenue, 10 years, $148,000, or $14,800 per year.

d. Blankets more than 3 yards long.
Same duty as cloths.

	Importations.	Value.	Duty.	Unit value.	Ad valorem.
	Pounds.				*Per ct.*
40 cents	142.00	$40.00	$67.16	$0.286	165.42
40 to 70 cents	5,917.50	3,668.00	4,437.70	.62	120.98
Above 70 cents	9,253.80	8,217.60	8,591.35	.888	104.55
Total	15,313.30	11,925.60	13,096.21		

e. Flannels more than 30 cents and not more than 40 cents per pound:
22 cents and 30 per cent—Dingley.
22 cents and 35 per cent—McKinley.
30 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	124
Value		$24.00
Duty		$34.68
Unit value		$0.194
Ad valorem	per cent	143.67

Wilson revenue, 4 years, $856, or $216 per annum.
Dingley revenue, 10 years, $617, or $61.70 per annum.

f. Valued more than 40 cents, not more than 50 cents:
33 cents and 35 per cent—Dingley.
McKinley, same.
Wilson, 35 per cent.

Importations, 1907	pounds	257
Value		$128.00
Duty		$129.61
Unit value		$0.498
Ad valorem	per cent	101.26

g. Valued more than 50 cents, not more than 70 cents:
11 cents square yard and 50 per cent—Dingley.
33 cents a pound and 35 per cent—McKinley.
35 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	square yards	560
Value		$111.00
Duty		$117.10
Unit value		$0.198
Ad valorem	per cent	105.49

h. More than 70 cents:
11 cents square yard and 55 per cent—Dingley.
33 cents a pound and 35 per cent—McKinley.
Wilson—35 per cent.

Importations	square yards	17,234.25
Value		$6,039.13
Duty		$5,217.29
Unit value		$0.35
Ad valorem	per cent	86.39

Wilson revenue on all above 40 cents, 4 years, $10,600, or $2,650 a year.
Dingley revenue on all above 40 cents, 10 years, $26,900, or $2,690 a year.
But for an unusual importation of 40,000 square yards, in 1906, the Wilson schedule would have been a far better revenue getter.

i. Flannels, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard—
More than 50 cents, not more than 70 cents, 44 cents per pound and 50 per cent—Dingley.
All values, McKinley, the same.
50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, pounds	pounds	7,506
Value		$4,356.00
Duty		$5,480.64
Unit value		$0.58
Ad valorem	per cent	125.80

Wilson revenue, 4 years, $120,500, or $30,125 per year.
Dingley revenue, 10 years, $44,800, or $4,480 per year.

j. More than 70 cents a pound—
44 cents and 55 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	pounds	58,475
Value		$49,890.00
Duty		$53,108.50
Unit value		$0.853
Ad valorem	per cent	106.57

Total blankets—

Importations	pounds	45,111.39
Value		$42,199.15
Duty		$34,873.47
Unit value		$0.935
Ad valorem	per cent	82.64

Total flannels—
Importations—

Value		$60,548.13
Duty		$60,147.62
Unit value		$0.719
Ad valorem	per cent	105.94
Exportation flannels and blankets, value		$54,937.00

HEARINGS.

Page 3311.—William Whitman, Boston, stated that the quantity of blankets consumed in the United States was very large, but he could not state how large, in figures; several millions of dollars; he did not stand for a prohibitive duty; the imports are very small of blankets and flannels; would not admit that an import of $106,000 with duties of 82 and 105 per cent in a consumption of millions was prohibitive; the fact that less than 1 per cent was imported did not make it prohibitive; we make them so cheap that there is no object in importing; thought a profit of 10 or 12 per cent a losing game; did not think the duties on blankets and flannels could be reduced; the export of $54,000 in flannels was no indication that we do not need the present high tariff; flannels are out of fashion and we dump them; we are not exporting blankets in competition; it is not possible for us to do it; we have the exclusive control of the American market on blankets; I do not produce blankets.

A pamphlet without name, published on page 3446, attacks Whitman and North very seriously, especially North.

EXHIBIT D.

Paragraph 368. Women's and children's dress goods, cotton warp.

a. Not exceeding 15 cents per square yard and not above 70 cents a pound:
7 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.
Not over 15 cents, 7 cents and 40 per cent—McKinley.
Not more than 50 cents, 40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations 1907	square yards	11, 128, 071
Value		$1, 392, 913. 00
Duty		$1, 475, 421. 77
Unit value		$0. 125
Ad valorem	per cent	105. 92

b. Valued not exceeding 15 cents per square yard and above 70 cents a pound:
7 cents and 55 per cent—Dingley.
7 cents and 40 per cent—McKinley.
40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations 1907	square yards	1, 016, 360
Value		$138, 489. 00
Duty		$147, 314. 18
Unit value		$0. 136
Ad valorem	per cent	106. 37

c. Valued above 15 cents per square yard and not above 70 cents per pound:
8 cents per square yard and 50 per cent—Dingley.
Same McKinley.
40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations 1907	square yards	194, 086
Value		$33, 131. 50
Duty		$32, 092. 63
Unit value		$0. 171
Ad valorem	per cent	96. 87

d. Valued above 15 cents a square yard and above 70 cents a pound:
8 cents per square yard and 55 per cent—Dingley.
8 cents and 50 per cent—McKinley.
50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	square yards	6, 721, 266. 83
Value		$1, 373, 974. 45
Duty		$1, 293, 387. 28
Unit value		$0. 204
Ad valorem	per cent	94. 13

e. Weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard and valued not more than 40 cents per square yard:
33 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.
44 cents and 50 per cent—McKinley.
Not classified—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	476. 50
Value		$149. 00
Duty		$231. 75
Unit value		$0. 313
Ad valorem	per cent	155. 54

f. Over 4 ounces per square yard and valued not more than 70 cents a pound:
44 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.
See above. Wilson and McKinley.

Importations	pounds	379. 75
Value		$255. 00
Duty		$249. 59
Unit value		$0. 672
Ad valorem	per cent	115. 53

g. Over 4 ounces and more than 70 cents:
44 cents and 55 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	pounds	9, 709. 42
Value		$11, 358. 40
Duty		$10, 319. 31
Unit value		$1. 17
Ad valorem	per cent	92. 61

RECAPITULATION.

	Value.	Duty.
a	$1,392,913.00	$1,475,421.77
b	138,489.00	147,314.18
c	33,131.50	32,092.63
d	1,373,974.45	1,293,387.28
e	149.00	231.75
f	255.00	249.59
g	11,358.40	10,519.31
Total	2,950,270.35	2,959,216.51

Exportations, 6,551 square yards, valued at $5,674.

EXHIBIT E.

Paragraph 369.

A. Women's and children's dress goods, not above 70 cents per pound:
n. s. p. f., 11 cents square yard and 50 per cent—Dingley.

Importations, 1907	square yards	32, 298. 93
Value		$6, 556. 50
Duty		$6, 831. 13
Unit value		$0. 203
Ad valorem	per cent	104. 19

B. Value above 70 cents per pound:
11 cents per square yard and 55 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	square yards	18, 124, 900. 22
Value		$4, 109, 310. 49
Duty		$4, 253, 859. 77
Unit value		$0. 227
Ad valorem	per cent	103. 52

C. Weighing over 4 ounces per square yard and valued not over 40 cents per pound:
33 cents per pound and 50 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	pounds	1. 25
Value		$2. 00
Duty		$1. 41
Unit value		$1. 60
Ad valorem	per cent	70. 50

D. Weighing more than 4 ounces, valued from 40 to 70 cents:
44 cents and 50 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	pounds	252, 543
Value		$162, 760. 00
Duty		$192, 498. 92
Unit value		$0. 644
Ad valorem	per cent	118. 27

E. Weighing more than 4 ounces, valued above 70 cents:
44 cents and 55 per cent—Dingley.

Importations	pounds	2, 381, 026. 97
Value		$2, 297, 821. 93
Duty		$2, 311, 453. 93
Unit value		$0. 965
Ad valorem	per cent	100. 59
Total value		$6, 576, 450. 92
Total duty		$6, 764, 645. 16

Total for paragraphs 368 and 369:
Importations—

Value	$9, 526, 572. 87
Duty	$9, 723, 674. 92

EXHIBIT F.

Paragraph 370. Ready-made clothing, shawls, knit goods, and felts.

A. Clothing:
44 cents a pound and 60 per cent—Dingley.
49½ cents and 60 per cent—McKinley.
Not less than $1.50 per pound, 45 per cent; and not more than $1.50 per pound, 50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	383, 258. 59
Value		$1, 016, 250. 38
Duty		$778, 384. 02
Unit value		$2. 65
Ad valorem	per cent	76. 59
Exportations, value		$1, 688, 778. 00

B. Shawls:
44 cents and 60 per cent—Dingley.
Under 30 cents per pound, 33 cents and 40 per cent—McKinley.
Between 30 and 40 cents, 38½ cents and 40 per cent—McKinley; 35 per cent—Wilson.
Above 40 cents, 44 cents and 50 per cent—McKinley; 40 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	47, 823. 52
Value		$61, 283. 75
Duty		$57, 812. 67
Unit value		$1. 28
Ad valorem	per cent	92. 70

C. Knitted goods:
44 cents and 60 per cent—Dingley.
49½ cents and 60 per cent—McKinley.
50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	451, 378. 75
Value		$617, 267. 88
Duty		$568, 967. 47
Unit value		$1. 37
Ad valorem	per cent	92. 17

D. Cloaks, etc.:
44 cents and 60 per cent—Dingley.
49½ cents and 60 per cent—McKinley.
50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	65, 491. 27
Value		$141, 740. 60
Duty		$113, 860. 52
Unit value		$2. 16
Ad valorem	per cent	80. 32

E. Hats of wool:
44 cents and 60 per cent—Dingley.
16½ and 30 per cent, 22 cents and 35 per cent, 33 cents and 35 per cent—McKinley.
30 and 35 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	9, 616. 80
Value		$15, 900. 00
Duty		$13, 771. 32
Unit value		$1. 65
Ad valorem	per cent	86. 01

F. Felts:
44 cents and 60 per cent—Dingley.
49½ cents and 60 per cent—McKinley.
25, 30, and 35 per cent—Wilson.

Importations	pounds	91, 117. 75
Value		$111, 405. 73
Duty		$106, 935. 26
Unit value		$1. 22
Ad valorem	per cent	95. 98

RECAPITULATION.

	Value.	Duty.
A. Clothing	$1,016,250.38	$778,384.02
B. Shawls	61,283.75	57,812.67
C. Knit goods	617,267.88	568,967.47
D. Cloaks	141,740.60	113,860.62
E. Hats	15,900.00	13,771.32
	1,852,442.61	1,532,796.00
F. Felts	91,117.75	111,405.73

American manufacturers, men's clothing:

Number of establishments		4, 504
Salaries paid 13,210 officials and clerks		$13, 703, 162
Wages paid 137,190 workmen		57, 225, 506
Men over 16	58, 769	
Women over 16	75, 468	
Children under 16	2, 963	
Miscellaneous expenses		57, 695, 240
Materials		185, 793, 436
Total expenses		314, 417, 344

American manufacturers, men's clothing—Continued.

Value product		$355,796,571
Profit		41,379,227
Capital (about 27 per cent)		153,177,500
Value importations	clothing	1,016,250
Value product		355,796,571

Less than one-third of 1 per cent.

Women's clothing:

Number establishments		3,351
Salaries paid 10,920 officials and clerks		$9,975,944
Wages paid 115,705 workmen		51,180,193
Men over 16	42,614	
Women over 16	72,242	
Children under 16	849	
Miscellaneous expenses		24,349,282
Materials		130,719,996
Total expenses		216,225,415
Value product		247,661,560
Profit		31,436,145
Capital (about 42 per cent)		73,947,823

Less than 1 per cent is imported.

Wool hats:

Number establishments		17
Salaries paid 68 officials and clerks		$94,245
Wages paid 1,503 workmen		619,194
Men over 16	1,030	
Women over 16	433	
Children under 16	40	
Miscellaneous expenses		293,208
Materials		1,369,810
Total expenses		2,376,457
Value product		2,457,206
Profit		80,809
Capital (about 5 per cent)		1,646,064

Importations are as 15,000 to 2,450,000, or as 3 to 49.

Felt goods:

Number establishments		39
Salaries paid 201 officials and clerks		$350,594
Wages paid 3,254 workmen		1,356,754
Men over 16	2,546	
Women over 16	699	
Children under 16	9	
Miscellaneous expenses		612,766
Materials		5,754,026
Total expenses		8,074,140
Value product		8,948,594
Profit		874,454
Capital (about 9 per cent)		9,667,136

Page 5026.—William R. Ellis states that English hat bodies weighing 3 pounds to the dozen, price in England $2.06 a dozen, take 1.32 specific duty and 1.23 ad valorem, or $2.55 on an article valued at $2.06; telegraphed England for labor cost on a dozen such hats, and the answer was 40 cents a dozen. In American the labor cost is 70 cents. Very little is imported, and the cost of machinery for a plant to manufacture them is great. If duty were lower, the hat bodies would yield a revenue and give labor to American labor. Suggests 40 per cent duty on hats in the cone or unfinished state and 65 per cent if blocked, shaped, or trimmed.

Page 3319.—Mr. LONGWORTH submitted a letter from a constituent merchant tailor, stating that the real users of ready-made clothing—the laborers, mechanics, and farmers—are practically receiving no value for their money; that the manufacturers of cloth are turning out inferior goods—poor qualities and coloring—fading soon and cockling.

Mr. Whitman, on the other hand, stated that never in the history of the United States were its people wearing such good clothing. The merchant tailors of Cincinnati came back with a statement, saying that all that Mr. LONGWORTH's constituent had stated was true.

Page 3134.—Mr. Theodore Justice, of Philadelphia, stated that an all-wool suit of clothes, such as he had on, could be made for $12.50; that the suit he had on actually cost that. He produced the bill as an exhibit. Its retail price in Philadelphia was $12.50. The wholesale clothing business in the United States is enormous, and we sell ready-made clothing cheaper than anyone in the world. The suit I have on will cost as much in England as here.

All-wool suit, $12.50, is made from 3½ yards, weighing 21 ounces per yard, or 74 ounces scoured wool:

Wool costs	$0.63
Manufacturing	.20
Net mill cost	.83
Profit	.08
Clothiers' price	.91
3½ yards, at 91 cents	3.19
Making	3.50
Wholesale price	6.69
Profit	1.50
Price to retailer	8.19
Profit	4.31
Price to consumer	12.50
74 ounces of clean wool (quarter blood) in America	2.29
74 ounces of clean wool (quarter blood) in England	1.32
Difference between free and protected wool	.97

Mr. Justice, page 3239, claimed that the free-wool schedule of the Wilson law saved the people $65,000,000 in clothing—a tangible essence, which he offset by an intangible quantity, a creation of argument—and claimed that we lost $426,500,000 in purchasing power.

Page 6269.—Sutton's Mills, North Andover, manufacturers of woolen goods (dress), represent that any reduction of duty would close their mills; capital, $450,000; 150 to 200 workmen; operating since 1802; manufacture broadcloths, kerseys, venetians; come in competition directly with French and German goods; labor cost in our mills three times that of the French.

Page 6270.—Richard Rauft, New York City, importer of pianos, asks that felts for pianos be taken out of ready-made clothing; the Wilson bill classified them properly as "felts n. s. p. f.;" the present rate, 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem, to which I do not object, if they are placed in a separate paragraph; I import 60,000 pounds per annum; value, $80,000.

Page 5038.—American Hosiery Company think there should be no change in Schedule K, and that woolen knit underwear should remain in the wool-clothing paragraph; the duties on knit underwear should remain as they are, at a minimum rate.

EXHIBIT G.

Paragraph 371. Webbings, gorings, etc.:

50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem—Dingley.
60 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem—McKinley.
50 per cent—Wilson.

Importations, 1907	pounds	5,218.05
Value		$12,122.50
Duty		$10,122.59
Unit value		$2.40
Ad valorem	per cent	80.83

In 1898 and 1899 goods came in yielding a revenue of $275,000, or $137,500 a year. Since 1890 the highest revenue has been $88,089 in 1900, and the lowest in 1907. The total for eight years has been $382,600, or an average of $38,260. During the Wilson period the total revenue was $250,700, or $62,675 a year.

HEARINGS.

Page 4742.—Pioneer Suspender Company say that they are interested in paragraphs 320 and 371; that ten years ago they bought foreign fabrics freely, but that to-day, on account of protection, the purchases of foreign fabrics are practically nothing. We are exporting suspenders to almost every part of the world. Our business has trebled in ten years; gives employment to hundreds of employees, and has daily sales amounting to $5,000—7,000,000 pairs of suspenders and garters a year. Does not say what he wants, but evidently no change.

Pages 2976 and 4982.—The Braid Manufacturers' Association of the United States ask that the duty be retained.

Page 6279.—Lace and Embroidery Manufacturers' Association represent that machine-made woolen embroideries and laces are great luxuries and nearly all imported. Ask a proviso to paragraph 371, making laces made from certain machines subject to highest rates.

EXHIBIT H.

Profits of wool manufacturing.

Census Bulletin No. 57, 1905, gives the following statistics on woolen and worsted goods and clothing manufactures:

Number of establishments	8,873
Expenses:	
Salaries paid 28,454 officials and clerks	$30,015,521
Wages paid 394,893 workmen	163,503,042
Miscellaneous expenses	98,564,867
Cost of materials	514,002,738
Total expenses	806,086,168
Value of product	911,399,841
Profit	105,313,673
Capital	529,892,740

Approximately 20 per cent.

Miscellaneous expenses cover, according to the census report:

1. Rent of factory works.
2. Taxes.
3. Rent of offices, interest, insurance, etc.
4. Contract work.

EXHIBIT J.

Shrinkage.

Samuel S. Dale, of Boston, in a circular reprinted from the Textile World Record of February, 1909, gives shrinkage on scoured wool, based on experiments running through forty-six months:

1. Loss which can not be accounted for by any tangible material, 21.22 per cent of the weight of the scoured wool and dyed material; or 1.27 pounds of scoured wool produce 1 pound of cloth.

2. Loss which can and which can not be accounted for by tangible by-products, 35.11 per cent; or 1.54 pounds of wool and waste produced 1 pound of cloth.

Greasy wool to 1 pound of cloth:

6⅜ pounds Texas wool for lot bought May 18, 1888.
5 pounds Oregon wool for lot bought April 10, 1890.
4 pounds California wool for lot bought February 17, 1887.
3 pounds Oregon wool for lot bought April 28, 1887.
2⅜ pounds ⅝-blood wool for lot bought June 24, 1887.
1⅞ pounds East India wool for lot bought June 12, 1890.

There is no ratio between grease wool and finished cloth.

Justice Tables. Page 3263:

5 pounds 5½-ounce western Australia wool to 1 pound of cloth.
4 pounds 9¼-ounce Buenos Ayres.
4 pounds Good Hope.
3 pounds 8⅞-ounce Adelaide.
3 pounds 3⅛-ounce Port Philip.
2 pounds 14¼-ounce Port Philip fine lamb's.
5 pounds 5½-ounce Montana.
4 pounds 9½-ounce Ohio xx.

Schedule K. Wool—Paragraph 356.

The skirting provision of this paragraph is objected to by the Montana Wool Growers' Association, page 5009; it has been interpreted

and operated so as to prejudice the interests of all woolgrowers in the Union; indorses the letter of W. K. Harber, filed as an exhibit; asks that the duty of 11 cents be retained without the skirting clause; also protests against the dual classification of third-class wool, inasmuch as this wool enters into clothing; claims that 82 per cent of it enters at 4 per cent.

The Harber letter filed claims that an importation of 100 pounds of Australian skirted wool shrinks 50 per cent and pays $11 duty; it yields 50 pounds of wool upon which the duty that has been paid averages 22 cents a pound, compared with the 33 cents contemplated by paragraph 354. To produce 50 pounds scoured wool would require 135 pounds of Montana unwashed wool, shrinking 63 per cent, which is displaced by the Australian wool as above. In other words, 135 pounds of Montana wool is protected by $11 duty, or 8 cents a pound.

The manufacturer benefits by this through a compensatory duty on imports of woolens, about 33 cents a pound, to offset the duty assumed to have been paid upon imports of raw material and the enhanced cost of domestic wool. The actual duty paid, however, was but 22 cents.

PARAGRAPH 357.

a. All wools and hair of the first class.
Eleven cents per pound—Dingley.
Same—McKinley.
Free—Wilson.

First class, not on the skin, unwashed.

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	90, 045, 325. 75
Tons	45, 022. 06
Value	$22, 249, 572. 25
Duty	$9, 904, 985. 85
Unit value	$0. 247
Ad valorem per cent	44. 52

In addition there was 1,675.25 pounds of washed wool, not on the skin, paying a duty of 22 cents a pound and 8,119.50 pounds of scoured wool paying a duty of 33 cents a pound.

b. All wools or hair of the second class.
12 cents per pound—Dingley.
Same—McKinley.
Free—Wilson.

Second-class wool, not on the skin, washed or unwashed.

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	9, 807, 394. 50
Tons	4, 903. 6
Value	$2, 863, 081. 75
Duty	$1, 176, 887. 36
Unit value	$0. 292
Ad valorem per cent	41. 11

c. Hair of the Angora goat, Alpaca, and other animals, second class.

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	2, 191, 547
Tons	1, 095. 7
Value	$738, 540. 00
Duty	$262, 985. 64
Unit value	$0. 337
Ad valorem per cent	35. 61

PARAGRAPH 358.

All wools of the third class and camel's hair of the third class valued at less than 12 cents per pound.
4 cents a pound—Dingley.
50 per cent ad valorem—McKinley.
Free—Wilson.

Third class, on the skin, value less than 12 cents per pound.

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	43, 924, 853. 50
Tons	22, 962
Value	$4, 891, 660. 60
Duty	$1, 756, 994. 15
Unit value	$0. 111
Ad valorem per cent	35. 92

Russian camel's hair, washed and unwashed:

Importations, 1907 pounds	628, 424
Value	$67. 050
Duty	$25, 136. 96
Unit value	$0. 107
Ad valorem per cent	37. 49

PARAGRAPH 359.

All wools of the third class and camel's hair valued at more than 12 cents per pound, 7 cents a pound wool:

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	44, 440, 828. 86
Tons	22, 420. 4
Value	$8, 843, 857
Duty	$3, 110, 858. 03
Unit value	$0. 199
Ad valorem per cent	35. 18

Camel's hair:

Importations, 1907:	
Pounds	1, 582, 561
Tons	791. 2
Value	$261, 612
Duty	$110, 779. 30
Unit value	$0. 165
Ad valorem per cent	42. 34

PARAGRAPH 360.

Wool on the skin:
One cent less than for same class of other wools—Dingley.
McKinley schedule required same rate as other wools.
Free—Wilson.

Importations, 1907:	
Class 1 pounds	1, 449, 303. 50
Class 2 do	78, 604
Class 3 do	1, 836, 804. 50
Total do	3, 364, 712
Total tons	1, 682. 3
Value:	
Class 1	$305, 162. 50
Class 2	21, 908. 10
Class 3	206, 159. 70
Total	533, 230. 39

	Duties.	Unit value.	Ad valorem.
		Cents.	*Per cent.*
Class 1	$144,930.35	0.211	47.46
Class 2	8,646.44	.279	39.47
Class 3	55,104.93	.112	26.73
Total	208,680.93		

In addition there were 3 pounds taxed at 33 cents and 50 per cent, 49 pounds at 44 cents and 50 per cent, and 847 pounds at 44 cents and 55 per cent.

	Importations.	Value.	Duties.	Ad valorem.
	Pounds.			*Per cent.*
Class 1	91,504,587.00	$22,562,514.75	$10,052,977.24	44.55
Class 2	12,077,545.50	3,623,529.85	1,448,519.44	40
Class 3	92,453,118.86	14,275,547.30	5,061,251.40	35.45
Total	196,035,251.36	40,461,591.90	16,562,748.08	

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION.

Domestic wool produced, 1907, washed and unwashed, pounds	298, 294, 750
Total importations, all classes pounds	196, 035, 251. 36
Total pounds	494, 330, 001. 36
Domestic wool produced, 1907, washed and unwashed, tons	149, 147. 3
Total importations, all classes tons	98, 017. 6
Total tons	247, 165
Domestic wool exported pounds	214, 840
Domestic wool exported tons	107. 4
Total pounds	494, 115, 161
Export of foreign wool pounds	3, 231, 908
Total American consumption pounds	490, 883, 253

The Bureau of Statistics, in the Statistical Abstract, gives this 498,695 547 pounds; percentage of importation on production, 65.71.

The value of the home production was:

1. Sheared wool, washed and unwashed	$62, 958, 165
2. Pulled wool, washed and unwashed	15, 305, 000
Total value	78, 263, 165

Monthly import prices, 1907—Raw wool.

	Class 1.	Class 2.
January	$0.243	$0.303
February	.259	.304
March	.255	.306
April	.260	.313
May	.265	.292
June	.257	.320

Domestic prices—Washed Ohio fleece, per pound, in eastern markets—July 1 and October 1, 1907.

	July.	October.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
Fine	34	35
Medium	36	38
Coarse	35	34

Average value, scoured wool, October 1, 1907, 50.2 cents.

Annual average import prices, 1907:

Clothing wool cents	26
Combing wool do	30
Carpet and other do	15

On January 2, 1896, the Wool and Cotton Reporter gave the following prices, among others, on wools for Texas, California, Oregon, Wyoming, and Arizona:

	Texas.	California.	Oregon.	Wyoming.	Arizona.
Spring choice	12 to 13	12 to 15	12 to 13		13
Spring average	11 to 12	11 to 12	10 to 11		11
Fall choice	10 to 11				
Fall average	9 to 10				
Burry and defective		6 to 7			
Defective		6 to 7			
Fine medium				10 to 11	
Fine				7 to 9	
Choice				13 to 14	
Heavy					7

In February, a slight change in higher grades; no change in lower; no change in March, April, or May.

In June, burry and defective, 5 to 6; fine, 6 to 8; heavy clips, 7 to 8.

In July, California defective went to 5 to 6; all higher grades fell off a cent everywhere. The prices remained practically unchanged for the rest of the year.

American wools.

	October 1, 1896.	May 7, 1896.
Washed clothing:		
Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia	17 to 19	18 to 19
Do	16 to 17	16 to 17
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York	14 to 15	15 to 16
Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York, No. 1	17 to 18	18 to 19
Washed combing and delaine	19 to 20	19 to 20
Fine delaine, Michigan and Wisconsin	17 to 18	18 to 19
No. 1 combing	19 to 20	20 to 21
Unwashed combing, one-half blood	15	15 to 16
Kentucky, Indiana, and similar wool	16	16 to 17
Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin	14 to 15	15 to 16
Unwashed, light and bright, Ohio and Pennsylvania	12 to 13	13 to 14
Michigan and New York fine	11 to 12	12 to 13
Kentucky, Indiana, and similar	15 to 16	15 to 16
Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin	13 to 14	14 to 15
Choice brushed, scoured, extra	32 to 33	33 to 35
A supers	29 to 31	30 to 32
B supers	25 to 26	26 to 27
C supers	22 to 23	22 to 23
Combing	26 to 27	26 to 28
Fine combing	30 to 32	32 to 33
California:		
Finest	31 to 32	32 to 33
Second	26 to 29	27 to 30
Defective	18 to 25	18 to 25

Foreign wools.

	October 1, 1896; December 3, 1896.	January 2, 1896.	May 7, 1896.
Australian combing, choice	22 to 26	21 to 24	22 to 26
Australian combing, good	20 to 22	19 to 20	20 to 23
Australian crossbreeds	22 to 23	22 to 24	22 to 24
Australian clothing	20 to 24	18 to 21	20 to 22
Australian choicest clothing	24 to 27	21 to 24	22 to 26
Cape and Natal	14 to 15	14 to 16	14 to 16
Montevideo	15 to 16	15 to 16	15 to 16
South American pulled	27 to 29	27 to 29	27 to 29
English coarse	24 to 26	24 to 26	24 to 26
English ¼ to ⅜	22 to 23	25	25
Canada combing, fleece	22 to 23	25 to 26	23 to 24
Canada combing, pulled	22 to 23	26 to 27	22 to 23

On December 1, 1896, English one-fourth to three-eighths went to 25 cents.

HEARINGS.

Page 2776.—William Hooker Atwood, for New Haven Carriage Factory: Tariff on wool should be reduced so that there could be a reduction on cloths suitable for carriage and automobile builders. Tariff on goatskins should be reduced to at least 10 per cent, as American manufacturers have had time enough to make in quality and finish equal to Europe, and they are not doing as well now as they did twenty years ago.

Page 3132.—William E. Dana, of New York State Sheep Breeders' Association, asked for a retention of the tariff.

Page 3134.—Theodore Justice, Philadelphia, Pa., held that Schedule K of the Dingley bill was all right and should be maintained; wore a suit of clothes which he said proved that the United States, under Schedule K, could now make better and cheaper clothing than England or Germany. He showed that an American with four in family, buying eight suits a year, was out of pocket $7.76 by reason of tariff on wool. To offset this, he has received 200 per cent more than German wages, which enables him in three days' work to make what the tariff cost him. He filed several exhibits showing the importations of wool for eleven years, the wool supply of the United States, the use of shoddy, general Republican prosperity, etc.

Page 3270.—Hon. Charles H. Grosvenor maintained that you can not reduce the tariff on wool materially without destroying that industry. He held that it was not naturally as profitable as other agricultural industries and, on the whole, only fairly profitable. He held that XX wool of Ohio could not be produced at 20 cents a pound, and that it needed protection. He held that the free-wool schedule of the Wilson bill cut down the industry in Ohio and throughout the country. Ohio wool sells at the home of the producers at from 25 to 28 cents, and that was the low-water mark of production. He held that wool was the finished product, so far as the farmer was concerned. Argued that the sheep in Harrison County ran down from 161,000 under McKinley bill to 92,000 under the Wilson bill.

Mr. CLARK called his attention to the fact that there were only 107,000 there now, and there was no explanation. He admitted that the price of wool was affected by an increase in the price of land, and this has had some effect in the number of sheep in Ohio. He defined no material reduction to mean no reduction whatever.

Page 3286.—Mr. Moore, of Mannington, W. Va., a woolgrower, representing the fine-wool district of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, held that the industry was in such condition as to demand a tariff, and that not a low tariff. His section produced as good wool as Australia and Argentina. We produced 298,000,000 pounds of wool last year, of which 130,000,000 were scoured. Our wools are sold on the scoured basis on an average of 62½ cents a pound. Our wool income was $78,000,000. Ohio produced $3,700,000 worth, Pennsylvania $1,640,000, and West Virginia $815,000. If Argentina can compete after paying the tariff, what would she do with the tariff removed? So as to Australia. He did not think the industry could stand the least reduction. Wool in 1896 brought from 12 to 15 cents; to-day unwashed wool 20 to 22 and washed wool 25 to 27.

His attention was called to cotton, which sold from 4 to 6 cents in 1896, but he could not explain it. Could not fix the labor cost on a pound of wool. Could not say whether less labor was employed in raising sheep than other animals.

Page 3294.—Mr. P. G. Johnson, for Idaho woolgrowers. Expenses of 1,700 sheep, being 1,200 ewes and 500 yearlings, was $1,479 a year in 1897 and $2,844 in 1907, an increase in cost of production of $1,365. This would be $1.67 a head. The tariff is 11 cents a pound on a 7-pound fleece, which would make the tariff protection $1,309 per given flock, or less than the added expense. In Idaho sheep raising is one of the principal industries, and the tariff should remain on wool—the finished product of the farmer.

Sheep in 1907 were worth $3.50 each and in 1903 but $1 each, going up in value from $1,700 a flock to $5,950 a flock in 1907, which they are worth to-day. Sheep are raised for both mutton and wool. One thousand seven hundred sheep will yield 7 pounds of wool each, and 11,900 pounds of wool, at 17 cents, would be $2,023 for the wool. The mutton sold compensates the loss, and but for that we would go out of business.

Page 3206.—Theodore Justice follows a number of blank pages omitted by request of the committee. A large part of what Justice said might well have been omitted in justice to Justice, to Justice and the committee. Mr. Justice said that Texas wool, under the Wilson bill, now worth 20 cents, was then worth 4, and California wool but 2. The Statistical Abstract for 1907, page 566, gives wool prices for the whole United States, as follows:

	Fine washed.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January	19	21½	19
April	19	21	18
July	17	18	17
October	18	19	18

The lowest prices for the whole country were in 1895:

	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January	17½	20	19
April	16½	20	18
July	18	21	19
October	18	21	19

The prices were furnished by Messrs. Maujer & Avery, New York. The prices in 1897 were:

	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January	19	21	19
April	21	22½	2C
July	21½	22½	21
October	27	29	25

These are seaboard market prices, but it is hardly conceivable that Texas or California wool ever receded to 4 cents, or 2-cent prices.

He adduced statistics showing that the sheep in the United States from 1880 to 1905 had increased 10 per cent, while cattle had increased 105 per cent. To produce the wool imported in 1907 would require 38,000,000 sheep, and to raise all our own wool would require 20,000,000 more sheep to make the ratio of sheep to population in 1905 equal to that of 1880. In other words, we would have to double our supply.

Page 3298.—Mr. William Whitman, of Boston, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, stated that his association asked for no reduction on raw wool, and believed that the existing rates should be maintained. The American woolgrower supplies 70 per cent of the wool used in wool manufacture; that encouragement of the sheep industry not only secures the woolen industry, but results in cheaper food and clothing for the people; that the imported wools are not grown here and can not be. Some foreign wool is superior to home-grown wool for some fabrics, but all imported wools compete.

He asked that wool tops be transferred from paragraph 364 to 365, which is a reduction. He asked for no increase on any schedule of manufactures, regarding the present as the most satisfactory schedule ever drawn, and the present protection adequate for every purpose.

The people engaged in woolen manufacture are not paid excessive wages, nor are the managers receiving excessive profits. Neither is there any monopoly. The present duties do not prohibit importations. A reduction of the tariff would reduce wages and profits, causing the industry to lose capital. There are $370,800,000 invested in the business now, employing 185,592 people, making a product worth $380,000,000. There are 1,200 establishments, 333 operated by individuals, 311 by firms and partnerships, and 567 by corporations. There is no monopoly. Dividends are relatively small and few great fortunes have been made.

Page 3469.—Mr. Hans Schmidt, Buffalo, N. Y., representing Schoellkopf & Co., importers of sheepskins and tanners, argued that the difference of 1 cent on fleece wool and wool on the skin was not enough to build up the importing business. Asks for no change in schedules beyond this. Of 200,000,000 pounds imported less than 3,500,000 came in on skins. Asks for a difference of 5 cents a pound, and for a reduction of 50 per cent on class 3 wool. Has been making from 8 to 11 per cent on the wool and leather business combined for several years.

Page 3478.—Mr. Henry O. Reineke, Philadelphia, Pa., wool puller for fifty years. Wool separated from skin chemically and called pulled wool. Being worth 3 to 4 cents less than fleece wool, the differential of 1 cent in the tariff does not permit them to get a sufficiency of foreign skins. The domestic supply is fast going into the hands of the great packers, who pull the wool and tan the skins. The chemical treatment makes the wool less valuable. It costs 50 cents a skin to pull the wool and the average skin will yield 2½ pounds of greased washed wool. Asked that the difference be made 5 cents.

Page 3480.—Mr. Patrick McGraw, of Allegheny, Pa., made the same statements as the preceding.

Page 3486.—Mr. G. M. Wilson, of Douglas, Wyo., stated that before leaving home he had gone to the county clerk and got a statement show-

ing the status of the sheep industry in Wyoming. Converse County showed 225,585 sheep, with mortgages on them to the amount of $566,736, or about $2.50 a head; that is, about 40 per cent are mortgaged, and all the balance are encumbered in some way. Wants no change in the tariff. Wool in 1903 worth 6 cents; this year 15¾.

Page 3506.—Mr. A. S. Erickson, of Salt Lake City, for the Utah Wool Growers' Association, claimed that on account of skirting and shrinkage the woolgrowers did not get the full 11 cents protection. It cost $1.50 a head to run a band of sheep a year in Utah. Greasing costs 20 cents a sheep, shearing 15 cents; whether by hand or machinery it costs every man in Utah 12½ cents a head; the old-fashioned shearer gets 8 cents a sheep; a hand shearer shears 75 to 80 sheep a day; some say it is cheaper to shear by hand, others by machinery; he could not say; the machine gets more wool off the sheep and is taking the place of hand shearers; all the items of expense, taxes, herding, etc., make the cost $1.50 a head; the wool sells for about $2.25 a head, which he modified to $1.74—96 cents for wool and 78 cents for lamb—or a profit of 24 cents a sheep, or about 8 per cent. The $2.25 was for the lamb, but only about 35 per cent have lambs, which averages 78 cents for lambs. Started in with 100 head and now has 2,000; fourteen years' growth; increase by raising lambs and buying sheep; has not raised one-half his lambs.

Page 3518.—Mrs. E. Bounemort, of Salt Lake City, stated about the same as the preceding.

Pages 3520 and 3523.—Two men asked that the tariff on wool be let alone.

Page 3525.—Mr. E. J. Huling, of Trinidad, Colo., representing the sheep raisers of New Mexico and southern Colorado, asked for a continuance of present duties. Thought the present rates adequate. Cost of raising sheep increased 75 to 100 per cent; has 10,000 sheep; grazes 4,000 acres and does nothing else; capital $85,000, but in debt; no dividends in six or seven years; incorporated ten years; rate of interest 10 per cent; twenty years in the business; have made money at times.

Page 3527.—Additional by Mr. Wilson: Owns 20 shearing machines, which cost $1,000 each; engine cost $750; shed, $1,000. It costs more to shear sheep by machinery. We shear that way because it does neater work. Get more wool first year with the machine, but never afterwards. In fact, we lose more by the use of the machine. Shearing by machine costs 10 cents a head for yearlings and 11 cents for 2 and 3 year old wethers. Shearing by machine is at least 1 per cent higher than by hand. A wether sheared by machine will bring 2 cents more a pound in the market. Wool in 1903 was about 13 cents and 6 cents in 1893.

Page 3560.—Mr. S. N. D. North filed a brief showing his connection as secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, as clerk of the Senate Finance Committee in 1894 and 1897. Claims that it was entirely clerical and legitimate, and that he used his position as clerk for no illegitimate purpose. Explains why the National Association presented him with $5,000 and raised his salary.

Page 4444.—Mr. Solomon Luna, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., asked that the tariff on wool be let alone. The price of wool to-day only makes a profitable investment. The expense of raising sheep has advanced so much that it almost absorbs the 11-cent tariff. Runs a flock of 60,000 sheep; owns land and leases forest reserves; pays 7 cents a head for five months' grazing to forest reserves and 3 to 5 cents per acre for territory land; pays the Government 7 cents a head for 20,000 sheep; rents 25,000 acres from the Territory, 15,000 of which cost 3 cents an acre and the balance 5 cents. Seventy men are needed as herders, at $20 and $25 a month, the year round. About 30 get the higher price. No; 30 get $25, 30 get $20, and 10 from $40 to $50. The 70 men cover the 60,000 sheep. During lambing season we need 210 extra men about forty-five days, at $20 a month and board, which costs about $20 a month more. We also hire shearers at 3 cents a head and board. Shearing lasts about a month, and 30 men are needed. Employ 8 extra men for dipping, which lasts eight days, at $20 a month. The material for dipping costs 3 cents a head when tobacco is used and 2½ cents for lime and sulphur. Loss from storms and drouth about 30 per cent in 1903; in 1904 about 5 per cent; in 1905 about 15 per cent; and the same in 1906 and 1907. Losses from predatory animals from 2 to 3 per cent. The entire clip of wool in 1908 was 360,000 pounds and in 1907 310,000. Last year we netted 12½ cents a pound and in 1906 13 cents; in 1905 about 11 cents. Shears but once a year; some 10 per cent of New Mexico herds shear twice. In 1907 sold 5,000 lambs; in 1906, 16,000. Does not sell much mutton. Gets 3½ to 4½ cents a pound for lambs. They weigh an average of 50 to 60 pounds. Sell some sheep at $2 a head. Two years ago sold 16,000 head at $2.75 each. The wool and sheep that were sold paid expenses, and the profit was the 40 per cent ewe lambs retained. We get 65 per cent increase by lambing. I had 32,000 ewes. This year I had 22,000 lambs and kept 8,000 head, worth $2.50 a head, or $20,000 profit. I made no more profit, and this was not clear profit. Lost 18,000 head of sheep in 1899 in a snow storm. We raise fair-sized sheep and what is called "clothing wool." Can not raise very fine sheep. We raise big sheep, but send none to market. We sell to feeders. Besides the land I lease I own 12,000 acres. Lease from individuals also. We put down wells. It costs about $2,000 to put down a well and to put up a windmill. We have 13 wells that cost us $26,000. It requires 10 acres of land to the head. Got 4½ to 5 cents for wool under free wool. I think I am the largest individual sheep raiser in New Mexico. Under free wool we got from 4½ to 5 cents a pound, but now am getting only 1 cent. In both cases I got the mutton. In all the years of free wool I mean we lost money. (Mr. HILL wound the witness up at this point and showed him that he was making less money to-day under a 11-cent tariff than he made under free wool—page 4453.) Mr. Luna then submitted an estimate for a man who had 2,000 sheep (p. 4454), which purported to show that a small man could make more money. (He was required as soon as he got home to make a balance sheet of his business for five years, swear to it, and send it to the committee.) He kept his sheep in flocks of 2,000.

Mr. Clark then wound him up as to the saving of a wholesaler over a retailer, but he parried; he denied that the lamb crop was velvet; argued that no man in the Territory would so claim; he claimed that wool on the free list would cause wool and sheep, as to prices, to go back to the prices of 1893. In 1907 we had 1,000,000 more sheep than in 1904. (1894.) The industry has grown in Wyoming and I think the future will show an increase; we can stand no reduction in tariff; he admitted that we would never raise wool enough for our own consumption and that the mutton market was about equal to the wool market; I am making about 10 per cent now and would like to have the schedules fixed to make more; mutton is the principal profit and the wool second (4458); I get more for my wool under the tariff, but the people do not pay more for their goods; the manufacturer also gets more; I suppose the consumer pays it; to take the tariff off wool would materially affect the sheep industry, the mutton not being sufficient to make it a paying business; sheep in 1893 ran from 75 cents to $1 a head. On page 4463 he submitted an itemized statement.

Page 4463.—Mr. H. W. Kelly, of Las Vegas, N. Mex., a member of the New Mexico Wool Growers' Association: Have about four and a half million sheep in New Mexico and need all the protection possible; the drought this year destroyed about 25 per cent of the lambs and from 10 to 12 per cent of the old sheep; we had another in 1903; again in 1899—3 in nineteen years. The only calamity demanding feeding is the drought. In business since 1884; started in with $1 sheep; bought 10,000 sheep in Arizona in 1893 at 50 cents a head and sold them in 1894 at $1.50; raise sheep for both mutton and wool, wool first and mutton second; lambs are not clear profit because we do not have 80 and 90 per cent crops; we get 55, 60, and 65 per cent; we have not graded our sheep up to Missouri sheep and can not hold a candle to them; in some places 20 acres to a sheep is required, in others 10; I have about 4,300 sheep; I have made nothing this year, even with the tariff; I raise no lambs; made about $1,100 or $1,200 last year, about 8 to 10 per cent; many years ago two men could care for 3,000 sheep, but not now; we could in old times run 5,000 in a flock, but not now; our sheep are larger to-day, but not one-half larger.

Page 4501.—Mr. J. A. Delfelder, of Lander, Wyo., a woolgrower: Wool product of Wyoming, in the grease, 36,000,000 pounds, shorn from 4,510,300 sheep; requires 5,000 men, supporting 25,000 people—or practically about half our population is dependent on sheep; have been in the business since 1894; own 21,000 sheep; ranches worth $150,000, and make a profit of less than 3 per cent; before 1894 I speculated in sheep; pay 15 cents a head for shearing; my pay roll is $9,000 a year; dipping costs 3 cents; own 12,000 acres; lease about 10,000 acres, at from 2½ cents to 5 cents an acre, averaging about 3½ cents; allow 9 acres for 1 sheep; feed in the winter time; fed 1,500 to 2,000 tons of alfalfa; this costs $5 a ton, but we raise some; winter before last fed 1,000 tons; for five years past about 1,000 tons a year; increase in output this year about 50 per cent; in ordinary years, 70 per cent; some years run 80 per cent; we sell the entire lamb crop; last year we got 5½ cents a pound for an average weight of 62 or 63 pounds—about $3.25 or $3.50 a head; we get a clip of 8 pounds per sheep each year, which two years ago brought 18 cents; this year 15 cents; in 1906 it was 13½ cents; in 1908 I made 3½ per cent, but in 1897 about 18 or 20 per cent; in 1906 about 10 per cent; began with 2,600 head, and it is now 21,000 sheep and 10,000 lambs, practically made out of the business since 1894. I had $960 when I went into business, and, on a safe estimate, I am worth $100,000 to-day. I have made $99,050 in fourteen years; thought that a scaling of the tariff to 5 or 6 cents would lead him to change his business. I ask that the tariff be raised; paid for my sheep in 1894 $2 a head; worth $4.50 to-day. Mr. Delfelder then tried to hedge on the profits he had made, but did not change the status materially.

Page 5505.—Mr. R. J. McClury, Alexander, Pa., protested against any reduction of tariff. Wool is selling at 30 cents a pound, and that is as low as it can be raised for; he submitted estimate of cost of 100 fleeces for $305, with a sale credit of $310, showing a profit of $5; went into business in 1879, under tariff of 1867, with wool selling at 40 cents; the tariff of 1883 gave us a jolt, and sheep went down 50 per cent; recovered under the McKinley tariff; when Cleveland went in the second time I had 200 sheep, worth from $25 to $50 a head for breeding purposes; the Wilson tariff reduced their value to almost nothing; sheep went to the shambles at from 50 cents to $1 a head and I had to quit; under the present tariff I manage to make a living.

Page 5006.—The Oregon Wool Growers, from Morrow County, state that when the Dingley bill came into operation the cost of running a band of 2,000 sheep depended on the following facts: The necessary deeded land was 500 acres, there being enough government land free lying adjacent to make up the necessary 2,500 acres; range land was worth not to exceed $3 an acre; now the sheep raiser has practically to own all his range, and the price has increased from $5 to $8 an acre; wages of herder and camp tender increased 30 per cent; that the summer range, then free, now costs a rental of from 7 to 12 cents a head; 50 per cent more help is needed; there is also an increased loss of sheep through government regulations and increased predatory animals; freights have increased and the price of shearing has gone up; 2,000 sheep then cost in expense $8,930; the cost to-day is $21,790.

Page 5008.—Mr. George P. Dudley, Garo, Colo., protested against any reduction in wool; have been raising sheep twenty-five years in Park County, Colo.; during the Cleveland administration the low tariff wiped out the sheep business; submitted a statement showing the expenses of 2,000 sheep in 1908 to have been $2,154 and the wool and pelt account $1,780, or a loss of $374. This was a dry herd; had there been lambs and a ewe herd the increase would have been from 80 to 90 per cent; sell my wool at the ranch; freight, commission, and drayage when shipped East average 5 cents per pound.

Page 5009.—Eureka Live Stock Company, Eureka, Nev., ask for an increase.

Page 5012.—Lewis Penwell, of the Montana Wool Growers' Association, stated that the average cost of running 16,000 sheep twelve months was $1.25 a head, and that the wool clip was a little less than 7 pounds.

Page 5013.—J. B. Long & Co., of Great Falls, made practically the same statement.

On same page Rea Brothers stated that it cost from 10 to 14 cents a pound to raise wool, and submitted a statement.

Page 5016.—Missouri Sheep Breeders' Association, made up of 500 sheep breeders, asks for a higher import duty on wools; prior to 1900 few men were engaged in the industry; since 1900 about 3,000 have gone into it, handling about 1,100,000 head; the State could sustain 6,000,000 sheep, or an average of 20 head to the farm; think the duty should be raised 5 per cent.

Page 5017.—Chaves County Sheep Breeders' Association, 75 members, with 600,000 sheep, protests against any change in duties on wool or hides.

Page 5018.—National Wool Growers' Association states that it represents several hundred thousand growers, producing annually 300,000,000 pounds of wool, valued at $79,000,000, and mutton valued at $100,000,000, and indorses the present tariff on wool, woolen fabrics, hides, meats, and meat animals. This was the resolution adopted at the forty-fourth annual session of the association at Salt Lake City, January 19, 1909. They ask specially for continued protection of the duty on mohair, to help the Angora goat industry; for a tariff on Angora skins.

Page 5023.—President and secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and of the National Association of Wool Growers ask that the duties on wool and woolen goods be maintained without reduction.

Page 5039.—Winslow Brothers & Smith, of Boston, ask for an increase of the differentials on wools on the skin; claim that the present tariff discriminates against wools on the skin because they are uniformly heavier in shrinkage than sheared wools, and because they require a pulling to prepare them for market; the shrinkage is from 65 to 72 per cent; a difference of 1 cent should be allowed for shrinkage and of 2½ to 3 cents for pulling; think 3 cents might be enough, but that 4 cents would not be too high.

Page 5043.—Stone, Timlow & Co., Boston, oppose any reduction of wool duties and any increase of the differential on wool skins. On same page P. McGraw Wool Company, Allegheny, Pa., ask that the differential be raised to 4 or 5 cents.

Page 6275.—Funstin Brothers, St. Louis, file letter protesting against any reduction of rates.

Page 6276.—Pennsylvania Wool Growers' Association submit statement of account with 100 sheep; expense $162 a year at lowest prices of feed and $270 at high prices, or an average cost of $2.16 a head for keeping and shearing sheep; clip 6½ pounds a head; in 1904 this brought 30 cents, 35 cents in 1905, 32 cents in 1906, 33 cents in 1907, 30 cents in 1908, or an average of 32 cents, making the receipts for wool $2.08 against a cost of $2.16 for the fleece; a man can keep 200 sheep on a farm of from 100 to 200 acres—50 one year old, 50 two years old, 50 three years old, and 50 four years old; of these 50 must be breeding ewes which will yield 40 lambs, male and female; from his flock he can sell each year 40 head; one-half of these, or 20, would be old ewes at from $3 to $3.50 per head, and 20 wethers, at $4, or an income of $160, which represents interest, care of the flock, losses, etc. For mutton producing a larger and coarser wooled sheep are kept; it is true that 100 ewes will produce from 70 to 80 lambs, but these lambs are sold for mutton while young and the wool from the ewe is all that is produced.

Page 6550.—Datus C. Smith, Blanchard, N. Dak., a farmer, states that he owns 2,800 acres of land and is a Republican; no farmers, so far as he was aware, except woolgrowers, have appeared before the committee, while those that have appeared are the very ones engaged in selling their products to farmers who serve them; both sides of the enormous farming business deserve to be heard; the entire agricultural list should be free; the tariff is not of the slightest advantage to the farmer; even if Canadian wheat should come to Minneapolis, it would not depress the American price; the fear that Manitoba wheat will depress the price of Dakota wheat is groundless; Minneapolis does not and never has made the price on Dakota wheat; Minneapolis prices always lag behind Duluth prices; I am a sheepman; have fed 2,000 at a time and now carry 500 ewes the year round and sell about the same number of lambs annually; I have exported mutton to England and can not see where it mattered much in the price whether Canadian mutton came to New York or mine went to England, or vice versa; the tariff on wool does generally add to the price of the American product, but it has never been of any benefit to American farming; why should sheep ranch men be assisted by the Government when cattlemen and horse raisers are not? I oppose the tariff on wool because it has never accomplished its aims; it has not built up a sheep industry and has degraded sheep husbandry into wool raising; sheep for mutton is neglected for sheep for wool; the Wilson bill gave a real impetus to sheep husbandry, from which it has never departed; farmers lost on bounty, but got a far better class of sheep; I oppose the tariff in that it steals the judgment of the beneficiary; for a little bounty on 40 fleeces of wool he will go the whole length of protection—getting a little and paying much; another fallacy is that the farmer buys little; if a farmer sells $5,000 worth of produce and has $100, he had bought $4,900 worth of things. He has paid for steel rails and trainmen's clothing, for grain elevators and barges, railroad profits, etc.; in so far as the farmer's living expenses are increased by the tariff his toll is increased; on the other hand, the manufacturers have grown great; the factories are accumulating wealth and the farmers alone remain poor; he needs protection while these do not; if he can not be protected, would it not be well to protect him at least from further high prices?

Page 6584.—F. B. Findley, a dealer in woods from Boston, thinks the wool schedule should not be touched, because sheep raising develops arid lands.

Page 6585.—F. E. Warren, for Big Horn County Wool Growers' Association, protests against any reduction.

Page 5019.—Mr. Edward Moir filed a strong paper asking ad valorem rates on all wools. Under the specific system the woolen manufacturer is handicapped on his raw material; one branch of the textile industry is greatly favored.

English pulled and fleece washed wools suitable for combing purposes may be imported at a duty of 12 cents a pound; they lose in washing 16 to 28 per cent, whereas manufacturers using Cape, Montevideo, or fine Australian, whose washing loss averages 65 per cent, must pay 11 cents duty; this helps the worsted manufacturer and hurts the woolen. Says Arlington Mill brings in pulled wool losing 16 per cent; the duty is 12 cents; the compensatory duty on cloth is four times the duty on wool, so that on 4 pounds of this wool the return would be 3.36 clean pounds, on which 48 per cent duty is paid, or 14.3 cents per clean pound. On the other hand, if wool losing 65 per cent washing is brought in at a duty of 11 cents, the compensatory duty on the cloth being four times the wool duty, he would pay on 4 pounds 44 cents and get back 1⅜ pounds clean wool, making the duty 31⅓ cents, as against less than 15 cents paid by the worsted manufacturer. A wool that shrinks 70 per cent, paying 11 cents duty, is nearly 37 cents a pound clean, the extreme duty being 22 cents a pound. A specific duty on wool is absurd; the lowest duty that would have been collected on our importations in 1895 figured 75 per cent on the cost of the wool and the other extreme, 140 per cent; the washing loss runs from 15 to 80 per cent, and a specific duty is unfair to some industries; if the Australian can grow wool successfully and make money, it seems singular that a western woolgrower, with the cheapest land in the world, and grazing for sheep practically free, should have the cheek to ask a duty on foreign wool running from 40 to 120 per cent ad valorem; I have never believed that carpet wools should come in cheaper than clothing wools. Why should a higher rate be paid on a necessity than on a luxury? An ad valorem rate of 25 per cent on all wools paying the same rate of duty would be desirable. One manufacturer told me that he never made so much money as during the last two years of the Wilson bill.

Page 4999.—William H. Harris: The importing trade think the duties on third-class wools should be cut in half; the policy of the Manufacturers' Association prompted not by the needs of the trade nor by any sense of right or justice, but entirely from the fear that any honest readjustment will prompt woolgrowers to demand a reduction on manufactured goods; the present duties on classes 1 and 2 range from 50 to 100 per cent; at low market rates they have several times in the last ten years reached 120 per cent. Mr. Moir is right in asking an ad valorem duty on classes 1 and 2. My interest is in class 3, and every argument here favors an ad valorem duty; class 3 wools call for no protection, there being no carpet wools produced in the United States, some are used for clothing, but only to a very limited extent, none for the last three years; to jump a duty from 4 to 7 cents when the cost of wool crosses the 12-cent line is iniquitous; it leads to fraudulent invoicing and other iniquities; it has injured the carpet industry of the United States.

Page 5002.—The Arkansas Valley Wool Growers' Association asks an increased duty on third-class wools, on the ground that they compete with American wools as clothing wools.

Page 5003.—The Bristol (Pa.) Carpet Mills ask for lower duties on third-class wools.

Mr. WASHBURN. Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I shall move to strike from the bill the provision imposing a direct inheritance tax as a part of our permanent national system of taxation. It is not my purpose to consider in any way the details of this provision, but rather to object to the appropriation by the Federal Government of a tax which has been adopted in either the direct or collateral form to a greater or less extent by at least 36 States of the Union. The latest information I have access to is that 20 States tax both direct and collateral heirs and that in 13 States the tax is progressive.

The new constitution of Oklahoma authorizes progressive taxation of both direct and collateral inheritances. It has happened in my own State of Massachusetts that a collateral inheritance tax was levied in the act of June 11, 1891, which imposed a tax of 5 per cent on collateral relatives only. The principle was further extended in the act which became effective September 1, 1907, including lineal ancestors and descendants and progressive in the amount of the tax. The tendency of the States when the tax has once been adopted seems to be to extend it as the needs for increased revenue become pressing, and it makes up in some measure for the loss of taxation incident upon the elusive form in which so much personal property now exists. As an illustration of this fact, let me say that in my own State one of the most instructive and painstaking reports on the subject which I have ever seen recommended the abolition of the tax on intangible personal property and as one of the substitutes the importation of a direct inheritance tax upon real and personal property.

But whether the tax be regarded as a means for collecting taxes which have been evaded during the lives of the owners or as a substitute for a property tax or as a capitalized income tax, the fact remains that it is a tax which the States have come to rely upon and are likely to develop as their needs may require, and which is likely ultimately to be relied upon as a substitute for the tax on intangible personal property which is now impossible to collect. It would, in my judgment, be most unfortunate if the Federal Government should, by making the inheritance tax a permanent part of its taxing system, make it impossible for the States to avail of the tax to any necessary extent.

I do not forget that the National Government has in times of stress availed of this tax. It did so for four years, ending in 1802, but the conditions then were hardly comparable with those of to-day. An inheritance tax was recommended to meet the expenses of the war of 1812, but peace was declared, and the tax was not levied.

Legacy and succession taxes were levied for the ten years ending in 1872, covering the civil-war period and five years thereafter, yielding nearly fifteen millions, and again during the Spanish war for a period of four years, ending in April, 1902; but these were war taxes and were repealed when the immediate need had ceased.

This is a very different proposition from that to make the inheritance tax a permanent part of our federal-tax system. I fear that the result would be to prevent the States from realizing all the benefit they should from the tax through fear that the Federal Government might increase its tax, and the Federal Government, on the other hand, might hesitate to take full advantage of the tax through fear of embarrassing the States, so that both taxing powers would, in a sense, be paralyzed in administering this particular tax, or else, if it were administered vigorously by both, the double tax might easily become oppressive. I should hope that other sources of revenue should be found by the National Government, and that this should be left to the States. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in every country revenue is the most potent factor. It supports the government; it controls the government. It has been said "the revenue is the state."

It may be consistent with the moral obliquity of this bill for its advocates to sneer at moral considerations and with cavalier air decline to "discuss it in an academic way." That, of course, would leave the true purpose of taxation out of question, and confine all debate to the details of narrow and selfish claims and interests. Leader PAYNE is woefully mistaken, however,

in his assumption that protection is the fixed policy in this country. No such state of popular ignorance and commercial corruption has settled in hopeless gloom over the American people, satisfying them with conditions and insuring the perpetuity of prohibitory duties. His habitual sneer at CHAMP CLARK's celebrated utterance and his customary contortion of that gentleman's expression about "custom-houses" can hardly deceive anybody, nor conceal from our people the truth, that prohibitory duties and free trade are equally unproductive of revenue. One would put the custom-houses out of business as effectually and quickly as the other. Neither is desirable. The difference between them is that free trade would permit general production and business prosperity, and enable the people to pay the taxes which either system would render necessary to support the Treasury; while prohibitory protection would exclude and paralyze all business and impoverish the common people, enriching only those who can not possibly be reached by the taxing power, and leaving those subject to taxation bereft of all means to replenish an empty Treasury.

Countries are endowed with elements of wealth and prosperity. Wisdom and economy in levying revenue and conducting the government can largely affect the development of those resources and the currents of commerce. People are entitled to make the most they can out of their resources, and their opportunities should not be abridged by discriminating legislation. As the winds and the waves flow ceaselessly around the earth when unobstructed, so the activities of men exchanging commodities for commodities would flow freely and profitably throughout the civilized world if unobstructed by restrictive legislation, and bring the greatest wealth to the best equipped, the most skillful, and the most active.

They should never be obstructed, but should be charged with the expense of government, and for that purpose only should be wisely and fairly taxed. The only just and honest pretext for levying taxes is the support of the Government, and the old-fashioned doctrine that no more should be levied than essential to an honest and economical administration should be observed. It is impossible so to levy that tax as to avoid affecting incidentally the interests of various parties. The discovery of that fact led to the practice—vicious in the abuse—of demanding the laying or omission of taxes for the sole or main purpose of affecting the interests of somebody instead of for the benefit of the Treasury. The Republican misstatement, shouted on so many stumps and written on so many pages, that the fight is between tariff and free trade, is an outgrowth of the claims of different interests, who, having discovered that some protection inevitably attends every rate of duty, have entirely lost sight of the constitutional function of taxing to support the Government and have become lost in the contemplation of their own selfish ends.

The fight between different political parties has been consistently, through all our history, a contest between honest and fair taxation and a prohibitory tariff. Honest and fair taxation, laid for revenue only, places the proceeds in the Treasury, and is used to support the Government, going under our theory, to benefit the people who pay the taxes. If the rate of duty is too high, nothing is imported and no revenue reaches the Treasury. If the rate is too low, very little revenue goes to the Treasury, though importations may be large. Neither of these conditions is desirable. However, the lower the duties the more imports, and the more imports the more exports, for usually they keep pace through long periods. Only fortunate and exceptional conditions produce large balances of trade continuously in favor of the same people for a long time. If the people who pay the taxes are prosperous the Government's financial condition is strong, whether the Treasury be full or empty, for it has only to call and collect the money from people whom fair conditions have left able and willing to pay. Therefore a policy which enriches the common people strengthens the Government and the Treasury.

It has long been popular to collect revenue by import duties. Indirect and disguised taxes levied on consumption are not always realized by the taxpayers, and if rightly adjusted, tax people fairly according to the quality and quantity of what they consume. But greed and political cunning have taken advantage of the method, indirect and easily concealed, to transfer the taxing power from the Government to favorite grafters, and substitute political favorites as beneficiaries of the system, designed to replenish the Treasury. The favorites contribute to campaign funds, while it would be somewhat difficult to devise an indirect and undiscoverable method of taking their campaign funds from the Treasury. Necessarily, the tax, whether great or small, operates incidentally to protect the home products against foreign competition, and it does seem that honest and fair men ought to be satisfied with that. What the Republicans call "protection," euphoniously styled "the principle of protection," means fixing the duty so high that no foreigner can pay it and sell as low as the home man.

Therefore no foreign goods are brought in; therefore no revenue is paid into the Treasury; but the object is accomplished, the home manufacturer or producer has no competition. He adds almost the amount of the duty to the value of the article, thus enabling him to sell it just a little below the point which would permit competition, thus making the home consumer pay almost the amount of the tariff in addition to the value of the article, by which operation he is forced to pay to his neighbor an exorbitant tribute, and still the Treasury is empty. But that is not the worst feature of it. The balance of the "protective principle" is that you must then find some other means to tax the same people who paid the tribute in order to secure money to supply the Treasury. This looks hard enough if the common people, constituting the great masses, more than 90 per cent of the entire population, had a fair chance to raise money to pay taxes with; but the most disastrous thing about protection is not that it forces us to pay a higher price for home goods, but because it denies to us all the markets of the world and deprives us of the opportunity to sell to all the world the multimillions of wealth produced by our people, but on which they are not able to realize on account of protection. All of our ports are closed to most of the products of the rest of mankind which could compete with anything produced by the favorites.

We can not carry our products abroad and sell them because we can not take in exchange therefor the products of other countries, the people of other countries being, like us, dependent on their products for their income. In the language of President McKinley, "We can not always hope to sell to people from whom we buy nothing."

As a prohibitive duty prevents bringing into our ports the products of those people with whom we could drive profitable bargains, we can not sell them much. The consequence is that while a few thousand of our people are authorized by our Government to control the home markets for their products, they compel the other ninety-odd millions to rely upon a home market which is utterly insufficient to consume the commodities which they are able to produce, and at the same time the particular commodities which constitute the great staples of our products are not protected and can not be protected against foreign competition, so that our producers must sell all their products in competition with the whole world to the only people who are permitted to buy them and are forced to buy what they need from the only people who are permitted to sell to them at all.

The favored few are authorized by law to exempt themselves from all competition as to their products and then take arbitrary control of all the products of everybody else, selling at their own price and buying at their own price, and controlling the surplus of both. Then the Government, having enriched the favorites and impoverished the masses by the tribute exacted, levies upon the same masses taxes to support the Government, so that the masses are first robbed for the benefit of the classes, and then taxed to support the Government, a double burden and both burdens heavy. There is a stock argument always used in justification, that the duty is designed to protect American labor and should represent the difference between prices of labor abroad and at home. The cost of living is largely a matter of taste and economy, and is always increased under a protective tariff. Making some articles high by levying a tariff has been demonstrated to operate to raise the prices of all things in that particular community, even those untaxed. Besides, the old doctrine of "come easy, go easy" has full force and operation.

People who make money easily by discrimination, legal or otherwise, against their fellow-men become lax and lavish in their expenditures, and the contagion of their spirit and example spreads throughout the community and produces extravagant living; but I have never admitted that intelligent Americans are not skillful enough and resourceful enough to produce commodities of almost any character as cheaply as any people on earth. It is not so important, however, that we produce all things that we need or the world needs as it is that we enjoy sufficient trade relations everywhere to sell profitably the important and valuable things that we do produce. In fact, the protected interests do go outside the tariff wall, and in other countries sell in competition with all the world. They must sell as cheaply as anybody. They sell very much more cheaply to the foreigners than to their own people, and nobody believes, neither have they ever claimed, that they export and sell those goods at a loss.

They may not make as much money on them as they make on those they sell us at home, but I make the statement without fear of contradiction, that it would be more economical for our people to pay taxes and provide bounties or pensions for all those protected favorites, and allow them to live in ease and idleness to the amounts they make or would make on us by operating under the protective tariff, if the exclusion were relaxed so that the masses would be permitted to sell their products in the markets around the world. The other fact, which is plain to everybody, is that the laboring man, in whose interest this iniquity is claimed, does not realize the benefit of it. It is true some of the operatives live well, are paid good wages, but that is nothing remarkable. The profits of the concerns for which they work justify it, but it is well to consider the expensive means to which they have to resort to secure any fair share of the profits. They must keep up iron-bound organizations and tax their members large amounts to maintain a regular standing army of organized workers and fighters, in the shape of federations and labor unions, in order to coerce from an unwilling set of protected employers any fair share of the profits of the business.

If you will take the pains to calculate the expense incurred by the employees to force anything like justice in their wages, you will find that the amount will far exceed any difference in wages at home and abroad. If the Government is to take paternal control and support eleemosynary institutions to maintain industrial establishments on the plausible pretense of looking after American labor, then the Government ought to maintain inspectors and auditors to apportion the profits on a fair basis and see that the laborer gets his dues, for certainly "the laborer is worthy of his hire," even while the employer operates on fair terms with his fellow-men; but when he is permitted to discriminate against 90 per cent of his fellow-men on the pretext of taking care of 10 per cent, he certainly ought to pay the laborer his share. Let those who claim that he has been getting his share fairly and squarely account for the necessity of the expense and time devoted to federations and labor unions and strikes, and let them show a few examples of laborers grown wealthy, traveling in Europe, owning castles in Scotland, building monuments in the shape of houses all over the country, and lying awake at night quaking with dread of inability to spend all their ill-gotten wealth before they die. [Laughter.]

The truth is, the same callous conscience and laxity of morals, which at once are produced by protection and demand more protection, will as readily rob a man's own laborers as his neighbors. The narrow and selfish exponents of special privilege sometimes talk about patriotism as demanding the support of the conditions which I have described. I do not believe law is necessary to compel American citizens to trade with their neighbors. I believe that if the compulsion were released, and the protected favorites would show an honest and fair disposition to sell to our people at home as cheaply as they sell abroad, our people would voluntarily absorb larger quantities of domestic commodities than they do, for they would be able to absorb and pay for a great deal more, being allowed to send the surplus around the world and find a profitable market for that; and the protected favorites, through importers and exporters, on opening their own gates, would find the gates of all the world open to them, so that instead of complaining of congestion and depression in business and warehouses full of goods and securities up in banks they would find American shipping, which protection killed, suddenly resurrected, taking on new life under the impetus of fair trade conditions, and they could send all the goods they could possibly produce around the world and bring back fair returns for their own use and the use of their fellow-countrymen.

It would require a little more work; they would have to handle more goods and deal with more people, but they would make more money. Their characters would be better; their fellow-countrymen would be richer; the Treasury would overflow with revenues; nobody would be robbed; all our institutions would flourish; all parts of the country, treated alike under the sunshine of fair opportunity, "would blossom as a rose and flourish like a trust." [Laughter and applause.] This country, with its vast resources, sturdy stock of intelligent and energetic population, splendid climate, enjoying all the favors of heaven, exempt from the machinations of mean men, would be what heaven designed it to be—the home of the greatest, happiest, and most prosperous people on the face of the earth [applause], glorying in free institutions and prospering by fair and honest conduct. A little enumeration and alignment of the people concerned on the two sides of the proposition would show the desirability of the change. On one side stand a few thousand protected favorites, who claim the right to hold up all business and levy tribute on every living creature and every kind of labor and production; to increase their own wealth and decrease the labor and trouble necessary to secure their gains.

On the other side stand all their own laborers, to begin with, for they consume all their wages will buy, and everything they buy pays tribute, and is thereby increased in price without any benefit to the Treasury. The idea that they are dependent on protection for their employment is a mere delusion and a snare, promulgated every election year to influence their votes against their own interest. Under honest and fair tax laws they would find all they could do at fair wages and buy all their supplies more cheaply, be free from the necessity of keeping up organizations, and exempt from espionage, political guardianship, and intimidation. With their own laborers stand all the importers and exporters, and all American shipping, driven out of business or crippled by protection; all the merchants, who are robbed by protection, unless they recoup by charging the robbery up to their retail customers; all the farmers, lawyers, preachers, artisans, mechanics, doctors, school-teachers, all laborers of every kind—everybody in the country except the handful of protected favorites—must stop and submit to exactions of tribute, and then, in addition, find some other way to pay taxes to the Government, impoverished as they are, and their business paralyzed by being deprived of markets.

Even if it were shown that the employees of the favorites were benefited by protection to any extent, in the face of such tremendous interests on the other side and such appalling losses in the profits and business of the masses, it would be a great deal cheaper just to add the eight or nine million employees of the protected favorites to the pension roll already suggested with the favorites themselves and support them all in ease and affluence at the public expense than to allow such a pernicious system longer to prey upon the industries and commerce of the country. The mainspring, the only reason that maintains the vile system, is that the protected beneficiaries pay campaign funds to the Republican party and persuade, cajole, deceive, and coerce their deluded and downtrodden employees to vote the Republican ticket, and in turn the Republican party votes more protection. Thus the game goes on, commercial greed and political power exchanging favors until the moral sense loses its vitality and goes out of business, and men of intelligence and pretended respectability, acting under oath, deliberately empower a handful of men to rob all their fellow-citizens under the form of law.

Before going into Republican politics Mr. Roosevelt considered that to be immoral, and a poor plan for the distribution of wealth. It is not denied that for the support of government and its institutions all things are rightfully subject to taxation if necessary, but articles of general and prime necessity ought to be the last and most lightly taxed, if at all. Exactly what the revenue point is is a question of practice, to be determined by experts. The trouble with the dominant party in preparing a revenue bill is they hear parties interested for or against the duty, with no reference whatever to the condition of the Treasury nor the production of revenue, but with a view solely to its effect on their own interests. As a matter of fact, the proper question on a tariff hearing ought to relate to conditions of production and trade possibilities at home and abroad and the necessities of the Treasury, and find out approximately the rate of duty to produce the most revenue on each article, if it is thought necessary to tax all to produce sufficient revenue.

For instance, everybody recognizes that sugar is a proper revenue-producing article. It is impossible for the United States to produce what we need, but as it is a comfort to a great many people to use sugar, it is not necessary to collect all our revenue from sugar. The small number of producers of the small quantities of domestic sugar could be made rich by a great deal smaller rate of duty than that fixed on refined sugar by this bill. Millions of people could use more sugar and have it at a lower price. It is not right to make our citizens pay an exorbitant price for all the millions of tons that come in from other countries in order to pay an unnatural and artificial profit either to the cane growers themselves or to the sugar trust, the real beneficiary, which would not hesitate to rob the cane growers any more than the balance of us. The luxuries which the rich are determined to have and are able to pay for should pay the heaviest taxes. The most common necessaries, which the masses of the people must have, should pay the lowest taxes and some of them none at all. If all things were properly considered, according to the rules I have laid down, there would be no trouble about sufficient revenue. The incidental protection unavoidably going with every tax would be found sufficient to satisfy all honest men. [Applause.]

This bill fails signally, and I am satisfied that the failure is

entirely intentional. Prohibitive rates are retained, some of them increased, and other means sought for raising revenue, including additional taxation and bonds. About the only effort at a good thing is the modified and complicated tax on inheritances. It is not popular with protectionists, and will doubtless be eliminated, because it might exact some money from the favorite classes and thus offset their benefits under other provisions of the bill. For the same reason, there is no hope of an income tax. The valid and constitutional objection to the inheritance tax is that it is direct and a proper subject for state taxation, and might cause the common people to be double taxed. That objection, however, may commend it to the dominant party.

There are some kinds of protection which I favor. I would like to protect the forests, and to this end lumber should have a low rate, or go on the free list, thereby we might arrest the rapid and senseless denudation of our forests. We could then exchange for foreign lumber other products, regulate the flow of water, and preserve our rivers and streams.

The pending bill, however, makes a hollow mockery of that, reducing only rough lumber which is little affected by import duties. I would also like to protect our laborers in industrial institutions in the way already indicated, but there are many times that number of laborers in the fields and the forests and the mines whose rights I would like to protect. They constitute the bulk of our population, and, "unawed by power and unbribed by pelf," make up the large majority of honest and independent American citizens who think and vote as they please. In ancient times agriculture was respected by government, and is yet in some countries. In the greatest nations the world ever saw, which reached the most advanced civilization, agriculture was held to be the most honorable profession and was protected and encouraged. Under the operation of Republican policies our greatest agricultural products have been tabooed. They have been crushed down in our own country and practically outlawed abroad. The burdens should be taken from them. Restrictions should be taken off their liberty of trade. Their opportunities should be restored; then they would take care of their own character and prosperity.

The secret which the favorites have discovered is that if they can have all their products protected against competition and everybody else's products put on the free list their fortunes are ready-made and wrapped up in the bank for them. No competition at home for their products, all the world comes to their aid and helps to beat down the price of all they buy from their neighbors. It would baffle the chicanery of a Philadelphia lawyer to explain why cotton-seed oil is placed on the free list. It is the cheapest and best rival and substitute for butter, lard, and all kindred aids to the kitchen and table. It is said that "it is sent abroad and adulterated with olive oil" and brought back here and sold and used as the best "olive oil" obtainable. As a by-product of cotton it can be produced in sufficient quantities to supply this country and exchange large quantities abroad for articles that could profitably be used here. But the bill attempts to enforce the opposite course; it puts our commodity on the free list and protects all the articles for which we could otherwise exchange it, so that we can not possibly bring them home. If from our cotton seed shipped abroad, or from the little fragmentary cotton patches competing with us, any foreign cotton-seed oil comes here, the fair and honest course is to tax it for revenue and then reduce to a revenue basis the rates on the foreign articles for which we desire to exchange. Nor would this mean "passing around the benefits of protection."

It would be a fair and equal distribution of taxation. Republicans love to claim that protection is a local and personal issue, that everybody to whom its benefits are offered favor it, and that the infection is rapidly pervading the South. When a man South demands a tax he is at once applauded as a protectionist and the entire section derided for the spread of the contagion. We need no prohibitive tariff protection. We neither need nor demand tariff for the purpose of protection. We know that protection was invented in this country to prevent our prosperity, and arrest our commercial and political supremacy. We demand that import taxes be honestly and fairly laid, so as not to discriminate against our products, raw and manufactured.

To tax out of competition the things which could compete with other interests and put on the free list all things that compete with our products is dishonest, sectional, and partisan robbery. Let burdens of taxation be placed fairly and equitably, and let incidental protection affect all alike. We want the markets of the world open to us, and are willing to defy all competition if no handicaps are placed upon us. Eastern mills try to hedge and postpone the success of southern competition by carrying their politics with their capital when they go South, foreseeing and dreading the inevitable control of cotton manufacturing by mills located in the South.

They are not even fair and consistent as protectionists, but discriminate sectionally as set out in this letter which I read to show their dishonest inconsistency, and also call further attention to the heresy of free raw materials:

GEORGIA INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION,
Toccoa, Ga., March 22, 1909.

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a set of resolutions passed at a convention of southern cotton-mill men held under the auspices of the Georgia Industrial Association in Atlanta on March 16. We had not then seen the new tariff bill, but it seems that the things which we feared are about to be—a decrease in the tariff on coarse yarns. The South makes, very largely, the coarse yarns and the low counts in cloth, with heavy weight. The East makes the fine yarns and the high counts. Of course this is speaking broadly, for the South does produce some high numbers in yarn; three mills in Georgia produce yarns around number 80. We hope that Georgia will go further and further into fine goods and ultimately finish these goods in Georgia. We need to get further from that much talked of raw material, so when a bale of cotton is shipped from Georgia in the manufactured state it will bring a return from one to two hundred dollars instead of from thirty to fifty as it now brings in the raw. I especially call your attention to section 2 of the inclosed resolutions. We beg that you use your very best endeavors to the end that we get for our southern industries, especially the infant cotton manufactures, their full share of the benefits accorded in the new bill.

Yours, very truly,

JEFF DAVIS,
President Georgia Industrial Association.

But their effort is not necessary, nor will it be successful. Their views are entirely too narrow. They do great injustice to the magnitude of their country and its stupendous possibilities for production, manufacture, and commerce. We want their capital. We invite all other capital to come there and put up mills. We want a thousand more. We want to take down the Republican protection barrier, which closes all the markets of the world against us, so that mills in the East and the South may prosper, and in common with all other industries may realize prosperity from the use of world-wide markets. If protection does not get out of the way in aid of that consummation, the change will come like a deluge, in spite of protection. There was never a greater piece of folly than to talk about everybody in a country sharing the benefits of protection.

Brick Pomeroy wrote a cheerful lie about two boys locked up in a barn on a rainy day, "who made $10 apiece swapping knives with each other, besides all the fun they had." I have always believed that one boy lost what the other gained. Such smart boys could have made money if they had been permitted to extend their field of operations and get out and trade with the other people. To protect everything and everybody would leave nobody to rob and starve, and would consequently bankrupt and starve everybody. Successful protection necessarily involves the exploitation and subserviency of a large majority for the benefit of the few. When one set gains the other necessarily loses, and unfortunately, under the operation of protection, loses more than the other gains. The Government has nothing to give away, and when it enriches one class out of its own money, it must rob another class to raise that money; likewise, if it prostitutes its taxing function to the use of a favored class to enable that class to enrich itself, it must subject to its ravages another class, upon whom the losses falling far exceed the gain to the favorites. Under protection, the law of supply and demand is suspended, and it is impossible to ascertain the normal or intrinsic value of anything. Prices depend on artificial and arbitrary conditions.

The master, having control of the situation, prices the products of the people as he pleases. The masses, in abject helplessness, part under compulsion with their commodities for whatever price is offered. "Reciprocity" is a favorite word with the Republicans of late. In its ordinary signification it means fair exchange of courtesy and opportunity. If we had been actuated by a true spirit of reciprocity, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and all neighboring islands, as well as the Central and South American countries, would have been our warmest friends and best customers. Canada, Cuba, and Mexico would be loving us well enough to clamor for admission to our Union. As practiced by the Republicans, reciprocity is, first, an apology for protection—an admission that duties have been placed too high and must be reduced by contract, in order to help commerce; but, second, in making the alleged correction, they aggravate the outrage by making their favorites the sole beneficiaries of reciprocity. They exercise it only to make protection more profitable to their friends and more oppressive to the masses.

The States and Territories of this United States, comprising the largest and most populous territory in the world, enjoying unrestricted trade, present in their stupendous domestic commerce an unanswerable argument against the fetish or dogma or crime, or whatever you call it, of protection. My under-

standing is our domestic commerce is more than forty times greater than our foreign commerce and many times as great as all the commerce, foreign and domestic, of all the balance of the world. As there can be no such thing as protection of one State or Territory against another, commerce has run unobstructed within our boundaries, and we have enjoyed great prosperity in spite of protection blighting our shipping and foreign trade. The prosperity, unfortunately, is affected and warped by the operation of protection so as to produce abnormal fortunes in unnatural ways and repress general prosperity to that extent. That very fact is bringing people to their senses and rapidly building up sentiment against protection.

The original claim in behalf of infant industries, that being exempt from foreign competition they would grow up, become strong and prosperous, multiply, and then cut prices and cut one another's throats to the general joy and prosperity of the masses, has developed into a monumental falsehood, for instead of competing, they simply avail themselves of the opportunity, combine their capital and resources, fix their prices, discharge all unnecessary men to join the great army of the unemployed, close all the plants deemed unnecessary for their purpose, retain just men enough, and operate just plants enough to produce at the least expense only as many commodities as they can sell at the highest prices, and that is the benevolent operation of protection; but it has been discovered that conditions are different in different localities of our vast territory, that climate and fuel and long seasons affect different interests, that protection does not protect Massachusetts manufacturers against Georgia cotton mills, nor Pennsylvania coal and steel against Alabama products. In order to accomplish that, obnoxious interference must be resorted to as to labor and certain other industrial and social conditions. Besides, capacity to produce has been wonderfully increased, and it is being rapidly realized that the surrounding barrier must be broken down in order that manufactured products, as well as surplus raw materials, can enjoy more liberal conditions for general trade throughout the world.

The truth is, the increase of industrial institutions and producing capacity North and South have entirely outgrown the narrow, contracted policy of protection, and all will yet learn that, though involving a little more labor and trouble, a more liberal policy will prove vastly more profitable. Being more familiar with the great cotton staple than with some of the others—my own people relying on that entirely, and this whole country being more dependent upon it than upon any other or all others to maintain our balance of trade with the world—I especially insist that trade conditions be so liberalized that cotton, raw and manufactured, can find a world-wide market. It is far more profitable to us that it be manufactured at home and shipped abroad as far as possible in manufactured form, because a more valuable form. I would like for the manufacturing to be done in this country, and as far as possible in the cotton fields or adjacent thereto; but it is impossible, and always will be, to manufacture all of it. Some surplus will go abroad. Several other great countries depend upon our raw cotton to support millions of people and enable them to buy millions of dollars' worth of our foodstuffs and other products.

They produce some fabrics which some of our people want and have a right to buy. What we insist upon in the interest of the millions of cotton producers and a few thousand who have millions invested in cotton manufactories, is that exclusion of competition be modified, that fair and reasonable reductions be made in duties that will permit the export and exchange of both surplus raw cotton and surplus cotton goods, on which to base profitable exchange for commodities which we need, and which other people want to sell and must sell if they buy from us. The demand often made in the same breath by the same party for free raw material and prohibitive duty on the product manufactured from those materials looks very selfish, but it is quite natural, and natural selfishness, if dealt with at all by government, ought to be curbed and regulated rather than gratified where its tendency is detrimental to the general public. It would be just as fair to insure to the millions of people producing raw material a low price for all they have to buy and a high price for all they have to sell, but the common people do not ask for any such paternalistic preference. They only ask for fair and honest conditions. They complain at discrimination which waste their substance to enrich favorites by artificial means.

I glory in our great industrial advancement. Our splendid institutions, the great industrial establishments, I would not destroy nor weaken any of them. I do not think it would be right for the same Government which established conditions to induce them to enter business suddenly to destroy them by rapid and radical changes, but inequalities in our tariff laws ought to be corrected and equalized as rapidly as possible. The South has always been the victim of protection, but it has never been its dupe. Our people have always known that we were robbed, and the method of the robbery. It has always been our regret that some of the great agricultural people in the West, while likewise being victims of protection, have sometimes also been its dupes. They have frequently ratified and condoned the robbery. We never have. I rejoice that an awakening is going on. The American intelligence and conscience are being quickened. Demands for fair dealing, equal and honest taxation, are arousing the West like a moral revolution. This bill pretends to comply with a promise made to those elements, to revise the tariff downward. Usually a successful party construes its reelection as a ratification of its policy, and makes no changes, but the reformers were so hot and active after the Republicans last fall that they were compelled to make reluctant and equivocal promises in order to carry the election.

I am not advised whether or not the President regards this bill as a compliance with those promises. If so, he is easily pleased. He is renowned, however, all over the world as a most amiable man. I fear that it will not meet the expectations of those people who relied upon promises. It has been anticipated, in the best-informed circles, that only a pretense would be made, and this bill seems to justify the apprehension, to lop off obsolete duties no longer regarded as productive, while increasing others desired for greater protection; and making a great hue and cry about a reform bill really does nothing to benefit the people nor curtail the exactions of the favorites. Verily, it is giving a stone for bread and a serpent instead of a fish. [Applause.]

There are many honest people, however, who voted the Republican ticket last fall who may not share nor appreciate the President's amiability if he accepts this bill. Of course the protectionists who "stood pat" and the regular grafters who wanted patronage willfully, and with malice aforethought, voted the Republican ticket, expecting no reform.

They will not be disappointed if the bill is a sham. It was not necessary to call an extra session and enact a farce to delude and pacify them; but those who really desired tariff reform and relied on the unusual promise of reforming the tariff at an extraordinary session, which would be a most extraordinary performance by a party reelected to power, stand on a different plane; they must be pacified either by substantial compliance with the promise or by deceiving them again, a performance often successfully repeated by the Republican party.

In that connection I would call attention to the following letter, which presents in striking style a sample of many instances of outrage and injustice offered in the pending bill. If any reason for those items can be offered except the selfish desire to extort unjust profits and swindle the masses, I would be glad to hear it.

NEWNAN, GA., *March 17, 1909.*

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to call your attention to the schedules on kid gloves and linoleum in the new tariff bill just introduced and to urge upon you the importance of opposing increases incorporated in this measure. An increase in tariff on the lower grades, especially of kid, French lamb, and Schmaschen gloves, will make them prohibitory for import and will put us at the mercy of a few manufacturers in Gloversville, who will be the only ones to profit by this measure. Gloves of this kind made in this country are far inferior to the foreign-made article. The proposed schedule will entirely shut out French-made lambskin gloves, such as we now retail at $1 a pair, and will make the price on the better quality so high that their sale will be very limited. A like reason applies to linoleums, which are better made abroad. We hope you will use every effort to prevent the passage of these schedules.

Very sincerely, yours,

P. F. CUTTINO & Co.

Of a kind with this is the hosiery schedule, which is throwing into hysterical indignation the sweet and lovely comforters of mankind. [Laughter and applause.] It is said that 2,000,000 of the fair creatures will wage a crusade against high duties on stockings. If our charming sisters would broaden the scope of their vision just a little so as to extend their demands to reducing duties which prevent sale abroad of cotton and cotton goods, the cotton producers of the South would enjoy such enormous legitimate profits now denied them as to enable them, without feeling the burden, to buy out Gloversville, pension all its tariff barons, supply all the ladies with gloves free, and afford an abundant supply of $10 stockings free of charge to all ladies who have shapely diminutive pedal extremities [laughter and applause]; those with more substantial equipment, not caring to make their nether members conspicuous, might rely entirely on other charms and accomplishments for popularity and not care so much about stockings. They would, however, find consolation in both cheaper stockings and cheaper leather. [Laughter and applause.] It is said by persons high in authority that a difference of 10 or 15 per cent ad valorem

is not so important as a speedy settlement of the question, which would restore confidence and settle conditions in business.

This is a most egregious error. If protectionists so believe, let them consent to take 15 per cent ad valorem from their protected schedules and observe the tremendous impetus it will give to commerce, suddenly pulsing and swelling with unaccustomed activity, and rolling and reveling in prosperity, while the Treasury rapidly fills with revenue from import duties. The toiling millions of our country could afford to wait a few days for such a glorious change. The speedy settlement of the question has no charms for them unless settled right, so as to bring relief from oppression long suffered. Protectionist newspapers attempt to gull unthinking people by pretending that revision of the tariff downward would cut off revenue. That is willful and mean deception. Those journals all know that reducing schedules that are so high as to be prohibitory, and therefore barren of revenue, would increase the revenue, but as that would admit some foreign goods and permit our people to buy necessaries at lower prices, these papers object and try to pervert the truth. Some people want to take the tariff out of politics, and treat it as a nonpartisan question. I wish that, consistently with the truth, I could regard such people as innocent or even ignorant. A commission appointed by Republicans would first make the system worse, and then make it permanent, rendering it more difficult to amend or relax.

The Republican party and protection are so mixed up and interwoven that the party could not live beyond an election without the doctrine of protection, and protection could not survive a single session of Congress without the Republican party. Sometimes through ignorance, but oftener from malice, people deplore the South's sectionalism and partisanship, basing the slander on our steadfast adherence to the party of the Constitution and its consistent and paramount demand for local self-government and honest taxation. It is true that we are more solidly and permanently Democratic than some other States, but it is because from environment, education, and conditions affecting immigration we have a greater per cent of native, upright, intelligent, honest voters than favor most other States. [Applause.] Referring all questions to fundamental principle, we not only vote right on political questions, but present the best and purest type of Americanism now extant. Our integrity, purity, and unswerving devotion to principle will prove the bulwark of conservatism and good government, the mainstay of the Republic in dark days that may come when madness, confusion, malice, and reckless desperation destroy peaceful conditions in some regions and plague our country. [Loud applause.]

We have suffered most grievously and without provocation the shafts of sectionalism aimed at us, our social conditions, and our commercial and political ascendency. It has afflicted us with every conceivable form of insult, indignity, and robbery. We have calmly, firmly, honestly, and bravely resisted sectionalism, and for so doing have been called sectional. We ask nothing inconsistent with the good of the people of all parts of the Republic. We want no special favors and advantages, but, in turn, we object to their being conferred on others. We support the only national party ever prominent in this country, the only party that offers fair conditions and honest government and equal protection to all parts of the country alike. We do not care what you call a party. If other people prejudiced against the name "Democratic" would only open their eyes and wake up their consciences so as to cooperate with us in restoring the application of correct principles to the administration of this Government, we would, if necessary to please them, be willing even to go back and take up our old name "Republican," which we discarded long ago, though the practices of the party in power under that name have brought it into considerable disrepute. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The enormity of protection might in some measure be mitigated through some device permitting the Treasury to share the profits the privileged class is enabled to extort from the people. Fifty per cent of the net profits ought to provide the beneficiaries princely incomes; the other half would keep the Treasury overflowing with money. The necessity for further exactions upon the people to replenish the Treasury would be eliminated. The automatic arrangement to support the Government might prove more popular and even remove the system from partisan politics. For such a soft snap in perpetuity as the transferred power to levy tribute on all our people ad libitum the barons should be willing to divide profits with the Treasury. In kingly countries it used to be fashionable to farm out royal prerogatives, something being paid to the crown for the concession. If it is competent to transfer the taxing power gratuitously, it would certainly be equally proper to farm it out on halves or some other reasonable per cent. It is thought that the steel trust could easily support the Post-Office Department; the Standard Oil Company could finance the army and navy; the spool-thread trust and all the other thriving brood of protection could easily meet the expenses of all the other departments of the Government, improve all our rivers and harbors, connect them by canals, restore and maintain our merchant marine, driven from the seas by protection, erect a public building at every county site in the United States, dig the Panama Canal, in a few months pay off the public debt, and leave in the Treasury at all times sufficient loose change for spending money. [Laughter and applause.]

Let those who at first blush regard this as a joke analyze it and satisfy themselves. Those who exercise the taxing power to exhaust the resources of the people and destroy their profits, to increase their own gain, ought in some way to support the government that permits such outrageous conditions. I believe that there are some good, honest men in the Republican party. Some, even, who in honest good faith advocate protection. In the language of my friend, Hon. GEORGE F. BURGESS, of Texas:

> No party has a monopoly of good men, nor is any party chargeable with all the rascals.
>
> In that respect the chief difference between the two parties is that the good men in the Republican party are not numerous enough to control it and change its habit of promoting special privilege and serving and protecting dishonest wealth, while there are not enough bad men in the Democratic party to dominate it and prevent it from advocating popular rights, fair and honest taxation, and good government.

By the glamour of success and the power to reward, the party in power constantly draws to its standard as recruits those men of unsettled convictions and adjustable principles who are not happy nor prosperous in the minority party. On the other hand, the minority party, constantly losing members of that character, would become weak in numbers and probably extinct but for accessions from the party in power in the persons of men of principle and character who prefer right and conscience to success and power. When such recruits outnumber the desertions far enough to reverse the majority a change of administration occurs.

Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am waiting, but looking and confidently hoping, for that "consummation devoutly to be wished" as promising our first and only opportunity for reform. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether anyone else desires to take the floor. To-morrow I will try to run to 6 o'clock. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker 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 further considered the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, for a few days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. LEE, for a few days, on account of sickness in family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he is willing that unanimous consent may be granted to all gentlemen who speak on the bill to revise and extend their remarks?

Mr. PAYNE. Not quite yet. I will talk with the gentleman later on the subject.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Glasgow, Mo., against The United States (H. Doc. No. 9), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

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. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 4301) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of soldiers and sailors who enlisted

or served under assumed names, while minors or otherwise, in the army or navy during the war of the rebellion," approved April 14, 1890, so that the title shall read: "An act for the relief of soldiers and sailors who enlisted or served under assumed names, while minors or otherwise, in the army or navy during the wars of the United States of America"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4302) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4303) appropriating $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the improvement of the Kanawha River in West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 4304) to reorganize the Navy Department of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4305) authorizing the appointment of dental surgeons in the navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4306) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4307) for the erection of a bust to the memory of Charles Thompson, first Secretary of the Continental Congress—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COWLES: A bill (H. R. 4308) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wilkesboro, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 4309) to improve the navigation of the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke, and to develop water power in connection therewith—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 4310) granting a pension to all persons who have lost their hearing from causes originating in the military service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4311) granting an increase of pension to all persons who have lost the sight of one eye from causes originating in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4312) providing for the erection of a public building at Van Wert, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4313) providing for the erection of a public building at Defiance, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4314) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Napoleon, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4315) for the protection of the banks of the Guyandot River at Barboursville, Cabell County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4316) to authorize the granting of pensions and the increase of pensions in extraordinary cases not now provided for—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) to extend the pension laws of the United States to the soldiers engaged in the Utah expedition of 1857 and 1858, and to the widows and children of such soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4318) to provide for the manufacture and sale by the Government of diphtheria antitoxin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) concerning employment in the classified civil service in the departments at the seat of government—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the Secretary of War to detail officers of the army for service in the construction of good roads in the several States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) concerning permits to sell intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) to require national banks to contribute to a fund for the protection of depositors, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4323) to provide for securing interest upon deposits of public funds, to prevent their use in gambling operations, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) to declare and limit the jurisdiction of courts as to the question of the constitutionality and validity of acts of the Congress and acts of state legislatures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4325) concerning national-bank statements and prescribing the punishment for certain offenses—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) to authorize and direct the Postmaster-General to procure postal cars and contract for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4327) to regulate practice as to instructing juries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) providing for the assessment by jury of the punishment to be imposed upon conviction of crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) concerning jurisdiction in judicial proceedings—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) to change the time for the meeting of the Congress and the time for the inauguration of the President—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4331) to provide for the erection of a public building at Grand Junction, State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Durango, State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4333) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building to be used as a summer residence by the President of the United States at or near the city of Glenwood Springs, Garfield County, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Glenwood Springs, State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4335) to establish an agricultural experimental station on the western slope of Colorado—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4336) authorizing certain national banking institutions to make loans on real estate in certain cases—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) to provide for the erection of suitable monuments over the graves of deceased ex-Presidents of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) to erect a monument to Gen. James W. Denver in the city of Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Garfield County, State of Colorado—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 4799) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 4800) for dredging and removing sand bars in Ohio River near Hawesville and Uniontown, Ky., and near the mouth of Green River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) for the relief of farmers, merchants, and other dealers in leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in Christian County, in southwestern Kentucky—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) authorizing a survey of Tradewater River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4804) authorizing a survey of Pond River, Kentucky, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4805) for the erection of a public building at Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) for the relief of tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) relating to punishment for contempt in federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) to admit free of duty certain articles

manufactured in the United States of America—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) relating to punishment for contempt in federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below the mouth of Green River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments and determine the practicability of making paper material out of cornstalks and to erect buildings and purchase apparatus therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) to provide for an investigation of and a report upon the services of certain militia and home guard organizations in the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the United States to insure the lives of citizens thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4340) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Kindig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) granting an increase of pension to Solomon D. Stutz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) granting a pension to Bessie L. Rogers and children—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 4343) granting a pension to Michael P. Roehrig—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4344) to correct the military record of Stephen W. Coakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4345) to reimburse the city of Chicago for damage done the Chicago Avenue Bridge by the U. S. lighthouse tender *Dahlia*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 4346) for the relief of Theodore R. Timby—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 4347) granting an increase of pension to William Bernhard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to James Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4349) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bucklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4350) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Butcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4351) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4352) granting an increase of pension to Matthew N. Chappell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting an increase of pension to Chester A. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting an increase of pension to Olney A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to John Cotter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) granting an increase of pension to John P. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4357) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4358) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Henry Jewett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4359) granting an increase of pension to Nahum A. Kelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4360) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Lincoln—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Le Valley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) granting an increase of pension to Ethan D. Pendleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4363) granting an increase of pension to James H. Rickard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4364) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Straight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4366) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Sharpe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) granting an increase of pension to Peter Shaughnessy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) granting an increase of pension to Timothy W. Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4369) granting an increase of pension to Richard D. Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4370) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Vigeant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Wilmarth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4373) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) granting an increase of pension to Terence McDuff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) granting a pension to Sarah A. Dow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) granting a pension to John J. Coughlin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) granting a pension to Nancy A. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) granting a pension to James M. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) granting a pension to Edward Plunkett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) granting a pension to Jedidiah Wilbur—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 4381) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Schell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4382) granting an increase of pension to Pelig Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4383) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Heffelfinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4384) to correct the military record of Andrew K. Hite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE. A bill (H. R. 4385) granting an increase of pension to Robert Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4386) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon Willard Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4387) granting an increase of pension to Oliver D. Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4388) granting an increase of pension to Otho Kinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4389) granting an increase of pension to John V. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 4390) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Capen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) granting an increase of pension to Lyman M. Ramsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) granting an increase of pension to Ira B. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4393) granting an increase of pension to Warren C. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge G. Arlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Gilman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4397) granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Heald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) granting an increase of pension to Walter E. Jaquith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4400) granting an increase of pension to Jason Densmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4401) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Corey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) granting an increase of pension to Levi Witham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4403) granting an increase of pension to George W. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Gaskill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) granting an increase of pension to John D. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) granting an increase of pension to William S. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) granting an increase of pension to James Britton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia S. Haynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) granting an increase of pension to William O. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) granting an increase of pension to Laura K. Starkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4412) granting an increase of pension to Lorenza Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) granting an increase of pension to James Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4414) granting an increase of pension to George F. Edmunds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) granting an increase of pension to Reuben C. Philbrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) granting an increase of pension to William H. Veasey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) granting an increase of pension to George W. Currier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) granting an increase of pension to George Roby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) granting a pension to Mary E. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) granting a pension to Celeste C. Beattie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) granting a pension to Mary L. Bingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Worcester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4424) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Ayres—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4425) granting an increase of pension to Jeannette Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4426) granting an increase of pension to John Bridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) granting an increase of pension to Joel A. H. Buckalew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4428) granting an increase of pension to James T. Cantrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) granting an increase of pension to William Conoway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4431) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Drummond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4432) granting an increase of pension to Abner Gwinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Hardesty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4436) granting an increase of pension to David McGehee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4437) granting an increase of pension to William Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4438) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4439) granting an increase of pension to Culvin V. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4440) granting an increase of pension to Lee W. Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rains—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4442) granting an increase of pension to John S. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Seim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4444) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Shane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) granting an increase of pension to Mark A. Shelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) granting an increase of pension to George A. Shephard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stockwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) granting a pension to Martha J. Thorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) granting an increase of pension to William K. Trabue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) granting an increase of pension to William S. Trader—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) granting an increase of pension to William H. Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) granting an increase of pension to David R. Walden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4455) granting an increase of pension to Ellenor E. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Willhoit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4458) granting an increase of pension to David Work—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4459) granting an increase of pension to James L. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting a pension to Newton Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) granting a pension to Lucinda J. Carman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) granting a pension to Sanford P. Cutler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) granting a pension to Joe B. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) granting a pension to Louisa M. Ferrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting a pension to Margaret S. Griffith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4467) granting a pension to Sudie Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4468) granting a pension to Catherine Husted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) granting a pension to M. W. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4470) granting a pension to Sarah B. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4471) granting a pension to Nannie E. Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4472) granting a pension to D. W. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4473) granting a pension to Davis Woody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4474) granting a pension to Fred Yeomans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4475) for the relief of William J. Briggs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4476) for the relief of Caroline F. Eddy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4477) for the relief of Joseph Hunter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4478) for the relief of Frank Keller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4479) for the relief of Samuel L. Landers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4480) for the relief of Samuel H. Lofland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4481) for the relief of Herbert Vanderberg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4482) for the relief of W. W. Wall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4483) for the relief of Benjamin F. Whitlock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4484) for the relief of Mary E. Willett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) for the relief of William T. and Hannah J. Woolard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) for the relief of Jacob S. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of the heirs of Robert J. Allen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) for the relief of the heirs of Peter S. Clemments, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of the heirs of William F. Crenshaw, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) for the relief of the heirs of William Friar—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4491) for the relief of the heirs of Mary H. Holloway, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4492) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Hufty, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) to correct the military record of William J. McGhee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Christian Church of Pleasant Hill, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the county court of Cass County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Elijah B. Hammontree, administrator of the estate of John Hammontree, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Harrisonville, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) granting a pension to Margaret Huston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 4499) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon L. Angel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 4500) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Mater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 4501) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of the First Nebraska Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting an increase of pension to William F. Bullock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) granting an increase of pension to James G. Carnahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bricker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 4507) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robertson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Lochwitz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) granting a pension to Nancy A. Watkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting a pension to John Burton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4511) granting a pension to Lewis N. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting a pension to Anna L. Young—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of William Murray and David Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4514) for the relief of William Murray and David Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4515) for the relief of William P. Alexander—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4516) granting a pension to P. S. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) granting a pension to Samuel F. Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) granting a pension to Alexander Thacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting a pension to David Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting a pension to John Muck Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Pennypacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gideon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) granting an increase of pension to William Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Boso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) granting an increase of pension to Paul Schools—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Pickens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) granting an increase of pension to William Lawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4529) granting an increase of pension to Jessie Queen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) granting an increase of pension to William J. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Haws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Hungerford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) for the relief of John H. Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) for the relief of James M. Clouston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) for the relief of Jacob Harshbarger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of Mary A. Smith and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4537) for the relief of F. F. Morris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) for the relief of Leroy Douglass—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) for the relief of Louis F. Brooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) for the relief of Thomas McCallister—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of the Hurricane Baptist Church, Hurricane, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4542) for the relief of James M. Stephenson, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of heirs of William Douthit—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Ruffner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4545) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Parsons and Mildred Parsons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) for the relief of John Morgan's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) for the relief of the heirs of Edward and William Holderby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Ruffner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4549) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) to correct the military record of H. C. Dunkle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) to correct the military record of John A. Patterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4552) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of War Department against James T. Billups—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4553) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Shelton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Limes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) granting an increase of pension to David L. Yarnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wrightsel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to John Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting an increase of pension to James R. Stroup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting an increase of pension to John Southard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) granting an increase of pension to Madison Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to Harvey W. Shockey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting an increase of pension to John C. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) granting an increase of pension to Alfred K. Rouzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4567) granting an increase of pension to James W. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4568) granting an increase of pension to William L. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4569) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Reddick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) granting an increase of pension to Levi Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Nisewanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) granting an increase of pension to James Mahaffey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) granting an increase of pension to Emily McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4577) granting an increase of pension to Trophenius Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) granting an increase of pension to William N. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) granting an increase of pension to James Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hogendobler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4581) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) granting an increase of pension to John J. Hicksenhytzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Heiserman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) granting an increase of pension to Joseph O. Hasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) granting an increase of pension to James W. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4586) granting an increase of pension to Henry Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting an increase of pension to Vincent H. Gaskill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Fultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ehle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Julia B. Drum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) granting an increase of pension to John Detrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Dellinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas M. Crossland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Counts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) granting an increase of pension to John R. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) granting a pension to Albert Fletcher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) granting a pension to Helen W. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4601) granting a pension to Belle Speelman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) granting a pension to James Turk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) granting a pension to Theresa Kilpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) granting a pension to Charles W. Kester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting a pension to Martha M. Harrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) granting a pension to Mary E. J. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) granting a pension to Fannie F. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) granting a pension to Sarah Bray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) granting a pension to Presley F. Black—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) granting a pension to Margaret Bowser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel B. Dump, alias Samuel Brown, and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4612) to compensate the estate of Eber Currie, deceased, for the death of said Currie, etc.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4613) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bossler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 4614) granting an increase of pension to John Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 4615) granting an increase of pension to Peter McCanna—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) granting an increase of pension to Amos Shirey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) granting an increase of pension to Shiloh S. Walthour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) granting an increase of pension to William Strutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) granting a pension to John S. Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 4620) authorizing the Omaha tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 4621) for the relief of Henrietta V. Dale—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 4622) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) granting an increase of pension to Charles V. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4624) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Trotier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting an increase of pension to Charles Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to Hannah M. Rising—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 4627) granting an increase of pension to William T. Handy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4628) granting a pension to Silas P. Rainey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) granting a pension to Anna Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4630) granting an increase of pension to William Lindsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Cranston, alias John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to William N. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to Berry R. Pedigo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) granting a pension to William W. Maroney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting a pension to Henry R. Boatman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4636) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. M. Temple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) granting an increase of pension to Louise C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Meehan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Maher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting an increase of pension to E. H. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Bench—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Rand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) granting a pension to Johanna O'Brien—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) granting a pension to Francis Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) granting a pension to John H. Leslie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Margaret Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) granting a pension to Annie Gillis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to Alexander A. Garvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) granting a pension to Frederick A. Emery—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) granting a pension to Margery F. Daly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) granting a pension to Anna Mansfield—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) for the relief of William W. Stewart—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) for the relief of Joseph Manning—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) for the relief of Michael Curley—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4657) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Corruthers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY W. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 4658) granting a pension to Mary Costello—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) granting an increase of pension to James K. Lunger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4660) to grant a disability discharge to Levi D. Buckingham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 4661) granting a pension to John Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) granting a pension to Mary Petrik—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Paul—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) for the relief of Thomas Reed—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 4666) granting an increase of pension to James E. Ells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. De Pue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Foshay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) granting an increase of pension to Elmira E. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 4670) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel S. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) granting a pension to Emmett Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) for the relief of the drafted men of Henderson County, Ky., and other counties of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4674) granting an increase of pension to William F. Mozier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Sameul A. Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) granting an increase of pension to George V. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) to correct the military record of James M. Hensley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) to correct the military record of George M. Watson and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West, deceased—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STURGISS: A bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Zirkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Barrickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Joyce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Girault—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Breakiron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4687) granting an increase of pension to David H. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4688) granting an increase of pension to John A. Stuart, alias John Vanderpool—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4689) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Madden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Coffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) granting an increase of pension to James H. Michael—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4694) granting an increase of pension to John W. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4695) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Elisha A. Hartman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Wile—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4698) granting an increase of pension to George W. Chidester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4699) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Hendrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4700) granting an increase of pension to John M. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4701) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. A. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4702) granting an increase of pension to Eleam Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4703) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Tattersall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4704) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dearing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4705) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4706) granting a pension to John A. McCauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4707) granting a pension to Stocton Sponseller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to John Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Adam Minear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) granting a pension to Ella Cotterill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) granting a pension to George Sorrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) granting a pension to Edgar Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) granting a pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Charles H. Keefer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4715) granting a pension to Isaac D. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4716) for the relief of Santford Bruce—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) for the relief of Andrew J. Weese—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4718) for the relief of Dennis A. Litzinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4719) for the relief of Margaret A. Timberlake, administratrix of Richard Timberlake, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of William D. Graham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) for the relief of Edward Tearney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4722) for the relief of Edward Tearney, administrator of Samuel Ridenour, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of John Whittington—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) for the relief of James H. Hooe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) for the relief of Maj. James M. Burns, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4726) for the relief of John Edwards, alias John D. Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4727) for the relief of Joseph R. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob J. Foreman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4729) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) for the relief of the heirs of Lydia A. Hockensmith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Geaslen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Dinkle, heir of John F. Dinkle and J. Daniel Dinkle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) for the relief of heirs of James Watson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Custer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) for the relief of the estate of Henry Gannon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) for the relief of the estate of John Burns, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) for the relief of the estate of James Allender, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) to correct the military record of Urias Bolyard, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) to correct the military record of and grant to Louis F. Upwright, alias Ludwig F. Rupprecht, an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) to correct the military record of William D. Garner and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) to correct the military record of Willis B. Cross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) to correct the military record of and grant to James Irwin, alias James Williamson, an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) to correct the military record of and grant to Lieut. Benjamin S. McDonald an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of James W. Myers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4746) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Mary E. Buckey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) for the relief of the board of education of the Harpers Ferry school district, of Jefferson County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) to reimburse the estate of Samuel Caldwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) providing for the payment of the amounts due the employees in and the contractors who furnished castings to the United States armory at Harpers Ferry, Va., from January 1, 1861, to April 19, 1861, inclusive—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4750) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Godat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 4752) granting a pension to Edwin Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHBURN: A bill (H. R. 4753) to grant an honorable discharge to Theodore N. Gates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Clement Lamoureaux—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 4755) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Crocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) granting an increase of pension to William Dignin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Dye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) granting an increase of pension to William E. McCready—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Palmiteer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4760) granting an increase of pension to John Pommerich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4761) granting an increase of pension to Fred Heronimus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4762) granting an increase of pension to Richard Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) granting an increase of pension to James McDonough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) granting an increase of pension to George H. Daubner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) granting an increase of pension to John Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4766) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. De Voin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) granting an increase of pension to Edward Pfister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) granting an increase of pension to August Knocke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4769) granting an increase of pension to Elvin A. Estey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4770) granting an increase of pension to Michael Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4771) granting an increase of pension to Christian Blanke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4772) granting an increase of pension to Math. L. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4773) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Shultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4774) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dassow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4775) granting a pension to Margaret Williamson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4776) granting a pension to Elnora J. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) granting a pension to Edgar C. Sturges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4778) granting a pension to Adeline Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) granting a pension to George F. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) granting a pension to Melinda J. Perham Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) granting a pension to Mary O. Daum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) granting a pension to Adrienne T. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Battey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Wightman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) granting an increase of pension to Edwin N. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Archer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) granting an increase of pension to Melchior Hoerner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4788) granting an increase of pension to James C. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) granting an increase of pension to Carl B. Traver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) granting an increase of pension to Frank Odin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) granting a pension to John R. Shirley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Frosch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael J. Doyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George S. Green, and to allow his widow, Minnie E. Green, a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Melville N. Goodrich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) to appoint Edgar C. Sturges a captain in the army and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of Wright, Lybarger & Funk, of Warsaw, and L. Neiswander, of Holmesville, Ohio—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of many residents of Tennessee, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Knoxville (Tenn.) Lodge, No. 160, and Morristown (Tenn.) Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring the preservation of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Clinton Council, No. 83, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for legislation to more effectually restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Manufacturers and Producers' Association of Knoxville, Tenn., favoring a higher tariff on tannic acid—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Oronogo (Mo.) Circle Mining Company, for a duty on zinc ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, favoring increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York members of the American Paper and Pulp Association, against removal of duty from wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of employees of Harry C. Aberle & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., for retention and adoption of the proposed rates of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank A. Schimpf and others, favoring a higher rate of duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petitions of J. H. P. Peterson, of Maquoketa; L. M. Stahle, of North Liberty; and Theo Martin, of Bellevue, all in the State of Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Waynesboro (Pa.) Lodge, No. 731, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Marblehead Lime Company, of Chicago, Ill., for an investigation by the United States Geological Survey on the subject of lime—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Paul Taylor Brown Company, of New York, against a proposed tariff on fruit with sugar added—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New England Dry Goods Association, against the proposed tariff on hosiery and gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chicago Mill and Lumber Company, of Chicago, Ill., against reduction on lumber and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of job printers of Salem, Mass., against practice of Post-Office Department printing return envelopes free of charge—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of residents of Danvers and Groveland, Mass., against a duty on coffee and tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Paul N. Chaput, of Salem, Mass., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, against elimination of the countervailing duty on petroleum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring establishment of a line of steamers by the National Government touching all points on the Pacific coast and connecting at Panama with the Panama Railway—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petitions of citizens of San Jose and numerous citizens of San Francisco and Redwood City, all in the State of California, protesting against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of S. P. Ulch (H. R. 1964)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of W. H. Wright & Sons and other merchants and citizens of Ogden, Utah, against an increase of tariff on gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: Petition of employees of Green Bay (Wis.) Paper and Fibre Company, against reduction of duty on plain paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Brandon, Minn., against a duty on teas and coffees—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Hardwood Manufacturers' Association of the United States, against any reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain residents of Culbertson, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petitions of Andrew Corrothers, S. J. Walter, William Held, J. T. Boyce, and J. M. Cost, all of Grafton, W. Va., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Leggerman Brothers, New York, against increase of duty on chicory—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Protest of the Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., against any reduction in the rates of duty upon articles in the lumber schedule of the Dingley tariff act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Martin Jancer, against reduction of the duty on barley, wheat, and other farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of William Chenoueth and other citizens of Gassaway, Burnsville, and Sutton, all in the State of West Virginia, against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 25, 1909.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

Mr. CLARENCE D. CLARK, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of useless papers, books, and so forth, on the files of the Department of the Interior, which are not needed in the transaction of public business and are of no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The Chair appoints the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and two opinions in the cause of John T. Ayres, executor, and the Chickasaw Nation *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 2) which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

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 concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 12) authorizing an additional number of copies of the daily RECORD to be furnished to Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.