Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for a reserve in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Clooke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Paepcke-Leicht Lumber Company of Chicago, opposing reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. Murray McCallum, of Streator, Ill., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Lodge, No. 255, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a petition of local union of the American Society of Equity of Ramsey County, N. Dak., against reduction of the present duties on grains—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of H. D. Siebring and 5 others, of Holland, Minn., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Fred Frutiger, of Holland, Minn., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Agnes Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of F. G., F. A., and L. D. Wool, of San Jose, Cal., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of representatives of the entire commercial interests of the Pacific coast, for government operated or assisted line of steamships in the Pacific Ocean—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco and San Jose, Cal., against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of Saghaunuck Grange, No. 100, Ellsworth, Conn., favoring legislation for parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Somerset Grange, No. 1662, of Barnesville, Ohio, asking for reduction of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petition of J. T. Shuman and sundry citizens of Guernsey and Noble counties, Ohio, against reduction of the tariff on wools—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of National Coffee and Tea Association, protesting against any duty on coffee and tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Manchester Grange, No. 1374, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring establishment of parcels post and United States banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LASSITER: Petition of Petersburg (Va.) Lodge, No. 237, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of 900 woolen mill workers of North Adams, Mass., against reduction of existing tariff duties on woolen goods of foreign manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of C. C. Pease and others, of the Thirteenth Illinois District, favoring repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sunbury (Pa.) Lodge, No. 267, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for an appropriation to create a reserve in the State of Wyoming for the protection of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of W. B. Trotter—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: Petitions of employees of Grand Rapids Pulp and Paper Company; also employees of Ne Koos Ka Edwards Paper Company, of Wisconsin, against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of certain residents of Hastings, Nebr., against parcels-post and postal savings bank bills—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REID: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James A. Hill, heir of Jane Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Post Card Manufacturers and Allied Trades Protective Association, favoring tariff on lithographic prints as per Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Seaboard Trading Company, favoring reduction of duty on salt fish—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Bath, Me., and vicinity, and Portland, Me., and vicinity, for improvement of Bass Harbor bar and Deer Island thoroughfare, on coast of Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring creation of National Highways Commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Houghton, Vulcan, and Negaunee, all of Michigan, opposing duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *March 26, 1909.*

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

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

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain editorials from the Engineering News, entitled "The reasons why the lock plan for the Panama Canal is preferable to the sea-level plan," together with the accompanying illustrations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the matter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made any inquiry as to the cost of the illustrations which he asks to have printed?

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, the cost of the illustrations will be nothing at all. The printing will be the mere item. The illustrations will be furnished by the Engineering News, if permission is given to have them appear.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very doubtful practice, a practice that is open to many objections, to fill the RECORD with illustrations, aside from purely outline cuts that are necessary to illuminate the text. I would further inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if his illustrations have any other purpose, and if they are necessary to an understanding of the text?

Mr. WANGER. I think they are reasonably necessary, Mr. Speaker, to an understanding of the text. Many of them are simply engineering sketches.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. WANGER. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state in regard to this that that is one of the best articles on the Panama Canal that has ever been written. The Engineering News sent one of its editors, a civil engineer named Baker, who is an expert on these matters, at its own expense, and not on the ship that the present President of the United States used, to examine and report the facts as he found them on the Panama Canal, and the reasons why the lock system should prevail. I am familiar with the article, hence I speak knowingly. These illustrations, while not absolutely essential, will be of the greatest service in understanding the text. To an engineer they would not be necessary, but to a layman I think they would be, and therefore I hope the gentleman's request will prevail.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, having been given an opportunity to examine the illustrations, I wish to remark that I would withdraw my objection if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] will limit his request to a consent to have printed such drawings as are necessary to illustrate the text. It certainly is not necessary to publish a half-tone picture showing the scene of a sinking of a railway track over the black swamp in Panama or to have a picture of the Chagres River near Gorgona. There are several pictures of that character, and I would suggest to the gentleman it would be well for him to limit his request to such outline drawings as are necessary to illustrate and make plain the text.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I should be sorry to limit the request exclusively to outline drawings, as I think the photograph of the so-called "flat arch" of the old church in Panama it would be well to have printed.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman change his request, to make it a House document instead of printing it in the RECORD. It is very unusual to print such a thing in the RECORD.

Mr. WANGER. Very well, I will modify my request to that extent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania modifies his request to the extent indicated. Is there objection to the request that it be printed as a House document with the illustrations (H. Doc. No. 10)?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire whether this article is in approval or criticism of the lock-type canal?

Mr. WANGER. This is in approval of the lock type of canal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

MAJ. PIERRE CHARLES L'ENFANT.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider at this time Senate concurrent resolution No. 2, respecting the remains of Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 2.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby granted the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol on the occasion of the removal of the remains of Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant from the present resting place—the Digges farm, in Prince George County, Md.—to Arlington National Cemetery, where the remains will be reinterred, such use of the Rotunda to be for a part of one day, and to be on such day and under such supervision as may be approved by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

TARIFF.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention at this time to make a speech upon the general proposition of the tariff, or to discuss the lumber or coal schedules. I hope I may have an opportunity to discuss the lumber and coal question before this discussion closes. My purpose this morning is to talk for a short time in regard to the employment of oriental labor, and especially to reply to some statements made by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The other day in making his statement he left the impression that the evidence before his committee showed that only about 5 per cent of the labor employed in the shingle and lumber mills of British Columbia were oriental labor. I attempted at that time to interrupt him, in order that I might call his attention to the error which he had made. I was not successful. I will say, however, to the credit of the distinguished gentleman, that he made a partial correction in the RECORD in regard to the testimony of the witness that he claimed showed this, and I am very glad that he did. But the statement that he had made, which has gone out to the country, that only 5 per cent of he men employed in the lumber and shingle mills of British Columbia are Orientals, is unjust to the country, the people of my State, and to the gentleman himself. I want to take up for a moment the testimony—the witness upon which he relied when he made that statement—and call his attention to some errors that that witness made.

In the first place, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the man whom he mentioned, Mr. W. A. Anstie, whose testimony is found on page 3130 of Schedule D, did not appear before his committee. He was not a witness. He was not even under oath, he made no affidavit, and there was no opportunity to cross-examine him. Now, what that witness did do was to write a letter to one Theodore M. Knappen, who constitutes the National Conservation League of this country in himself, a man who came down here before the committee under false pretenses, who said he was a real estate agent, that he was here in interest of conserving the forests, while as a matter of fact, as I am informed, he is a timber owner in Canada and was here in his own interest and the interest of those associated with him. Now, what this witness does state in the letter written to Mr. Knappen——

Mr. NYE. May I ask the gentleman a question? Have you any personal acquaintance with Mr. Knappen?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. NYE. I do know who he is, and I take pleasure——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know who he is, but I have a decided opinion as to what he is; it is shown by the testimony in the RECORD.

Mr. NYE. I personally know him, and I have always regarded him with great respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not very much respect for a man who appears before the Ways and Means Committee representing himself as the representative of the National Conservation League and then admits that he is the whole league himself. He is the individual who formed it for the express purpose of coming down and testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, hoping thereby to conceal his real purpose. Now, I will yield further, if I have the time, when I get through. Now, what this witness does state in regard to the employment of Orientals is that in his district, in the 65 mills which he represents, in good times only 5 per cent is employed, and I call the gentleman's attention [Mr. PAYNE] that in that statement he includes 4,000 men who work in the mills and 6,000 men who work in the woods, and by law they are prohibited from employing Orientals in British Columbia for work in the woods; so, according to his own statement, he employs about 12 per cent instead of 5 in the mills which he represents. But the greatest error the gentleman from New York makes in relying upon this so-called "witness" is that the mills of which he spoke are not situated on the Pacific coast. They are 400 or 500 miles from the Pacific coast, over in what is known as the "mountain region." I was not contending that 50 per cent of the labor in that region was oriental, but, from information, I may add that I believe it is, notwithstanding the letter that Mr. Knappen filed from this interested witness.

I want to call attention further to his witness's testimony and see whether or not he is to be relied upon, even in the statement he has made. He says further in his testimony:

With reference to Chinese immigration, I would say that there has been in force for some time a head tax of $500 on every Chinaman coming into the country, and this is practically prohibitive, as the returns for the past few years demonstrate.

Let us see whether he states the truth about that or not. I turn over in the hearings to page 3170, and find there a statement made by Mr. W. L. MacKenzie, commissioner, to the governor-general, in which he says that the Chinese that came into the two ports of Victoria and Vancouver in the year 1907 was 1,266, or over 120 a month. Does that look as though he made a true statement when he said the law was practically prohibitive? That same statement shows that during that year of 1907 11,438 Orientals came into those two ports. There are only a little over 200,000 white people in British Columbia. With 11,000 Orientals coming in in one year, it does not seem to me as though it was a prohibitive law, or that it was checking to a very great extent the coming of these foreigners.

I want to call attention to a further statement made by this witness when he gives you to understand, as he has further on in his testimony, that there are but few Orientals in British Columbia. I find that Mr. Clark, United States immigration commissioner at Toronto, says that there are not less than 60,000 Chinese, Hindoos, and Japanese in British Columbia, practically 25 per cent of the population, and 25 per cent of the population of Orientals means more than 50 per cent of the men who are able to work, because all these Orientals are men. So much for the favorite witness, the 5 per cent witness, of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. He referred to none other. I do not believe that any man could have been found to testify to any such statement before the committee where cross-examination might have shown the truth.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee seemed to speak somewhat lightly, and I think with something of a sneer, of the fact that some witnesses had appeared before that committee and had presented affidavits and pictures showing the amount of oriental labor employed in British Columbia. I happen to know how those pictures came to be made. I took a trip through British Columbia last year in an automobile; and as I passed these lumber mills and saw these Orientals and Chinamen employed in all of them, I became impressed with the amount of oriental labor in British Co-

lumbia. I had never before had the opportunity of witnessing it, and I on my return——

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to say that he visited all the lumber camps?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I said all the mills that I saw were employing Orientals. On my return I was talking with some lumbermen in Bellingham; I told them of what I had seen. I suggested to one that they ought to get photographs showing those conditions; that there might be some dispute as to the fact as to whether or not oriental labor was employed in those mills to such an extent. Events have demonstrated that I was correct in that surmise. On my suggestion, and under the direct promise made to me, those pictures that appear here in these hearings were made. When I inquired what had become of them they stated that instead of sending them to me they had sent them to the Ways and Means Committee.

Now, I want to analyze a few statements in regard to the oriental labor that is employed on the Pacific coast, not the intermountain region, but on the Pacific coast in British Columbia. I am reading from the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. The first man who testified, or rather who made an affidavit and sent it to the Ways and Means Committee, was Mr. Richard W. Douglas, of Seattle. He personally inspected eight mills. He is a reputable gentleman. He found 20 per cent of the men employed were white and 80 per cent Orientals. The next man was Mr. F. D. Becker, of Seattle, a man who had had the management of three different mills in British Columbia at different times, and he testified that in those three mills 90 per cent of the men employed in the planing mills were Chinese, and 50 per cent of the entire crew of the three mills were Orientals. Mr. Frank L. Housley, of Bellingham, who has been in the lumber business a good many years, testified that he went to British Columbia for the purpose of making inquiry concerning the employment of oriental labor; that he visited four lumber mills, and that he found 44 whites and 561 Orientals. That he visited nine shingle mills, and found that they employed 131 whites and 690 Orientals; he said that one of the shingle mills he visited employs the largest proportion of white labor of any mill in British Columbia. I think this shows he was fair and not attempting to single out the mills that employed oriental labor. He found that these 13 mills employed 175 white men and 1,251 Orientals. When I made the statement the other day that 50 per cent was the amount of oriental labor employed in British Columbia, I placed it entirely too low. Further investigation shows that it is nearer 75 per cent.

Now the question will doubtless suggest itself as to whether or not there are Orientals employed in the shingle mills and the lumber mills in the State of Washington. There are 13,950 American citizens, white men, employed in shingle mills in the State of Washington and only 41 Orientals. In the State of Washington there are 110,000 men employed in the lumber and shingle industry and 1,500 Orientals. In the city of Bellingham, a city almost on the border, only 20 miles from the British Columbia line, there are 1,200 men employed, and not one Oriental—1,200, every one of them white men; and within a few miles of these Canadian mills that employ 50 to 80 per cent Orientals 4,000 men are employed in the sawmills of Seattle, every one of them white. The wages of this oriental labor, on the average, is only one-half of what is paid to the white men employed in the mills in the State of Washington.

Mr. SCOTT. What wages are paid to the Orientals in Washington, as compared to the wages paid to the same class of labor in British Columbia?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am not able to state that, because we have only 41 out of 14,000 employed in the shingle mills and 1,500 out of 110,000. I did not look into the question because it is so insignificant that it cuts no figure, and for that reason I have not investigated it.

Mr. ESCH. What is the comparative capacity of the labor?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That is what I am going to state.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did you make this statement you are now making before the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They were all made by witnesses who appeared before the committee. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin has asked in regard to the efficiency of the oriental labor as compared with the white labor. That is a fair question. White labor, upon an average, will produce more in a given time than oriental labor. The difference between the cost of production by white labor and by oriental labor is not sufficient, however, to overcome the difference in the wages; or, in other words, it costs more to produce a thousand feet of lumber by white labor than it does to produce a thousand feet by oriental labor. It costs more to produce a thousand shingles by white labor than by oriental labor. The difference as to shingles is greater than it is as to lumber. Then there is another condition that should be taken into consideration. In working in the mills there are a great many places where it happens a man is placed in charge of a certain machine, and the machine regulates the amount produced, not the man. In this case the amount done by oriental labor is just the same as that done by white labor, because the machine regulates the quantity.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows what the labor cost is for the production of a thousand feet of lumber?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would not undertake to state that from memory.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jeresy. I think it is very important. Does the gentleman know what is the labor cost of the production of a thousand shingles?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is set out in the statements here.

Mr. CUSHMAN. If the gentleman will allow me, I can state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not know it, but I have it under my hand, right here. According to the statement made by Mr. Blodel, who is one of the foremost manufacturers in our State and who owns mills in British Columbia as well as in Washington, and has operated mills in both countries, it costs to produce a thousand shingles by white labor, 55 cents, and to produce them by Chinese labor 25 cents. Chinese are more largely employed in the shingle mills of British Columbia than any other Orientals.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What is the value of a thousand shingles?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know what the value is.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What would they sell for per thousand?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. About $1.50.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And what is the tariff?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Thirty cents a thousand.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. At present?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And the proposed tariff is nothing?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The proposed tariff is the same. I want to make it clear, so that the Republican party can not escape the responsibility as far as this oriental labor is concerned. I have shown the facts. What will you do? We have always talked about protecting the labor of this country from the ruinous competition of the labor of foreign countries. We have an opportunity here and now to show whether or not we are going to back up what we have said with our voices by our votes. There can be no escape from this situation. I challenge any man who shall follow me hereafter to produce competent evidence to show that the statement I have made here is not correct, when I declare that over 50 per cent of the men engaged in the lumber and shingle mills of British Columbia are Orientals; that they are paid practically one-half less wages than American labor; that the cost of production is less in British Columbia. I want some gentlemen who favor this reduction on lumber, and who have favored placing coal upon the free list, to give me one reason that I can present to my people in the State of Washington why I should vote for this bill.

Let me briefly restate for emphasis this proposition in regard to the use of oriental labor in the Pacific States of the Northwest in the lumber and shingle industry as compared with British Columbia. Fifty per cent of the men employed in the lumber and shingle mills of British Columbia are Japanese, Chinese, and Hindoos. Of the 110,000 men working in the timber mills of Washington all are white but 1,500, and nearly all are American citizens. White labor in Washington receives twice as much wages as oriental labor in British Columbia. The protection of this white labor from the deadly competition of this oriental labor is a responsibility that rests upon the Republican party, and it is a responsibility that the Republican party can not escape.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to ask the gentleman two or three questions, if it will not interrupt him.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. What proportion of the men employed in the lumber industry are employed in the woods? How does it compare with the number employed in the mills?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think it is probably equal or a little greater.

Mr. PAYNE. Greater; and under the laws of British Columbia they can not employ any Orientals in the woods.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; they can not.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I do not see that the gentleman has any cause to complain of the statement I made the other day. Does not Mr. Anstey in his letter say that his district, which is the interior district of British Columbia, produces about 60 per cent of the lumber of British Columbia?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; that is what he states.

Mr. PAYNE. And in that interior district the number of Orientals employed is 5 per cent?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Five per cent, adding the two together; yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; adding all those employed in the lumber industry, the number of Orientals is 5 per cent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Defining the lumber industry as separate from the logging industry, no; but taking them together, he so states.

Mr. PAYNE. Did I not state to the gentleman the other day that some witnesses had appeared who estimated it as high as 80 per cent, when the gentleman said he estimated it at 50?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Then, what is the gentleman complaining about in my statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am complaining because you left the impression in three different statements in your speech, on pages 187, 189, and 190, if I call the pages correctly, that the evidence before your committee showed that only 5 per cent of oriental labor was employed.

Mr. PAYNE. Did I not say there was such evidence before the committee, and the gentleman denied it, and then I referred him to the page?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman did say that a witness appeared before the committee who said that only 5 per cent of the labor employed in British Columbia was oriental labor, and I did dispute it.

Mr. PAYNE. And I gave the gentleman the page and the name of the witness?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and I went and looked it up, and the witness did not so testify.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the witness did so testify, according to the gentleman's admission just now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will read it to you.

Mr. PAYNE. The witness stated that he was in the interior district, and they made 60 per cent of the lumber of British Columbia in his district, and that 5 per cent of the labor there was oriental labor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he did not limit it to the interior district when I attempted to interrupt him. He did put it in the RECORD, and I thank him for it. But when the gentleman was on the floor and I attempted to interrupt him, he did not limit it to the interior.

Mr. PAYNE. When I found the statement I read a sentence and handed it to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am glad the gentleman corrected it in his printed speech.

Mr. PAYNE. Did I not hand it to you?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And later, when I attempted to interrupt you and show you you had made a mistake——

Mr. PAYNE. Then the gentleman said I was mistaken about it, and I took the book and verified it and put in the RECORD what was in the book. I do not see how the gentleman has any quarrel with me as to the statement I made before the House. Whether that witness told the truth or not I do not pretend to say.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will tell the gentleman the quarrel I had with him. Perhaps the gentleman had great provocation, but I had the evidence by me, and I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this was a region that was from 300 to 500 miles from that I was talking about, and he would not permit me to interrupt him nor permit me to read the sentence to show that he was mistaken and was leaving a wrong impression on the country. I repeat that this was not a witness before the committee, and this fact I also wanted to call to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. PAYNE. When I was talking the gentleman from Washington was continually interrupting me at every sentence before I completed it, and I asked him to allow me to complete my sentence.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I do not think I interrupted the gentleman at every sentence.

Mr. PAYNE. At the suggestion of the gentleman, I left that colloquy out of the RECORD.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understand the proposed tariff, it is 30 cents on shingles in the Payne bill, and the Dingley bill also, as far as shingles are concerned. Does the gentleman want to increase that duty?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I certainly do, and I will tell the gentleman why. I made a statement the other day, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] challenged, when I said the shingle mills in my country shut down from three to six months every year. He challenged that statement, and said "last year." That is a fact relating not only to last year, but it has been so for many years. I think I would be safe in saying that for the last ten years these mills were shut down from three to six months. It is a matter of common knowledge; something that would require no evidence to prove. They close down from three to six months a year, because they can not run in competition with the shingle mills across the line because of better timber and oriental labor.

Mr. HINSHAW. The tariff duty of 30 cents is not sufficient to protect the difference in wages on each side of the line?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; considering difference in other conditions.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will gladly, if I have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield two and a half minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to take the gentleman's time. I simply rose to ask him whether there has been any increase in the shingle mills in his State within the last ten years?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think so.

Mr. MANN. During the time that they have been shut down half of the time, as the gentleman says, how much has been the increase, 100, 200, 300, or 700 per cent?

Mr. CUSHMAN. If my colleague will yield——

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will yield to my colleague, although I can answer the question.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I will call the gentleman's attention to figures that are absolutely conclusive. The basic question is how many shingles are sent into Canada and how many are sent to us?

Mr. MANN. That would not answer my question.

Mr. CUSHMAN. It reaches the heart of the controversy.

Mr. MANN. That is the opinion of the gentleman from Washington, but I would rather have an answer to my question.

Mr. CUSHMAN. If the gentleman contends that we can manufacture shingles just as cheap as Canada, then the imports and exports should balance.

Mr. MANN. I am asking for information which I have not received.

Mr. CUSHMAN. The gentleman will receive some if he will wait a minute.

Mr. MANN. But not what I want.

Mr. CUSHMAN. You will get something that will do you good. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It is like the patent medicine. The gentleman wants to give me something good, but I prefer the brand I ask for. [Laughter.]

Mr. CUSHMAN. It is a brand in accordance with the fact that in the last five years Canada has sent to us shingles to the value of two and one-third million dollars, and during those five years we have only sent $75,000 worth of shingles into Canada.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, one other matter I want to touch upon before my time has entirely expired. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the other day read a dispatch from Pittsburg showing the result of this bill on certain mills situated there. I hope and believe that the dispatch read by the gentleman is true. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. E. G. Ames, of the Port Gamble Mill Company, one of the largest concerns in the world. He is one of the best-known citizens in my State, a man whose reputation for truth and honesty is equal to that of any man in the State of Washington or any other State. I want to put into the RECORD a statement from that letter against the dispatch from Pittsburg which the gentleman read.

After discussing the question of the new bill and what the effect has been, Mr. Ames adds this paragraph:

No one seems to know exactly what to do. Eastern buyers are not buying, as they do not care to stock up on a falling market. The result is, during the past thirty days, that more mills are shutting down. The cargo business is always affected in sympathy with the rail branch. When rail business is bad, rail mills that can engage in cargo trade, with the result that both branches of the trade are bad. Shingle mills are shutting down, and in the last two weeks two large cargo mills have decided to shut down, and one which has been shut down for the past year and was considering starting up on the 1st of April is still in doubt as to future prospects and has decided to remain shut down indefinitely. With our own concern we are now running about three-quarters capacity, and we have decided to shut down a part of one of our plants, so that probably, beginning with next Monday morning, we will be running only one-half capacity.

The complaint that I have to make of this bill is that while the industries in New England, in Pennsylvania, in New York, are protected, while their mills are running and while additional men are being employed, in my State exactly the reverse is true. Out in the State of Washington the mills are closing; men are being thrown out of employment. It recalls the days under the Wilson bill, when I saw 1,500 people in one line walking through the streets of Seattle begging for work; I want some of the gentlemen upon the Committee on Ways and Means who are going to follow me to tell me wherein this bill differs from the Wilson bill in so far as my industries are concerned. How can I expect any different result from those following the Wilson bill?

Mr. Chairman, it is true that under the Wilson bill certain classes of lumber were placed on the free list, but under this bill there is left a protection of only less than 6 per cent ad valorem, and coal is placed upon the free list, while it was left 40 per cent under the Wilson bill. Will some of these gentlemen please tell me how I can go back to my constituents and, as a Republican and as a protectionist, say to them that this bill is better than the one that is now upon the statute books? Talk about protecting raw material. You talk about lumber, and the gentleman from Indiana on the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. CRUMPACKER] yesterday classed lumber as raw material.

I happen to know something about the gentleman's district, and I want to say to him that there are probably more men in my district working in the lumber mills and the shingle mills, producing what he calls raw material, than he has living in his entire district. There are more men, there are more people, dependent for a living upon what he calls raw material, lumber and shingles, in my district, than live in his district altogether. What you call raw material here is a finished product with us. You have, in the gentleman's district, protected the steel mills, but what you call the finished product there is the raw material for our shipbuilders and for the men who construct our buildings in my country. You talk about wool being raw material. It is raw material for the people here, but it is not raw material in my country. You talk about lumber being raw material, and yet 80 per cent of the entire value of lumber is paid directly in wages to the men who work in the mills.

Mr. PAYNE. Is my friend satisfied with the duty on wool?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have no objection to the duty on wool as it stands.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman see any difference between the duty on wool in this bill and in the Wilson bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I say I have no objection to it. What I am complaining of is this, that you insist that everything we produce shall be placed on the free list, or else shall have practically no protection. They are your raw materials, and you contend they must be cheap, while the raw materials that we buy from you you insist must be protected; in other words, our raw materials you insist must be cheap, while your raw materials must be high.

You want to protect yourself, but not your neighbor. That is what I am complaining about—protection in spots, with yourself always in the spots protected.

Mr. PAYNE. Again I ask the gentleman about wool. Has the gentleman forgotten about wool?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I have no objection to wool.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Lumber is our product.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We have little wool in my district.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman has a good many cattle out there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes; and they talk about hides being raw material. Leather is raw material in our country. We have a number of boot and shoe manufactories in Seattle. Leather is a raw material out there.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman just made a statement about the number of people in his district working in the mills.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman make the statement advisedly, as compared with the number of people living in the district represented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think so, if it is an average district.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman investigated?

Mr. CUSHMAN. There are 110,000 people in our State in the lumber business.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Go ahead with the question.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to know whether the gentleman had made actual comparison or if it was merely hot air.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Go ahead with the question.

Mr. MANN. That is the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is the gentleman through?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman says he has made a comparison, I am through; but if he has not, I simply want to call his attention to the fact that the votes in the two districts are about the same. The gentleman received himself a vote of over 39,000, and that might naturally give him the impression that his district had increased very largely in population, while the district of the gentleman from Indiana had not; but the fact is that both districts have had the increase in population, and the vote last fall in both districts was about the same.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, it may be true with that particular district——

Mr. MANN. That is the reason I asked whether the gentleman had made the comparison of districts.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did take occasion to look at the vote in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and I found while I have a half million people in my district, according to his report he has less than 200,000. It is probably not true of the district of the gentleman from Indiana, whose district extends up to near Chicago. It has had a rapid growth in that particular district, as I think it includes the town of Gary.

Mr. MANN. While the census returns probably are not reliable in either district, the vote in either district was extremely large last fall and is about the same.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the percentage of the vote cast in his district is much larger than mine, according to the population.

Mr. MANN. I think it should be just the other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Indiana has more people, probably, who did not vote in his district than the gentleman from Washington has.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not think it is material to this discussion; but for the enlightenment of the gentleman I will say he is very much mistaken, because one reason is a man has to reside in my State a year before he can vote, and a large number have come into my State within the last year. Another thing, there is practically no political contest in my district. As the gentleman will notice, I was elected by the insignificant majority of 18,500. It is practically all one way, and there is no great effort made to get out the vote. I happened to live in Indiana once myself, and I know the percentage, as a rule, is very much less there, because when I lived in Indiana we let no voter escape.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to state to the gentleman that there was no controversy in my district.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am glad there was not.

Mr. PAYNE. But the gentleman has compared my district with his.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I am comparing the percentage of the population as compared with the vote, and you do not have one-half the population in your district that I have in mine. However, I do not think this is material.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. Is it not a fact that the people who started out advocating free lumber in this bill asserted that there was a lumber trust in this country which controlled the manufacture of lumber, and then I would like to ask him if they have not wholly and entirely failed to establish that as a fact? Then I would like to ask him if they did not start out with the other proposition that free lumber would conserve the

forests of this country and have failed wholly and completely to establish that fact?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Well, I do not like to pass upon the evidence for the gentlemen of the committee. It is before the House. In my opinion they did fail, but I am not discussing that particular question; but there is one statement that I will make, and that was that, according to the statement of a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I make this statement because he has given me permission to do so—I refer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]—every witness who appeared before that committee asking for a reduction of the tariff upon lumber had, either directly or indirectly, an interest in timber in Canada, every one of them.

Mr. PAYNE. Did he tell you this further fact that every gentleman who appeared for retaining the duty on lumber was interested in lumber in this country?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know whether he did or not, but I understand that is the fact and I was just going to say that every man who appeared there asking that the lumber duty be retained was interested in timber in this country; and that to my mind absolutely establishes one fact, that the removal of the tariff will benefit the Canadian and its retention will benefit the American.

It seems to me that we ought not to hesitate very long when that question is presented. For whom will we legislate, the man in this country or the man in Canada; to increase the value in America or in British Columbia? The only interests in this country that favor the reduction of the tariff on lumber, besides the men who own timber in Canada, are the railroads. The railways that run into the Northwest are interested in it. They want to get lumber that they can haul from east of the Cascade Mountains into the Mississippi Valley. They can get it in Canada; they can not get it in the United States. They are very much interested for this reason in free lumber; and they are also interested in having the tariff taken off of coal, so that they can bring their coal supplies into this country without paying a tariff upon it. It is a well-known fact that some of these western railways own large mines in Canada, and it is to their interest to have coal put upon the free list.

I want to speak for a few minutes in regard to the shingle industry of my State.

I know a clamor has been raised throughout the country for the reduction of the tariff upon forest products. This clamor is based upon a misapprehension of the facts, and made without knowledge of the existing conditions. To do this would greatly injure one of the greatest industries of the country. To remove the tariff upon shingles, notwithstanding the popular belief of those who live in the East, would have the following effects:

First. It would largely, if not entirely, destroy that industry.

Second. It would increase the price of shingles to the consumer.

Third. It would lead to a waste of the timber supply of the country.

In the State of Washington there are 498 shingle mills. Of these nearly all are small and independent concerns. They manufacture $12,000,000 worth of shingles annually. They employ 14,000 men, all of them white and all American citizens. This fact should not be forgotten: That these men receive in wages $9,600,000 a year, or 80 per cent of the entire value of the output. The State of Washington furnishes about 65 per cent of all of the shingles used in the United States.

DIFFERENCE IN TIMBER.

The Washington shingle mill is the scavenger of the forest. After the lumberman has gone the shingle mill takes up the refuse, the split butts, the stumps, the limbs, and tops; any portion of the tree that will make a 4-foot stick that has been left by the sawmill. Just across an imaginary line, so near that the hum of the machine can be heard in the American mill, are foreign mills of another country, Canada. These foreign mills cut largely from standing timber. Their government requires them to buy not by the tree or to buy the timber by the acre, but only that they pay for the timber they actually manufacture. Therefore their material is better than that used by the Washington mills. It takes less sawing, less work, and less cost to manufacture a shingle from good timber, free from knots and other defects, than it does from poor timber, the refuse of the lumberman. This is the first handicap of the American manufacturer.

DIFFERENCE IN WAGES.

The American workman receives an average of $3.12 per day. His competitor at his elbow, with few exceptions, does not belong to the white race. Compare their wages with his. They receive as follows: The Hindoo, 80 cents to $1.10 per day; the Japanese, from $1 to $1.25 per day; while the faithful Chinaman is paid by piecework, receiving 25 per cent less for the same work than the white man on this side of the line. It is true, as I have said, that the white man will, upon an average, do more work in a day than the Oriental, but not sufficient to offset the difference in wages. The Chinaman, while not so fast as the white man, is careful and painstaking to a degree not reached by any other workman. The shingle that he packs is the equal of the best in the world. So, on account of the wages paid to the laborer and poor timber, let me repeat, it costs more to produce a thousand shingles in Washington than in Canada. These disadvantages make certain either that wages must be reduced and the white American must produce a shingle out of inferior timber as low as the Oriental will produce it out of good timber or our mills must close if the tariff is removed. The only barrier that stands between the shingle mill of Washington and that of Canada is the duty. The Washington mill has not a single advantage to overcome the handicap of poor timber and high-priced labor outside of 30 cents per 1,000 tariff.

CONSERVATION OF THE FORESTS.

It has been said with a great show of superior wisdom that if we buy a pack of shingles from British Columbia we save that much of our timber resources. This is far from the fact. If our shingle mills in Washington do not run, being, as I have said, scavengers of the forest, the waste which now supplies these mills will rot in the woods, benefiting no one. Not only this, but by the removal of this refuse from which our shingles are made clearings for valuable farms are begun and a lasting improvement is added to the community. Of vital importance to forest conservation is the removal of this fallen timber, which is of a highly inflammable character, thereby reducing the menace of fire, the greatest of all enemies to our western forests.

Instead of the closing of our shingle mills helping forest conservation, it would add greatly to their destruction. If this refuse material is made too cheap to be cut into shingles by the removal of the tariff, it certainly would be too cheap to be protected. Cheap timber will not lead to conservation. The thing that is conservated is not the thing that is cheap but the thing that is dear.

WOULD IT REDUCE THE PRICE?

Our mills must close or reduce wages to the oriental level, for the market is already so limited that for many years the shingle mills of Washington have been idle several months each year. In spite of the tariff the Canadian is already selling largely in this country. After the Canadian becomes securely established in our market, the supply being less, American competition being gone, the demand remaining undiminished, does anyone believe that the price would be lowered? The wholesale price of shingles has varied greatly within recent years, sometimes as much as $1 per thousand. This difference has always been promptly absorbed by the broker, the wholesaler, and the retailer. The consumer has paid during all the time of this fluctuation practically the same price. The retailer never changes his prices except in one way—upward. If the retailer, the broker, and the manufacturer absorbs a fluctuation of $1 per thousand upon shingles, the consumer getting no benefit therefrom, what reason have we to think that they will not absorb the comparatively small change of 30 cents per thousand should the tariff be removed? If not only the possibility, but the almost certain, should happen, then when we take the import duty off the shingles Canada should place an export duty on them, then we would not only close our mills, waste our forests, throw our men out of employment, pay a higher price for our shingles, but give to Canada the duty, for which the Treasury at home, fast becoming depleted, is yearning. But conceding, for the sake of the argument, that Canada would not do this, and that by reducing the American workmen to the level of the Oriental we could reduce the price of shingles 3 cents per 100, the amount of the tariff upon them, is anyone in this country willing to say it shall be done? Will anyone say that it would be a wise thing to do? A free trader may be in favor of free shingles and know the facts.

But there is not a single reason for protecting a single industry in America that can not be urged in behalf of the protection of the shingle industry—not one. There are two, and only two, reasons why any Republican who believes in the principles of his party practiced and preached from the day of Alexander Hamilton to the day of Taft should advocate the removal of the tariff on shingles, and these are ignorance and fear. The duty on shingles should have been doubled. If the opportunity is given, I shall offer an amendment to that effect.

I am a protectionist and a Republican. I believe in protection of all the industries of the country, not only my own industries, but the industries of every section. My objection to

this bill is that it is a high protective bill in New England, in many of the Eastern States, and in the Middle West, but in the Pacific States of the Northwest it is a free-trade bill.

I do not believe in placing a burden upon your neighbor that you are not willing to bear yourself. I most emphatically protest against protecting one section at the expense of another. If protection is right, then it can not be wrong to protect all; if it is wrong, let us abandon it and adopt the theory of our ancient and oft-discredited enemy, the Democratic party. Justice demands that we protect all or none. This bill smacks too much of selfishness and expediency.

Everywhere it bears the marks of wanting to protect certain industries, and in order to do this sacrifices others that the appearance of a reduction may be given. If the Ways and Means Committee could have known the sentiment of the people to-day they would not have been so fearful of revising upward. The clamor for a reduction of the tariff has suddenly stilled, as men in their sober second thought have begun to realize the paralysis of our industries that will follow. In that demand they begin to see the silent mill, the deserted factory, the smokeless chimney. When it is done and the result follows the people will forget the clamor to which we listened. They will curse us only for the result. The great criticism of this bill that I make is this: It was fear, and not judgment, that controlled its construction. [Applause.]

I will insert in the RECORD some telegrams that explain themselves:

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 27, 1909.*

W. E. HUMPHREY,
Care House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your able stand. Climatic conditions such shingle mills can operate the year round. However, owing to Canadian competition mills have been forced to close from three to four months every year for ten years past. This is from personal knowledge.

VICTOR H. BECKMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 27, 1909.*

W. E. HUMPHREY,
Care House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Four thousand one hundred men employed in Seattle sawmills; all white and no Orientals employed.

VICTOR H. BECKMAN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 24, 1909.*

W. E. HUMPHREY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Oriental labor employed in State of Washington approximately 1,500 of total of 110,000 employed in lumber industry. Authentic statement to follow. See our brief before Ways and Means Committee. Congratulations on your stand. Lumber industry much misunderstood by Congress and people.

VICTOR H. BECKMAN.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I think the people of this country are particularly fortunate in having as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] at this time, especially in the preparation of this tariff bill. I want to do the chairman the honor to say that I believe that his knowledge of the tariff laws of this country to-day is far superior to that of any other man in the country. Therefore I think the people of the country have especially been benefited because of his expert knowledge in the preparation of this bill. I have not always agreed with the gentleman from New York as to the fixing of rates in some of the schedules, but it is because I thought that he was wrong and that I was right. I have in many instances, however, yielded to his good judgment in his explanation of his ideas of the correct rates to be fixed on particular articles in the bill. I am happy to say, however, that he yielded to my wishes in some things, which I considered a great compliment to me.

If I may be permitted, I will read just a few remarks, and then I will take up the question of lumber and will be pleased, indeed, to answer the question of any man on any phase of the lumber schedule. I will give as courteous and correct a reply as I am able to. If I am unable to explain to your satisfaction any part of that schedule, I will readily yield to your better judgment and confess my ignorance of the industry.

The American people at the last election were called on to make choice between two propositions for revising the existing tariff law.

The Democratic party declared, in their platform, for an "immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties."

The Republican party declared—

unequivocally for the revision of the tariff by a special session of Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President.

And it further declared that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries, and the benefits that follow are best secured by the establishment of maximum and minimum rates, * * * the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home—

And—

the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets, the aim and purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, that security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-earners of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

The American people, by an overwhelming majority, decided in favor of the Republican plan for and manner of tariff revision. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Republican platform is our chart and compass, and I for one shall be guided and governed by it absolutely. Indeed, I am frank to say that had I not been fully in accord with it and willing to subscribe to it without qualification I could not and would not have accepted a seat in this House at the hands of an electorate whose profession of political faith it embodies. Entire frankness obliges me to say further that, in my opinion, some of the schedules or parts of schedules in the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means do not measure up fully to the standard of protection commanded by the platform promises of the Republican party, and I trust upon a fuller digestion of all the facts presented to the committee amendments will be presented to cover such errors and omissions as are shown to exist. With the exceptions I have suggested, the bill is good in that in some of its schedules, where it has been shown that rates in the present law are higher than are necessary to preserve the home market to the American producer, those rates have been cut down in this bill to the protective limit; and in other schedules, where it has been shown to the committee that increased rates of duty were required to enable our own producers to successfully compete in the home market with foreign-made products—made where wages are only from one-half to one-third as high as in this country and where the manner of living of the wage-earners is such as no American citizen who is a wellwisher of his country would be willing to have his wage-earning fellow-citizen live—the rates of duty have been advanced.

In addition to the revision or review of the whole tariff law, and the changes of rates of duty referred to, the committee has put in this bill a minimum and maximum provision, and this I regard of the utmost value to all the people of this country engaged in gainful pursuits. The minimum rates are, according to our best judgment, only sufficient to cover "the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to the American producer," therefore the minimum rates of duty on all of the products of the farm, forge, and factory, mine and mill, thus enabling the workers thereon and therein to receive American wages in their various occupations, which are from two to four times as much as is received for the same work in other countries, consequently to live better, eat more and better food, wear more and better clothing, and altogether to be better men and women than the people occupying similar positions in any other country in the world.

Also, we have made some changes in the administrative clauses which are beneficial, so that, as we believe, undervaluation of imported goods at our customs-houses will be made more difficult. Undervaluation is not only a crime in cheating the Government of revenue, but by it the American producer is robbed of the protection which is promised him by the schedule rates, and the effort of the committee is to stop this nefarious practice as far as possible. We have consequently established specific instead of ad valorem rates to guard against under valuations.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented by the committee is not perfect—no tariff ever was and, as human knowledge is limited and human judgment is fallible, I assume none ever will be—but, as I have before said, this bill, taking into consideration all the difficulties and perplexities surrounding the formation of a tariff law covering 4,000 items, to be operative upon and touching the industries and daily life of 90,000,000 of people, and excepting the errors and omissions to which I have referred and which I hope will be corrected before final passage, I declare as my deliberate judgment that this bill will meet the requirements of present existing business conditions and the expectation of the American people, and not only bring to this country a return of the prosperity which we enjoyed before the late panic, but a sufficient revenue to meet the expenses of the Government, thus justifying the confidence placed in the Republican party by the voters of the country. [Applause.]

LUMBER.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the duty on lumber. The present rate of duty collected on pine and other lumber, not

including hard woods, coming into this country from Canada, British Columbia, and Mexico is $2 per thousand feet on rough sawed lumber, and on dressed lumber or planed lumber an additional duty is added, 50 cents for each side or edge planed, and another rate of duty on lumber converted into flooring, ceiling, siding, and such like.

The ad valorem rate of duty is 11 per cent, the lowest rate of duty collected on any prominent product coming into the United States. Every man who purchases lumber and does not produce it would like to have lumber placed upon the free list. The human family are all selfish. All want the highest measure of protection to their own product, whether it be agricultural or manufactured or labor, but believe they could purchase the things they consume but do not produce, at a less price, if duties on such articles were removed. It is quite inconsistent for any man to ask for protection on his finished product and free trade on his raw material, when his raw material is the finished product of his neighbor. The tanners demanding free raw hides and protection on leather are most inconsistent in such demands.

The lumber industry in the United States is one of the great industries of the country. The production last year reached the enormous sum of 40,000,000,000 feet, one-half of which was produced in the Southern States. The market value, at the point of manufacture, for this lumber is about $15 per thousand feet, or a total value of $600,000,000. The cost of production, not including stumpage, is about two-thirds of this total sum, or $400,000,000; labor receiving at least $300,000,000 of this amount. The average freight rate on the entire forty billion is about $7.50 per thousand feet. This industry furnishes a greater tonnage to transportation than does any other industry except agriculture. Seven hundred and fifty thousand to 800,000 men are employed in the manufacturing of lumber. About 30,000 sawmills are scattered about the country in every State in the Union. More than 26,000,000,000 feet of the output is produced by small sawmills, none of which cut more than 10,000,000 feet per year. Some small towns in many States are entirely dependent for employment upon this industry.

It is true our forests are being rapidly depleted of their magnificent pine timber, and values of stumpage are increasing. The lumber industry needs protection only on low grades of coarse lumber. Our high grades compete in the markets of the world with any lumber from any part of the world, but a very large percentage of the product of the tree is low grade, and British Columbia is much interested in seeing the duty on lumber wiped out, that they might enjoy a greater proportion of our market. On the low-grade or coarse lumber the operator has the greatest struggle to realize a profit or the cost of production, and it is on this the lumbermen are making a desperate fight to maintain the small measure of protection now provided for in the Dingley law.

I am a firm believer in protection to every American industry, lumber included. I know of no reason why lumber should be made the mark for free-trade argument. Men engaged in that business are just as honorable and fair in their dealings as any other class on earth, and no man, high or low, great or small, has any license to make any statement to the contrary. If he does make such a statement, he does it with absolute unfairness and prejudice and without cause or provocation.

Under present conditions, prices in all lines of industry are depressed, none more so than in the lumber industry. No great industry can be mentioned or pointed to in the United States that has suffered more during our present financial disturbance than has the lumber industry. While the price of lumber to the manufacturer has fallen off fully 40 per cent in the last twenty months, values of agricultural products have practically remain unchanged, and there never was a time in the history of the Republic when a given amount of agricultural products would buy more lumber than they will to-day. Therefore, if this statement be correct, and I insist that it is, what reason is there in the contention that the values of lumber are out of harmony with other values at the present time?

Mr. Chairman, in advocating a duty giving a fair measure of protection to lumber, I have in mind the army of laboring men employed in that industry and the amount of the purchasing power they may have in supplying the necessities of life and a few comforts to their wives and their children. I also have in mind and give due consideration to the men who spend their lifetime in the industry and have their capital invested. Much credit is due to any man in legitimate lines of industry who acquires wealth, if he is fair in his dealings, and no less credit should be given to manufacturers of lumber than to men engaged in any other line of industry.

Some people have gone into hysterics over the question of free lumber. I want to ask any man present or within the sound of my voice if he can pick out a single prominent industry in this country that has as low a rate ad valorem protection as has lumber. I defy any man to point it out. There is none in the entire tariff laws that has anywhere near as low a rate of protection as has the lumber industry. All kinds of manufactures and farm products are used in the production of lumber in this country, consumed by the lumbermen or the people engaged in that business. Not one single article consumed by any man engaged in the industry has anywhere near as small an amount of protection as the finished product of the lumberman—rough lumber. Wheat, oats, and corn, all kinds of farm products, have somewhere from 25 to 60 per cent ad valorem protection. All those articles are used to a very large extent in the manufacture of lumber. Machinery, such as engines, cables, saws, belting, and all kinds of lumbering tools have the highest measure of protection. Every industry in the country furnishing those supplies to the lumbermen has more protection than has lumber.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman refer to the existing schedule or to the one in the proposed bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Either one.

Mr. FERRIS. I wish the gentleman would, if he can do so without trouble, let me know how much revenue the Government has received annually from the lumber schedules since the enactment of the Dingley law.

Mr. FORDNEY. I can give it to you in round numbers. The importations of lumber, which come principally from Canada, are somewhere in the neighborhood of 800,000,000 or 900,000,000 feet, and the duty about $1,600,000 or $1,700,000. The dressed lumber, such as flooring, siding, and ceiling, ready for the use of the carpenter, pays a higher rate of duty, and on all kinds the total revenues amount to less than $3,000,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. And the revenue for the whole amount imported from Canada is a little over a million dollars?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the statement of the estimated revenues, $3,650,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is what it is.

Mr. GAINES. On rough lumber, $1,700,000 in 1906.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is the amount that is paid on the rough lumber.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman is aware that certain southern Atlantic and Gulf States are interested in yellow-pine lumber. Has the gentleman investigated and determined whether the freight rates from the lumber mills in the South, in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Tennessee, are not so high as to prevent competition with Canadian lumber on that lumber coming from any of the States which I have mentioned coming into competition with Canadian lumber at Chicago and the West, and in States north of the Ohio River, and I suppose the principal amount of lumber from which these revenues were received is rough lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. I would say to the gentleman that the total production of lumber in the entire United States last year was 40,000,000,000 feet. Of that amount, nineteen billions, and about 400,000,000 feet were produced in the 12 Southern States. The average freight paid on all lumber—all rough lumber, shipped, dressed, or planed in the United States—was about $7.50 per thousand feet. From the State of Mississippi the rate on lumber to the Canadian border is about 30 cents per hundred pounds. Where the lumber is rough, not dried, it weighs about 4 pounds to the foot, or 4,000 pounds to the thousand feet, or $12 per thousand freight. If it is dry lumber, it weighs about 3 pounds to the foot or $9 per thousand feet. Canadian lumber can be taken from any port on the Lakes by water shipment and delivered to Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, Tonawanda, or any of the principal distributing points upon the Great Lakes for about $1.75 to $2 per thousand feet, whereas from the southern mills it will cost over $7.50 per thousand feet to the same distributing point.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, may I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If the tariff were taken off rough lumber and the other kinds, would not the freight rates that you have given be prohibitive, so far as permitting the lumber from southern mills to compete with Canadian lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. It would beyond a certain zone or territory; but when you get to a certain zone or point between two

great distributing points of manufactured lumber, then there is a territory along which there is common fighting ground, and in this territory the southern lumber will be met by the Canadian lumber.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me one minute more?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say that the better quality of lumber—the best lumber manufactured in this country and in Canada or in any other country—has a ready market and can compete with any lumber in the world in any market of the world.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Just one question more.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. What I was undertaking to arrive at and get an opinion on from the gentleman, who is so bountifully supplied with knowledge on the subject, is this: If this tax remain on the rough lumber at $2 per thousand under the Dingley bill, the people who are engaged in the production of lumber in the parts of the country to which I referred—the Southern States—can not compete with the Canadian lumber in the States north of the Ohio.

Mr. FORDNEY. You can not in certain territories. The best markets in the world for the consumption of lumber are the thickly populated States of Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Iowa, and those territories.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Then the tax being left on or taken off would not aid our people to successfully compete for any of the lumber trade in the localities the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not catch that question.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That is, whether the tax of $2 a thousand on rough lumber remains as it is in the Dingley bill or is reduced to $1.50 or is taken off altogether will not permit the people who manufacture lumber in the Southern States to compete with the Canadian lumber in the localities that the gentleman has stated?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will answer it in this way: The $2 duty now on lumber permits your southern lumber to go to a certain zone in the markets, and there it meets the lumber from Canada. Any reduction in that duty that would give an advantage to Canada, forces you back to your second trench, and lessens your market for your southern lumber. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRD. I understood you to say, and I think you are correct in it, that this duty does not do the southern yellow-pine dealer any good, except on his cheaper grades; that he can take the better grades of his lumber and compete with the world.

Mr. FORDNEY. You do not need it in the lumber industry in any territory in the outside world on your high-priced lumber.

Mr. BYRD. Now, the cheap lumber only costs about $9 a thousand to make it at the mill, does it not? Is not that all?

Mr. FORDNEY. That depends on the kind of lumber you are making and the territory in which your timber stands.

Mr. BYRD. You are in the lumber business in Mississippi, are you not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It costs you $9 a thousand to make it, does it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Two dollars a thousand on $9; what per cent is that?

Mr. FORDNEY. You figure it out. I will answer your questions.

Mr. BYRD. Then you are mistaken when you say that it is a less rate of duty than we have on any other product or article?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no, my friend. You can not give a fair comparison by picking out your mill culls or scoots, the lowest grade in the product of the log. You must take the entire product of the log in order to get a fair average.

Mr. BYRD. I say, it does not do you any good except on the lower grades, according to your statement; and if it does not, and the lower grade is only worth $9, then $2 on $9 makes between 20 and 25 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether it is low grade or whether it is high grade, you meet the Canadian high-grade lumber with your high-grade lumber, or you meet their low-grade lumber with your low grades, and free trade gives them just that much advantage over you.

Mr. BYRD. Still, you do not answer the question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now wait a minute. My dear friend, if you must reduce the price on your high grade to a minimum, you then incur a loss on 60 per cent of the product of your log, and you can not exist or make a profit on the whole output——

Mr. BYRD. I want the gentleman to stand by what he has just said—that the duty does you no good on your high grades.

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not needed to compete with Canada in any foreign markets in the world on high grades.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not true that the yellow-pine people and people principally from the States south of the Ohio River sell annually from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000 worth of their lumber in Canada in competition with the Canadian lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think it is. Let me answer that right here. I am engaged in that business myself, and I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] did the industry this much injustice, not intentionally, but as an error of judgment on his part: It has been said that southern lumber is going into Canada in large quantities. I say that statement is not correct, no matter from whom it comes, because there is no lumber going into Canada to-day, except on special bills, such as timbers 12 by 12, in long lengths. In Canada there is no longleaf pine, and there is no timber in the United States except Douglas fir from the Pacific coast that equals it in strength and lasting quality for building purposes, such as bridge timbers and bill timbers of all kinds. Canada comes to our market to get special bills and no other.

Mr. BYRD. Now, will you answer this question: If we insist on this $2 duty and tax on the cheaper grades of Canadian lumber, is there not danger of Canada putting on a retaliatory duty so as to tax the yellow-pine timber out of Canada, so that they will get their own supply from the forests of the Pacific coast?

Mr. FORDNEY. The great danger of removing the duty on lumber is of bringing in the competition of the low grades of lumber from British Columbia and from the maritime provinces of Canada, the low grades meeting our southern pine in Ohio, Indiana, and the territory along the line of those States.

Mr. BYRD. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will, in a minute. I will be pleased to answer any question the gentleman may ask, if I can have time to answer it. Now, in the preparation and manufacture of this lumber, such as I have mentioned, it is often found to the advantage of the sawmill men in taking a coarse log, if it is perfectly sound, to put it into bridge timber or building timber, which will admit of some coarse knots; and in putting that class of timber into bridge and building timber instead of into boards, a higher price is obtained for it, whereas if it is put into boards it goes into a low grade of lumber, or mill culls, and sells for six or seven dollars a thousand at the mills. If you put it into bridge or building timber, you get $18 or $20 for it. That is the advantage the southern lumbermen have in preparing bills of that special character and shipping it into Canada.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not a fact that the lumber association of British Columbia, one of the provinces in Canada, can manufacture a grade to compete with the southern pine, and that they are now petitioning the Canadian Parliament to put such a duty on yellow pine so as to enable them to supply the markets of eastern Canada, which is now cut out by the overland freight rates?

Mr. FORDNEY. We have many kinds of timber in this country that will produce lumber which will compete with the British Columbia timber, but as I have said, for bridge timber, strength and lasting qualities, the longleaf pine and the Douglas fir from the Pacific coast are the best timbers in the country. But when you come down to common grades, such as box, shook, barn boards, and lumber that is sheltered from the weather, any kind of cheap lumber will do just as well as southern pine or the Douglas fir.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman said a while ago that the great consuming districts in this country were the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. FORDNEY. The thickly populated States.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is it not a fact that less than 3 per cent of the shipments of lumber from the Southern States on the Atlantic seaboard are shipped into this great consuming territory?

Mr. FORDNEY. I beg to differ with the gentleman. The firm in which I am interested in the State of Mississippi shipped last year 36,000,000 feet, and 95 per cent of it went into the States I have named.

Mr. KITCHIN. But is not the market for the Atlantic seaboard States in the South, New England, the State of New York, and part of Pennsylvania and West Virginia?

Mr. FORDNEY. The market for southern lumber is in the North. You have nothing to the south but the Gulf of Mexico. The amount of lumber consumed in the South—in the warmer climates, where people do not build as good houses to live in as they build in the colder climates, they do not consume the amount of lumber per capita that the people do in the colder countries.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman does not catch the point of my inquiry. Do the shipments of lumber from the States of Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia, that go into the great consuming States mentioned by you—Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and other Western States—amount to more than 3 per cent of their output?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it is much larger. The great portion of the product goes north; I know it is so from our mill.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman says that in the high grade of timber there is no need of protection. I agree with him. But what does he mean by low grades, and what prices do they bring f. o. b. at the mill? I recollect that it was stated before your committee that this low grade of lumber is lumber that sells for $6 to $8.

Mr. FORDNEY. The distinction between high and low grade lumber is this, especially in the South, in the longleaf yellow-pine belt and the shortleaf pine belt of the South. The usual number of logs cut from each tree—say, 12, 14, or 16 feet in length, which are standard lengths—are about four logs to the average tree. The average height of the body of a tree is from 50 to 60 feet. There is one log in every tree fallen—and that is the top log, among the limbs—that makes coarse boards when cut into lumber. So that in all cases the top log in every tree, and many times the second log from the top, has limbs and knots in it, and the lumber cut from those logs is the low-grade coarse lumber.

The high-grade lumber is that portion of the tree from the first or second logs in the tree, which is free from defects such as knots or ring rots, or, as lumbermen call it, "punk knots."

Mr. KITCHIN. And that same kind of grade, low grade and high grade, pertains to the log of the tree in Canada just the same as in the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, anywhere in the country. Now, my friend, the difference as to the price of your lumber depends on whether or not you can take the log from the woods, convert it into lumber and finish it, and put it on board of cars at a profit, or whether it pays you to leave that coarse log in the woods.

When the price of your low-grade lumber is so low, $5, $6, $7, $8, or $9 per thousand, when put on cars at your mill, it will cost that much money to take the log from the woods and convert it into lumber and put it on the cars. Unless you can see some profit in it you are going to leave it lie where the tree has fallen in the woods, and therefore, instead of conserving your forests, you abandon the coarse logs in the woods and deplete your forests by leaving 20, 25, or 30 per cent of the forest lying in the woods for the fire to destroy.

Mr. KITCHIN. If this class of lumber which the gentleman speaks of as low grade will net at the mill f. o. b. from $10 to $12, the gentleman does not think that will need any protection, does he?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that every piece of the tree, if it is no bigger than a match, is entitled to protection, no matter what grade it is. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Will this bill or does the Dingley bill protect this low-grade stuff that will net $12 f. o. b.?

Mr. FORDNEY. It gets a fair measure of protection, but not as much as I would like.

Mr. KITCHIN. If, however, it nets from $7 to $8 at the mills, this protection is about 25 or 30 per cent ad valorem, is it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not say net. I said the cost of production, figuring nothing for the stumpage—the timber, the price you pay for it in the woods.

Mr. KITCHIN. You misunderstood the question. If your low grades net, selling price f. o. b. at the mill, from $6 to $8, then the ad valorem tariff now is about 25 or 30 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; on your low grades it is high, but how about your white pine that sells as high as $70 per thousand? What is the ad valorem there?

Mr. KITCHIN. It would be about 3 per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you pick out low grades and measure the ad valorem as against the entire product of the log, why, when sorting beans, do not you put the duty on the hand-picked beans, and not on the beans that go to Boston for baked beans?

Mr. KITCHIN. I understood the gentleman to say that the high-grade lumber needs no protection.

Mr. FORDNEY. In the foreign markets of the world we can compete with any lumber from any country in the world. That is the position.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is it not a fact that we export of boards and deals and low grades and high grades——

Mr. FORDNEY. No.

Mr. KITCHIN. Wait a minute. Do we not export twice as much as we import from every country in the world of that same class of stuff that we import?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know of any exports of low-grade lumber from any part of the United States.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is it not a fact that last year we exported of the very kind of lumber, planks, board, and deals, rough and planed, more than twice as much as the whole outside world imported into this country?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have no doubt that that statement is correct.

Mr. KITCHIN. And of the same class of material.

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait; let me answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman can stand here and ask me questions all day, and I will answer them courteously, but let me have time to answer them. Now, I say this: That we export our high grades, and in the foreign markets meet the lumber from any country in the world. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] stated the other day that our exports from the Pacific coast far exceeded that from British Columbia, when it had been stated that it cost less money to produce lumber in British Columbia than it does in the great States of Washington, Oregon, and California. Let me tell you why that is true. He is correct in that statement, but it needs an explanation.

Only the high grades are exported. No sawmill man in the world can run steadily day after day and cut up the product of the log and pile up in his yard the low-grade lumber without any market for it and continue to export his high grades, and the British Columbia exporting market is limited absolutely by the market she has for her low grades; and she has been here this winter, through representatives of British Columbia ownership in timber, demanding that the tariff wall of $2 per thousand be taken down, so that they can enjoy the markets of the United States for their low grades, and thereby increase their export on their high grades. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I want to ask the gentleman, speaking about zones, if it is not an indisputable fact that—as to southern lumber, and especially as to the lower grades of southern lumber—the lumbermen of North Carolina, Georgia, and the other Southern States do market their lumber in the markets of New York and Pennsylvania in competition with Canada?

Mr. FORDNEY. Very little, indeed, sir; because the freight is prohibitive. Now, let me say something about freights——

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. One minute. My information is that the lumbermen of North Carolina—and I take it also of other Southern States—do market their lumber, both the low grades and the high grades, in the markets of Pennsylvania and New York. That is my information.

Mr. FORDNEY. Canada, you say?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. No; I said in competition with Canada. I will repeat my question if necessary, but I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps I understood your question, and if so I will answer, and if I did not you can ask me again. Low-grade lumber from southern mills comes in competition in the States of Pennsylvania and New York with the low-grade lumber of many varieties of timber, such as hemlock and hardwoods of all kinds. Hemlock, no matter where it is marketed, is low-grade lumber, and sells in connection with the low grade—from 30 to 40 or 50 per cent—of the product of the longleaf pine of the South, and you must meet that competition and a high rate of freight when you get into other territory; and the low-grade pine coming from Canada and the hemlock produced over there meets those low grades in these great consuming States, and therefore the competition is very keen and the profit exceedingly small, if any at all.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. That is exactly the point I was making. The lumber cut, according to the figures of 1906, in North Carolina, was worth $20,000,000. The lumber cut of the whole South is about one-half the product of the country. Now, my information is that the lumber of my State—and, I take it, of other Southern States—is marketed in the markets of New York and Pennsylvania, in that competitive zone to which the gentleman refers, and it is now marketed there and comes in competition with Canadian lumber. I am not speaking of any shipments into Canada. Now, one further question: Allusion has been made here to low grades of lumber. I think I understand fully what the gentleman means by the low grades——

Mr. FORDNEY. Coarse lumber.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Yes; I am talking about the rough or coarse lumber of the lower grades. As has been stated on the floor, southern yellow pine can compete with the world, but is it not a fact that within the last decade the low grades of lumber, Nos. 2 and 3, have been most largely manu-

factured in the South, and that the southern mills have gone largely into the manufacture of low grades of lumber? Is that the fact or not?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is the fact in many cases, let me say, gentlemen. The only men appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means and advocating a reduction of the duty or a removal of the duty on lumber were from a little territory in the State of Minnesota, and I want to tell you about that before I go further in answering those questions.

There came before our committee, and I will be plain and mention their names, a man by the name of Knappen, and, I believe he is in the city, and I hope he is in the gallery to hear what I have to say. There came with him a Mr. Lynch, who is well known to gentlemen from Minnesota as the campaign manager of Governor Johnson of that State, an elegant gentleman. There came with him a man by the name of Rogers, a lumberman, and another gentleman by the name of Scanlon. Mr. Scanlon and his associates have large lumber holdings in the State of Louisiana. Those gentlemen advocated a removal of the duty on lumber.

Mr. Knappen, a young gentleman who prepared a magnificent paper and presented it to the committee, was the spokesman of the crowd. He represented himself to be the secretary of the Great Northwestern Conservation Association. I asked Mr. Knappen who the men were that made up the association. He smiled and said, "I am principally it."

It developed, however, that Mr. Knappen was here as the representative of the other gentlemen whose names I have mentioned. I remember Mr. Rogers in particular advocating the abolition of the duty on imported lumber; and he stated, as I now remember it, that the consumer would get the benefit of a reduction, but that the yard dealer would be benefited in that $2 reduction by the fact that he would have less money invested in his stock of lumber in the yard, and therefore his investment would be less, his insurance would be less, and his risk in every respect would be less, but that the consumer would get all the reduction. Now, let me tell you, gentlemen, I believe Mr. Knappen would not know a sawmill if he met it in the road. [Laughter.] He never was a manufacturer of lumber, and admitted that fact to the committee. I say that he was the spokesman for the other gentlemen. Mr. Scanlon, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Lynch all admitted they had exceedingly large holdings of timber in British Columbia and were manufacturing in British Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, did not those men testify that they owned timber both in Canada, or both in British Columbia and the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Scanlon did, and I have just stated that he owned timber in Louisiana. A few days later a Mr. Bloedel, a lumber manufacturer living in the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], at Bellingham, came across the country to Washington to request the retention of the duty on lumber, because he is in the business and interested. On his way—at Minot, N. Dak.—a Mr. Murphy, whose letter I hold in my hand, got on the train with Mr. Bloedel, and in a conversation the question of the tariff came up. Mr. Murphy said that there was one thing in the tariff bill that he wanted to see put on the free list, and that was lumber. Mr. Bloedel stated:

> That is the one thing that I do not want to see put on the free list.

Murphy said:

> If you had my end of the string you would want to see free lumber. I am a farmer, living at Minot, N. Dak. I own some farms about there, and in the last few years have been putting up some buildings. I placed an order with a lumber yard at Minot, N. Dak., the other day for eleven hundred dollars' worth of lumber, and I paid $24, $26, and $28 per thousand feet for bill and dimension stuff, barn boards, and so forth, and it is too high.

Bloedel said to him:

> What did you pay for those same grades two years ago, my friend? Absolutely the same price, sir—

He replied.

Mr. Bloedel then turned to him and said:

> My friend, let me tell you something. I know who you bought that lumber from. His name is Rogers, is it not?
>
> Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. BLOEDEL. Mr. Rogers is to-day buying these grades of lumber at from $5 to $8 per thousand feet less than he did eighteen months ago, and he is charging you the very same price per thousand feet you paid him when he paid a lower wholesale price for it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. FORDNEY. This is the gentleman, Mr. Rogers, that came before our committee and said that the consumer would get the benefit of the reduction of the duty. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I hold in my hand a statement prepared and presented to me after a thorough investigation, I am told, and I will show you to what extent Mr. Rogers is interested in lumber yards in North Dakota, the gentleman who wanted free trade on lumber and said the consumer would be benefited by the removal of the duty. He is interested in and I am told is the president of four companies—the Rogers Lumber Company, the Meyers Lumber Company, the Longworthy Lumber Company, and the Phoenix Lumber Company—which companies have 99 retail yards in that country. In 54 out of 74 towns they own 1 yard; in 18 towns they own 2 yards; and in 2 towns they own 3 yards, and absolutely monopolize the retail lumber industry in that region.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me finish this statement. That gentleman is manufacturing lumber in British Columbia, and he is exacting from the Dakota consumer the same price to-day, $7, $8, and $10 profit above that which he received when the lumber industry was in its prime two years ago. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman know whether Mr. Rogers has the retail price of his lumber fixed by an association with headquarters in St. Louis, Chicago, or somewhere else, as I have been informed is done for retailers in the State of Texas?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Pinchot, of the Forestry Department, came before our committee, and while we know that that department of justice has for two or three years been investigating, if I have it correct, have had at their disposal and spent about $500,000 of the Government's money trying to find and locate a lumber trust, admitted before the committee that he had not been able to find one anywhere. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have my information from lumber people in Texas that prices were fixed for our section of the country in St. Louis, and I know of numerous instances reported by reliable people charging that the price of lumber is fixed for them there, and that the retail dealers do not dare to depart from the schedule so fixed.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit a correction? The gentleman states that Mr. Pinchot has been making investigation as to whether there was a lumber trust. No investigation has been made by Mr. Pinchot through the Forestry Service, but by the Bureau of Corporations.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, the gentleman may be correct. I think he is. Mr. Pinchot has access to the facts obtained by the investigation, and he has at his disposal all the information gathered by the Government. Now I am going to answer this gentleman as to the existence of a lumber trust. I have been in the lumber business since I was a boy and I have never known in that business any such thing to exist, and it is pretty certain that I would have known something about it if it had existed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Rockefeller has the same sort of ignorance with reference to an oil trust.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do not class me with Rockefeller. I hope the gentleman does not dispute the correctness of my statement.

Mr. SLAYDEN. You have just said that Rogers himself had a monopoly and controlled the trade.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, suppose you had a peanut stand and there was nobody else had one, you would have a monopoly of the business, would you not? [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do you not know that the price of lumber is fixed by associations throughout the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not. There is no such thing in this country, and I defy the gentleman to furnish any reliable proof of his assertion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have at least been told that it was so.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I have been told that there is a hell and a heaven, but I have never been there. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have been told so by a number of people, and if the gentleman will be courteous and patient——

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly I will.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have been told so by a man who is the owner of standing timber, who is a manufacturer of lumber in the State of Louisiana, who is a wholesale dealer in lumber in Texas; and, furthermore, he wrote me the other day that, in the interest of the people, I ought to vote for free lumber and free coal. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be courteous with you, my friend; and let me say to you that if you will request that fellow to come forward with his proof of a combination, and if he furnishes the proof, I will show you a white blackbird. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think it very likely they cover their tracks so that you can not get witnesses; but that it exists is a matter of common knowledge.

Mr. HARDY. I buy lumber, and we have retail lumber dealers in my town. I had one of those gentlemen come to me for the purpose of investigating this question of the lumber trust. He showed me circular price lists issued from a syndicate in St. Louis, by the month, and told me that every mill in south Texas that he went to had that circular price list, and he had to buy his lumber at those prices, and I have those circular price lists in my office to-day. It is simply a pricing machine, or combine or trust, or call it what you will; but it makes the market price. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, let me answer that.

Mr. HARDY. And those prices are made from year to year and month to month.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me answer your question. I will repeat that I have been in the lumber business since I was a boy, and I hope to remain in that business until I die, because I do not know anything about any other line of business; but I will demand from the people to whom I sell lumber the best price I can obtain, but deal fair with them.

Mr. HARDY. Very well. Will you combine with all the other lumber producers to fix the price?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I never did and never will.

Mr. HARDY. And if you do combine——

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it would be unjust. I do not think it ever has been or ever will be done. I will tell you why it has not. In the United States there are to-day about 30,000 sawmills, and out of the 40,000,000,000 feet of lumber cut last year 26,000,000,000 feet were cut by small sawmills, none of which cut more than 10,000,000 feet in any one year. [Applause.]

Now, in the face of that fact, will you say there is a lumber trust among the manufacturers of lumber? I am not a retailer of lumber. I am a manufacturer, and I know of no combination, and there is none in existence, and I defy any man to come forward with proof to the contrary.

Mr. HARDY. Then, I ask you, how do you account for this price list coming from St. Louis? What would you call proof?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I never was in St. Louis but once in my life, and I do not know anything about the retail trade there.

Mr. HARDY. But this is the retail trade in Texas—with prices fixed at nearly all the mills there by a mill men's syndicate in St. Louis.

Mr. FORDNEY. And I am not at all concerned in it, in my remarks, because I am ignorant of the conditions existing there.

Mr. HARDY. But I am asking you about this circular that goes down to southeast Texas and fixes the price of our lumber there for the mills in southeast Texas—fixes the price at the mills for the retail dealer in lumber. I have not only the word of one retailer but of more than one retailer who showed me these circulars, and my own personal inspection of these monthly circulars. How do you account for that, if there is no agreement—no gentleman's agreement or trust in lumber? It may not be a trust, but it makes a noise just like one.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know anything about your circulars. I have a circular here which I want to explain to the House.

Mr. HARDY. Those are the facts anyhow.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to say that while some circulars may be unreliable, I want to show you how unreliable this one is, and it has the name of my friend Mr. Knappen attached to it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute, and I will yield.

Mr. GAINES. Before my colleague goes on may I ask this question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Have you stated that Mr. Pinchot testified before our committee that he had been for several years looking for a lumber trust and could not find one and did not believe that it existed in the country?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; he did so state. Now, my friend, let me state this, and then I will answer your question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOUTELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be allowed to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be allowed to proceed until he completes his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. There ought to be some limit on the time.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman knows that I am answering questions. There are several other things I want to speak about besides lumber. I am endeavoring to answer all questions courteously, and all I ask is sufficient time, but I do not want to take up more time than the patience of the House will accord to me.

Mr. MANN. Has the matter of time been closed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair submitted the request and announced that there was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I did not hear the Chair. It seems to me there ought to be some limit of time where it is purely asking questions. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one hour.

Mr. GAINES. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has already granted the gentelman time to complete his remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask a question in connection with the one asked by the gentleman from West Virginia: Is it not also true that after we got through with these hearings it was announced in the public press that Mr. Weyerhauser and Mr. Walker and others were down here at the New Willard Hotel forming a lumber trust?

Mr. FORDNEY. I saw it in the papers the other day that King Edward was having an operation for appendicitis, but I do not know anything about the truth of the statement. [Laughter.] I will be courteous to the gentleman from Missouri. Mr. Walker was here in November or December. I know also that Mr. Weyerhauser, junior, was here, but Mr. Weyerhauser, senior, has not been here to my knowledge this winter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that, because he is sick.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman, Knappen, the only man representing the only interest here asking for free trade on lumber, as an American citizen demanding protection for the consumer, whose sole interest seems to be in the consumer, has sent out a circular published in the American Lumberman, and I want to call attention to it.

Mr. Scanlon, from Minneapolis, of the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Company, and Theodore Knappen, as secretary of a timber-holding company of British Columbia, say they have recently purchased 1,500,000,000 feet of standing timber, which I know can be purchased for from 50 to 75 cents per thousand feet, have offered for sale stock in that company, capitalized at $6,000,000—I say, they offer to dispose of the stock of their company to American citizens, which means, at this price, $4 per thousand on the billion and a half feet. That is the class of men that have been here asking for a reduction of the duty on lumber. If we have to go to British Columbia or England to get the opinion of King Edward or to the Czar of Russia as how to make up the schedules in the tariff bill, where does the wisdom of the members of the committee and this House come in?

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Since the gentleman has referred to Mr. Murphy, of my State, whom I know very well, I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true, or if he knows anything to the contrary, that lumber is now being sold at retail in the State of North Dakota by the Retail Lumber Association?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have not the slightest idea of any such thing; I never heard of it. I have Mr. Murphy's letter with the figures stating the price he paid, and it was given to Mr. Blaudell on the train. I have repeated just what he stated; and if the gentleman knows him, I ask him for the integrity of Murphy as a gentleman.

Mr. GRONNA. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that I have been a retailer of lumber and have sold a great deal of it, and the price is regulated absolutely by the Minneapolis association. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Association of what?

Mr. GRONNA. Association of lumbermen.

Mr. FORDNEY. Producers of rough lumber or retailers that fix the price to the consumer? Will the gentleman be fair? I am pleading for the protection of rough lumber, and I know nothing about the retail business. Tell me whether or not that association is an association of manufacturers of rough lumber or a retail association.

Mr. GRONNA. If the gentleman will permit me, I will explain. The people of my State—I can not answer the question by yes or no—the people of our State have demanded free lumber, for they believe that by having free lumber it would be sold considerably cheaper than it now is. Of course, that is a ques-

tion we can not now decide. But the retailers of the State of North Dakota, the individual retailers, are being driven out of business.

Mr. FORDNEY. By whom?

Mr. GRONNA. By these associations.

Mr. FORDNEY. Who makes up the associations?

Mr. GRONNA. I could give the gentleman the names if he would give me the time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Tell me who they are, if you know; and if you do not know, say so.

Mr. GRONNA. Some of them are manufacturers.

Mr. FORDNEY. Who are they?

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Michigan permit me to ask the gentleman from North Dakota a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Dakota if it is not a fact that the price he speaks of being fixed by an association in Minneapolis is not fixed by a retail lumber dealers' association; and is not this also the fact, or was it not the fact only a short time ago, that that association parcels out the territory in which the local retail dealer may sell lumber, and that if the manufacturer in Minneapolis sells direct to the consumer within that territory he is either blacklisted or must pay to the local dealer 10 per cent of the amount of the cost of the lumber sold by the manufacturer to the consumer?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if I may have permission to answer that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman——

Mr. GRONNA. But I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FORDNEY. I refuse to yield any longer. I am going to answer the gentleman. Gentlemen come here with generalities, but I wish to say to them to bring their proof, and if they know of any such thing they ought to do it. You have had for three months the oportunity to furnish the proof, and why do you not present it. Do not deal in generalities.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman need not address his remarks to me. I was talking about a retail lumber dealers' association. I do not know that there is a combination among the manufacturers.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen should not attempt to prejudice the Members of this House with generalities without the facts.

Mr. GRONNA. But I know personally of the facts. I have been a retail lumber dealer.

Mr. FORDNEY. What proof has the gentleman?

Mr. GRONNA. I know of my own knowledge.

Mr. FORDNEY. Bring the proof in here. I refuse to answer any further questions of that character, because the gentleman only makes statements. Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. But the gentleman has just laid down a condition that I can not possibly comply with.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman's inquiry is along the same line as the others, there is nothing to it except to prejudice some man within the sound of his voice without furnishing proof.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to put the question and let us see? The gentleman has yielded to me three or four times for a question, and then has turned his back on me and declined to hear it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can ask his question without complaining about it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am addressing my remarks, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Michigan, and not to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. That is very fortunate.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And, Mr. Chairman, I appeal for protection from the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. And I hope the gentleman from Michigan will appeal for protection from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who unfortunately has lost his temper although he is one of the most genial Members of the House.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the privilege, and invariably addressed the Chair, and I have not injected my questions into a conversation between other Members.

Mr. FORDNEY. Please ask the question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is a significant and suspicious circumstance when all the retail dealers in a particular commodity make a uniform price throughout a large given territory, and when that is further confirmed by credible and respectable people with the statement that the prices are named by the lumbermen's association in St. Louis, and does not that make what we speak of as a trust?

Mr. FORDNEY. Good God, I have explained that in the plainest way, in my opinion, that it could be explained. Here is Rogers, a lumber trust within himself.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And there is another one in St. Louis, and that makes two.

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute. Do you blame the manufacturer in Mississippi for what Rogers is doing in North Dakota?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; but I blame the manufacturer who associates himself with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do not go too far. Do not come here and criticise a manufacturer of rough lumber in Mississippi, or in any other State, for what the retailer is doing in North Dakota. I know nothing about their associations, and the manufacturers of rough lumber are in no way responsible. I shall not answer any more questions along that line, because gentlemen do not furnish the proof.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit a slight interruption right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; and then I must go on.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman denies that there is a trust. Is it not a fact that most or a larger portion of the standing timber in this country is in the hands of a very few people?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; it is not.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will ask the gentleman——

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute. It was stated before the Committee on Ways and Means that those great timber holdings of the country amounted to about 2 per cent of the standing timber of the United States. I know, my friend, that some men do have large holdings of timber; and, so help me God, if I had the money I would be one of them, and I ought not to be criticised for it, either. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Just one more question, so as to jog up the gentleman's memory. Did not you state in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee that most of the profit arising under the protective tariff was made by the stumpage men, and that the stumpage of the United States had gone into "strong hands?" Did not you use that language?

Mr. FORDNEY. I might have, but not just in the same line in which the question of the gentleman has been put.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman please explain what he meant by the timber holdings going into "strong hands?"

Mr. FORDNEY. Men who are able to hold and demand such a price as will bring to them a fair return or profit on their investment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Another question right there——

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I am not going to answer any more such questions. If you will ask me a question for information, I will answer it, but I do not want you to take any more of my time in this way. I will be courteous, but do not be afraid that I am alarmed about any question you may ask me, for I can answer the gentleman correctly and will answer it without fear.

Mr. KITCHIN. I believe the gentleman will. Will you permit one question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Speaking about large stumpage holders, you attended the recent lumber banquet at the New Willard Hotel?

Mr. FORDNEY. No, sir; I did not.

Mr. KITCHIN. You read the speeches.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I did not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Have you not heard that Mr. Skinner, the chairman of a committee sent to Washington by the Pacific Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, stated in his speech there that half of the standing timber of this country was in the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, and 90 per cent of that half was in the hands of a few individuals and corporations?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know that Mr. Skinner made any such statement. If he did, I think it is entirely incorrect, because I know better. I know as much about the business as Mr. Skinner, because I have been in the business since before he was born.

Mr. KITCHIN. He is a larger lumber operator than you are——

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps he is.

Mr. KITCHIN (continuing). And a strong protective tariff advocate?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; he is a splendid fellow and saturated with the same theory of Republican principles that Mr. CLARK said I possessed, and I am proud of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then you would not mind his statement going in the RECORD that 90 per cent——

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I did not say anything of the kind. I admire Mr. Skinner for his advocacy of the protective tariff

to American industries; that is what I said. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I want to emphasize this question about a trust before the gentleman leaves it. If I understand it correctly, there are over 28,000 mills in this country manufacturing lumber.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. There are a great many of them in my district. I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be practically impossible to get 28,000 manufacturing corporations to go into any trust; if it is not as nearly impossible as it is to get the cotton producers of the South to go into a trust to raise the price of cotton, which certain people down there have tried to do and have failed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Certainly there is no such thing as a lumber trust. It may be that certain men in the retail business, in local territories, combine to control prices to the consumer. I do not know anything about it. I have often heard it is so, but whether it is true or not I do not know; but I do know in general that the manufacturer of rough lumber, the man who takes the tree from the forest, who converts it into lumber and puts it on the market, knows no trust and never did, to my knowledge, in the United States.

Mr. BYRD. I want to ask the gentleman a question in regard to a lumber trust. Is there not an understanding in Mississippi among the sawmills and retail dealers, your mill being one of the manufacturing establishments of the State, that if a manufacturer of lumber sells directly to the consumer that the retailers will boycott his mill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Nothing of the kind. It is absolutely buncombe.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say here that I know absolutely of what I speak.

Mr. FORDNEY. I say that you do not know a blamed thing about it.

Mr. GARRETT. I call the gentleman to order, Mr. Chairman. I demand that his words be taken down.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say to you that if I have used strong language, unbecoming a Member of the House, I wish to apologize. But I say this, that when the gentleman says that there is a combination of that kind, and that my firm belongs to it, then I say that he knows nothing about it. That is what I said, and that is what I repeat. No man has any license to say that my firm belongs to a lumber trust.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say that.

Mr. FORDNEY. You asked me if my firm did not belong to that combination.

Mr. BYRD. Among the lumber retailers and manufacturers, I said, was that not an understanding? And now, if you will let me explain, I will tell you that it is so, and give my reasons for it. The legislature of Mississippi investigated the question and directed the attorney-general to prosecute the lumber trust, and it was then discovered, namely, that there was an understanding between retail dealers in the State that if the manufacturers sold directly to the consumer the manufacturer would be boycotted by every retail lumber dealer in the State.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say, in the most courteous terms—and if I have offended you I will most humbly apologize—that I never heard of such a thing until it was uttered from your lips. I say that you have no license to say that my firm belongs to a trust. That is what I said.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say that it belonged to a trust. I did not say that. I said there was an understanding.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you did not, then I will apologize.

Mr. BYRD. Your mill is in Mississippi, is it not?

Mr. SIMS. My district and State are interested in this matter. I would like to ask how much of the duty goes to the owner of the lumber as such, and how much goes to the manufacturer, the mill man, so that it may go in turn to the labor he employs? I really want information.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you, my friend. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has been exceedingly courteous. He has answered all inquiries that have been made of him. I want to inquire how long should this thing, in courtesy to the gentleman from Michigan, continue?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is at liberty to decline to answer any question whenever he chooses.

Mr. FORDNEY. I think that gentlemen in the House are laboring under a misapprehension about the lumber industry, and I believe I know something about it, and would like to explain it, and explain it correctly, and be courteous in my explanation. I will just stay here and answer questions as long as the House will bear with me and give me time, but they must be in order in their questions and give me reasonable time in which to answer; and I will be courteous, as before stated.

Mr. SIMS. Now, I will ask the question over, because I am not asking it in the spirit of antagonism, but for information.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is all right, my friend. Go ahead.

Mr. SIMS. Does any of the present duty of $2 go to the owner of the timber, the stumpage man; and if so, and in the judgment of the gentleman, about how much? If any of it goes to the manufacturer of lumber, in what proportion, to the best of the gentleman's knowledge of the subject?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, just how much of that $2, if it is wiped out, would go to the consumer or to the man that owns stumpage or to the planing-mill man or to the sawmill man or to the retailer no man on earth can tell. But I will say that at one time I was a manufacturer of lumber in Canada when there was a duty on lumber of $2 per thousand feet. As an exporter to the United States, I often thought that if that $2 were removed on the 30,000,000 feet of lumber that my firm produced annually we would be benefited to the extent of $60,000.

We looked for it all, and so do the Canadians look for the entire benefit, and the retail lumber dealer expects to get it all, and the consumer expects to get it. Just how much each one along the line of the movement of lumber would get no man on earth can tell. The price of lumber in this country depends upon the supply and the demand; and if you wish to conserve the forests, let me say to you that bringing in foreign lumber to reduce the price of lumber to the consumer is not the correct method to be employed to conserve the forests of the United States. Let me explain this. Let me say, gentlemen, that 25 per cent of the timber in the tree is left in the woods and rots or burns, because there is no money in removing it, and the manufacturer, therefore, leaves in the woods that portion of the tree in which there is no profit to him.

Mr. Swenck, I think a German, who is the chief forester on the Vanderbilt estate in North Carolina, stated the other day that in Germany the timber as it stands in the tree in the forest—and Germany is the mother of forestry countries—to-day brings from $17 to $50 per thousand feet in the forests. When the time comes that the timber in the forests of the United States is worth anything like that amount, then, gentlemen, it will be that American citizens or the American Government or the various States can go into forestry conservation. No private citizen, or set of men, can to-day raise timber or cultivate forests with the hope of realizing from it during his lifetime. But the time must come, I say, when high price of stumpage must prevail in order to conserve our forests, and I would suggest this plan. I have thought the matter over very seriously. I am too old to attempt to reforest any part of the land and expect to realize profit from it during my lifetime. Now, if a State or the Government, where reforestation is practicable, will set aside certain land free from taxation until that timber is cut and then tax the man who owns the timber a certain amount per thousand feet, so that local political bodies can not tax the life out of his property before he is ready to market it, then you will engage in reforestation, and not until then. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I got a letter from a gentleman living in one of the counties in my district that claimed seriously that if this $2 would come off, it would come off the people who owned the timber. He claimed that the entire thing would come off the owner of the timber and not off the manufacturer. I want the gentleman, if possible, to furnish me the information so that I may answer that letter.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman is wrong in his claim. One gentleman has said that a great deal of the lands in forests are to-day in the hands of moneyed men who can afford and will hold them until they get their price. I am one of the fortunate number of gentlemen. I own a little standing timber. I can furnish a livelihood for my wife and children and wait until I get my own price for that standing timber, and I will do it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRONNA. The gentleman has been very courteous in answering gentlemen's questions. I want to know the mill price for the last five years—whether it has been increased or decreased on such lumber as we use—in boards and dimension stuff?

Mr. FORDNEY. I can say to you that two years ago, when high prices were prevailing in all lines of industry, the average of Mississippi longleaf pine would be for all products of the log, except the lowest grades of mill culls, from $18 to $20 per thousand feet. That same lumber is selling to-day f. o. b. at the mills for $12; and the firm in which I am interested last year, as I said, manufactured and sold 36,000,000 feet of timber—and it cost us to produce it no less than $10 a thousand feet to take it from the woods and convert it into the finished product and put it on board the cars—and we sold it for less than an average of $13 per thousand, and we paid $3.50 per thousand for the timber in the woods, and at the end of the year we had lost money.

Now, my friend, if by the removal of this $2 per thousand duty the consumer gets the entire benefit of it, how long do you suppose we would run and lose an additional $2 per thousand feet on 36,000,000 feet a year, or 140,000 feet per day? We would not run fifteen minutes. We would close our sawmills, discharge the 300 men employed, pay taxes on our timber, and hold it for a better day.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to thank the gentleman for the information. I have not said at any time that I laid all the blame on the manufacturers.

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish to answer the gentleman's question, and I mean to be courteous. I have not been sarcastic, have I?

Mr. GRONNA. Not at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would not think of being so to my dear friend.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. He stated that the total production of lumber in this country is 40,000,000,000 feet.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. And that 26,000,000,000 feet of that is produced by the small mills.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. Now, I wish you would state for the information of the House—taking into consideration the production of all the mills of all classes of lumber, the black oak and the blackjack and all that sort of stuff—about what per cent of that 40,000,000,000 feet would be termed "high-grade" lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. There is not to exceed 10 per cent of the choicest grades, or clear lumber. It varies very much. On the Pacific coast, in the great redwood belt and the fir and spruce countries, the percentage of clear lumber of high grade runs from 40 to 80 per cent of the product of the tree. In the South it is not to exceed 5 per cent, and in the great white-pine belt in its palmy days 10 per cent was an exceedingly high average of high-grade lumber; but the low grade, the grade that is in danger, consists of about 50 per cent of the product of the tree, taking the entire cut of the whole country.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Not to interrupt the gentleman, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I would be pleased to answer it.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I want to ask the gentleman if the principal clamor for free lumber does not come from sections of the Union which had a great deal of timber a few years ago and were very glad to receive the benefits, if there were any benefits, in the Dingley bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. But which have largely consumed the timber they once had?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. If those are not the sections that are complaining now?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, in my home city, Saginaw, Mich., there were at one time in a territory not to exceed 13 miles away from that city 109 sawmills, and we manufactured one year of our greatest production about 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber. To-day there is not 1 foot of pine timber being cut in that part of the country. When a boy I booked timber in that country, which I had an opportunity to purchase if I had had the money, at from 25 to 50 cents per thousand feet. To-day what white pine is left in the State of Michigan will readily bring $25 per thousand feet in the tree, and we are now bringing into the State of Michigan some lumber from the States of Mississippi and Louisiana. Some lumber from that section is going into my home city. To the price paid on board the cars at the mill in your State there is added $10 or $12 per thousand feet freight. Consequently the consumers of lumber in Saginaw, Mich., pay to-day two or three times what they paid for their lumber when it was in its bloom in that State.

Now, the great States of Iowa and Minnesota and the great prairie States of the country are here to-day complaining about the removal of the duty on hides. Gentlemen from those States, hides are the finished product of your farmers. I am frank to say that hides went on the free list against my earnest protest. [Applause.]

My friend, when you come and ask protection on your finished product and free trade on the things you wish to buy you are inconsistent. But that is human nature. I have a letter from a man in Moline, Ill., in which he said he was a manufacturer of farming implements, and especially plows, and he said he wanted the duty removed on lumber and removed from iron and steel and coal. But I say to you, my friend, that the products of the factory in the Middle West demand and must have the highest measure of protection in order to pay decent wages to our laborers.

Great Goodness! How long was that man's foresight? He could not see 1 inch beyond the end of his nose. He forgot the 800,000 men employed in the lumber camps of this country. [Applause.] He forgot the hundreds and thousands of men in the iron mines, the rolling mills, and the coal mines. He forgot all about the welfare of the miners hundreds of feet below the surface of the earth digging coal to get bread and butter for their wives and little children and who want some of the comforts. Ah, any man that will come and demand free trade on his raw material, which is his neighbor's finished product, and protection on his finished product is inconsistent.

Now, gentlemen, I want to do a certain member of our committee honor and due credit, and that is the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Bonynge. He is not now a Member of this House. He was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means up to the 4th of March. I want to say to the people of the country that his successsor, whom I have not had the honor of meeting, must get off from his free-trade or tariff-for-revenue theories if he wants to walk in the trail blazed for him by my friend, Mr. Bonynge. [Applause.] No man put more strenuous, more determined, and honest effort for the cause of protection in this country into this bill than did my friend from Colorado, Mr. Bonynge. I regret to see him go out as a Member of this House, and no matter who his successor may be, how fine a gentleman he may be, I hope to know him; but I want to whisper in his ear that I hope he will stand by us as loyally to the industries predominant in his State as did his predecessor, Mr. Bonynge. [Applause.]

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman yield a few minutes to me for a statement?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of 5 to 30 per cent on the following classes of leather and leather articles: Band and sole leather, from 20 per cent ad valorem to 5 per cent ad valorem. Upper leather, calfskins, chamois skins, kangaroo, sheep, and goatskins, and other leather not provided for, from 20 per cent to 15 per cent ad valorem. Patent leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins, from 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 10 pounds and not over 25 pounds per dozen, from 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 25 pounds, from 20 cents per dozen and 20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem, all to 20 per cent ad valorem. Pianoforte leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem. Boots and shoes, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem. Shoe laces, from 50 cents per gross and 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem. Leather cut into shoe uppers, and so forth, from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem. All other manufactures of leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent ad valorem, of which the American people consume about $700,000,000 worth. The average will be about 10 per cent, or a reduction of $70,000,000, which the leather manufacturers are willing to give up for a difference of 15 per cent on the hides; total production of which is $70,000,000 dutiable, or a total of ten million. The consumers of leather are getting $7 saving where the others are losing a dollar on a hide.

Book of Estimated Revenue, Schedule N, pages 113–114, gives the importation of leather and the amount of duty collected, but does not close the subject, showing that there was a reduction in the duty on heavy leather and leather goods made out of dutiable hides, but connects gloves with it, and on page 119 closes in the grand total, showing that there is an advance from 34.25 to 39.09 in the proposed bill.

It is an unjust and untrue statement to the heavy leather boot and shoe manufacturers and tanners and the members of the Ways and Means Committee, as they attach to this statement the duty on gloves, which has nothing to do with the other class of leather, and no doubt intends to carry and impress one that there is an increased duty on leather made out of dutiable

hides. The fact of the matter is that this is entirely on gloves, and we should not carry the burden of the outrageous increase of tariff in the glove schedule.

The fact is, heavy leather is reduced more than hides in value. Hides, from 1888 to 1892, sold as low in Chicago as 4¼ cents, and advanced to 10 cents a pound in 1896, and went up as high as 14 cents, and declined last year in panic to 6 cents a pound for No. 1. Buffs to-day are 11½ cents a pound.

Mr. FORDNEY. All I have to say about the duty on hides is this: The duty on hides is 15 per cent ad valorem on heavy hides. We import about 40 per cent of all the leather and hides that is consumed in this country, and furnish at home about 60 per cent. The hide of an animal, as I have said, is the finished product of the farmer. A gentleman representing the Armour Packing Company, of Chicago, appeared before our committee and said that to-day cattle 3 years old were selling, in December, for $96 a head. I asked him how much the hide from that animal brought in the market after it had been taken from the animal. He said that the price was about 10 cents a pound, and an average hide weighed from 60 to 70 pounds. Therefore, the hide would be worth about $7.

The duty at 15 per cent would be $1.05, or around a dollar. He said the duty on the hide would amount to from 90 cents to $1.20. I asked him how much by-products there was in the animal and he replied 43 per cent, and that his firm made a profit out of every one of the by-products of the animal.

When the hide of an animal is worth $7, and the total animal brings from $75 to $96, it seems to me the farmer must get something for the hide when selling the animal. He is not likely to throw away 10 per cent of the value of the animal. He is too shrewd a trader.

Now, my friends, I was not willing to make certain reductions, but I bowed to the will of the committee, and I say the bill is a great bill—a compromise among men—and I am going to stand by it; but I have a right to complain about some things. I believe that the reductions we made on leather goods and leather were too severe and out of proportion to the removal of the duty on raw hides, but I have no opportunity to get into law my wishes on that and many other things in the bill, and therefore I stand by the bill. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Michigan a few questions in regard to the proviso found in paragraph 197, Schedule D—the lumber schedule. It reads:

Provided, That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever upon, or any discrimination against, any forest product exported to the United States, etc.

Now, that is one subdivision of the proviso and relates entirely to the effect of the imposition of an export duty, and, as I understand that part of the proviso, if any Province in Canada imposes an export duty or discriminates against the exportation of any forest product, then, and in that case, the duties under section 3, which I understand are the duties imposed upon lumber under the current law, would be collected?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, the next part of the proviso is as follows:

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

Now, I want to ask the gentleman, because I know he is familiar with the disposition of timber land in Canada, if it is not a fact that there exists to-day, and has existed for at least ten years, a condition in Canada or in the Provinces of Canada which would make it absolutely impossible for any forest product to be imported from Canada under the schedule as the committee has reported? That condition is the one which is embraced in all of the leases or contracts for the purchase of timber limits in Canada, namely, that the timber must be manufactured in the Province, if it is provincial timber land that is sold, or manufactured in the Dominion of Canada if it is federal timber land that is sold by the federal government; and would not that limitation of the manufacture of the timber amount to such a restriction upon the exportation of forest products, namely, logs, as to put into force automatically the Dingley rates as soon as this bill became effective?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say this to the gentleman, that prior to the enactment of the Dingley law the forest products of Canada were permitted to be taken across the border into the United States without restriction. Any American citizen purchasing timber in Canada was accorded the same privileges as a citizen of Canada.

Mr. TAWNEY. That is, prior to the adoption of the Dingley law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Prior to the adoption of the Dingley law. There was no discrimination as against American citizens. When the Dingley bill was enacted into law, there was a proviso put into it which provided that if Canada placed an export duty on logs or round timber, or discriminated in any way in the moving of logs by an export tax or a duty on logs or boom sticks or chains, whatever that export duty amounted to, imposed by Canada, the same should be added to the $2 duty on rough lumber. That proviso was put in there for this purpose: It was thought, I presume, that by putting then a $2 duty on lumber, because under the Wilson bill lumber came in free, that Canada would impose an export tax on logs, and at that time 400,000,000 feet of Canadian logs, or timber cut from the forests of Canada, were coming across the Lakes annually and were manufactured in the great State of Michigan in its mills.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I at that time was a member of the Ways and Means Committee and drafted the proviso in the Dingley law myself; and I want to say to the gentleman, and for the information of the committee, that that proviso was put on there because the Michigan lumberman, manufacturing lumber on the Michigan side but owning timber in the Georgian Bay district, feared that the imposition of the duty on lumber would prompt the Canadian government or the Provinces of Canada to impose an export duty on the logs on the free list.

Mr. FORDNEY. Provoke them to do it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Provoke them to do it, and this proviso was inserted, and subsequent to the enactment of the Dingley law the Province of Ontario proposed an export duty on logs, whereupon the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, announced that in that event the duty on lumber in this paragraph, rough and finished lumber, would be automatically increased by the amount of the export duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Thereupon the Province, several Provinces of Canada, abandoned the policy of imposing an export duty, and put in the timber limits contract a condition that the timber must be manufactured in Canada. Now, is not that a restriction such as is contemplated here?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will explain that fully; I want to do it, because I do not wish any man to misunderstand the purposes of the proviso. The Michigan lumberman did not want to prevent the bringing of logs from Canada to Michigan sawmills and to Ohio. The Cleveland Sawmill Company, of which R. G. Hawley was president, had a large sawmill at Cleveland, Ohio, and brought logs from the Great Lakes to that point to saw. Since then, or since this bill went into effect, the Dingley law, Canada readily got around that proviso by inserting a clause in their timber licenses—for instance, in Canada no one owns the timber but purchases from the government the right to cut timber, paying a certain amount per thousand as stumpage when cut. One bids at public auction and secures a license to cut and you pay an additional $3 per square mile per year in some instances, the tax varies, for the right to have your license extended from the 1st of May each year to another year.

Instead of putting an export duty on logs they put a proviso in the law that timber cut from crown lands must be manufactured in Canada and thereby prohibited the exporting of logs to the United States or any of its raw forests product. I am guilty of having used my influence to get this proviso in this bill, and I will tell you what is is for: Do not misunderstand me, for I wish to be absolutely fair to every man and to Canada. Canada to-day prevents her raw material coming to our markets, but is clamoring for the removal of duty on her finished product lumber, and I am one of those who believe that Canada must relinquish her hold on her raw material or her finished product shall pay the present rate of duty of $2 per thousand on lumber. [Applause on the Republican side.] If this bill is enacted into law with that proviso in there it means this, gentlemen, that the American citizens will have access to the raw material of the forests of Canada or she must pay $2 per thousand on her rough lumber. Is there any good reason why we should admit Canadian flour into our markets if Canada will not permit her wheat to come across the line? Is there any reason we should take any finished product from Canada when she will not permit us to have her raw material? If so, I would like to have some reasonable explanation of it. This proviso, let me repeat, gentlemen, means that Canada must change her custom and stop the discrimination against Americans in her forests, or she must pay a duty on her finished products, which is a protection to the 800,000 men employed in sawmills in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman from Michigan believe it is possible by legislation of this kind to impose upon Canada a condition with reference to the disposition of the timber on her public domain any more than Canada or any other foreign country could impose upon the United States a condition with reference to the disposition of our public domain? I simply ask this for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not in the judgment of the gentleman from Michigan it would be possible for this proviso here to change the fiscal policy of Canada with respect to the disposition of her timber, and unless Canada does change that fiscal policy then the rates in the Dingley bill will continue to be in force notwithstanding this proposed reduction.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say the United States imposes no such restriction on Canada. Canada has access to our forest products. There is no raw material in the United States excluded from Canada's market. [Applause on the Republican side.] Canada has discriminated against American citizens, and, by the heavens above me, I contend that we have the right to strike back at Canada when she strikes at us. [Applause on the Republican side.] And that proviso is intended for that very purpose. We have no right to say to Canada that she shall change the manner of disposing of her timber, but we have the right to say, Mr. Chairman, to Canada that she must make a change or pay a duty on the finished product.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit another inquiry?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. Under the operation of this proviso, if any province of Canada proposes to continue its present policy in respect to the disposition of its timber, namely, prohibiting the exportation of it, then the rates of duty provided in section 3, which are the rates in the Dingley law, would apply as to all forest products coming from the entire Dominion of Canada or from any province in Canada, would they not?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is just what the proviso says exactly. We meant to say that, and I hope it means everything it says. There are parts of the Canadian country, or provinces over there, that impose a crown-land charge of 65 cents per cord on pulp wood, but if that pulp wood is manufactured in Canada, 25 cents per cord is rebated to the man that cuts it, but if it comes to the United States, to the great pulp mills in this country, from the country to which our pulp mills must look for their raw material, they are discriminated against by the extra charge of 25 cents a cord. And I say that it is unjust for Canada to impose any such conditions, and she ought to be brought to understand that we will look after the interests of this country just as earnestly and correctly as Canada looks after her interests. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. On the subject about which the gentleman is now talking, the bill says:

If there is any discrimination on any forest product.

Now, that includes everything from saw logs to toothpicks, does it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND. So that if there should be a discrimination or restriction of any kind imposed by Canada upon toothpicks, for instance, that would put the tax of $2 on lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; any forest product. And if yon can give, my friend—and I am not quarreling with you—if you can give any good reason why we should sit by and look on, and allow Canada to discriminate against our citizens without retaliating, I would like to have some man tell me why.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Would it not accomplish this if we retaliated on toothpicks, for instance, if the restriction was on toothpicks? In other words, ought we to compel the imposition of the tariff of $2 if we believe in $1, upon boards, if there is a restriction upon some minor product?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but I think the gentleman is picturing an extreme case. There is no disposition to impose a maximum rate of duty on Canada's forest products unless she discriminates against us in a substantial way. And I do not think any American citizen would ask to have the full penalty imposed if she discriminated in a single bundle of toothpicks, worth a penny.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Understand, I agree with the gentleman in this part of his discussion, and that we ought to protect ourselves against any discrimination on the part of Canada. But ought we to go so far as to pass a general law which could be considered to absolutely defeat the intention of the Congress in asking for $1 lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to my colleague that I do not know how much or what kind of language to put in that bill that will be a basket clause that Canada can not get around unless you discriminate against the entire forest products. You can not single out from anything that Canada might make from her forest products and name them and have the proviso constitutional. I think it is couched in fitting language and strong enough so that Canada will understand that we have awakened to the fact that we have been discriminated against long enough, and we will stand it no longer.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will permit——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wanted to carry this a little further. I agree with the gentleman, and I dislike very much to interrupt. I wish to say, without flattery, that no man has maintained himself better than the gentleman from Michigan has, and under much provocation to become impatient. I think on this countervailing proposition we might possibly agree. Suppose there should be a patent granted to some citizen of Canada under the general laws covering some wood production; now, would the collector of customs be entitled to impose a duty of $1 a thousand on lumber if there was that restriction or regulation, or whatever you call it, which somehow or other restricted the introduction of that article into the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will read that proviso. It is as follows:

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

Now, just one minute and I will yield. I do not know how to put it in stronger language. Had I been able to command any stronger language I would have put it in there and, if possible, gotten the committee to accept it, because I do not want to even leave a rat hole for Canada to get out of.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say I do not see how it is possible the granting of a patent would in any way restrict the importation of Canadian lumber or force the product into this country. I certainly think if a special privilege in the way of a patent should be granted for the making of some article out of wood, it would be a strained construction of this statute that would make it apply to a case of that kind. I do not believe any Secretary of the Treasury or any court would ever put any such construction upon it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to my colleague that I believe this—this proviso in paragraph 197, which applies to rough lumber, and rough lumber alone: I believe that the proviso if taken into court would be construed to mean—I am not a lawyer, and never studied law for a minute, and I have kept out of court all my life, with very few exceptions, and know very little about law—but, in my opinion, this proviso in the paragraph that relates to lumber, or some portion of the lumber industry, the court would construe to apply to all the lumber schedule. There is a proviso in the pulp schedule. I believe the courts would correctly say that it was not the intention of the proviso in paragraph 197 to be applied to the pulp schedule, which is entirely another product.

Mr. DAWSON. I understand the gentleman says forest restrictions. Now, does not the gentleman mean that if there is any restriction on the forests, it shall be restored upon the corresponding product?

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, the great difficulty in describing all forest products is this: Round timber, and shingle bolts and heading bolts, and pickets and posts, and telegraph poles all are forest products—forest products of some kind, and to describe them in the law itself would make it longer than the moral law, and we might forget to cover some things of importance, and therefore it is covered in as strong language and as few words as possible. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to ask the gentleman if it was his intention under this proviso to affect the wood-pulp schedule in Schedule M?

Mr. FORDNEY. I had in mind the lumber industry alone.

Mr. TAWNEY. Pulp is a forest product, and there is a proviso which relates to pulp, and I think would be so construed by the court as to relate to pulp alone. In paragraph 197 there is a proviso which the gentleman has inserted, which reads:

That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government forbids or restricts the exportation of any forest product of the United States in any way—

That would certainly include wood pulp, and if there is any restriction on wood pulp or pulp wood, that restriction would operate and put in force and effect the rates of the Dingley law.

Mr. FORDNEY. Can the gentleman suggest any language in that provision that he would strike out that would not leave a loophole for Canada to get away?

Mr. TAWNEY. I can suggest no language that would more thoroughly carry out the purposes of the gentleman from Michigan than the language he has used, which would make the peo-

ple of the United States who desire and believe they ought to have rough lumber free of duty depend upon Canada for that benefit rather than upon the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, when a fellow comes along and hits you on the nose, you will strike back and hit him where you can; and if you wait for a chance to hit him on the nose you may not hit him at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. But suppose the blow that you hit the other fellow hurts you worse than it does him?

Mr. FORDNEY. I never hit a fellow in my life but that I hurt him more than it hurt me.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him this?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why is the reduction made from the Dingley rates to the Payne rates on lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. Why? Because the majority of the Republican members on the committee so voted, but against my earnest protest.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am willing to believe that they had a reason. What I am anxious to get at is that reason. The gentleman has stated that he had a reason against their position.

Mr. FORDNEY. Those gentlemen on the committee who did not agree with me, I want to say for them that it is an honest difference of opinion. Perhaps they were right and I was wrong, but I disagreed with them.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, the assumption is this, is it not, that they voted for a reduction because they thought a reduction would be a benefit to the people of America?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to you, my friend——

Mr. SHERLEY. You can say "yes" or "no" to that.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well, I will answer it in my way, and I will do it courteously. In the revision of the tariff, I want to say to you, there was a difference of opinion at times between the Republican Members as to how much reduction or whether any should be made in certain schedules. My friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] did me the honor to tell the absolute truth about me. I sweat blood every time they reduced a schedule. [Laughter.] Because, as Mr. CLARK has said, if they had done me the honor to let me write this tariff bill I would have made it almighty short, and in deference to him it would have been almighty sweet to American citizens. I would not permit any article that can be produced in this country to have the duty upon it made so low that it could be produced abroad and come into this country and be sold at a price that would bring starvation wages to the man who gives his brawn and brain to the making of it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, will the gentleman come back to the issue? Is it not true that the reduction from the Dingley rate to the Payne rate on lumber was made with the idea of affording relief to the American people?

Mr. FORDNEY. I never thought for a minute, after getting the statement of the prices that Mr. Rogers is charging, that the consumer would get one farthing of the reduction, especially so if the retailers around the country are such fellows as some gentlemen have described them to be.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not asking the gentleman to change his view point; but for any sort of a logical argument we must have a basis to start from.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. It must be assumed that that reduction was made for that purpose. Now, if it was made for that purpose is not the effect of the provision as to retaliation against another country that if they do not agree to give up something that we do not like, then we will punish ourselves by putting the rate back to where we took it from?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, it is my opinion that the $2 per thousand on rough lumber is not a sufficiently high tariff to be protection beyond an amount that would appear as reasonable, and I do not want to see it reduced.

Now, I want to say this to you: I know of no interest in the United States that is producing an article for consumption on which I want to see the duty reduced to a point that the foreigner can come in and enjoy our markets and take them away from the laboring men, or deprive them of their right to produce that article in this country. Now, my friend CLARK did me simple justice yesterday in stating to the country that I was a standpatter on the tariff question.

My friend CLARK is one of the best fellows that ever lived. He said to me one day, and I believed him and believe him now:

FORDNEY, if Congress would permit you and me to make this tariff bill, I believe we would make one that both sides of the House would vote for.

[Laughter.]

I believe I could have persuaded my friend to be a protectionist if we had been accorded that great honor. But whether that is right or whether it is wrong, I want to say to the gentleman that the industries of the South are of great importance to the people of that country. Cotton is one of the greatest, amounting in volume to more than $450,000,000. I would have been pleased to see the duty on imported cotton fabrics increased.

The total importation of all manufactures of cotton last year, dutiable	$73, 059, 548. 93
Cotton and cotton waste, not dutiable	20, 791, 141. 00
Total	93, 850, 689. 93

Duty collected, $38,999,267.30.

And those imported goods, to a very large extent, were made in Europe from cotton raised in the United States, exported to Europe, there converted into the finished product by cheap labor—receiving, especially in Belgium, an average of the measly sum of 18 cents per day—and brought back to the United States, and after paying the rates of duty fixed by law on such imports, in some cases as high as 45 per cent ad valorem, and also paying transportation both ways, are sold upon our markets below the cost of production of the same fabrics manufactured in this country. It would have pleased me to see the duty on this class of goods materially increased.

I would also have been highly pleased to see a paragraph in this bill providing for a duty on long-staple cotton. It is a growing and important industry in the South, and needs protection to capital and labor to guarantee success. One hundred million pounds were imported in 1907.

Fifteen years ago, and before the construction of cotton factories in the South, cotton sold at 5 cents per pound, and at that time 10,000,000 bales of cotton brought not to exceed $300,000,000. The producers of cotton at that time were not at all prosperous. On the other hand, they gave a great deal of labor for the money received for their crop, and were poor.

Cotton factories were built in the South, and immediately there became competition for raw cotton between the mills of the South and of the North and in Europe; and while the price of cotton is now somewhere about 10 cents per pound, it brought 13 cents per pound less than two years ago. So that, for the same labor and outlay, the cotton raisers of the South are receiving $600,000,000 for 10,000,000 bales of cotton, as compared with half that amount fifteen years ago.

There are 10,500,000 spindles now operated in the cotton mills of the South and over 15,000,000 in the North, yet the duty on imported cotton fabrics is not sufficiently high to bring about conditions to enable the manufacturing at home of all the cottons we use. The establismment of these factories has diverted from the farm a large number of employees, thus finding a place in the factories for the surplus labor on the farm. This labor so employed in the factory also consumed large quantities of other farm products, such as vegetables and meat, and creates a wider market for various farm products. The money paid to this labor goes to the South, which would not go there were it not for the cotton mills. Cotton is the predominating product of the South, and therefore should receive its fair share of protection along with the products of other States. [Applause.]

Oh, gentlemen, such a condition should not exist; and I would like to see our tariff laws so high that cotton goods of no foreign country could enter our markets and make the shirt that is worn on the back of the man in Mississippi producing the raw cotton. [Applause.] Such goods ought to be made by American labor.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Is it not a fact that in this bill you have reported it reduces the tariff on articles made in the South and raises the duties on articles made in the North?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think that is right.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I can prove it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think that is right. As before stated, long-staple cotton is a growing industry in the South. Last year there were 100,000,000 pounds of long-staple cotton imported into the United States, 78,000,000 pounds of which came from Egypt. I would like to see a duty on long-staple cotton of at least 5 or 8 cents per pound to help that industry in the South. I think it needs it, and it is my earnest wish that before this bill becomes a law there will be a duty of some kind on long-staple cotton.

The capital invested in manufacturing in the South has increased from $1,153,000,000 in 1900 to more than $2,100,000,000 in 1908; and the products of the factories of the South have increased from $1,463,000,000 in 1900 to the magnificent sum of $2,600,000,000 in 1908. The population of the South has in-

creased from 23,500,000 in 1900 to 27,000,000 in 1908. In fact, the Southern States are to-day increasing rapidly in wealth.

The lumber cut in the South in 1900 was less than 14,000,000,000 feet, and in 1908 it was nearly 20,000,000,000 feet. Fifteen years ago the magnificent forests of the South were practically valueless, but the capital of the North, combined with that of the South, has opened up the lumbering industry of that country, and to-day it is one of the predominating industries.

The railway mileage of the South has increased from 52,600 miles in 1900 to 67,200 miles in 1908; and the true value of all property in the South has increased from about $14,000,000,000 in 1900 to more than $20,000,000,000 in 1908. It can not be denied that under our present protective tariff laws the South has advanced in wealth and commercial activity quite equal to the advancement in the North.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. If this bill should become a law, would it apply to the shipment of forest products from Canada under the conditions that prevail in that country at the present time?

Mr. FORDNEY. Was the gentleman here a few minutes ago when I explained that?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. No; I was not.

Mr. FORDNEY. I went at great length into that matter. This proviso in the bill means, as I intended it to mean—and I hope it will be enacted into law—that Canada must give up to the United States her raw forest products or pay a duty of the present rate in the Dingley bill on her finished products.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I thought that would be the answer of the gentleman. Under the law as it exists at present is it not true that in the Province of Quebec there is 65 cents duty on pulp wood?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. And in the Province of Ontario 25 cents. In the Province of Quebec if the wood is cut and manufactured into wood pulp, there is a rebate of 25 cents. There is a discrimination in favor of Canada at present, and when the special committee was considering the matter they reduced the duty on wood pulp, practically put it on the free list, and reduced the duty from $6 a ton to $2 a ton, or a little over, on print paper. In view of that fact, if this bill is passed as it now is, would not the duty on wood pulp go back where it is to-day, and would not the duty on print paper go back where it is to-day and thus the country get no relief in the prices of wood pulp or print paper?

Mr. FORDNEY. I stated at some length, a few minutes ago, that it is barely possible that this proviso would apply to wood pulp. But it is my belief, however, that it would apply only to the articles enumerated in the paragraph in which the proviso is found, and not to wood pulp.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Let me ask the gentleman this further question. He is thoroughly familiar with this subject. What is the reason for the change in the language of the proviso that was in the Dingley bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will state to the gentleman, as I have stated to the House, that the proviso in the Dingley bill immediately caused Canada, instead of putting an export duty on logs, to put an embargo upon her raw forest products, and absolutely prohibit its coming to this country under an export duty or otherwise. It must be manufactured in Canada.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If that is true, can the owner of the standing timber who sells his logs to the sawmill in the United States possibly receive any part of the duty imposed upon that timber?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not quite get the gentleman's idea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If a log can not come into the United States from Canada, does not that imply that there can be no competition whatever between Canadian logs and the United States logs?

Mr. FORDNEY. There is none now. They do not permit their raw material to come into the United States at all, but we want it to come in, and I will tell the gentleman why. If we could bring into the United States to-day saw logs or round timber, to be put through our saw mills and converted into lumber, American labor would get from $5 to $6 or $7 per thousand feet for the employment in converting that raw product into the finished product [applause], and I therefore want to help American labor that much.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My question is, that if they can not come as the gentleman says they can not, does the original owner of the log in the United States get any part of the tariff which is imposed?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I explained a little while ago as to where the benefits might go if the duty on lumber were removed. There are so many points of exchange in the tree from where it stands in the woods until the sash and door and blinds are put upon the gentleman's house, if he is building one, that it is very hard to tell which of the different hands that it goes through would receive the benefit; whether it would be equally distributed or whether it would go to the consumer. That is a question that no human being can intelligently answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I understood the gentleman, he declined to say where the duty went.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Is it not believed that the actual application of the duty begins at the sawmill and not to the owner of the log?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not think so. I will tell the gentleman why. I stated once before that I was at one time a manufacturer of lumber in Canada, and paid a duty of $2 per thousand upon our entire product, thirty millions a year, and brought it across the Lakes to a yard in Toledo, Ohio. I often thought that if lumber was put on the free list that our firm would get $60,000 a year out of it. Whether I was correct in my thoughts or not, I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That would be all of it?

Mr. FORDNEY. That would be all, absolutely. I believe that the Canadian believes to-day, if this tariff is removed, he is going to get the entire benefit. The consumer believes if it is removed he will get the entire benefit, and every man that touches that board or the board out of the log, from the time it leaves the woods until it goes into buildings, believes that he will be benefited. Where it may be distributed, no man can tell.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It is on the question of wood pulp and pulp wood. In one of the paragraphs of the bill pulp wood is enumerated with logs and other forest products in the rough, and is admitted free of duty. Pulp wood is now admitted free of duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Under section 3, however, there would be a maximum tariff imposed of 20 per cent on pulp wood if Canada should not come under the terms of the main provision. Does the gentleman think that the paper mills of the country can stand a duty of 20 per cent on pulp wood in any event?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I have not given a very great amount of study to this print-paper and pulp-wood proposition. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was the chairman of a special committee and gave it very careful consideration. I know that the papers of the country were demanding free trade on print paper. What right they have to ask that their raw material be furnished to them at a less price when they are putting up their rates of advertising I can not see. It does not seem reasonable to me. I will state to my friend that the newspapers of this country have no more right to consideration as to their raw material than has any other industry in the United States, notwithstanding the fact that this is a very unpopular position to take with the newspapers of the country.

Mr. MANN. I do not wish to enter into any controversy with the gentleman on that point, but I was trying to attract his attention not to the raw material of the newspapers, but to the raw material of the paper manufacturers, now admitted free of duty—pulp wood.

Mr. FORDNEY. They are discriminated against, my friend; they are discriminated against in the rebate on the stumpage they pay for their raw material over in Canada.

Mr. MANN. Well, they admit it free of duty to the extent——

Mr. FORDNEY. Whether you make it a duty or rebate in taxes, it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman will permit me to ask him the question——

Mr. FORDNEY. Well.

Mr. MANN. They are now admitted free of duty to the extent of a million cords a year. Under section 3 of this bill they may be required to pay a duty of 20 per cent on the value of the pulp wood, and if that should be the case, half the paper mills of this country would go out of business.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish to say to my friend here that he has had as much or more to do than any man in this House in

arranging your pulp-wood and wood-pulp and print-paper schedule. It has not been intended on my part to have paragraph 197 conflict with the paragraph in which that proviso appears which you prepared. It might be so construed, but I desire to say I had in mind only the lumber question and not wood pulp, and I am trying to save that industry from the discrimination now placed against us by Canada.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I am not endeavoring to criticise the committee in any way. I think these conflicts in the bill are purely inadvertent, that is what I have supposed, and because the gentleman is authority on forestry matters is the reason why I have asked him that question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well; have I answered your question?

Mr. MANN. As far as you have gone.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. If a tariff was put on that million cords of pulp wood, do you believe the mills would have to shut down, or could not they move down South in many of the Southern States where millions of cords of pulp wood are rotting annually and there continue in business?

Mr. MANN. There is no pulp wood in the South that would take the place of the spruce wood that is imported from Canada.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I would like to ask my friend if he has ever investigated the spruce wood of the South when he makes that statement of fact?

Mr. MANN. I have investigated it; there is very little of it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Friend Paper Company, I believe one of the leading paper companies, is shipping pulp wood out of my county in my district, and that a thousand million cords of pulp wood have gone to waste throughout the South.

Mr. MANN. Very likely, but not spruce pulp wood.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. Spruce pulp wood—there are millions of cords of it standing in my district to-day. The only trouble is you have been trying to compete with Canada when Canada is closer to the mills than our spruce wood. Now, why not move them down South where there is wood, and there locate the mills?

Mr. MANN. We have a number of paper mills in the South, but not one of them grinds wood, makes ground wood, because they have not got the spruce to make it out of.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. There is not one in the State of Kentucky——

Mr. MANN. There are many things in which Kentucky is behind in many particulars.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, she is ahead of Illinois in a good many things, anyway.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I can get substantial contractors who will undertake to furnish them with the spruce wood if they will come down there and establish the mills.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask out of the 40,000,000,000 feet of finished lumber how much is exported from Canada into this country?

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman asks how much lumber comes into the United States from Canada. Our imports of lumber from Canada are only about 2 per cent of the total consumption of lumber in the United States. Out of 40,000,000,000 feet of lumber manufactured in the United States less than 1,000,000,000 feet was imported last year.

And I do not believe that, if that 2 per cent were permitted to come into this country free of duty, the consumer would get his lumber $2 per thousand cheaper.

Mr. GOULDEN. Another question. Who, in your judgment, pays that duty on that 1,000,000,000 feet of lumber now?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I explained it as best I could a little while ago, during his absence.

Mr. GOULDEN. I was not absent.

Mr. FORDNEY. There are so many hands through which this lumber must go that it is so distributed, undoubtedly, that each and every man who handles it looks for the benefit.

Mr. LOUD. Does not the Canadian pay it indirectly?

Mr. FORDNEY. The Canadian pays it indirectly.

Mr. LOUD. By selling that lumber that much cheaper?

Mr. FORDNEY. By selling that lumber that much cheaper. But, on the other hand, this 2 per cent, or 1,000,000,000 feet, that comes into our market comes in at points where it hurts on the low-grade lumber manufactured in that part of the country.

Mr. GOULDEN. One more question, if the gentleman will be kind enough to yield. He has certainly been considerate and has stood the test remarkably well, and I have been here from start to finish. I would like to ask if the amount would be increased materially if the schedule in the Payne bill became a law?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not believe our imports would increase, but this is what would happen: At a time just like we have now, when there is a depression in the lumber industry, as well as all other industries, Canada is suffering the same as ourselves. And many men engaged in the business, who have large sums of money borrowed, must convert their forests into money in order to meet their obligations and sell, many times, below cost in order to get money to save them from bankruptcy. And just at such times, when this low-grade and cheap lumber from Canada is dumped onto our market and creates disaster among the lumber industries of this country, is when it hurts the worst.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman does not believe, as I understand, that the consumer would be benefited a particle by the reduction in the schedule proposed by the bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. From all the information at hand I should say that if the duty on lumber is removed no one in North Dakota who buys lumber from the gentlemen who are here asking for free trade would be benefited a penny. And it is quite reasonable that other parts of the country would be treated in the same way.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Does the gentleman seriously contend that a man has any reasonable chance of escaping bankruptcy by selling his product for less than it cost him?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, let me tell you something. I have been in business since I was a boy, and during the panic of 1896 I sold some of the timber that I owned at ruinous prices to meet my obligations and made sacrifices on what I sold in order to save what little I had left; just what every other man does in times of panic.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman a question right in that connection. My only excuse for asking him is that I believe he has more information on this question than any other man on the floor and perhaps in the United States, and the further excuse that my district is more interested in lumber than in any other product.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be pleased to answer the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky. The gentleman has stated that we produce about 40,000,000,000 feet of lumber annually, and that only 14,000,000,000 of that is produced by what are known as the "big mills." All this fight has been made on the monopolists, the big fellows. Now, I want to know if, in his opinion, the tariff was taken off of lumber the big mills would not be able to take care of themselves better than these men, who own this large stumpage, are not more able to take care of themselves, and that the real hardship would fall upon the 26,000 small sawmills in this country and the thousands of men who labor in the woods and in those sawmills? And is not that hardship distributed all over the United States, because nearly every State in this Union produces more or less timber and it is cut up by these small mills?

Mr. FORDNEY. In answer to the gentleman, I will say this, that in the lumber industry in the country the cost of production depends entirely upon the character of the land on which the timber stands.

In some localities the timber is much more favorably situated than in others. For instance, I know in California, from my experience there—I have spent a great deal of time in the forests of California near Eureka, Cal., which is near Humboldt Bay—there is a territory in which the timber stands within 10 miles of the city, and which can be brought to the mill for not exceeding $3 per thousand feet; and there is timber on mountainous lands and deep gulches; and in felling that great mass of tall timber across gulches there is a great loss, and then it is very expensive to build log roads on such rough lands; and in some instances it costs $9 and $10 per thousand feet to get the logs from the woods to the mill. Then, in addition to that, instead of having level ground on which to fall a tree of 300 feet in length, it falls on the rough mountain side and is broken in the fall, and from one-quarter to one-half of the timber is destroyed by the splitting of the tree and breaking it up into pieces. A great loss is made. So that in times when prices are low the sawmills and manufacturers of lumber situated where the advantages are much greater than at other places, those are the factories and men that can put lumber upon the market and survive when prices are low, when their less fortunate neighbor, who must go to twice that expense, must go out of business. These are conditions that control the prices of lumber, especially so when the price is low.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. If the gentleman will permit me, I think I understand his views on the subject of the duty on lumber. I want to know whether I am correct in believing that he would restore the old rates on lumber?

Mr. FORDNEY. If I had my way about it I would not make a change in the Dingley law by the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Under this provision there will be no change made, will there, in the judgment of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, I would have preferred to have a joker, with a club sufficiently strong enough to flail Canada into the line of giving us favorable conditions on raw material.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I do not think there is any question about the joker, and that it so plainly manifests itself in this bill as to carry out the wishes of the gentleman. Now, I want to ask the gentleman, How can Canada bring herself under the application of this bill, if it should be passed, with this proposition in here, in view of the fact that we know there is a tax on the crown lands of the Dominion in Quebec of 65 cents a cord and in the Province of Ontario of 25 cents a cord, that does not go to the Canadian government, but goes to the home Government, with which the Dominion government certainly has nothing whatever to do except to collect the tax and send it to the home Government? How can Canada bring herself under the application of this bill unless she previously secures permission for it from the home Government?

Mr. FORDNEY. I know of no fair rule on the face of God's green earth that should not bring Canada to terms and give us the same kind of treatment that we give to Canada, and I believe—do not misunderstand me, gentlemen—that if the provision in paragraph 197 remains and is enacted into law Canada will still pay the $2 duty upon lumber, but she may permit logs to come across from British Columbia on Puget Sound to the Washington mills; yet I say that if the embargo is removed to-day, I do not believe one log will come across the Great Lakes to the State of Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Would the gentleman be willing to have that proviso relate in express terms to paragraph 197?

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, that is the lumber schedule, and there are three, four, or five paragraphs on lumber. I am quite willing to have the proviso so changed that it will not apply to pulp. I had no intention to cover that, but my friend from Michigan must remember that there are many paragraphs in which products of the forest are mentioned that in no way relate to wood pulp.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understand that; and I am free to say that I am not very much concerned as to the Canadian, but I want to protect the American producer of lumber and the manufacturer and the consumer, and I want that proviso which you mentioned to apply to lumber and boards.

Now, I think if the gentleman will confine his proviso to the items actually mentioned in paragraph 197 there will be no difference between him and me on that.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to say to my colleague from Michigan that I am willing to say this: I have not made this statement before, but I will make it now, with the hope that it may go to the country, and that I may be understood just as I say it. I believe the reduction of the duty from $2 to $1 is too severe a reduction in the duty on lumber. Along with other reductions made in the tariff bill, I am willing that lumber shall stand a fair reduction of the duty, and I believe that a reduction of 25 per cent of the present rate of duty on lumber would be quite a sufficient reduction. If you will give us $1.50 per thousand on rough lumber and retain the differential on dressed lumber as provided in our present law, which is equitable, I am quite willing now to strike out the proviso and wipe out from the minds of all men any doubt as to what I want or what that proviso may do; because $1.50 per thousand protection on rough lumber is, I say, a fair protection, and I will stand by it and be pleased with it. But I am not satisfied with $1.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Does the gentleman believe, taking it all in all, that the Payne bill is an improvement upon the Dingley law?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I believe it is, and I will state why, briefly. It has been found by an examination of imports and exports that there are some rates in the Dingley law that are higher than the point of necessary protection to certain industries, and therefore can be justly and equitably reduced without injuring the industry affected. There are some rates in the Dingley bill that are too low and that do not afford sufficient protection to the industry, and therefore the duty should be and has been raised where, in the wisdom of the committee, it seemed correct and just. Therefore I do say that time has shown the Dingley rates were rather out of proportion as to some industries. It was as nearly correct as human beings could get it at the time it was drawn, but the experience of twelve years on exports and imports has shown that in some paragraphs it was not distributed with entire equity.

Mr. SULZER. Right there, is it not a fact that the taxes or tariff rates under the provisions of the Payne bill, taking them all in all, are greater than the prevailing rates under the provisions of the Dingley bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I think that computation, made by some gentleman on the other side, is not a just and correct percentage. For instance——

Mr. SULZER. Is not that the fact, according to the investigations and statistics furnished by the Treasury Department?

Mr. FORDNEY. If I understand the gentleman's question—and I want to be absolutely fair—the ad valorem, taking it on all imports, is higher in the Payne bill than it was in the Dingley bill.

Mr. SULZER. Exactly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, when a given article comes into our market under an ad valorem rate of duty or a specific duty, when prices are low the ad valorem is high, and when the price is high the ad valorem is low. It depends upon when you take the figures for the comparison. I believe that in the present bill the duties have been so arranged that they are more equitably adjusted than they were in the Dingley bill, and I believe those percentages given by some gentleman on that side are entirely out of proportion, on account of the fluctuations of price at the time when they were taken.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have occupied much more time than I expected. I hope I have been courteous to every man. I am exceedingly sorry that I have offended any gentleman of the House who seem to be exercised at something I said. I had no such intention. I thought a gentleman made a statement which reflected upon me, and I was denying his statement. He says that he did not so intend it. Therefore I wish most humbly to apologize to him, because I would not offend any man, either here or anywhere else, without reasonable cause, and I did not intend to offend him.

I ask permission of the House to extend in the RECORD some remarks. I had prepared something to say on sugar and about Cuban reciprocity, but I will not trespass upon the time of the House much further. I wish to say, however, that I think Cuban reciprocity was the most unfavorable trade agreement ever made between the United States and any other country in the world. Let me say briefly that I have taken the record of our exports and imports to and from Cuba for five years from the adoption of Cuban reciprocity, and here is the startling statement: The balance of trade against us for the five years prior to the adoption of Cuban reciprocity averaged $15,652,000 per year. Under Cuban reciprocity, which some gentlemen have lauded to the skies, the balance of trade against us for five years has reached the enormous sum of $43,781,000; and in addition thereto, in taking on an increased amount of imports from Cuba, the reduction of our revenues on goods coming from Cuba has amounted to more than $60,000,000. I believe, my friends, that the sooner we repeal Cuban reciprocity the better for the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, one word and I will close. We are trying to do something for the Philippine Islands. Let me tell you what the Philippine Islands are doing for us. I will stand by the bill and the compromise on sugar, the free importation of 300,000 tons per year from the Philippine Islands into the United States.

I am willing to stand by that, and the sugar men of the country whom I have consulted are also satisfied. For the last ten years there has been turmoil in this House over the duty on sugar. There never has been a session of Congress in the ten years that I have had the honor to be a Member of this House that the question of the reduction of the duty on sugar has not been advocated in some manner or other, and our present good President, Mr. Taft, has agreed in my presence that during his administration he will not permit, as far as he can avoid it by his action, any further reduction in the sugar schedule if we will accept this agreement and let the 300,000 tons come in free from the Philippines. Last year the Philippine Islands exported $60,000,000 worth of stuff and fifteen millions, or 25 per cent, came to the United States. She imported $30,000,000 worth of stuff, and she took the measly sum of $5,000,000 worth from the United States. It is costing us, if I am correctly informed, $14,000,000 per year to maintain peace in the islands, and if you will look up the record you will find that our pension rolls amount to $23,000,000 annually for Spanish war soldiers. Great goodness! After doing all this for the Philippine Islands, she buys only one-sixth of her imports from us—the measly sum of $5,000,000 of our products—and then comes back and asks us for more, and complains because we reserve the right

to tax in excess of 300,000 tons of sugar and tobacco coming in here above the limited amount.

I say the Filipinos have nothing to complain of after what the Government of the United States has done for them. As the humorist of the House last year, Adam Bede, said in speaking of the Philippine Islands:

So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to change them for Ireland and raise our own policemen.

[Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. The Republican platform adopted in 1896 contained the following plank on sugar:

We condemn the present administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than $100,000,000 annually.

The administration to which this plank refers is that of Grover Cleveland, and the sugar schedule which it condemns is the one found in the Wilson bill, which levied a 40 per cent ad valorem tariff on sugar.

The general tariff plank adopted the same year was:

We demand an equitable tariff on foreign imports which come into competition with American products as will not only furnish adequate revenue for the necessary expenses of the Government, but will protect American labor from degradation to the wage level of other countries.

The Republican party, in its national platform adopted in the year 1900, made this declaration:

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting our home market, competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity for the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at higher rates, higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country.

The platform of the Republican party in the year 1904 stated:

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican party. The measure of protection should always be at least equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

President Roosevelt's message sent to Congress in December, 1907, contained this statement regarding the position of the Republican party:

This country is definitely committed to the protective system, and any effort to uproot it could not but cause widespread industrial disaster. In other words, the principles of the present tariff law could not with wisdom be changed. But in a country of such phenomenal growth as ours it is probably well that every dozen years or so the tariff laws should be carefully scrutinized so as to see that no excessive or improper benefits are conferred thereby, that proper revenue is provided, and that our foreign trade is encouraged. There must always be as a minimum a tariff which will not only allow for the collection of an ample revenue, but which will at least make good the difference in cost of production here and abroad—that is, the difference in the labor cost here and abroad—for the well-being of the wage-worker must ever be a cardinal point of American policy.

The Republican platform of 1908, under which that party has been returned to power, contains the following statement in its tariff plank:

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad; together with a reasonable profit to American industries. * * * Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in a free interchange of products, with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests.

President Taft in a speech at Greeley, Colo., October 2, 1908, said:

I understand you are interested here a great deal in beet sugar, and I also understand that some people have intimated that I was against beet sugar. I deny it. I would not do anything that would injure the beet industry in any way, and the Republican platform pledges the Republican party to take no action which will not leave adequate protection to the beet-sugar interests.

It appears from the foregoing declaration of party principles that every platform adopted by the Republican party from 1896 to 1908, both inclusive, contains a party pledge in favor of a protective tariff, and that two of them—namely, the platforms of 1896 and 1908—contain specific pledges that the domestic sugar industry shall be protected. Moreover, it appears, further, that the President of the United States is recorded as saying that he would not do anything to injure the beet-sugar industry and that the Republican platform pledges the Republican party to maintain adequate protection to the beet-sugar interests.

The purpose of the sugar schedule in the Dingley bill is clearly the protection of the domestic sugar industry of the United States, with a view of the ultimate production on American soil of all the sugar the American people consume. The framers of the Payne bill have drawn the sugar schedule with the same end in view. While the present sugar schedule yields a greater amount of revenue than does any other schedule in the entire bill, still the primary object of such schedule is the protection of an American industry. This was the intent of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1897, and it is the intent of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in 1909.

THE SUGAR SCHEDULE OF THE PAYNE BILL.

The sugar schedule in the Payne bill now before Congress provides that sugar testing 96 degrees shall pay a duty of $1.68½ per hundred pounds, and that for each degree below 96 degrees, 3½ cents per hundred pounds shall be reduced, while for each degree above 96 degrees, 3½ cents per hundred pounds shall be added until 100 per cent, or refined, sugar is reached, which shall add an extra 7½ cents per hundred pounds, which excess is called a refiners' differential. This makes the duty on refined sugar to be $1.90 per hundred pounds. This section of the Payne bill is identical with the corresponding section of the Dingley bill, except in the matter of the refiners' differential, which, in the Dingley bill, is 12½ cents per hundred pounds, making the complete duty on refined sugar in the Dingley bill $1.95 as compared with $1.90 per hundred pounds in the Payne bill. A further concession in the sugar schedule is made by the insertion of a section which provides that there may be admitted annually into the United States, from the Philippines, not to exceed 300,000 tons of sugar in any one year duty free. Under the present law, Philippine sugar entering the United States is granted a 25 per cent concession from the rates fixed in the Dingley bill, and the 75 per cent that is actually collected at our customs-houses is returned to the Philippine treasury.

Another section of the Payne bill provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity between the United States and the Republic of Cuba of the 23d day of December, 1903.

The above-described provisions cover the only changes in the sugar schedule as set forth in the Dingley bill of 1897. It would seem at first glance that the schedule established in 1897 is practically unchanged. Not so, however. Since the passage of the Dingley law in 1897 the sugar schedule has been subjected to four distinct modifications prior to the ones enumerated in the Payne bill. The conditions growing out of our late war with Spain have led to these modifications. Hawaii was the first to profit by the war. Prior to 1898 free trade between these islands and the United States depended upon treaty. In that year the islands were annexed to our country and our tariff laws extended to include them. The permanency of the relation thus established led to a more rapid development of the sugar industry in the Hawaiian Islands than ever before. At the time of the annexation the Hawaiian crop amounted to 200,000 tons; this year it is 465,000 tons, all of which comes in free of duty. Such an influx of free sugar from Hawaii was not contemplated by the framers of the Dingley bill in 1897.

Porto Rico came to us by right of conquest—a trophy of the Spanish war. Because of her low wage rate it was at first thought best to maintain a tariff on goods from that island to the United States. This plan was soon abandoned, and the Dingley law was extended around Porto Rico, and her products were admitted into the United States free of duty, and none of which the framers of the Dingley bill ever intended should enter the United States without paying full tariff.

In 1903 a reciprocity treaty was made with Cuba, under which sugars from that island were admitted to the United States at 20 per cent reduction from the rates fixed by the Dingley schedule. Since the ratification of this treaty the entire Cuban crop of sugar has been sold in the United States. During the first four years of the operation of this treaty we received from Cuba 4,864,111 tons of sugar, as shown by the United States Annual Report of Commerce for 1907, page 340. On this sugar there was a concession of 20 per cent in the duty, or 33 7/10 cents per hundred pounds, the amount of the concession for the first four years of the treaty being $36,718,204.

Surely the framers of the Dingley bill did not contemplate that more than a million and a quarter tons of sugar should enter the United States from Cuba yearly at 20 per cent less than the schedule fixed by that law.

A fourth modification of the Dingley sugar schedule was made for the benefit of the Philippines. Sugars entering the United States from those islands received a concession of 25 per cent, and the 75 per cent that is actually collected is returned to the insular treasury, thus, as far as our National Treasury is concerned, establishing free trade with those islands. The framers of the Dingley bill certainly did not con-

template the importation of free or concessionary sugar from the Philippines.

The combined effect of these tariff modifications is as follows, the figures being taken from page 10 of Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, January 9, 1908, and from Senate Document No. 250, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, compiled by O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics:

In the calendar year 1897 the total consumption of sugar in the United States was 2,070,987 tons. The production of domestic cane sugar that year was 310,537 tons, of domestic beet sugar 39,684 tons, of domestic maple sugar 5,000 tons, making the total domestic crop to be 355,221 tons, none of which paid the duty. In addition to this, Hawaii, operating under a treaty with the United States, shipped us, free of duty, 232,219 tons, making a total of nonduty-paying sugar to be 587,434 tons, and leaving as the full duty-paying sugar entering the first calendar year of the Dingley bill to be 1,483,544 tons.

In the calendar year 1907 the total consumption of sugar in the United States was 2,993,979 tons. The domestic cane consumption for that year was 264,969 tons, the domestic beet consumption 375,410 tons, the domestic maple consumption 10,000 tons, and the domestic molasses sugar used was 6,249 tons, making the total domestic consumption to be 656,627 tons. The domestic cane crop for that year was 347,000 tons and the domestic beet crop 410,000 tons, the difference between the crop and the consumption being carried over and used early in the calendar year of 1908.

In addition to the above domestic crop we used, free of duty, 418,102 tons from Hawaii and 212,853 tons from Porto Rico. We also used from the Philippines, at 75 per cent of the Dingley rate, 10,700 tons, and from Cuba, at 80 per cent of the Dingley rate, 1,340,000 tons, making a total on which tariff concession is allowed of 1,982,655 tons, leaving a balance of 355,297 tons upon which the full rate of duty was paid. This shows that the tariff concessions granted since the passage of the Dingley bill in 1897 have resulted in increasing the free and concessionary sugar imported into the United States by an amount in excess of 1,700,000 tons. These various concessions have reduced the average rate of duty collected on the sugar entering the United States so that, if computed on the sugar originally intended by the framers of the Dingley bill to come in on payment of full duty, it is at present only $1.14½, provided by the Dingley tariff.

The facts as stated above have been corroborated during the past winter by the New York market for Cuban sugars and the New Orleans market for domestic cane sugar. The Cuban quotation has ranged from 40 to 50 cents below the European quotation plus full duty, while the New Orleans or Louisiana sugars have ranged from one-eighth of a cent to three-sixteenths of a cent below the Cuban quotations.

The average has been about 54 cents below the European price plus the full Dingley rate. If we subtract this 54 cents from the $1.68½ provided in the Dingley schedule, we have $1.14½ as the measure of protection afforded the domestic sugar industry during the past winter under the modifications of the sugar schedule of the Dingley bill as outlined above. The actual market conditions thus show conclusively the effect of the four different concessions already made in the sugar schedule of the Dingley bill.

The Payne bill proposes now to admit a maximum of 300,000 tons of raw sugar free of duty. This, added to the modifications already made, will make a still further concession in the duty on raw sugar. The sum total of the concessions from the Dingley raw-sugar schedule, when the Philippine provision of the Payne bill becomes fully operative, will be at least 45 per cent. In view of this reduction in the tariff on raw sugar, it is only fitting that the differential between raw and refined sugar shall also be reduced. The Payne bill provides for a reduction of 40 per cent in the refiner's differential.

IS THE SUGAR SCHEDULE AS FIXED BY THE PAYNE BILL IN HARMONY WITH THE DECLARED PRINCIPLES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AS SET FORTH IN THE PLATFORM OF 1908 AND INTERPRETED BY THE PRESIDENT?

The present sugar crop of the Philippine Islands is about 200,000 tons, of which approximately one-half is exported, the remainder being used for home consumption. The maximum export of sugar reached by the Philippines is 250,000 tons. It would, therefore, seem that a provision which permits them to export free of duty to the United States 300,000 tons of sugar annually would enable them to accomplish that which President Taft states he desires to see accomplished in the development of the Philippine Islands, namely, to enable their sugar industry to reach that degree of prosperity which it formerly enjoyed.

It will not, however, permit anyone to exploit the islands with the intent to make of them a great sugar-producing region. To make of these islands a great sugar plantation would be to fasten on them forever a system of sugar estates ranging from 25,000 to 50,000 acres, a system of absentee landlordism, and a system of semiservile or peon labor. Such is the universal result following the establishment of great sugar interests in any tropical country. The history of Java, Porto Rico, and Cuba abundantly illustrates the truth of this statement. It is not the policy of our National Government, as now set forth by President Taft, to exploit the Philippine Islands in any such way; rather it is the policy to encourage those industries which will cause the development of the individual Filipino, giving him the incentives which go with individual ownership of land and afford him the uplift consequent upon such ownership. By limiting the amount of free sugar imported from the Philippines into the United States the beneficial effects of access to our markets will be granted to the individual Filipino and not to the great corporations organized for the purpose of exploiting the sugar lands of those islands. This policy is in direct keeping with the enactment of the land laws of those islands, which prohibit any corporation from owning more than 2,500 acres of land.

It must be remembered that a minimum of at least 25,000 acres is necessary for the maintenance of a great sugar estate. The climatic and soil conditions of the Philippines are such that if there was no limit on the amount of sugar they could import, duty free, into the United States, the output of sugar from those islands would be such that it would result in the destruction of the sugar industry of the United States.

By limiting free export to the United States to the amount named in the Payne bill, namely, 300,000 tons, it is expected that the development of these islands can go forward without the destruction of our domestic sugar industry in the United States. Hawaii and Porto Rico, by virtue of their limited area and small population, can not increase their sugar output much beyond the present yield. Cuba, with her 20 per cent concession in the tariff, has the opportunity to develop her sugar industry to its normal capacity, namely, about one and one-half million tons. If the Philippines ultimately export to the United States 300,000 tons annually, it will still leave, with the constantly increasing consumption in the United States, an opportunity for the domestic beet and cane sugar industries to develop as rapidly as conservative business principles shall demand.

It remains for us to consider whether the rates fixed in the sugar schedule of the Payne bill are based on the recognition of the principle that the protective tariff should "equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." Let us first consider the duty on refined sugar. Europe is the only country that makes refined sugar for export to the United States. The price of European sugar for export is governed by the Hamburg quotation. From Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Trade Journal, December 26, 1907, page 7, the Hamburg price per 100 pounds for refined granulated sugar for the past eight years is given as follows:

1900	$2.64
1901	2.29
1902	1.79
1903	2.11
1904	2.55
1905	3.00
1906	2.31
1907	2.40

This makes the average Hamburg price for granulated sugar for the past eight years to be $2.38½ per hundred pounds f. o. b. Hamburg. A careful comparison of these figures with those given by the great English authority, H. H. Hancock, pages 104 and 105 of the International Sugar Journal, February, 1908, shows them to be practically the same as those quoted by the London authority. It is true that this $2.38½ per hundred pounds is the export price and not the consumers' price in Germany, but it is with this export price that the American producer must compete.

From the uncontradicted evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee, it appears that the average price paid by the beet-sugar factories of the United States to the American farmer for his beets is $2.40 per hundred pounds for the sugar in the beet before beginning the process of manufacture. In other words, our factories pay the farmer for the raw beets, when delivered to the factory, more money per hundred pounds of sugar than the European exporter asks for his finished product, refined granulated sugar. The chief witness who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee advocating the reduction of the duty on sugar was Mr. Atkins, of Boston. He states that he considered one of the most favorable localities for the production of beet sugar in the United States to be Utah, and gave $3.70 per hundred pounds as the cost of producing granulated sugar f. o. b. the factory in Utah. This price included the farmer's profit in raising beets, but did not include the manufacturer's profit. Beet sugar produced in Utah and imported refined sugar would meet on common ground at Chicago. The freight on sugar from Utah to Chicago is 50 cents per hundred pounds, making the cost of such sugar, without any profit to the manufacturer, $4.20 per hundred pounds delivered at Chicago.

If to the $2.38½ per hundred pounds, the average Hamburg export price for refined sugar, we add 12½ cents freight and insurance from Hamburg to New York, and $1.90 per hundred

pounds duty, we have $4.41 as the cost of this sugar f. o. b. New York, which cost includes the cost of manufacture, the German farmers' profit, and the German manufacturers' profit.

The freight rate from New York to Chicago is 24 cents, making $4.65 the cost of foreign refined laid down in Chicago, plus profit. This includes the profit to all foreigners engaged in the production of such sugar. Against this we have $4.20, the cost of beet sugar made in what is admitted the most favorable location of the United States and laid down in Chicago without profit to the American manufacturer.

In view of such showing it certainly can not be considered that a tariff of $1.90 per hundred pounds on refined sugar is excessive or that the establishment of such a rate is not in keeping with the enunciated platform of the Republican party, governing the principles upon which a protective tariff should be established.

Let us now consider the tariff on raw sugar. From the Report of Commerce and Navigation, 1907, page 1022, it is learned that the average consular price on raw sugar for the fiscal year stated was $2.10 per hundred pounds, and that the average price on imported Cuban sugar for the same year was $2.18 per hundred pounds. As the major portion of the sugar imported comes from Cuba, we should consider the operation of the proposed tariff on the kind of sugar imported from that island, namely, 96 degrees centrifugal sugar. Under the Cuban treaty such sugar pays $1.34 per hundred pounds duty.

The freight rate and insurance from Habana to New York is 10 cents per hundred pounds. When the Cuban sold his sugar, in 1907, for $2.18 per hundred pounds, he made a profit, as is shown by the fact that the sugar industry of that island, as reported by Governor Magoon in his report of December, 1907, was at that time in a more prosperous condition than ever before. If to the $2.18 we add 10 cents freight and the insurance and the $1.34 duty, we have the cost of that sugar, including planter's profit, delivered at New York, to be $3.62 per hundred pounds. The average difference between raw and refined sugar for the past ten years is 88 cents per hundred pounds.

This includes the refiner's profit. We therefore have the cost of refined sugar made from Cuban raws, including profits for the Cuban planters and the American refiners, to be $4.50 per hundred pounds. This sugar is sold f. o. b. New York, Philadelphia, or New Orleans with the freight rate added, whereas the domestic producer of sugar must pay his freight to the competing point. It will therefore appear that the Cuban planter, on the basis of the tariff provided for in the Payne bill, is not unduly taxed and that the schedule on raw sugar provides simply for such protection as covers difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

IS THE SUGAR SCHEDULE LEVIED BY THE PAYNE BILL OPPRESSIVE?

It has been shown that the average rate of duty on sugar provided by the Payne bill is about 40 per cent less than the full rate of duty provided by the Dingley bill. Since the passage of the Dingley bill, in 1897, the per capita consumption in the United States has increased from 60.9 pounds to 81.2 pounds. (See Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, Jan. 7, 1907, p. 2.)

This per capita consumption is greater than that of any other country in the world save England. The reason why England's per capita consumption is greater than that of the United States is that England exports great quantities of jellies, jams, and preserves. The amount of sugar actually consumed in England is less per capita than in the United States. It would thus appear that as long as the Americans have increased their per capita consumption of sugar one-third in twelve years that they have not unduly felt the price paid for their sugar. If the price on sugar had been oppressive, our people certainly would not have thus increased their per capita consumption.

It is interesting also to know the trend of market quotations since the Dingley bill went into effect in 1897. The wholesale price of granulated sugar f. o. b. New York City in 1896, the last year of the Wilson bill, was $4.53 per hundred. (See report of O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, S. Doc. No. 250, 59th Cong., 1st sess., p. 93.) The average price for the same grade of sugar in 1906, the year on which the committee bases its computations for the Payne bill, was $4.51½ per hundred pounds, and for the year 1907 $4.65 per hundred pounds. (See Willett & Gray's Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, January 7, 1909, p. 8.) It thus appears that there has been practically no advance in the price of refined granulated sugar under the Dingley bill.

Our present prices are substantially the same as those under the Wilson bill. Nearly every other necessity of life has had a marked increase in price during the past decade. Except during the times of war there is probably no ten years in our country's history when there has been such a universal rise in prices as during the decade just closed; while during this same period the price of sugar has remained practically a constant quantity, notwithstanding the fact that the rate of duty has been changed from 40 per cent under the Wilson bill to $1.68½ per 100 pounds for 96-degree sugar under the Dingley bill.

There are two distinct reasons for this condition in the sugar market:

1. The modification of the sugar schedule caused by the annexation of Hawaii, the free admission of Porto Rican sugar, and the reduction of the duty on Cuban and Philippine sugar have so modified the Dingley schedule as to bring it to nearly the same level as that fixed in the Wilson bill.

2. During the operation of the Dingley bill, the beet-sugar industry has developed to such an extent that during the winter months nearly 500,000 tons of domestic granulated sugar is placed on the market. Climatic conditions and carrying charges make it practically impossible to hold this sugar until the following summer. During the winter months the demand for sugar is reduced to the minimum, and during these same months the Cuban and Louisiana crops of raw sugar are placed on the market. The influx of beet sugar lowers the price of standard granulated sugar, which in turn reduces the price of raw sugar, thereby establishing, not only a lower price for sugar during the winter months, but a lower price for raws, upon which a lower price for refined can be based during the remainder of the year.

It has already been shown that during the past ninety days the price of Cuban sugar has ranged practically 50 cents per hundred pounds less than the world's price, plus our full duty. Our price for refined sugar has accordingly been depressed, and the result is that our people have been getting their refined sugar for nearly one-half a cent a pound less than they would have been getting it had it not been for the combined influence of the crop of domestic beet sugar and the Cuban raws both seeking the market at the same time.

The price for sugar paid by the consumers in the United States is less than the price paid by consumers in any other country except England and some of her colonies. Sugar-producing countries of Europe have two prices for sugar. One for export and the other for home consumption, the export price being 2½ to 6 cents a pound less than the consumption price.

It is with the export price that the producer in the United States must compete, but our laws are so adjusted that the consumer in this country actually gets his sugar at a less price than does the consumer in Continental Europe. If we should destroy our domestic sugar industry, it would not be rebuilt. Our consumers would then be at the mercy of the importers and the foreign producer. Every foreign country exporting sugar to us would then raise its export price and lower its domestic price, thus making us ultimately pay fully as much or more for our sugar as we do at the present time, and reducing the cost to the European consumer.

There is not the slightest doubt that this result would practically follow the destruction of the domestic sugar industry in the United States.

In view of the fact that the per capita consumption of sugar in the United States has increased one-third since the passage of the Dingley bill in 1897, and in view of the further fact that the cost of sugar to the consumer in this country has not increased since the Dingley law was passed, and in view of the further fact of the cost of sugar to the consumer of continental Europe, and in view of the further fact that the tax on sugar in the United States is less than the tax on sugar in any other sugar-producing country of the world, we maintain that the rates of duty fixed in the Payne bill, which are practically 40 per cent less than the rates fixed in the Dingley bill, can not possibly be construed so as to work to the detriment of sugar consumers in the United States.

SUGAR DUTIES IN EUROPE.

Every sugar-producing country of Europe maintains a higher tax on sugar than the full Dingley rate on that article, the tax per hundred pounds being as follows:

In Austria-Hungary the tax is $2.86 on raw sugar, and on refined sugar $4.02. In Russia the tax is $6.39 on raw and $8.56 on refined. In Germany the tax on raw sugar is $1.98, and on refined sugar $2.03. In Italy the tax on sugar above 94 degrees is $8.67, and on sugar below 94 degrees $7.70. In France the tax on raw sugar is $2.84, and on refined sugar $2.89. In Holland the tax is $4.82. In Belgium the tax is $2.23, and in Sweden the tax is $1.80 on sugar above No. 18 Dutch standard.

HAS THERE BEEN A REASONABLE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE THE PASSAGE OF THE DINGLEY LAW?

When the Dingley tariff was passed in 1897 there were but six sugar factories in the United States, and the combined output was 37,500 long tons a year. There are now 65 beet-sugar factories in the United States, with a combined output in 1908 of 492,969 long tons (Willett & Gray's Statistical Trade Journal of January 7, 1909). These factories are scattered throughout 16 States, as follows: One in Arizona, 8 in California, 16 in Colorado, 4 in Idaho, 1 in Illinois, 1 in Iowa, 1 in Kansas, 16 in Michigan, 1 in Minnesota, 1 in Montana, 1 in Nebraska, 1 in New York, 1 in Ohio, 1 in Oregon, 5 in Utah, 1 in Washington, and 4 in Wisconsin. The increase in the production of beet sugar since the passage of the Dingley law has been over 1,300 per cent.

The fixed investment of the beet-sugar business has reached a total of nearly $100,000,000, and the American farmers and laborers received in 1908 over $40,000,000 from the factories. The production of sugar from cane grown in the Southern States in 1908 was 390,888 tons (Willett & Gray's Statistical Trade Journal of January 7, 1909). The total consumption of domestic sugar in the United States in 1908 was nearly 900,000 tons.

ADAPTABILITY OF SOIL OF UNITED STATES TO RAISING BEETS.

There is much misinformation concerning the sections of this country suitable for the growing of sugar beets. However, the Department of Agriculture has for years printed maps showing the "beet belt" of the United States, and, undoubtedly Congress and the people will take the conclusions of the Department of Agriculture, based upon the experiments of experts, rather than the prejudiced statements of any person interested in bringing about free trade for the benefit of a particular sugar-refining company.

The following extracts from the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture give, in a general way, the best area of the United States:

It starts at the Hudson, takes in the southern half of New York and the northern portions of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, the southern half of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, all of South Dakota, large sections of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, and the coast side of California. * * * A great deal of territory that is showing first-class conditions for growing sugar beets and for manufacturing them into sugar is located around our Great Lakes.

A representative of the Department of Agriculture was asked by the Ways and Means Committee in the tariff hearings, November 16, 1908:

How much territory is there in the United States that is adapted to the growing of sugar beets? Can you state how much territory of that kind there is in the United States?

To this he replied:

It is adapted to a large part of the farming district of New York, Pennsylvania—I am talking about the real farming districts—in fact, you can take a line drawn across the country that will take in Chicago, the Northern States, say, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, the northern half of the State of Iowa, both of the Dakotas, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Montana, and it is adapted to nearly all of the intermountain States where they can get water.

This report of the progress of the beet-sugar industry in the United States and the adaptability of the soil in this country made by the Department of Agriculture is based upon experiments recited in detail in the report, and was compiled after years of study and personal investigation by the representatives of the department. It should, in all fairness, put an end to the assertions that only a limited area of the United States is capable of producing beets to be manufactured into sugar.

IS IT REASONABLE TO SUPPOSE THAT UNDER PROPER TARIFF REGULATIONS THE UNITED STATES COULD PRODUCE AT HOME ALL OF THE SUGAR IT NEEDS?

Germany, with an area of 10,000 square miles less than the combined area of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, had in operation, in the manufacturing season of 1907 and 1908, 365 factories, which produced 2,129,597 long tons of sugar. The actual area under cultivation in the season of 1907 and 1908 in Germany was 450,030 hectares. A hectare is 2.47 acres. The cultivated area given over to the raising of beets in Germany in the season of 1907 and 1908 was therefore 1,111,574.11 acres, which is considerably less than the area of three average counties in any of the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, or Minnesota. Germany, as just stated, produced 2,129,597 long tons of sugar in 1907–8. The total consumption of sugar in the year 1908 was 3,185,789 tons. Germany therefore produced from beets an amount equal to two-thirds of all the sugar consumed in the United States.

In the manufacturing season of 1907–8, the production of beet sugar in Continental Europe was: Germany, 2,129,597 tons; Austria, 1,425,000; Russia, 1,410,000; France, 728,000; Belgium, 232,000; Holland, 175,000; and other continental countries, 435,000.

The grand total of cane sugar for the world's markets manufactured in the world in the manufacturing season of 1907–8 was 6,909,481 tons, and the grand total of beet sugar manufactured in the same season was 6,972,200. (Willett & Gray's Statistical Trade Journal, January 7, 1909.)

Beet sugar furnishes more than half of the world's consumption of sugar, and, in spite of this fact, free traders are found asserting that the industry is not founded on permanent conditions.

The Department of Agriculture in the Report on the Progress of the Beet-Sugar Industry in the United States states:

If we consider only these localities in this country that have the best facilities for taking up the beet-sugar industry, and limit the territory simply to that portion capable of productng our own consumption of sugar, it might be said that the United States possesses some material advantages over Europe.

WOOL.

Mr. Chairman, I am a great friend of the American sheep; in other words, the woolgrower. It has been my great desire to obtain the greatest measure of protection to American wool. Cheap cost of living and cheap men can never be made the basis of economic progress. Cheap production means cheap labor; cheap labor means low prices; low prices means disaster to American industry. There never has been, and there never will be, a time when labor received starvation wages that the American people were or will be prosperous. The business prosperity of this or any other country depends, to a very great measure, upon the purchasing power of the masses of the people, and what is true of one industry is also true of another industry. When high prices for farm and manufactured products and American labor prevail, prosperity also prevails.

Mr. Chairman, when the duty on wool was less than it is now the number of sheep in this country decreased. In 1884 there were more sheep in the United States than ever before or since. The number, for some reason, fell off until, in 1892, statistics show there were about 47,500,000 sheep in the United States, and in 1897 that number had been reduced to 35,000,000 head. When the Dingley bill was enacted into law, which gave greater protection to American wool, it stimulated the growth of the flocks in the United States, and to-day we are again back close to the highest point in number in the history of the country, or about 47,500,000 sheep, and that industry is fairly prosperous. There is but one way by which this magnificent flock can be increased or retained—that is to give ample protection to wool and woolen goods.

The American woolgrower has no other market for his product except at the woolen mills of the United States, and unless the woolen mill is prosperous certainly the woolgrower will not receive a fair price for his wool. The American sheep and the woolen manufacturer are linked so closely together that it is impossible to separate them. They must and do go hand in hand. They must either prosper or languish as one.

An ad valorem rate of duty has been suggested by some as being more equitable than a specific duty, but this can not be more truly demonstrated to be impractical than by a statement which I received from the editor of the Textile World Record, published at Boston.

The editor of that journal gave me a report of a recent sale of wool in England, in which he stated that wools of the first class were sold on a certain day, and the maximum price received was 21 cents per pound, and the minimum price received the same day was 6½ cents per pound. The duty on such wool is 11 cents per pound, which would mean for the highest prices prevailing that day, wool, duty paid, laid down in the United States, at 32 cents per pound, and the minimum price on that day, duty paid, laid down in the United States, of 17½ cents per pound.

Again, he gives me the highest price obtained December 5, 1908, for 15,000,000 pounds of unwashed and scoured wool of the first class—Australian wool. On unwashed wool he gives 39 cents per pound as the highest price obtained, and 3½ cents per pound the lowest price obtained. This wool paid a duty of 11 cents per pound when brought into our markets. The ad valorem rate on the former is 28 per cent and on the latter 318 per cent. He complains about this high rate ad valorem. Again I say, on the lower-priced wool the tariff is 11 cents per pound, the same as on the high-priced wool. The lower-priced wools were admitted to our markets at 14½ cents per pound, while the higher were 50 cents per pound, duty paid, laid down in American markets. Where, on the other hand, had there been an ad valorem duty of, say, 50 per cent, as suggested by some gentlemen who

wish a change from a specific to an ad valorem, these cheaper wools would have been put upon our markets at the ruinous price of 5¼ cents per pound. No clearer demonstration could be made of the folly of an ad valorem duty on wool.

Again, on scoured wool he quotes the highest price obtained, 40½ cents per pound. The duty on this wool is 33 cents per pound. The ad valorem rate is 81 per cent. Where, on the other hand, the lowest price obtained on that day for scoured wool was 6½ cents per pound, the duty is 33 cents per pound, or 507 per cent ad valorem. Suppose the duty had been 50 per cent ad valorem, as above suggested, that Australian scoured wool would have been placed upon our markets at a cost of 9¾ cents per pound. I believe all men well informed upon this subject will admit that our present specific duty upon wool furnishes better protection and a more equitable scale for prices than would an ad valorem duty.

The total production of woolen goods in the United States last year was about $400,000,000. Of this total, there were imported foreign wools to the value of about $40,500,000 worth and of woolen goods about $22,400,000 worth. These values of course are foreign values. The total amount of wools of the first, second, and third class imported last year was a little less than 200,000,000 pounds.

IMMIGRATION.

Since 1820 more than 26,000,000 immigrants have come to this country from all parts of the world; a population almost equal to three-fourths of the present population of Great Britain. Since 1897 more than 7,000,000 of these people came to the United States, and within the last three years 3,500,000 immigrants have landed on our shores. Never before in the history of the world has the percentage of immigration equaled this, an average per year of 300,000 for eighty-eight years and more than 1,169,000 per year for the past three years. These people came to us because the United States furnishes more comforts to its people and gives greater opportunity for the accumulation of wealth than does any other country in the world.

A man at work is certainly the most valuable asset of a nation. Idle men, consuming and not producing, burn the candle at both ends, and are worse than worthless. Individuals can not make conditions under which our industries may be successfully conducted. Lawmakers must create the conditions. The duty of the lawmaker is to shelter industries from disastrous competition from outsiders, and to encourage and stimulate present and build up new industries. A protective tariff is in the nature of a wall around our garden to protect the worker and his product from foreign intrusion.

The intent and principle of a protective tariff law is none other than to foster capital and labor at home. American markets are the best markets in the world for American products, and great care should be taken in the enactment of laws to protect American industry from foreign competitive products. Domestic industries are none too prosperous to-day, and any revision of our tariff laws that would encourage greater foreign imports would be the most unwise act possible for Congress to perform.

It is my belief that the strongest demand for a revision downward of our tariff schedules comes from men of selfish motives, or men not thoroughly informed as to the true situation as to the inactivity in some lines of industry, largely caused by too much gossip about tariff revision.

There is no disputing that some of our tariff rates in some particular schedules are high enough to be beyond the point of necessary protection, and it is the aim and purpose of this bill to make equitable adjustments, and I believe it is of great importance that Congress should as speedily as possible settle this tariff question and the Members of Congress at the earliest possible date turn their backs upon the Capitol of the United States and hie away to their respective homes, so that our domestic industries may settle down to some fixed plan and know what they may depend upon, so that manufacturing industries may go forward as in the past.

An equitably arranged tariff means no willfully idle men. On the other hand, it means stability to both capital and labor, and is our greatest safeguard to Americans against ruinous foreign competition. Gentlemen, I thank you for your attention.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to consume a great length of time, and I ask now that I may have unanimous consent to conclude my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, forced to action by pressure of public sentiment well-nigh universal, a Republican House of Representatives, through its members of the Ways and Means Committee, has attempted to revise the present tariff law.

In 1900 the present Dingley law was considered so perfect, so beneficent in its operation, so stimulating to business, such a splendid producer of revenue that the party in power looked with scorn upon any man who dared to suggest necessity for revision. We were told it was so wonderfully drawn that, while it put up wages, yet it kept down to a minimum by healthy American competition the price of those necessities the wage-earner was compelled to buy. While it insured large profits to the manufacturer, yet those who were compelled to purchase manufactured articles paid for such articles even less than they would have been forced to pay if this marvelous law were not on our statute books.

It guaranteed the largest dividends to those engaged in protected manufacturing industries the country had ever seen; guaranteed the highest wages to the American workingman he had ever received; and, yet, by its operation likewise guaranteed to all the people the lowest prices they had ever paid for both the necessaries and comforts of life. In fine, even as Mr. Webster said of the Constitution, so the Republican party claimed in that campaign that this most marvelous piece of legislative handiwork was in itself "a copious fountain of national, social, and personal happiness."

In 1904, party leaders considered that they could not do better than base their hopes and claim of popular support upon the same foundation; so they solemnly warned the country that well enough had better be left alone.

Between the years 1904 and 1908 some mysterious cause wrought a radical change in popular sentiment. The people of the Nation realized that, while they had enjoyed a period of prosperity, the people of other nations not protected by the Dingley tariff, or, indeed, by any tariff at all, had also enjoyed a prosperity equal, if not higher in degree, than that enjoyed by us. The workingman realized that he had been deceived, for when he examined his account book he found that the cost of living had advanced in proportion considerably beyond any advance in the scale of wages he was receiving. The great mass of people realized that it was contributions taken directly from their pockets which turned out our annual crop of millionaires.

It should not be forgotten that the decade immediately following the enactment of the Dingley law has been characterized by the greatest extravagance in appropriating and expending the people's money in all the history of our national life. From a billion-dollar Congress in the years of the last decade of the last century we are now holding billion-dollar sessions of Congress, and the man who rises in his seat in this Chamber to call a halt is considered a demagogue merely playing to the galleries.

To make a long story as short as possible, in 1908, while the country had not yet passed from under the black cloud of financial panic, the party in power realized that if it did not explicitly promise to revise our present tariff laws, then the people would intrust the performance of the task to some other political party or agency.

A place at the pie counter is desired by us all, let us candidly admit, but I have often thought that our Republican friends get there quicker, stay longer, and are harder to force away than any class of people on the face of the earth. [Laughter.] Therefore, rather than lose its place at the counter of the national restaurant, that party agreed to revise your Dingley tariff; and when you agreed to revise it you intended the people of the Nation to understand that you meant to revise it downward, in a manner fair and just to all sections.

Let us examine how far you have performed your promise; whether or not you have performed it at all.

Mr. Chairman, I make bold to assert here and now that the Payne bill is a worse measure than the Dingley bill, which all parties now admit must pass from the pages of our law books. In the teeth of your promise to the people to revise downward you have revised upward, for you have increased the average ad valorem rate of 44.16 per cent under the Dingley bill to 45.72 per cent under the proposed Payne bill.

You have a deficit in the Treasury confronting you—thanks to your unbridled extravagance—and, in order to cover that deficit, of course you have got to raise more taxes, which will come directly from the pockets of the people; but, as I expect to show, you have been careful not to legislate so that any of your great tariff-fostered trusts will be forced to surrender any part of their unreasonable profits or the protection against competition which has surrounded them like a granite wall. Even where there is the slightest danger of forcing your tariff-made trusts to meet competition you have made them secure by giving them free raw material.

Those of you who support this bill may as well bring yourselves to realize in the beginning of this debate that all the increase in revenues provided by this bill is taken from the pock-

ets of the masses, with no compensating benefit in return, and that when you support the Payne bill you are voting for a higher ad valorem rate than that provided by either the McKinley or the Dingley bill.

IRON AND STEEL.

Probably more time was devoted by the committee to a consideration of the steel and iron schedule than to any other schedule in this bill. Do you gentlemen claim that your revision of this schedule will afford any relief whatever to the consumer? Do you suppose for one moment that the result of your work will save to the man who uses steel one single dollar? If so, I venture the prediction that you will be disappointed.

After all, Mr. Chairman, what are we here for? Is not the consumer entitled to some consideration? Must he be forever taxed and forever forced to buy in a market where all competition is killed? Such has been the position occupied by the consumer for many years. Special interests can afford to send their representatives here. Not so with the average citizen. If he is represented at all, you and I and all other gentlemen elected to fill seats in this Chamber must see that he has a square deal. Will any gentleman on the other side of this Chamber rise in his seat and declare his opinion that the man who is forced to buy and use steel and iron will actually get his steel and iron cheaper if the Payne bill shall become a law?

Great is the reduction, indeed. The average ad valorem rate under the present law is 36.96 per cent. The Payne bill actually reduces this rate to 36.15—that is to say, less than 1 per cent.

One of the most radical changes in the entire bill is that on steel rails. You have cut the import duty in half—that is to say, you have reduced the present duty of $7.84 per ton to $3.92.

It would be interesting to know upon what evidence the majority of the committee based their action in making this reduction. If you acted upon the evidence of Mr. Carnegie, then you should have removed the duty entirely, for he said the steel manufacturers of this country need protection no longer. Even if you accept the evidence of Judge Gary, the head of the steel corporation, you would be justified in taking the same action; but if you acted upon the evidence of any other steel or iron manufacturer, you should have done one of two things—either raise the Dingley rates or permit them to remain as they now are.

Mr. Carnegie spoke with great frankness, and evidently knew what he was talking about. More largely interested in steel and iron than any living man, he yet had the frankness to admit that the time has come when we can beat the world in the manufacture of steel and iron, and that it is idle to talk about our manufacturers needing protection any longer.

Every man who travels a mile on a train or ships a pound of freight over a railroad is interested in the price of rails. Do you imagine that you have helped the man who travels or the man who ships by reducing the duty on rails 50 per cent? Let us see.

In 1907 we imported railway bars of iron and steel to the value of $133,936, or 4,610 tons. Probably not a single additional ton will be imported because of the reduction from $7.84 to $3.92 per ton. Why? Because $7.84 is practically prohibitive and $3.92 is also practically prohibitive. In the same year, 1907, we exported rails to the value of $8,384,241, and a large proportion of rails exported was sold to foreigners considerably cheaper than the same rails were sold to our own people.

In 1899, Mr. Charles M. Schwab, at that time president of the Carnegie Company, wrote in a letter to Mr. Frick:

> You know we can make rails for less than $12 per ton, leaving a nice margin for foreign business. (P. 4895, Hearings.)

At that time the market price of steel rails for home consumption was $28.12 per ton, and has ranged since then from $27.33, the lowest, to $32.29, the highest.

Does anyone wonder that we have been turning out each year a new crop of steel millionaires? I know Mr. Schwab has revised his figures so as to put up the present cost of steel rails to $21.50 per ton.

One who knows nothing about the steel and iron business, except such information as can be obtained from books, government statistics, and the like, has but little warrant to speak on the subject; but I wish every American citizen could read in full the evidence of Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Schwab, and Judge Gary before the Ways and Means Committee in framing the steel and iron schedules offered in this bill for the approval of Congress and the people.

The reductions are paper reductions merely; will help the consumer little, if any, and certainly will not subject the steel corporation or any other concern producing iron and steel to that fair, just, healthy competition which the consumer has a right to expect. The Government can not pass laws which force such competition, but it can, at least, by law, remove obstacles which the Government itself erected. That is what the people expect. They will be satisfied, in my judgment, with nothing less.

But for fear that the manufacturers of steel and iron might suffer some little inconvenience by reason of the change in schedules, behold how careful the majority of the committee has been to compensate for all possible or prospective loss!

Actually, Mr. Chairman, the Republican majority of this committee has placed iron ore on the free list. Just think what a boon this will be to the average American citizen! Iron ore on the free list! After this bill becomes a law you can buy your iron ore in open market, with no duty at all to force you to pay tribute to the man who owns the ore. Who will receive benefit from this change? Certainly not the consumer, for the price of iron and steel will be fixed in Pittsburg and Chicago, as it is now, largely by the Steel Corporation. The revenue which the Treasury will lose by reason of the placing of iron ore and the dross from burnt pyrites on the free list amounted to $344,511 in 1906. This amount is a present to the manufacturer, pure and simple, and attests the tender solicitude of the Republican party in dealing with those who are so abundantly able to take care of themselves.

This fact was established by undisputed evidence during the progress of the hearings, to wit: The Steel Corporation fixes prices, and the independent concerns do not dare to vary those prices. That was admitted in the hearings before the committee. Mr. King, of Pittsburg, representing the Jones & Laughlin Iron and Steel Company, was asked this question:

> As a practical proposition, the price of steel is largely controlled by the "steel trust," as you call it?
>
> Mr. KING. I think that is the fact.

Now, here is this iron and steel schedule, practically prohibitive, under the control of a monopoly, and you leave it practically prohibitive and under the control of a monopoly still; but for fear somebody would think you hurt the steel trust you are in this bill proposing to give them iron ore free, and when you do that you put your hand in the Treasury of the United States and take out $344,511, which is a present, pure and simple, to the steel trust and its allied corporations. Now, gentlemen, that is what took place when you came to deal with the iron and steel schedule. Do you think that the people of the United States are going to say that you have made good your pledge when you go before them with the schedules you have written into this bill? If you do, I predict you will be mistaken. I know that your orators will throw up their hands and declare you put iron ore on the free list; but in Heaven's name, whom is that going to help? The consumer does not buy iron ore; you do not buy iron ore; I do not buy iron ore. The average citizen has no earthly need for iron ore. The housewife returning from market has no iron ore in her basket. [Laughter.] It is the man who is engaged in the manufacture of iron and steel who buys the ore, and when you take off that duty you make him a present of $344,000; nothing more or less.

It is no wonder that this business has turned out an annual crop of millionaires in our country. Let me give you, gentlemen, an extract from the evidence taken by the committee in these hearings. There was a gentleman who appeared before the committee who impressed me as trying to tell the exact truth whether it helped his cause or hurt it; my friend Mr. GRIGGS asked him to tell the amount of the capital stock of his corporation, and he replied $30,000,000. Mr. GRIGGS asked him then what his stock was selling for, and he said there was none of it for sale, but that he supposed it would be worth, certainly, around 110. Then this same gentleman was asked how much capital his concern started with, and what amount do you suppose he named? He said he did not know, but the amount was less than $100,000. Then he was asked the further question whether anything had been paid in since the corporation was originally organized, and he said not a penny. Now, this corporation started with less than $100,000, not a dollar has since been paid in, and it is now capitalized at thirty millions, and is really worth far in excess of that stupendous amount. It is a close corporation, and none of the stock can be bought; and, according to one of the officers, it is worth at least 110 on the market.

That is an illustration of the enormity of this schedule. This is but a small illustration of how the steel producers of the United States build up immense fortunes out of the pockets of the people. The next schedule that illustrates the love of the majority of the committee for the large manufacturer is the leather schedule——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I do not desire to interrupt the symmetry of the gentleman's speech, but before the gentleman passes from the iron schedule I want to ask the

gentleman what you have done for the farmers in the way of cotton ties?

Mr. POU. Cotton ties are still on the dutiable list. The bill reduces the duty from five-tenths to three-tenths of a cent per pound.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Is this corporation, of which the gentleman spoke as making millionaires every year, engaged in making cotton ties?

Mr. POU. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Was there any evidence as to what it costs to make the ties?

Mr. POU. There was evidence before the committee, but I will say to my friend that I have not investigated that and could not answer offhand; but the cotton-tie business is controlled by the Steel Corporation and the price of ties is fixed by the corporation, as Mr. King, the gentleman from whose evidence I read a while ago, admitted. I have the evidence here in this connection, and I suppose I might as well read that also. He admitted that prices were not only fixed by the Steel Corporation, but that, as a rule, the manufacturers of steel sold their products cheaper abroad than at home.

I again quote from his evidence:

Mr. POU. As a rule, all of you do sell a little cheaper outside of this country than you do inside, do you not?
Mr. KING. I think that is true; yes.
Mr. POU. And therefore all steel manufacturers have an export price and a domestic price?
Mr. KING. Yes.
Mr. POU. The export price is less than the domestic price?
Mr. KING. I think that is true.

Mr. Chairman, when this measure comes to be discussed before the people of the country and its practical benefits are brought home to the thousands who toil and pay the taxes that go into the National Treasury, you will find that this steel schedule is still a fraud and a sham; that it protects the man who is able to protect himself; is still making the rich richer and the poor poorer all the time, and that you have failed to carry out the pledge which you made in your platform to revise your tariff, which everybody understood to mean to revise downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

DUTY ON SHOES AND HIDES.

Now, take the item of shoes. I have not time to go over these schedules at length. Yes; you reduce the import duty on shoes. Do you think the reduction is going to help anybody? Does anybody think that any more shoes are going to be imported than are imported now? Your schedule is still practically prohibitive. Yes; you cut it down a little. We brought in, I believe, last year, $155,000 worth of shoes. That was the entire amount of importations from abroad. That shows that the American shoe manufacturer has control of the American market. And what did you do for him? You put hides on the free list.

Do you think that is right? I wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] yesterday, when he was making his plea for free raw material, to answer this question: If it is right to put hides on the free list, tell us why it is not right to put wool on the free list also? I understand the gentleman did not want to be asked that question. Possibly our friend from Indiana had in mind a remark, the author of which I will not name—

There's many a speech for home consumption
Badly spoiled by a cruel interruption.

[Laughter.]

But if it is right to put one on the free list, it is right to put the other on the free list, and no man can——

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

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. WEISSE. Does the gentleman believe that if there was not any duty on hides they would be any lower?

Mr. POU. If there was not any duty on hides?

Mr. WEISSE. Yes; if the price in this country would be any lower?

Mr. POU. I think it would.

Mr. WEISSE. When they put calfskins on the free list, they went up higher, and the markets of the world went up to our market. What caused that?

Mr. POU. I suppose it was due to the great demand for calfskins. There was a peculiar demand for calfskins that did not apply to skins generally. But the gentleman will not deny the proposition that putting an article on the free list affects the price of it, will he?

Mr. WEISSE. I absolutely will in regard to hides and calfskins, because we are the largest consumer of hides and calfskins in the world and establish the price in the world's market, and we will establish it if we have free hides and free calfskins. Further than that, the market declined last year about 70 per cent, and it was not on account of the duty, but it was on account of the Republican panic, which was the cause of the decline in all merchandise, and now they are trying to bring in a tariff bill to brace up the prices that went down, even during the existence of the great Dingley tariff.

Mr. POU. I can not defend the action of the majority of the committee in framing this bill at all, Mr. Chairman. I started out to prove that schedules in the bill are unjust, that they discriminate, and I stick to what I said, that no man can tell a reason why there should be discrimination against the cattle raisers of this country. That is what I am talking about. If you are going to put hides on the free list, then you ought to put wool there also.

I have not heard a solitary reason assigned yet, and do not expect to hear any good reason assigned, because none exists. I believe that a duty on hides does affect the price of hides to some extent, though but little. And in the laying of duties for the purpose of raising revenue, I contend that the people who are engaged in the business of raising hides are entitled to as much, if not more, consideration than the manufacturer of the shoes. Why? Consider the people who are engaged in farming, and there is a vast number of them. It is very much more difficult for them to unite and combine for their own protection and mutual advantage than it is for the large manufacturers. It is a hard matter for these people to unite for their own good. It is a comparatively easy matter for those that are engaged in the manufacture of the finished product. And if you are going to put hides on the free list, no human being, in my judgment, can assign any good reason why shoes should not be put there also. Yet you leave a duty of 15 per cent on shoes. You put hides on the free list. You leave the cattle raisers in the mountains of North Carolina, on the prairies of Texas, and of the West open to competition with the entire world. When it comes to the man who is engaged in the business of manufacturing shoes, you shut out competition from abroad to the extent of 15 per cent, and you have made him a present of the duty that hitherto has gone into the Treasury that comes from the importation of 124,000,000 pounds of hides, which amounts to nearly three millions of dollars—$2,829,000, to be exact.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. POU. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. Do I understand the gentleman to state that the duty on hides has been to the advantage of the farmer?

Mr. POU. I say I think it has had a tendency to keep up the price of hides a little.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. I have gone over the statistics as published by the Government, and I find that the price of cattle is practically the same to-day as it was before the passage of the Dingley tariff bill. I find that cattle sell at 4 and 5 cents a pound on the hoof, and the hide is taken off by the beef trust and sold to the people of this country at about 14 cents a pound. I would like to know where the farmer comes in? I am a merchant in New York, and in Pennsylvania am a farmer. To minimize the loss on the farm, I have for a number of years fattened steers. Last year, and for two or three years past, I sold them for about 4½ cents a pound, and for the beef I bought back I paid about 16 cents, and the hide was sold for about 12 cents. I would like to know where I, as a farmer, was benefited by the duty on hides?

Mr. POU. That would involve too long an explanation for me to make here this afternoon. If the gentleman will ask me a direct question on a subject that I am supposed to know something about, I certainly would answer him; but as to his private financiering as a farmer in Pennsylvania and as a merchant in New York, I would imagine that the balance was largely in favor of the New York merchant and against the Pennsylvania farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG of New York. I can imagine that the cattle business is entirely controlled by a monopoly, and, as I understand that side of the House, it is absolutely opposed to monopolies and trusts.

Mr. POU. What do I understand the gentleman to say is controlled by a trust? I understood the gentleman to state something about a trust.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. The price of beef and hides is controlled absolutely by a trust, the packers of the United States.

Mr. POU. Then, if that is true, according to the gentleman's own contention, the repeal of this duty on hides is not going to hurt or help the farmer, but will inure to the benefit of the trust only.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. It will give the world hide supply to all tanners.

Mr. JAMES. In view of the fact that the gentleman has asserted that there was a trust, a beef trust, why did he not have that monopoly brought to the attention of this vigorous Republican administration, and have the trust prosecuted and destroyed?

Mr. YOUNG of New York. In answer to that I will say that the Government has already prosecuted that trust.

Mr. JAMES. I know they prosecuted the trust, but what did they succeed in doing with it?

Mr. YOUNG of New York. They did the best they could with the evidence procurable.

Mr. JAMES. And what was that?

Mr. YOUNG of New York. I do not want to interfere with the gentleman further, but to say just this one word.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman——

Mr. JAMES. Do not prevent him from answering that question.

Mr. YOUNG of New York. If you will permit one more interruption, I was talking to a large tanner from your own State within three days, and he told me that he found it was impossible to conduct his business as an independent tanner, and he has made arrangement with the trust to tan hides for them to keep in business.

Mr. JAMES. I have not heard an answer to my question. The gentleman said he was going to tell us what was done with the beef trust. That the entire country is trust-ridden all men must admit, and why is it that his party, which is in power, does not do something to free the people from the oppression of monopoly?

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, the inquiries of the gentleman from New York were involved with so very many preliminaries and so many conditions I hardly think I could be expected to answer them. What I am arguing, and what I shall not be diverted from, is this: That in the framing of a tariff bill we ought, if possible, adhere to a principle, and no man has assigned any reason which, to my mind, is sufficient why hides should be put on the free list, unless you are going to put shoes, wool, and other raw material also on the free list. Why except hides? What conditions surround the farmer engaged in raising cattle that justify you in exposing him to a competition world-wide unless you require the shoe manufacturer to meet the same competition? You force the cattle raiser to sell his hides in competition with all the world, and you say that is right. But when that same cattle raiser goes to buy shoes you say to him, you must patronize a protected manufacturer or pay a duty of 15 per cent; and I say that is wrong. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I undertake to say that when you took the duty of $2,829,000 out of the Treasury, which has been annually collected from 124,000,000 pounds of hides, you made a present of just that amount either to the trust or to the shoe manufacurer; I do not care which. You have taken it out of the Treasury. The Treasury will no longer receive it. You have denied the benefit of it to the cattle raisers all over this country; and if your tariff is worth anything, it is worth as much to the cattle raisers, or ought to be, as to anybody else. You have told us it was a great blessing to all classes; that it was a fountain overflowing with benefits to everybody. If that is true, and we have heard that song ever since 1897, why is it that you take the cattle raisers of Texas, North Carolina, and the mountains, plains, and prairies all over this country and force them to compete with the world, when you have surrounded every trust and combination in the country with an all-sufficient wall to protect it against all competition? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say that in the next campaign, when you go before the country, if you still have that injustice in your bill, you will find that the people will hold you accountable for making a discrimination against this large and respectable class of citizens. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The item is a revenue producer; and in the laying of revenue which must incidentally protect, I hold that the farmer is entitled to exactly the same consideration as any other citizen of the Republic; and in changing this schedule I respectfully admonish you, here and now, that you have perpetrated a gross injustice upon thousands of American citizens which they ought to resent, and which they probably will resent as soon as they understand the treatment they have received at your hands and when the opportunity is presented. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You have taken nearly $3,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States and given it to the shoe manufacturers of the country. You have exposed the cattle raisor, as I have said, to competition with the entire world. The price of his hides will be fixed by the world-wide law of supply and demand. This being the case, I respectfully submit there is no reason why the price of the finished product should not be fixed by the same law.

INEQUITY OF THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

Again, Mr. Chairman, every man, woman, and child in America is interested in the wool schedule. Whoever wrote that schedule in the Dingley law did great injustice to the people of this Nation. Here was your opportunity, Mr. Chairman, if you really intended to help the average citizen. The Dingley rates were ridiculously high, and I doubt if anybody in America really understands exactly what these rates mean, except Mr. William Whitman, of Massachusetts.

Women's and children's dress goods protected by an ad valorem rate ranging from 71.43 per cent to 167.68 per cent, averaging 103 per cent; wearing apparel, clothing ready made, and so forth, with an average ad valorem rate of 94.54 per cent; flannels for underwear, with an average ad valorem of 107.52 per cent; blankets, with an average of 80.78 per cent; knit fabrics, with an average of 101.94 per cent; yarns, with an average of 87.77 per cent; wool itself, with an average ad valorem of 42.61 per cent.

Here was your opportunity, Mr. Chairman, if you really wanted to help the man who needs your help—the wage-earner, the salaried man, the farmer, the professional man—all classes in every station in life—here was the great opportunity which the American people offered to your committee when they took you at your word and returned a Republican Congress last November. In 1907 the American people imported $62,000,000 worth of wools and woolen goods, and paid therefor an even hundred million dollars. How much they paid to the manufacturer of woolen goods is beyond all calculation.

Did you avail yourselves of this opportunity? Here is how you did it: You reduced the present average ad valorem duty on wool and woolen goods from 60.02 per cent to 59.40 per cent. The revenue you received under the present law during the last fiscal year was $37,973,891.34.

The revenue which you yourselves reported will be taken from the people under the proposed bill is $37,586,491.96. Wearing apparel you did not reduce at all, and still remains at 94.54 per cent. Women's and children's dress goods you only reduced one-tenth of 1 per cent. Under the old law it was dutiable at 103.33 per cent, while under the new law it will be dutiable at 103.23 per cent. Blankets, which must be used by a large per cent of our people, where they are able to pay for them, are still dutiable, as under the old law, at 80.78 per cent.

I wish every American citizen who can read would send and get Schedule K of your new bill and examine the same for himself. The burden which the people have borne so long, and which you have still left upon their shoulders, would so reveal itself that the people would rise up and require that you make an honest revision of this schedule in the interest of the consumer as well as the manufacturer. The outrage the people have endured would shock the conscience of the Nation, if fully realized, if the people fully understood how the prices of the very necessaries of ordinary everyday living have been doubled by the imposition of the unjust rates provided in Schedule K.

MONOPOLY TO MANUFACTURERS OF GLOVES.

Let us consider, also, the manner in which the majority of the committee has dealt with another very important article of wearing apparel—women's and children's gloves. Gloves worn by men are almost entirely of American manufacture, because the duty under the Dingley bill was placed so high that there has been practically no competition from abroad. In 1907, 108,000 dozen men's gloves were imported from abroad. The duty runs from $4 to $7.55 per dozen. The duty on women's and children's gloves, of sheep origin and not over 17 inches long, under the present law is $2.50 per dozen, and the duty on this class of gloves likewise runs from $2.50 per dozen to $5.80, the ad valorem duty on women's and children's gloves being around the average per cent of 51.98.

This condition of affairs was too much for the Republican party. The opportunity was too inviting; the stake was too large. The result was that this committee, pledged to revise and revise downward, actually increased the ad valorem duty on women's and children's gloves from 51.89 per cent to 72.65 per cent. Gloves under 17 inches in length are increased from $2.50 to $4.70 per dozen; kid gloves not over 14 inches are increased from $3 to $4, from $3.40 to $4.40, from $3.80 to $4.80, from $4 to $5.75, from $4.40 to $6.15, according to the lining, finishing, etc.

If this schedule should be enacted into law, there is not a woman or a child in America who wears gloves who would not

suffer by reason of the change, and the beneficiaries of the change would probably be confined within the limits of one city, Gloversville, N. Y.

The change in this schedule is not surprising to some of us who have been in Washington for quite a while and have gained some little insight into the way in which things are done. During the last days of the last session of the Sixtieth Congress the fate of the subsidy bill was hanging in the balance. The measure had passed the Senate and had come to the House for ratification or rejection. It was known that the vote would probably be very, very close. In this exigency Republican leaders who had this measure in charge brought to their assistance all of the old guard within reach, who were supposed to have influence over the membership of the House of Representatives. One very genial gentleman in particular, who is largely interested in the glove business, was on the scene and, it is said, did yeoman service in bringing up Republican recalcitrants to the support of that vicious measure. Likewise, immediately preceding the assembling of the present Congress, when the organization of the House was in doubt, this same genial gentleman was on hand doing yeoman service to force back into line bolters from the regular Republican column.

His town of Gloversville has control of the output of men's gloves to a very large extent. His community enjoys a protection against competition which is so complete that during the year 1907 only 108,000 dozen men's gloves were brought into the United States from abroad. His community has had a monopoly of this business. Now, lo and behold, he is to be rewarded with an additional monopoly probably of the manufacture of women's and children's gloves also.

It will not be very long before the women of this Nation will experience an object lesson of Republican revision of the tariff on gloves. Woe unto the Republican party on that day when the wrath of the American woman is aroused! The rocks and the hills will not be sufficient to hide you from her vengeance. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

During a speech of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, leader of the minority in the House of Representatives, on Wednesday last, a colloquy occurred between him and the present Speaker of this House. In that colloquy a statement was made by the Speaker which, when considered, will probably cause some people of this Nation to sit up and take notice. In a speech made by himself in the State of Missouri in the last campaign the Speaker stated, in substance, that he informed the voters of one of the zinc-producing districts of Missouri that if at the ensuing election that congressional district returned a Democrat, he would take it to mean that the people did not desire a duty on zinc; but if they returned a Republican, he would interpret the result as meaning that the people did desire a duty on zinc ore, and that he would vote in accordance with the politics of the gentleman elected by the people of that district at the ballot box in November, 1908.

I have very great respect for the Speaker and can not believe he was speaking seriously when he made that statement; but if he was serious, the statement may throw some light on the action of the committee in framing this bill.

The farmers of Virginia and North Carolina asked for an increase in the duty on peanuts. It was denied to them. The long-staple cotton raisers of Georgia and Florida asked for a duty on long-staple cotton, 300,000 bales of which are imported annually. A reasonable import duty on long-staple cotton would raise considerable revenue, but the request of these people was denied by the majority of the committee.

Their cause was not worthy of consideration. They had sent a Democrat to Congress, not a Republican. If an import duty on long-staple cotton is a good thing for them, then they must be punished for recording their honest convictions at the ballot box.

One of the important mining industries of the mountain district of my State is the mica industry. In 1902, 40 mica mines were reported in operation in the United States. Of these, 28 were located in North Carolina, and 14 of them were reported idle. Those engaged in the industry earnestly begged the committee not to change the import duties provided in the Dingley Act; but they made their plea in vain, and they even sent a Republican to Congress.

No doubt they had heard of what the Speaker of this House told the voters of the Joplin district in Missouri. By a very narrow margin they defeated one of the most useful Representatives in this Chamber. Now, lo! and behold! the Speaker has failed to keep his word; and, even though a Republican has been sent here—for only one term, however, I predict—the committee has recommended a radical reduction in the import duty on mica.

In the face of a probable annual deficit of $100,000,000, the committee was forced to provide for the raising of additional revenue. This additional revenue could easily have been raised by reducing the import duty on various articles in the Dingley bill to the competing point. Without inflicting one iota of injury upon the wool growers of America, much additional revenue could have been raised by an honest revision downward of the wool schedule.

I have not time to discuss this proposition at length, but I have been told by those who have made a careful study of the Dingley schedules, that it is possible to raise much additional revenues by an honest revision downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

HOW REVENUE WILL BE RAISED.

Let us consider how the additional revenues have been provided. First, by a tax on tea. Immediately upon the passage of this bill there will be an advance in the price of tea, and every American citizen who is forced to pay that increase in price may understand that the majority in this House is directly responsible therefor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, the southern people are largely interested in the manufacture of lumber. We have a perennial growth of timber. The present rate on sawed lumber is only 12.94 per cent, but your committee has felt constrained to cut this in half, thereby reducing the ad valorem rate to 6.47 per cent. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, the importation of lumber and the manufactures thereof amounted to a trifle more than $28,000,000, paying into the Treasury revenues amounting to $3,650,054.

In the last campaign, throughout the length and breadth of my State at least, Republicans were warning every voter who owned a bunch of trees not to vote the Democratic ticket, because a Democratic Congress would certainly reduce or remove this duty entirely. Everywhere the promise was made that a Republican Congress would see to it that the duty on lumber should not be changed.

LUMBER SCHEDULE.

I am told by those engaged in the lumber business that a duty of $1 per thousand, practically speaking, leaves them at the mercy of the lumber manufacturers of Canada; that is, so far as the esatern market is concerned. They insist that the present rate of $2 per thousand has only benefited them to the extent of enabling them to find a market for their lower grades. In other words, they say it enables them to clean up the cut of the tree. Why strike at these people? Many of them voted your ticket in the last campaign.

Why leave an average ad valorem import duty of 59 per cent on wool while you reduce the average ad valorem on wood and its manufactures from 16.03 per cent to 10.42 per cent? If the manufacturer of metals is entitled to a protection of 36.15 per cent, as proposed by this bill, is not the lumber manufacturer entitled to the same consideration? If the manufacturer of earthenware and glassware is entitled to an average ad valorem duty of 52.13 per cent, which is an actual increase, by what process of reasoning did you feel justified in reducing the average ad valorem rate on lumber from 16.03 per cent to 10.42 per cent?

The chemical schedule is protected to the extent of 28 per cent. Tobacco and the manufactures thereof are protected by an average ad valorem of 104 per cent. Agricultural products and provisions are protected by an average equivalent ad valorem of 39.08 per cent. The manufacturers of spirits, wines, and other beverages are protected by an average equivalent ad valorem of 74.92 per cent—increased from 71.18 per cent. Cotton manufacturers are protected by an ad valorem of 50.27 per cent. I challenge the majority of the committee to name a single individual who has received such a scant consideration as the lumber manufacturers of this Nation.

Upon what evidence the committee based its action I do not know, but I do know that throughout the length and breadth of the country, with singular unanimity, a plea has come up to this committee from lumber manufacturers asking that the old rates of duty be permitted to stand. I charge that this is a discrimination against these people. If you are going to have a tariff at all, they are entitled to exactly the same consideration as any other class of manufacturers of this Nation. [Applause.]

You gave to the woolgrower ample protection against competition from abroad. Is not the man who has carefully protected his forests entitled to the same consideration? Why should you make a distinction? What has the owner of stumpage done that the value of his property must be impaired, as he contends, by the reduction of this duty? [Applause.]

This is another illustration of the discrimination and favoritism which characterizes the pages of this bill. I may be mistaken, but I believe that this large and respected class of citizens will hold you accountable for this discrimination against them at the first opportunity. If you had reduced all duties 50 per cent these people would not have one word to say. If you had made an honest revision as you promised to do, so that lumber manufacturers would receive some benefit when they go upon the market to purchase necessaries, they would have no right to complain.

I believe you had a deliberate purpose in view when you made this radical reduction in the duty on sawed boards, and so forth. Until a storm of protest was raised you intended to make lumber the scapegoat of this bill. You intended to sacrifice lumber to atone for all your other sins. No doubt you think you can go before the people in the coming campaign and use this as a justification of the promise made in your platform. Be warned, here and now, that it is a two-edged sword. The people to whom you will appeal believe in justice, fair play, that which a distinguished gentleman was pleased to denominate "a square deal." You have not given to the lumber people of America a square deal in this bill—a bill that is far worse, as a whole, than the one you are proposing to repeal. Both are bad enough, heaven knows. But were conceived in sin and born in iniquity. The old bill, because it is unjust, has already risen up to curse and plague you. The day is not far distant when the favoritism of your new bill will become so apparent that the people will rise up and sweep from power those who are responsible for its enactment into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Reckless extravagance is the cause of the deficit of $100,000,000 annually, which now confronts the party in power. You could easily have covered a large proportion, or perhaps all, of this deficit by an honest revision of the Dingley law. Possibilities of largely increased revenue are involved in the wool schedule alone. You have preferred, however, to raise additional revenue by a tax on tea, by a tax on inheritances, which have been fully discussed in this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The abuse which was heaped upon those who provided an income tax in the Wilson bill is yet fresh in the memory of most of us. This Congress, in less than thirty days, can provide for submitting to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for a tax on incomes. Very many prominent lawyers suggest that probably an amendment to the Constitution is not necessary; but even if you had proposed the amendment you would have done your part. You preferred, however, to impose a tax upon inheritances of the poor as well as the rich—a tax already provided by most of the States of the Union. You are, therefore, imposing a double tax upon inheritances in most of the States. It is not surprising, therefore, that the legislature of at least one State has passed resolutions protesting against your inheritance tax. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, before leaving this proposed inheritance tax, I will mention one peculiar provision. In the same spirit of discrimination and favoritism the Republican majority of the committee has provided in the bill that where any property is devised or bequeathed to any person who is a bishop, said bishop shall not be required to pay the tax. Why the majority of the committee was willing to extend this exemption to a bishop and not to the ordinary everyday preacher is something I would like to hear explained by those who drew the direct inheritance tax provision. [Laughter.]

DEFICIT UNDER THE DINGLEY BILL.

Mr. Chairman, desperate, indeed, must be the plight of a party which is willing to impose such burdens as these upon a long-suffering people. You have a deficit of a hundred millions annually on your hands, and the Dingley bill is still in force. *A deficit, and the Dingley law still in force.* I will tell you how you are going to cover your deficit, and you are going to have it all right. You may partly cover it by a direct tax on tea, you may partly cover it by a direct tax on inheritances, but there is one thing you are going to do about which there is no earthly doubt. *You are going to issue bonds.* Oh, how we have heard of the Cleveland bond issue! It has been rung in our ears in this Chamber to my knowledge for eight years; yet now, lo and behold, while the Dingley bill is still in force, which was all sufficient, we were told, to bring back prosperity, to furnish abundant revenue, when there is not a cloud that darkens the horizon of national peace, when there is an absolute calm throughout the length and breadth of the land, we are to provide for issuing $250,000,000 of bonds annually! Do not forget that, if you please.

That is the way you are going to raise your revenue—by an issue of bonds and by a direct tax on tea and on inheritances. You could have raised, in my humble judgment, every dollar of this additional revenue if you had put down the wool schedule, if you had revised it honestly in the interests of the consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You would have not had to put a tax on tea; you would not have had to put a tax on inheritances, which in 38 States is going to operate as a double tax. Take a body of experts, who are honestly favorable to a revision of this tariff in the interest of the masses and not in the interests of a few, and let them revise the tariff. The tariff has always been revised in the interests of the few, and that has been the curse of this country during my lifetime. You can not put a dollar into one man's pocket without taking it out of another man's pocket. You can not establish a prohibitive protection without giving to the manufacturer a monopoly of the home market; and the party I belong to says that that is wrong. I am willing to have you put an import duty on almost any article, a duty sufficient to cover the difference in cost here and abroad; and when you have done that, you have done all that any man ought to ask you to do.

When you put the manufacturer in America upon an equality with the manufacturer of the world, he has no right to ask you to do any more. When he asks you to surround him with a protection that kills off all competition, he is asking of you the privilege of putting his hand in somebody's pocket and taking out dollars without giving the value thereof in return. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Such a principle as that can not last forever. I do not wonder the Dingley bill has risen up to plague the party responsible for it, and this bill will rise up to plague you, and if you pass it there will be an ever increasing restlessness among the masses, and the time will come when under God you will be forced to do justice between the masses of the people and the favored few. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] That is the principle of the party I belong to. I would to God we could take the tariff question out of politics. I would to God we could submit the whole question to some commission or some body of men who would deal with it from a business standpoint, who would deal with it from the standpoint not of the manufacturer's interest, but from the standpoint of the people who dot the hills and live upon the plains, and who are forced to pay the taxes that run this great Government.

I would be willing to favor almost any measure that would remove the tariff question as a football to be kicked back and forth between the two political parties. It is too great, there is too much involved in it. The whole country is waiting now while we are discussing this question in this Chamber. The American people are waiting to see what we do here. I say, let us act upon this question as quickly as the importance of the question will justify. Let us settle this spirit of unrest, this fear to do business that now exists throughout the land. [Applause.]

OPPORTUNITY FOR FRAUD.

One of the most important sections in this bill is susceptible of two or more constructions. If there is any gentleman on the other side of this Chamber, or on either side, who can explain to us exactly what section 29 of the Payne bill means, he will confer a favor upon at least one Member of the House by making such explanation. This section corresponds with section 30 of the Dingley bill and section 22 of the Wilson bill. It is identically the same in both, and is not difficult of interpretation. The Dingley law provides that where imported materials on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States, there shall be allowed on the exportation of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the materials used less 1 per cent.

Before the exporter can place his hand in the Treasury, under the old law, he must show, first, that he has manufactured an article for export; second, that all or part of the materials used in the manufacture of such articles were imported; third, that he has paid the import duty upon such articles. Having shown this, he is entitled to receive back 99 per cent of the duties paid out by him upon the imported material.

Now, the Payne bill materially changes this section, and what it really does mean is certainly not plain. It may mean a great deal, or it may mean nothing. It certainly does provide that a drawback shall be paid, not only in cases where articles manufactured for export are made up of foreign material, but also where such articles are made up of domestic material, as well. If the section means that the exporter is entitled to a drawback where articles for export are made up, wholly or in part, of domestic material, then the committee has conferred upon the exporter a bounty, pure and simple. It is insisted by gentlemen in this Chamber that the section really means that the exporter is

entitled to a bounty wherever he exports articles made up of domestic material. If this construction be correct, it will be difficult to compute the amount of money this section will take out of the Treasury.

I do not believe even a stand-pat Republican can afford to commit himself to such a radical departure as this. Certainly we are entitled to know what the section means, and up to this hour I submit there has been no sufficient explanation.

Now, what do you say in section 29?

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 to the amount of duty paid on the imported articles used, or where domestic materials are used, to the duties paid on the equivalent of imported material, less the legal deduction of 1 per cent.

Does anybody know what that means? Now, I will tell you what I think it means or rather what I think it was intended to mean.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is that section 29?

Mr. POU. Yes. I think that it was intended to mean this: That where articles are imported and afterwards exported the exporter gets a drawback, and it means that where a man imports an article for any purpose he credits himself with the amount of duty paid to the Government on that article and then if at any time within three years he exports anything, and has used therein either imported material or domestic material, he is entitled to be paid back out of the Treasury whatever amount he has theretofore paid out less 1 per cent. That is what I think you intended to say, but you did not say it.

The result is that a great many gentlemen construe this section to mean that wherever a man is engaged in the export business and uses domestic material he is entitled to be paid out of the Treasury a bounty to the extent of what would have been paid if he imported all the material used, and it looks as if the section might bear that construction. If it does, then during the next year or two after this bill goes into effect you may expect to see $200,000,000 taken out of the Treasury by way of bounties. Why enlarge this section at all? Was it not good enough? We paid out under the old law nearly $7,000,000 annually in drawbacks, and the Standard Oil Company got a large portion of it. Are you not satisfied with the operation of your drawback clause? I think it is broad enough now. Now, I may be obtuse and may not understand the English language sufficiently to construe this section, but I do think that some one of the able lawyers on the other side of this Chamber, and there are quite a number of them over there, ought to take this section and reform it so that it will be perfectly plain and nobody can misunderstand it. I know of no man who could perform that task better than my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will pardon me for just a moment, I admit the thing is somewhat confusing, and must necessarily be, but if the gentleman will just bear this in mind, if instead of calling it a "drawback law" he would give the French title to it, "the law of temporary admission," then I think he would find that all the difficulties would resolve themselves, the only difference being that in France the manufacturer pays no duty when importing his material, but gives a bond, which is canceled when the manufactured product is exported. Here the manufacturer pays the duty and gets a drawback when the manufactured product is exported, but if in discussing it you will simply bear in mind it is "a law of temporary admission," I think the difficulties will resolve themselves.

Mr. POU. I understand that; but with a period extending over three years——

Mr. HILL. Pardon me just a moment. That is a very great modification of the existing practice. To-day people are getting drawbacks on importations made ten years ago. This is a limitation, and probably the time would not be as long as three years, but for the necessity for providing for the construction of vessels, for instance, where it would require a year or two years or three years to complete the process of construction. It is a limitation rather than an extension, and a great limitation rather than an extension.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept the challenge of my colleague on the committee in redrafting this section, providing I could have his cooperation in the matter, and we could sit down and do it in an entirely nonpartisan way. I think there are some features of this bill—the administrative features, like the patent-law provision and this drawback provision—which would be entirely outside the realm of partisanship and would receive the unanimous approval of the House and the country. If this drawback provision does not carry out the intention which the gentleman from North Carolina, and I supposed the drawback provision should carry out, then I think we ought to make it clear. But I would like to redraft the provision with the knowledge that it would meet with such approval, and I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he does not believe in the wisdom of a general drawback provision by allowing a drawback for the exportation of imported goods when manufactured?

Mr. POU. I believe the law as written in the Dingley bill and the Wilson bill is a reasonable and proper provision, but I do not believe in enlarging the drawback provision so as to cover domestic material. I do not believe that it should be enlarged to that extent.

Mr. BOUTELL. Then, as I understand it, you believe there should be no drawback except on the identical article imported, which must be identified all the way through the manufacture to the point of reexportation?

Mr. POU. I believe that would be the safer route. I believe the enlarging scope of section 29 is fraught with too many possibilities of danger and fraud.

Mr. BOUTELL. Of course the gentleman will recall that we had had a great many illustrations—the manufacturing of foreign cutlery, for example, from Norwegian steel, and manufactured shoes from imported hides—where it is difficult to follow the raw material. That was the reason for the provision.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? Now, suppose a case like this: A canner in Florida and a canner in California putting up goods for shipment abroad and for domestic consumption also. He has to do it quickly, when the fruits are ripe. He has to make an estimate as to what his foreign trade will be and what his domestic trade will be.

He buys foreign tin for his foreign trade and domestic tin for his domestic trade. His foreign orders fall off in certain lines and increase in others. His domestic orders fall off in certain lines and increase in others. What harm can come from his shipping the domestic tin abroad and getting a drawback, if the can made from foreign tin, similar in every respect and to an equal amount, goes into domestic consumption? It is a great deal easier for him to fill his orders in that way, and nobody is harmed. In that case there is simply substitution from one to the other. In the other case, if the imported tin must be exported, he stands to lose on both the domestic and foreign business, for the export trade is oftentimes carried on at a profit less than the amount of the drawback.

Mr. POU. The old law is a concession to the exporter anyway.

Mr. HILL. Oh, not at all.

Mr. POU. If I remember correctly, the Wilson tariff bill was the first tariff law that contained that provision. I will not state that positively, but if I am mistaken my friend will correct me.

Mr. HILL. It is simply a question of securing the foreign orders and doing the work here, or of going without the business and without the work, too.

Mr. POU. I think I have answered the gentleman's inquiry. I think I have answered the gentleman's question as to what harm would come in a given case as stated by him. My answer is, as I stated a while ago, that I think the possibilities of fraud on the Government would be too great. I think it would open the doors too wide. But I respectfully submit that neither of the distinguished gentlemen, neither my friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] nor my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], both of them on the committee, has stated to us clearly and exactly what this section does mean. And at some time during the debate I hope to hear from one or the other of these gentlemen, because I believe that they both feel about it as I do, and that is that all administrative features of this bill ought to be divorced from any political consideration whatever. I would like to hear them explain exactly what section 29 does mean, and if its meaning may be misconstrued, then it should be reformed so that there can be no doubt as to its meaning. I suppose we will have no opportunity to amend it in committee. If we are to have that opportunity, I would like to be informed of it in advance, because there are quite a number of amendments which I have in mind and would like to offer to this bill. Is it possible, gentlemen, that you are going to pass a measure of such stupendous importance as this, so far-reaching in its results, affecting such a vast number of people, without allowing a reasonable opportunity to amend it in the interest of the people? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What are we here for if a committee is to be permitted to bring in a great measure, only reported to this House probably once in a decade, and yet the majority on the other side of the Chamber appears to be so fearful of somebody or something that it is not even willing to trust the American

House of Representatives? Even worse than this, you are not even willing to trust your own membership in this body. We have got to a pretty pass if we can not trust ourselves. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I know as well as I know that I am standing here this afternoon that there are enough men in this House who believe that this bill is radically wrong—that is, radically and inherently unjust—to change it if we will stand together. That is the plain truth, and you all know it. [Applause.] I challenge every man in this Chamber who believes that the bill is wrong to do his duty as an American Representative, to insist upon his right as a representative of the people, and thus let those of us who believe that it is wrong unite in changing it in the interest of justice and fairness. [Applause.] Let us eliminate the favoritism in this bill. Let us see to it that no committee, no matter what its membership may be or how powerful they may be, shall bring in a bill and force it through under gag rule, a bill which directly affects every man, woman, and child in this country. [Applause.]

It is humiliating to feel that when a man is elected here as a Representative to this House—the greatest legislative body in the world—his individuality must be dissolved and lost; that he must sit here and see wrong done, injustice perpetrated while his hands are tied by some rule reported from your all-powerful Committee on Rules. [Applause.] I say it is a proud privilege to be a Member of this body, and I do not feel like surrendering up my rights or evading any responsibility, and I know that there are gentlemen on the other side who feel exactly the same way. I predict now that a rule will be brought in here within the next week or two to force this bill through. The question is whether or not the men who want to see fair play to all classes, who want to see the toilers of the land receive a square deal as well as the rich manufacturers, shall unite and put this great measure above party, above and beyond all political considerations, or whether we will cringe to the lash of the machine [loud applause]—whether we shall see to it this measure is considered in a proper way with reasonable opportunity for amendments, or whether it shall be put through under a gag rule. [Loud applause.]

That question is coming; you can not escape it; you are going to be forced to confront it within the next ten days. On this side I hope you will find unanimous response to any proposal from any source that will change this bill in the interest of fairness and justice to all classes. The question is, as I said a moment ago, whether or not the independent men of this body will surrender their independence, whether or not they will submit to the power of the party lash. [Applause.]

I do not subscribe to the doctrine we hear so often mentioned—that no man is bigger than his party. I do not believe that. I believe a sovereign American citizen is bigger than any political party. I believe that the political party is but a machine to register the views and honest convictions of the sovereign voter, and when it ceases to do that it becomes the agent of tryanny of the party boss, and a curse rather than a blessing to a free people. [Applause.] I believe that in this Chamber our interests are very nearly identical.

I represent an agricultural district largely, and there are gentlemen on the Republican side who represent districts with interests almost identical. The same things that I have in mine they have in theirs. Now, why is it that we must be divided by that middle aisle? Why is it we can not stand shoulder to shoulder in behalf of those who send us here? As God is my judge, I want to put this question above party consideration. No matter whom it operates to help or to hurt, I want this measure shaped according to a principle that is just and fair to all—the rich and the poor, the high and the humble, to the strong and to the weak as well; to all of God's creatures equally who dwell in this fair land. [Loud applause.] Now, Mr. Chairman, just one word in conclusion. It may not be exactly apropos just here, yet I desire to submit an extract written by a very distinguished gentleman, and bearing somewhat upon this subject. Just at this time I am not going to tell his name. You may be able to guess it, however, while I am reading:

> When it comes to reward, let each man within the limits set by a sound and far-sighted morality get what by his energy, intelligence, thrift, courage, he is able to get, with the opportunity open. We must set our face against privilege, just as much against the privilege which would let the shiftless and lazy laborer take what his brother has earned as against the privilege which allows the huge capitalist to take toll to which he is not entitled. We stand for equality of opportunity, but not for equality of reward unless there is also equality of service.

Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, is the author of this sentiment, which I commend to those gentlemen in the Chamber who favor building our tariff schedules so high that they shut off all possibility of competition and leave the American people to the protected manufacturers for their legitimate prey. Equal and exact justice to all men; equality before the law; economy in the public expenditures, that labor may be lightly burdened; equal opportunity to all citizens, States, and sections; these are the symbols that make a nation great. We can do no better than to recur to them in the consideration of this measure. Let us address ourselves to this question conscientiously. Let us see to it that the gratuities, the favoritism, the unjust features of the Dingley bill are not magnified, not made worse than they are. That is what you have done in this bill, and the American people will hold you accountable for it at the first opportunity. Do not be deceived, gentlemen. You can not perpetrate such a legislative fraud as this upon the people. It is a gold brick, pure and simple, and rest assured the people will find it out. You had better let the law stand as it is than to put this measure on the statute books.

You have helped not a single consumer, so far as I can judge, while, on the contrary, you have increased his burdens. You have taxed the poor man's tea; you have taxed his direct inheritances; you have provided for the issue of bonds; you have raised schedules; you have not changed a single schedule in the real interest of the consumer. You have put ore on the free list. Oh, yes; you have done that. When we go out in the market the average citizen has no need to buy ore. [Laughter.] He has no use for it. What you want to make cheaper are the things that the poor, the needy, the wage-earners, the salaried man, the thousands who have made this Nation great, the farmers, the toilers all over the Nation are compelled to use. [Applause.] These are the people who are entitled to our first consideration. I bring to you here this evening in my humble way this appeal to put this measure above all party considerations. Let us legislate under God in the interest of all the people. [Applause.]

And, in conclusion, I say, as I began, that this bill is more oppressive, more vicious, than the present Dingley law, which all parties admit should now be repealed. There are gentlemen on this floor who insist that industries located in their districts will be absolutely paralyzed if this bill ever becomes a law. No doubt you are considering what you will do. There are gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber who, in private conversation, will not deny that there is disaster lurking in the provisions of the proposed law.

I hope I will live to see the day when no American industry will need any protection. I am opposed to the protective policy on principle. It has never been possible to administer such a policy in a manner fair and just to all the people. It is the same old, old story over again. The law can not put a dollar in your pocket without taking that dollar out of mine. I regret that the time has not yet come when either party can even consider the entire removal of all duties levied for the purpose of protection. The expenses of running the Government are so large that a system of import duties is necessary, and these duties are necessarily so high that they are protective in their operation, whether it is intended or not. I am not asking you for any favors for the State or the section I represent. I am opposed to your entire bill, but I also know you intend to pass it. It is no sacrifice of my Democracy or my principles to insist that in the laying of duties you ought not to discriminate against one State or section. Benefits, if there be any, should be equally distributed, and burdens should be, if possible, borne by all.

The party to which I belong asks that in the laying of these duties, as far as possible, injustice shall be done no one. I call upon the independent membership of this body to unite in one common effort to defeat this, the worst of all tariff bills ever submitted for the consideration of the American Congress.

I venture one thing more: I do not believe the President is favorable to the schedules in this bill, which kill competition and make the building up of monopoly all the more easy. The President is broad and patriotic, and wants a bill passed which will make favoritism and discrimination as nearly as may be impossible. In instead of lowering some of these ridiculously high schedules, you permit them to remain, while you increase other schedules; if you permit your Standard Oil countervailing duty to remain; if you decline to change section 29, which may take millions out of the Treasury; if you permit your direct-inheritance tax, operating as a double tax in 38 States, to remain unchanged; if you insist upon taxing tea instead of beer, I predict that William H. Taft will never sign your bill.

Before it is too late, let us all put aside all considerations of party policy and party advantage. It is all right to be a good Democrat or a good Republican, but it is better still to be a patriotic American.

If, in readjusting duties some of our great manufacturing interests are required to meet a little competition from abroad, it is no injustice to them. All that anybody has promised to do is to levy duties so as to cover the difference in cost here and abroad. Nobody wishes to force American labor to compete with the pauper labor of Europe. I think we are all willing to levy duties amply sufficient to accomplish this, but when you raise duties so high as to become absolutely prohibitive, you do an injustice to the wage-earner, as well as to everybody else, except the manufacturer who enjoys such favoritism; you are thereby unjust to the Treasury of the people, and you raise the standard of monopoly. [Applause.]

It is hard to rise above party, and yet, when one does it political enemies as well as friends applaud. The President has called us together to deal with this great question. Shall we legislate for the benefit of special interests or for all the people of this great Nation? That is the question now presented to every Member of the Sixty-first Congress. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I propose to discuss a schedule in this bill in regard to which there seems to be a remarkable unanimity of opinion, to wit, the lumber schedule. No schedule in the Dingley bill has been the subject of such adverse criticism as the lumber schedule in that bill; and when the Ways and Means Committee approached the revision of the tariff, there was a great public sentiment in this country that looked forward to a revision—yes, a repeal—of the lumber tariff. In reporting a schedule which, as we supposed, cuts this tariff in two, the committee took a step in the right direction. If they had only taken another step in the same direction, they would have arrived at the proper destination and placed rough lumber on the free list where it belongs. If circumstances ever justified the lumber tariff, they do not justify it to-day, and on the contrary demand its immediate repeal. The agitation in connection with this matter has produced some very interesting literature recently upon this subject. I refer particularly to a letter by the Chief Forester of the United States, Mr. Pinchot, which has been placed in the hands of every Representative on this floor—not by Mr. Pinchot himself, but by Mr. Defebaugh, the representative of the lumber interests here in Washington.

If this had not thus been made practically a public document, I should hesitate to discuss it here on the floor; but inasmuch as it has been placed in our hands by the lumber interests in order to influence our votes upon this question, I propose to call the attention of the House in a public manner to some of the thoughts which have occurred to me in connection with this letter. Before doing so, however, I wish to read a sentence from the Use Book, containing the regulations and instructions for the use of the national forests, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture July 1, 1908, and edited by Mr. Pinchot. Remember that Mr. Pinchot is speaking in this book to the American people. The sentence to which I wish to call attention is on the first page of the book, and is, I might say, the text on which he chooses to lecture us. He says:

> We know that the welfare of every community is dependent upon a cheap and plentiful supply of timber.

Bearing that sentence in mind, we will look for a moment at the argument presented by Mr. Pinchot to the American people upon this question to-day. This letter, Mr. Chairman, is addressed to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and its ostensible purpose, as he says, is to avoid any chance of misunderstanding. I do not know that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, or anybody else, misunderstood the distinguished gentleman when he was testifying before the Ways and Means Committee. No one was asking him to write this letter; and why, therefore, was it written? It was written so that it could be given publicity by the lumber interests and placed in the hands of Congressmen in order to influence their votes upon this very question.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HOWLAND. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. GAINES. I think the gentleman is not exactly correct in this statement of fact in connection with the Pinchot letter, and that is the only reason I interrupted him. Mr. Pinchot was examined before the Committee on Ways and Means, and after he had given his evidence he was asked whether he would revise it, and he suggested that probably it would be well to put what he said to the committee in the shape of a letter. I do not know whether he was asked to write this particular letter, but he was asked if he would revise his testimony.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Pinchot asked leave to revise his remarks before the committee.

Mr. GAINES. That is it.

Mr. HOWLAND. Not to write a letter. What I am complaining of is that the day after the letter was written to Mr. PAYNE it appeared in the press all over the country, and the very next day was laid on the desk of every Congressman in this House, with a note from Mr. Defabaugh, representing the lumber interests in Washington.

Now, then, Mr. Pinchot goes on further to say:

> The Forestry Service never has declared in favor of reduction or abolition of tariff on lumber. On the contrary—

And I am reading his exact words—

> we have been at some pains to avoid taking any position one way or the other until we could complete a satisfactory investigation of the subject.

Mr. Chairman, ex-President Roosevelt hurled philippics at the head of Congress in season and out of season, recommending the placing of forest products on the free list in order to conserve our forests. Who inspired the messages; from whom did the President get the information on this subject, except from the distinguished gentleman who is now advising Congress to stand pat upon the tariff on lumber? [Applause.] Is it any wonder that there has been a misunderstanding as to the position which the gentleman, the Chief Forester, occupies on this question? He says further:

> Many believe that the Forestry Service had declared in favor of the abolition of the duty on lumber.

How in the world did they get such information, and how did many of us in conversation with the distinguished gentleman get that impression? The truth of it is, of course, that Mr. Pinchot has changed his mind, undoubtedly. He has a perfect right to do so, and in that connection has a right to submit to us the arguments which convinced him and changed his mind upon this subject.

But imagine the peculiar situation in which Mr. Pinchot has been, according to his own statement, for the last seven years—sitting astride the fence while the President of the United States has been bombarding Congress in favor of the abolition of the duty on forestry products. [Laughter.] All of a sudden this distinguished gentleman, on the 10th of March, six days after the passing away of the last administration, sees a great light and jumps from the fence and tries to carry the whole Forestry Service into the ranks of the "standpatters" and lumber interests of this country. [Applause.]

What is the reason for this sudden change? The reason is plain. On page 5 of the letter he says:

> By asking for the reduction of the tariff in order to protect the forests the lumber men have, in substance, entered into an agreement with the people of the United States to perpetuate their forests by wise use. This tacit agreement is freely recognized by many of the leaders. If the tariff is allowed to remain, the lumbermen should be held to their agreement, and if they should fail to carry it out—

That is to say, if they should go ahead and cut down the forests—

> the people of the United States should take the matter in hand and enforce such control of lumbering as will protect the forests.

What good will it do to take steps to protect the forests after they have been cut down?

He further says that—

> The lumbermen must recognize that the forests they own are not simply pieces of private property, but that they are a public trust.

Mr. Chairman, this would be a most peculiar kind of a trust. The res, the subject of the trust, would be the forest; the trustee, the owner of the forest; and the beneficiary, or the cestui, would be the public. Whoever heard of a trust where the beneficiary, the cestui, had to pay the market price and then some more in order to have his own trust fund turned over to him? [Laughter.] Such an argument as that ought to be submitted to a graduating class in some high school on Arbor Day. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, now we want to turn right back to serious matters. We propose now to examine the reasons why this distinguished forester is insisting upon having a high tariff on forestry products, and he presents two arguments.

On page 2, he says:

> 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.

If the removal of the tariff on lumber would not reduce the price of lumber, then what do they want it on there for? If the removal of the tariff would not reduce the price, it certainly would not raise the price. They must take one horn of the dilemma or the other, and he says it would not reduce the price to the consumer. Now, here is where the theory of protection to lumber, it seems to me, gets a very suicidal thrust at the hands of Mr. Pinchot:

> Free lumber would not materially reduce the price to the consumer. Most of the lumber that is now imported comes from Canada, as most of it would if the duty were taken off. We are importing from Canada only about 2 per cent as much lumber as we are cutting from our own

forests. It is not likely that under free lumber more than 5 per cent of our annual cutting would be imported. Contrary to the general impression, Canada, as compared with the United States, has no great timber supply. Her total amount of standing timber is probably not more than one-third of what is left of ours. In the end the Canadians will undoubtedly require for home use all the timber they can produce. Imports from Canada would not be enough, therefore, to limit the cutting from our own forests or to reduce the price of lumber to any important degree.

Can it be that such facts as these are the cause of the hysterical argument that has been presented here on the floor to-day, fearful of this terrible inroad which Canadian lumber was going to make in the American market? This gentleman, Mr. Pinchot, who now becomes the advocate of the standpatters on the lumber tariff, tells you there is no danger because they have not got enough timber up there to import more than 5 per cent of our annual cut, and they will need all their own timber for their own use. Then what in the world do you want a tariff against Canadian lumber for? Oh, but we have heard about these Hindoos and these Japanese up there—trying to make out that the cost of production in Canada is cheaper than here in order to bring themselves within the ordinary rule of protection. But Mr. Pinchot is very careful not to leave any loophole there, for on the same page he says:

The average cost of logging and manufacturing in Canada is probably as great as it is here.

Under these circumstances, with the cost of production as great in Canada as it is here, with no timber supply in Canada to be imported, and with what they have got needed for their own use, what in the world is the use of putting a tariff on Canadian lumber?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOWLAND. With great pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not true that Gifford Pinchot originally did more to build up the sentiment in favor of free lumber than nearly anybody else in the country?

Mr. HOWLAND. I have so understood it, and while I do not know it to be a fact, I have said here to-day that I believe he inspired every word that President Roosevelt has said upon the subject of free forest products.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so, too.

Mr. HOWLAND. I do not know it to be so personally, but I believe it. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pinchot having demonstrated to his own satisfaction, at least, and I trust to the satisfaction of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] that there is no danger of any importation of lumber from Canada in any large amount, and that the removal of the tariff would not reduce the price of lumber, on page 3 of the letter he adopts the very ingenious argument which has been devised by the lumbermen that low prices for lumber increase waste, and he goes on to say that this tariff of $2 a thousand must be maintained in order to prevent low prices and keep down waste in the woods.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we have been operating under this very identical tariff for twelve years and it has not decreased waste in the woods. Mr. Pinchot says:

The waste in logging is already enormous.

We have been operating under the very tariff that he is asking to have retained to cure waste for twelve years.

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

Mr. HOWLAND. With great pleasure.

Mr. WHEELER. Could the gentleman tell us how he knows that that is true—that the waste is still as great under the Dingley bill as it was before? Has the gentleman any personal knowledge of that?

Mr. HOWLAND. I am using now for my authority the recent recruit of the standpatters, Mr. Gifford Pinchot.

Mr. WHEELER. Does he say that?

Mr. HOWLAND. He says:

The waste in logging is already enormous.

And you have been acting under the Dingley law for twelve years. If you can not cure waste with a $2 tariff in twelve years, how long will it take to do it?

Mr. WHEELER. That is true, just as he says. Does he say that it is as great as it was when we began, or does the gentleman know that or will any lumberman tell him that?

Mr. HOWLAND. Oh, I am not claiming to be a lumberman. I am arguing this on economic principles, and I am showing that Mr. Pinchot's argument is pure moonshine from an economical standpoint. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. And yet that is supported by any forester who will talk about it, and practically supported by every lumberman in the United States who knows what he is talking about.

Mr. HOWLAND. I have no doubt they know what they want.

Mr. WHEELER. No; in the preservation of the forests. I have been in the business all of my life, and I know that the waste is nothing like what it was thirty or forty years ago.

Mr. HOWLAND. I will take up the question of waste in a minute or two, to the satisfaction of the gentleman, I think. Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel possibly I ought to apologize for spending so much time upon this letter, but in view of the fact that it was thrust under the nose of all of us a day or two after it was written to influence our votes upon this question, I really take exception to it, and I must say that Mr. Gifford Pinchot as a standpatter on the lumber tariff is simply impossible. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another very interesting document that has come into my hands as a result of the agitation in connection with this proposed revision of the lumber tariff, and that is the report of the banquet that was held at the New Willard Hotel some time ago, given by the lumber interests of the United States to all the Congressmen, and I was very sorry, indeed, I could not be present, because I was out of town otherwise I should have accepted the very courteous and kind invitation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. However, in order to take care of all Members who were not present at the banquet some one very kindly had a stenographic report made of all the speeches and presented a copy to every Member of Congress, so that any absentees were taken care of in that respect. Now, Mr. Chairman, these forestry experts have come forward in force on this question, and the same argument in regard to waste in the forests was developed at the New Willard banquet by Doctor Schenck, I believe it is, a distinguished forester who was imported from Germany some fourteen years ago by Mr. G. W. Vanderbilt to look after his forest estate in North Carolina.

In the course of his remarks at the New Willard banquet he laid down a law of economics which should apply to the conservation of the forest products, I think he called it, and I will read from the remarks of Doctor Schenck on that occasion. You will find them on page 23 of the pamphlet. He said:

We have to apply the economical rules to the management of our forests—

Everybody supposed that was true—

Now, I ask you gentlemen, is it worth while to apply economics to save and husband a commodity so long as it is at a low price? When I am in a mountain at a 4,000-foot elevation I do not economize in the use of water, because I have fine springs, pure crystal springs, mountain springs, nothing to compare with them; but when I go back to Asheville, where I have to pay water rent, we economize, we conserve, we husband only that commodity which commands a price. The buffalo hunter in the olden times did not economize in buffalo meat; he had plenty of it. But now we raise cattle in lieu of it, owing to the higher price of the beef—

Mr. Chairman, I have carefully looked over all the market reports in an endeavor to find out what the quotations are to-day on buffalo beef, but I have failed to find buffalo beef quoted in the market. The good doctor, it seems, would have us commence to conserve our forests when they are as scarce as buffalo beef; in other words, when they are all gone.

Why, these forestry experts, it would seem, would have us, before they commence to conserve forest products, make them so valuable that we would be proud to wear wooden ornaments instead of diamonds, make the white pine as scarce as the cedar of Lebanon, and charge us admission to the grounds in order to see a real live white pine in the United States of America. [Applause.] Another argument, Mr. Chairman, was presented at this same dinner by Capt. J. B. White. He says:

We ask that the tariff remain on lumber as a means of forest protection. The upper grades of lumber will sell anywhere. They will bear transportation to the foreign market, but the bringing into our market—

And this argument was developed this morning by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan—

The bringing into our market from Canada of the lower grades is certainly against the interest of forest conservation.

In other words, the Captain's argument is this: That the lumbermen do not need a tariff on first grades and first quality. They can export that to the markets of the world and meet competition anywhere, yet they have got to have a tariff on seconds and culls, in order to enable them to sell seconds and culls to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, when it becomes necessary to impose a tariff upon any commodity in order to enable the producer of the commodity to export their first grade and sell their inferior grade to the people by means of the tariff, I am against any such kind of a tariff, and I do not believe it comes within the scope of the protective doctrine anywhere along the line.

Why, notwithstanding the frank statement—and that statement of Captain White was only equaled in frankness by the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] this morning—notwithstanding the frank statements of both those

gentlemen, it is urged by others interested in the retention of this duty that the American lumberman can not compete with Canada for one reason or for another. Under those circumstances you would not expect that the American lumberman would be exporting lumber right into the Canadian market itself and selling in the Canadian market and holding the Canadian market against the Canadian manufacturer himself in his own market.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman desires it, I can tell him right now that the British Columbia manufacturers are petitioning Parliament to give them a protective duty against the American manufacturers.

Mr. HOWLAND. They are in need of that. There would be some reason to ask protection against us. Our lumbermen are invading their market. Canada is the largest purchaser we have on the list, with the exception of Great Britain. I have the figures right here, but I will not take the time to read them. But they are absolutely accurate, because I got them from the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. HOWLAND. With pleasure, if I can.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman kindly tell me what kind of lumber it is that is exported from the United States to Canada?

Mr. HOWLAND. You have got a tariff on all kinds of lumber, and if you do not want to keep a tariff on your first grade, why do you not come in here and say so instead of insisting on it?

Mr. WHEELER. That is not the idea. What kind of lumber is it that is shipped from the United States to Canada?

Mr. HOWLAND. No difference what the lumber is, you insist on a tariff on all grades and kinds of lumber.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman has argued that the reason why we ship lumber to Canada is that it is cheaper here than there. Now, what are the facts? We do not export anything to Canada that they have there. We ship to them yellow pine, which does not grow there at all, and it is used for certain purposes and is better than anything they have got. That is the reason it goes there.

Mr. HILL. The exports to Canada year before last were 194,000,000 feet.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not object to that, but it is not the kind of lumber they have there. That is the reason they buy it in the United States.

Mr. HOWLAND. We are exporting directly to the Canadian market, and Canada is the largest purchaser of forest products we have outside of Great Britain in the wide, wide world. Four million dollars and over was the amount Canada paid the American lumbermen for imports direct into Canada during the last year. So much for that.

But we are exporting into the markets of the world, where we have to meet directly the competition of the Canadian lumbermen, and we are able to hold the markets of the world in competition with these Canadian lumbermen on an equal basis. Why, more than an equal basis!

Let me call your attention in this connection to the testimony of Mr. D. E. Skinner, of San Francisco, who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on November 20 last, during the hearings. Mr. Skinner, according to his own statement, represents the Port Blakely Mill Company, a corporation that has the largest export trade of any in the United States. He said—and I am using his exact language as taken from the hearings:

> We ship all our products, at least, on an average of 20 per cent higher in the export trade f. o. b. the mill than we do to the American trade. * * * We ship to Australia and to the west coast of South America and the Orient.

A question was interposed by a member of the committee:

> On that export trade you meet the competition of British Columbia, so that export prices are 20 per cent higher in full competition with British Columbia, and yet you fear British Columbia shipping into the United States?

He answered:

> Yes, sir; by all means.

He goes on to explain, and the information is rather interesting. He says:

> We know the increase of population in British Columbia is not large enough to increase their output very rapidly. The result will be we will have that timber there ten or fifteen years from now without any cost to us, and it is a pretty good storehouse for us to keep it in, too.

Showing, Mr. Chairman, that in the export trade American lumbermen go forth into the markets of the world and not only meet foreign competition, but add 20 per cent to the domestic price, and with the 20 per cent added are able to hold the market of the world in competition with the Canadian lumbermen. Under these circumstances, when we are invading the Canadian market itself, when we are going forward into the markets of the world, and adding 20 per cent to our domestic price for export, what becomes of all those Hindoos that have been injected into this discussion to try to show that we can not compete with the Canadian in cost of production?

We are competing with Canadian producers, and that question of oriental labor is injected into this discussion to try and bring in some strange manner this peculiar industry within the realm of the protective theory. Why, my friends, the lumber interests contend that the annual cutting of the American forests is marketed for something like $650,000,000, which is undoubtedly true. They compare it with the annual production of corn and wheat, and claim that because it is the fourth greatest industry in the United States that therefore they must be protected. Why, we used to approach this argument from the other side. The burden of proof was put on the industry to establish that it needed protection in order to protect American laborers, in order to protect it against ruinous competition; but to-day the lumbermen talk about the size of their industry and their great exports, and then demand protection against Canada, which sadly needs protection against them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, there is nothing more erroneous than the statement of the annual cutting of our forests as an annual crop, and there is no more fallacious comparison that can be made than to compare the value of the annual cutting with the value of the farm products of the country. The annual cutting of the forests is simply changing one form of wealth into another, plus the labor. That is all you have got. And instead of its being an annual crop, it is drawing so much from nature's storehouse in depleting nature's forest surplus in the United States. It has taken nature decade upon decade—yes, I might say, century upon century—to provide these forests for us, and the question of the net profit to this country arising from their destruction has not yet been settled and will not be settled for years to come.

We are hearing to-day all sorts of questions and theories upon the effect the destruction of our forests is going to have on our climate and the fertility of the soil and the navigability of our rivers, and I tell you the net profit to this country can not be measured by the annual value of the cutting away of our forests.

It is conceded by every one of us that the conservation of our forests is of the utmost importance to our people; and it is estimated that under present conditions our entire forests will be destroyed at least in a generation. The forests of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are all gone. There is nothing practically but brush piles where once these splendid forests stood. The mills have been shut up, and most of them moved into the timber States of the South, or into the forest States on the Pacific coast. In a short time these splendid forests will have followed in the wake of the forests of the older timber States.

I am going to trespass by reading a statement, referred to by the gentleman from Missouri the other day, of Mr. R. L. McCormick, on the condition of our forest supply. Mr. McCormick, president of the Mississippi Valley Lumbermen's Association, and secretary of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Company, as early as 1903, in an address delivered at that time, used the following language:

> Every man in the timber business to-day, whose dealings are of a sufficient extent to be subject to influences beyond those of purely local demand and supply, realizes that the lumber industry is, in many regions, confronted by a growing scarcity of available timber. Statistics point to it. Estimates of timber resources still remaining point to it also, but the strongest proof lies in the conditions which affect our industry.

It is not necessary to turn to statistics to prove that supply of certain valuable timber trees of the United States is rapidly failing, of others is practically gone, and of still others has entirely vanished as a factor in the lumber market. In speaking of the great pinery of the Great Lakes region, he says:

> The forests of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota originally maintained a stand of about 350,000,000,000 feet. Lumbering began there in the thirties and was of small importance until the early seventies. Since then the great pinery has been cut over in a way unprecedented in lumbering.

Mr. McCormick estimated that there was not more than 35,000,000,000 feet of marketable timber left in this territory. He says the end of the white pine is near, and that ten years will see it disappear as an important factor in the lumber trade. After calling attention to the supply of yellow pine in the Southern States and the consumption, he says these figures show that at the present rate of consumption the present stand of longleaf yellow pine will be exhausted long before a second crop can be produced to take its place.

> We have reached the point now where we are often unable to supply the demand for lumber which we have fostered. We must look to the production of the second crop or prepare to stop lumbering when the

first crop is gone. In the old days it was easy to lumber one forest and then turn to another. To-day we can not count, however, on new fields to turn to.

This article was called to the attention of the gentleman when he was heard before the Committee on Ways and Means, and he said that he knew more now than he did then. Under the exigencies of the case it would be fair, I believe, to criticise that statement, and say that in 1903 he was reciting facts, with no interest at stake, and that in 1909 he was trying to shape the facts to secure the retention of a tariff upon his private business.

Mr. Chairman, the retention of a tariff upon lumber can not help but hasten the destruction of our forests. The Canadian forests or our forests must go first. So far as I am concerned I am in favor, so far as possible, of allowing the Canadian forests to go first. We need not worry about them, however. They are trying harder to keep their own forest products at home than we are to keep them out of the United States.

The acute agitation which has grown up in this country in favor of the conservation of our forests has its basis in the deplorable effects which have resulted in certain sections of this country from the depletion of our forests. And this has gone to such an extent that now they are knocking at the Federal Treasury, asking for an appropriation at the hands of Congress to buy back these denuded areas and reforest them. The forests of New England are gone, and our friends from New England are asking us to buy back the White Mountains and their adjacent drainage areas and reforest them. The forests of the Southern Appalachians are substantially gone, and the Representatives from that section of the country are asking us to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury and buy back the Southern Appalachian Mountains and reforest them. And now in a few years our friends from the Pacific slopes, when their forests have gone the same way, will be knocking at the doors of the Federal Congress, asking us to appropriate money to buy back the Rocky Mountains.

Why can they not learn wisdom by the experience of the older timber States in this country, and before it is too late cease to place a premium upon the destruction of our forests in the shape of a tariff against Canada? [Applause.] The situation is simply this: The lumberman is insisting that a tariff shall be placed upon lumber in order that he can sell his seconds and culls to his fellow-citizens, and after he has sold his seconds and his culls to his fellow-citizens at a high price, by means of a protective tariff, then the public is to be taxed again in order to buy back the very land from the lumberman at a robber's price after the forests have been destroyed. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me the height of folly to vote a dollar out of the Federal Treasury in behalf of any reforesting project so long as the Federal Government in another department is placing a premium upon the destruction of our remaining forests. [Applause.]

It has come out in the debate, and the truth is, that this tariff simply protects stumpage values in the United States. The manufacturer of lumber, unless he happens to be an owner of stumpage, would, perhaps, not get much benefit out of it. It is immaterial to the retailer or the middleman. The owner of the stumpage is the man who reaps the benefit. And in proof of that I want to again refer to my good friend Doctor Schenck, whom I hope to meet some day. Here is what he says upon this subject, and it gives you the meat of this whole controversy. I read from page 24 of the report of the banquet at the New Willard:

> We have in this country altogether stumpage amounting to about 200,000,000,000 feet, and if we cheapen that by $2—

That is, remove the tariff—

> If we cheapen that by $2, it means a loss of about $4,000,000,000 to the owners of stumpage in the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish any harm to come to any particular person or any particular class of people; but if there is a speculative value of $2 in stumpage by reason of the Dingley tariff, that is no reason why we should continue that speculative value in stumpage by continuing the tariff upon lumber; for the owner of the stumpage is the only one it protects. [Applause.] Why, the prices which are charged for lumber now make it almost a luxury, while it still remains a necessity for hundreds of thousands of our fellow-citizens. The prices have increased 100 per cent in the last fifteen years according to the admissions of Mr. Defebaugh, in the American Lumberman, last September.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twelve minutes.

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

Mr. HOWLAND. Oh, I do not know that I care for any suggestions. I am getting along all right. [Applause.] If the gentleman has any question to ask, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. JAMES. I quite agree with the gentleman that he does not need any suggestions, and I am heartily in accord with his position. I merely wanted to call his attention to the fact that those gentlemen who are most urgent upon the floor in favor of the purchase of the White and Appalachian mountains, in order that they may be reforested, are likewise most strenuous in their opposition to the removal of the tariff.

Mr. HOWLAND. No; I do not agree with the gentleman. I do not think so. I think the gentleman's suggestion is not accurate. There has been no vote on that question, and possibly there will not be. I hope there will.

Now, in regard to this question of prices and the explanation which Mr. Defebaugh gave in the American Lumberman of September last. He said:

> Undoubtedly it is this sort of advance which has aroused the ire of many people and led to talk of a lumber trust. An average advance of 100 per cent in fifteen years in a commodity based on natural resources seems enormous—

I should say it was enormous—

> It is merely the expression of inflexible, economic influences. As any commodity of common use needed by the community becomes scarce the pressure of competition is felt and prices advance.

After some explanation the article concludes:

> In spite of all the explanations that can be made, the bald comparison is a startling case. It indicates how far the cutting away of the white-pine resources has progressed, and is significant of the future that confronts every other of our great commercial woods. Yellow pine is already beginning to feel the influence of a restricted timber supply, and within a few years more of the west coast woods—even fir, now so abundant—will testify in their prices for stumpage to the fact that they will be the last great resource of our timber users.

These are the words of Mr. Defebaugh in the Lumberman. Now, Mr. Chairman, scarcity of value which he refers to is now an element in the price of lumber and is bound to be for all future time, and the fear expressed by the lumbermen that they will be compelled to leave the tops and limbs in the forest are the nightmares that sometimes follow a New Willard banquet. [Laughter and applause.]

Why, they are digging up stumps, the gentleman from New York said, to make shingles to-day. Everybody that knows anything about the industry knows that they are cutting saplings to-day. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] tells us that the lead-pencil manufacturers are going down into the State of Missouri buying up the old cedar fence rails in order to get cedar to manufacture lead pencils.

The idea that the removal of the tariff will lead to wasteful logging methods in the woods, when we bear in mind the fact that this tariff has been in existence for twelve years, would hardly seem to appeal to anyone with any degree of force. Nobody would expect the simple continuation of this tariff to work any great revolution in the manufacture of lumber in the United States.

Since the enactment of the Dingley law our forests have simply been raided; millionaires have sprung up overnight. I am not complaining about that; they are lucky men; but the argument that the simple retention of the tariff on lumber would revolutionize existing conditions does not appeal to me. I do not claim that the removal of the tariff would reduce the price of lumber to the consumer $2, possibly not a cent. The lumbering interests may be able to take care of the supply and demand in such a careful way as to adjust themselves very satisfactorily to that changed condition, but it might possibly result in preventing an increase of 100 per cent in the next fifteen years.

The argument that high prices tend to conserve forest products is simply an attempt on the part of the lumbermen to take advantage of the sentiment in this country for the conservation of our forests, hoping that we will fail to distinguish between the utilization of forest products and the conservation of our forests. High prices undoubtedly would have a tendency to utilize forest products, but a tree cut for a butt log destroys just that much of the forest, no matter what disposition may be made of the balance of the tree.

Why, if we are to make forest products so valuable that the lumbermen will cut up every limb and branch, it seems to me that if the limbs and the branches are so valuable, the better grades of lumber would be more valuable still, and would result in simply a greater raid upon the better qualities of timber. Mr. Chairman, if the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table were valuable to the hungry Lazarus, what would he have done to the feast if opportunity had offered? [Laughter and applause.]

Everybody but a forestry expert knows that the more valuable you make timber the more of it will be cut, as long as there is a stick standing, and you can not stop it.

There is one industry left in this country which we desire to encourage, whether we are free traders or protectionists,

and that is the building of homes. The frame dwelling is still the type of building of the great majority of our people. The practice of our Government, as expressed by our homestead laws and in other ways, has been to do everything in its power to provide homes for our people, prompted by the belief that the man who owns his own home will be a better citizen. In my judgment the time has come when the Government should refuse longer to put a burden in the shape of a tariff on lumber on the home builders of our country.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this lumber tariff, I might be permitted in conclusion to compare the protective-tariff system to a tree, beautiful, symmetrical, and strong. On that tree a rotten limb appears, useless, a blemish, and dangerous. The good husbandman cuts off that limb, thereby increasing the strength and beauty of the tree. It is good advice, Mr. Chairman, when a rotten limb like the lumber tariff appears to cut it off lest a hurricane of hostile public sentiment destroy your entire tree. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, the tariff question has now gotten to be practically as old as it is great, and it apparently has been discussed to a finality long ago; therefore, I will not undertake to discuss it academically. I find from a reading of the reports of the discussions of the tariff in 1846, before I was privileged to help make up the great population of this world, when the Walker tariff bill was being considered by Congress, that it is stated that the debate on the bill in the House commenced on June 16 and continued until July 3, that nearly all of the speeches were of the "set" variety, and that but few of them contained a syllable that was new. Therefore, if in that day and time of wise statesmanship and splendid oratory the tariff question was discussed from the 16th of June until the 3d day of July, and hardly a single new syllable was uttered in connection therewith, it is not to be expected that we at this time will be able to do much better than Members of Congress did at that time; but we of to-day have a responsibility resting upon us as Members of the House, and we owe it to our constituencies to let them know what we think about great questions of this character, to let them know whether or not we are trying to dodge this or that issue, let them know whether or not we have the courage to represent a brave constituency, and whether or not we are capable of contending with the important issues that confront the American Congress of to-day. It is often the case that Representatives seek to please their constituency for political purposes, and hence, sometimes they are induced to dodge a vote or the expression of an opinion upon an important question because they do not know whether the way their vote would be cast or whether the opinion expressed by them would be popular at home. I insist that whenever any matter confronts us in our representative capacity that we ought to be willing to walk up to the rack, "fodder or no fodder," and do our duty as we see it as long as we have the honor of holding a commission from the people of a congressional district, whether we know that our action will be popular at home or not.

As stated, the tariff question is about as old as it is great. The first tariff bill was presented to the American Congress in 1789 by James Madison, of Virginia, afterwards an illustrious President of the United States. It was framed with a view of protecting infant industries and to assist in raising a revenue to help support the Government. The rate of duty carried in it was 8½ per cent ad valorem, which rate prevailed in all of our tariff laws until 1816. After the war of 1812 it was increased to 24½ per cent, and it kept advancing with the enactment of each revenue act until it reached the high rate of 43 per cent in 1828. The Clay compromise next followed in 1833, with a reduction of 23 per cent by a sliding scale, which terminated in 1842, and, during that year, another revenue act was passed increasing the rate from 20 to 32 per cent. The next tariff law was known as the "Walker tariff," it being enacted in 1846, and reduced the rate from 32 to 22 per cent, which rate continued until 1857. During the life of the Walker tariff that extended over a period of eleven years, the Nation prospered financially and industrially as it had never done up to that time or has done since that time. Under the 22 per cent tariff everybody and everything prospered normally, which is the only kind of true, equitable, and lasting prosperity. Such prosperity as that will always bring gladness to each and every home, no matter how exalted or how humble. Normal prosperity is the only kind that men of sense and honor ought to ever try to produce in any country. It does not produce millionaires over night, nor does it oppress the toiling masses of the country. It will bring smiles to the faces of labor rather than frowns, and it will put praises upon the lips of constituents for their Representatives for what they have done, rather than curses, and hence, Mr. Chairman, in the enactment of a tariff law, we ought to be very careful to levy a just and reasonable rate that will produce just enough revenue to support the Government when economically and honestly administered—a measure that will, as nearly as possible, bridge over the great financial and social chasm that now so completely and unhappily divides what we are pleased to term the "classes" and the "masses."

The revenue law that was enacted in 1857 set a pace for the rapid increase of our tariff rate that did not stop until it reached the high-water mark of nearly 50 per cent in 1897, under the law commonly known as the "Dingley tariff law," which is still in existence. Under the Dingley tariff there has been more wealth created on the one side and more poverty upon the other than at any other period of the history of our country. It has also succeeded in causing a panic that fairly shook the foundation stones of the great commercial institutions of the country when there was no apparent reason for a panic whatever. Ah, Mr. Chairman, it has completely emptied the "full dinner pail" that we have heard so often glowingly described by orators who undertook to sustain it as the greatest piece of tariff legislation that was ever known to mankind. The Dingley tariff law, coupled with the Spanish-American war tax, produced a great deal of revenue for a time, which, when supplemented by the proceeds of the bountiful crops of the farmer—which have been kept at a fair price by the law of supply and demand, a law that has not made fortunes for a favored few at the expense of the toiling many—caused the so-called "government of the people" to enter upon a period of reckless extravagance and expenditure, the very thought of which was calculated to bring on a ruinous panic at almost any time, until we have reached a point where we must have more than a billion dollars a year for the support of the Government; and hence it appears that any tariff that is levied with a view of only raising a revenue sufficiently large to support the Government will necessarily be tainted throughout with the bad odors and impurities of protection.

Mr. Chairman, you will please pardon me for saying just here that since I have had the honor of occupying a seat in this House I have done everything that I could do, in an humble way, to keep down the extravagant expenditures that have brought on this unhappy condition. [Applause.] My course has not entirely pleased all of the Members of the House, perhaps, but I am sure no one will say but what I have been conscientious in what I have done in that regard, and that I have not known politics in connection therewith. If in doing what I have in the interest of right, as I saw it, I have unintentionally displeased anyone, I can not help it now; and, upon the other hand, if what I have done has met with the approval of my colleagues in the House, I appreciate it to the fullest extent. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made the opening speech upon this side of the House against the Payne bill, he stated that the average minimum tariff rate carried in it would be slightly above 45 per cent. That would indicate that every consumer would have to pay only 45 per cent more for what he purchased, by reason of the tariff, than he would otherwise have to pay; but, sir, I insist that that rate of tariff would force him to pay a much higher per cent than that, and I will undertake to show it at this point. So let us suppose that our commercial affairs were free from tariff of any kind and that a wholesale merchant residing in Memphis, Tenn., were to go East to buy goods from the manufacturing establishments with which to supply the retail merchants of his community and that it was his purpose to buy $100,000 worth of goods at that particular time. He would, of course, have to pay $100,000 for them. He would then have them transported to his place of business in Memphis, and there he would add to the original cost of the goods 10 per cent for cost and carriage, and then he would sell them to the retail merchants for a profit of 10 per cent; then the retail merchants would, when the goods were received at their places of business, add 10 per cent for cost and carriage, and then sell them to the consumers of their respective communities at a profit of 15 per cent. The consumers would therefore have to pay $153,065 for the $100,000 bill of goods, which would close up the transaction. Then let us suppose that the average tariff rate under the Payne bill will be 45 per cent if enacted into law and the Memphis wholesale merchant were to go East to buy the same $100,000 worth of goods that he bought when there was no tariff on them. He would select the $100,000 worth just as he had done before, and when he went to pay for them the manufacturer would say, "Why, sir, there is a tariff of 45 per cent upon these goods since the Payne bill became a law, and instead of paying us $100,000 for them, as you did before, you must pay in addition thereto $45,000 because of the 45 per cent tariff rate." "But," replies the merchant, "they have not been imported; they have not passed through a custom-house where a tariff of 45 per cent has been collected upon them, and hence I think it is an outrage for you

to require me to pay you $45,000 in excess of what I paid you for the same goods when I was here before when you have not paid a single cent of tariff upon them. I can go to London and buy this identical bill of goods, in spite of the Payne bill, for $100,000." "That is true," replies the manufacturer, "but after you have bought them you will have to pay freight and insurance upon them across the ocean, and when they get to the American port at New York you will there have to pay a duty of $45,000 on them, so you see that by buying them from me you will save what you would have to pay for freight and insurance on them from London to New York."

The wholesaler accepts the statement as a fact and pays the $145,000 for the $100,000 bill of goods. He has them transported to his place of business in Memphis, and there he adds his 10 per cent for cost and carriage to the $145,000; he then disposes of them to the retail merchants of his community at a profit of 10 per cent upon the amount paid out by him for them, just as he did before. The retailers, when they reach their places of business, add their 10 per cent for cost and carriage, as before, and sell them to the consumers at a profit of 15 per cent, just as they did before. The consumers, therefore, would have to pay $221,944.25 for the $100,000 bill of goods that cost the wholesaler $145,000 at the factory by reason of the 45 per cent tariff, which would close up that transaction. Now deduct the $153,065, the amount the consumers would have to pay for the $100,000 bill of goods without a tariff, from the $221,944.25 that they would have to pay for the same goods with a 45 per cent tariff, and you will find that they would have to pay $68,879.25 more for them with the tariff than without the tariff. The following table will save Members the trouble of making the calculation to prove the correctness of the statement:

Bill of goods without tariff of 45 per cent.

(Example No. 1.)

Bill of goods	$100,000.00
Wholesaler's 10 per cent for cost and carriage	10,000.00
	110,000.00
Wholesaler's 10 per cent profit	11,000.00
Amount paid for bill of goods by retailer	121,000.00
Add retailer's 10 per cent on $121,000 for cost and carriage	12,100.00
	133,100.00
Add retailer's profit of 15 per cent	19,965.00
	153,065.00

Bill of goods, with 45 per cent tariff, under the Payne bill.

(Example No. 2.)

Bill of goods	$100,000.00
Add average tariff of 45 per cent under Payne bill	45,000.00
	145,000.00
Add wholesaler's 10 per cent for cost and carriage	14,500.00
	159,500.00
Add wholesaler's 10 per cent profit	15,950.00
Retailer's purchase price in the market	175,450.00
Add retailer's 10 per cent for cost and carriage	17,545.00
Retailer's price in the store	192,995.00
Add retailer's profit of 15 per cent	28,949.25
Total cost to consumer	221,944.25
Deduct bill of goods without 45 per cent tariff in example No. 1	153,065.00
Excess price of $100,000 bill of goods to consumer on account of 45 per cent tariff	68,879.25

Thus you will see, Mr. Chairman, that the consumer will have to pay a tariff of 68.879 per cent instead of 45 per cent for every average dollar's worth of goods that he buys as a tariff tax if this bill becomes a law, and hence that the toiling masses of the country, who constitute by far the greater part of its consumers, will be tax ridden from year to year and from ocean to ocean [applause], and, sir, you will further observe that notwithstanding the consumers will have had to pay $68,879.25 more for the $100,000 bill of goods with the tariff than they would have had to pay if there had been no tariff, that not one single cent of the amount will find its way into the Treasury to help pay courts and officers for protecting the goods and wares of the tariff barons against the competition of foreign-made goods and wares. It is my judgment that if the Payne bill is enacted into law the average rate under it will be decidedly greater than under the Dingley law, because of the maximum-tariff feature of it, which will be used to a greater extent than the minimum. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think it can be safely said that the minimum feature of it is a delusion and a snare, and that no one need expect to receive any benefits from the minimum rate as long as the maximum rate is left in the bill.

When the Dingley bill was enacted it was openly stated by its advocates that the rate carried in it had been deliberately made 20 per cent higher than was necessary so as to enable us to make terms with foreign countries whereby our goods could be exported into them and theirs into ours for a 20 per cent less tariff rate than would otherwise be levied against them, which was tantamount to the maximum and minimum tariff rate provided for in this bill, but no one has ever heard of that provision of the Dingley law having been put into force during its existence of twelve years.

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

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. By way of suggestion, if I understand your proposition, you mean that in the Dingley bill the tax was professedly fixed 20 per cent higher than was necessary to allow the Government of this country to trade downward?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir. I mean that very thing.

Mr. HARDY. While in the Payne bill they substantially take the average Dingley rate and allow 20 per cent rise for that purpose, so that there seems to be a 20 per cent higher rate in this bill than there was in the former bill, which was put into it for the purpose of trading downward?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARDY. The Dingley bill provided for trading downward, but this bill fixes substantially the Dingley rate. It has a minimum clause in the bill and then it has a maximum; in other words, they have taken the maximum of the Dingley bill and made it the minimum of the Payne bill?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir. That seems to be just what has been done. As I said a moment ago, I expect the average tariff rate in the Payne bill, if it becomes a law, to be higher than the average rate has ever been before in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as indicated a few minutes ago, the early tariff idea that prevailed in this country was for a rate just large enough to assist in supporting our Government when honestly and economically administered with an incidental protection to the infant industries, and that idea prevailed throughout most of the stages of our Government up to the time that the Republican party became the dominant party, and conceived the idea of continuing to be the dominant party by extending special favors to a favored few by way of the high-tariff route, thus making sure of financial support from that source while they made themselves solid with labor by proclaiming that the high tariff was for labor's benefit instead of for the benefit of a favored few that it had really been levied in favor of. Sir, it is a sin and a shame for them to try to make labor believe that their wages were made higher than the wages of pauper labor abroad by reason of a high tariff when, as a matter of fact, supply and demand and their organizations have brought about their improved wage condition, and not the tariff that finds its way into the "tills" of the captains of industry. Why, sir, if labor did not have a vote it would no more be thought of or mentioned in connection with the tariff arguments and arrangements of the country than would the horses or hogs of the country. [Applause.]

Supply and demand and labor organizations have been the sole cause of the maintenance of the superior wage scale in this country to that prevailing in foreign countries, and the vote of the laborers has been the cause of labor's mention in connection with the tariff legislation of the country. The whole tariff schedule as found in the existing tariff law, or in the Payne bill either, when carefully scrutinized contradicts every suggestion that is made by the tariff advocates that any of them are really and truly in the interests of labor.

Under the existing law laborers in the highly protected manufacturing establishments do not receive more than one-fifth of the profits of their toil, whereas the negro of the South engaged in agricultural pursuits is given one-half of the profits of his toil where the landowner furnishes everything connected with the production of the crops except the labor, just as the manufacturer furnishes everything connected with the manufacture of the finished product except the labor; and yet we of the South, who give the negro one-half of the profit of his toil, have been maligned and misrepresented for forty years concerning our treatment of him by the people who reside in the industrial districts of this Union and who loudly clamor for protection for labor's sake and yet only give to those that labor in industrial institutions one-fifth of the profits of their toil.

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

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WEISSE. Does the gentleman from Arkansas believe that the negro in the South is fed as well as the white man in the North?

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman from Wisconsin means the white man that toils in the industrial institutions of the North, I will say that I have no personal knowledge upon the subject, but that I have lived all of my life in the South and have never seen a negro in the South in a free soup house. Has the gentleman ever seen a white man of the North in one? [Laughter and applause.] I have never seen a negro in the South standing in a bread line in front of a bakery waiting for some generous hand to pass him out a loaf of bread. Has the gentleman ever seen that sight among the white laborers of the industrial institutions of the North? [Laughter and applause.] I will say further, for the gentleman's benefit, that if the manufacturers of the North will give to the industrial laborers of their sections anything like the same fair share of the profits of their toil that we of the South give the negroes that he will never see any more of them in soup houses or in bread lines. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Has the gentleman from Arkansas been able to discover a paragraph in this bill which provides that any part of the tariff shall go into the pockets of the people whom the advocates of the measure say it is designed to protect?

Mr. MACON. No. There is not a single letter, word, line, or paragraph in the bill that provides, or even indicates, that any part of the tariff provided for in it will go into the pockets of the laboring men whom it is claimed to be designed to protect, and yet they tell us that the tariff is levied in the interest of the industrial toilers of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. WEISSE. The gentleman is talking about the allegation that this bill will protect labor. Does he believe that if this bill is enacted in its present form, it will give work to more laboring men than the Dingley bill?

Mr. MACON. I do not. I am firmly fixed in the belief that if this bill is enacted into law it will come nearer putting men out of work than it will to giving work to them, for the rates will be so very high that the trusts of the country will be able to "gobble up" all of the independent enterprises and in that way destroy many opportunities for labor that now exist. Under this bill trusts can not help but flourish, and it stands to reason that where they do that all competition must perish. We have had many industrial institutions that once gave employment to labor shut down by the strong arm of the trusts, and when that arm is strengthened by additional friendly legislation there is no telling what will be the result of its merciless onslaught.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACON. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that under the present law and under the proposed bill the laborers of the country, skilled workmen and common laborers, have to purchase everything they use in their household in a protected market and have to sell the only thing they have for sale, their labor, in a market that is open to all of the world, except China, practically?

Mr. MACON. That is true.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Then it is not a fact that it is taking something out of the pockets of one class of labor to put into the pockets of another class, but simply taking out of the pockets of laborers and putting it into the pockets of capitalists. [Applause.]

Mr. MACON. Of course. I have been insisting throughout my remarks that the tariff as now provided, fostered, and appropriated was never intended to benefit the laborers of the country. As I stated, the term "labor" would never have been heard of in connection with this bill but for the fact that labor has a vote. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the tariff had been instituted for the benefit of labor, does not every one know that a commission would have been created, or some officer designated to collect that part of it to which labor is entitled and pay it over to labor? Under existing law every cent of it is put into the hands of the manufacturer, and he pays to labor just such part of it as he, the manufacturer, thinks labor ought to have. That kind of procedure is unjust in every particular, and I can not understand how an honest, intelligent man could make up his mind to even attempt to try to sustain it. Gentlemen, it is a farce to talk about levying a tariff for the benefit of labor and then put it into the hands of the manufacturer for whom labor toils and allow the manufacturer in his discretion to give to labor just such part of it as he, the manufacturer, thinks labor ought to have. That kind of a policy is contrary to common sense, contrary to all reason, and the friends of honest toil ought to rise up everywhere to proclaim against and condemn it. As long as it was believed that the tariff was levied to assist infant industries and to help support the Government, it was not so strenuously contended against as it must be from this day on, if the ordinary every-day human being of this Nation is to have any rights that are to be respected at all. The gigantic combines that have grown so prolificly under the nurturing and fostering care of a high protective tariff have become so arrogant that they no longer respect the rights of individuals, the rights of courts, nay, I may almost say, the rights of the Government. Sir, they have practically throttled the majority party that has nurtured and cared for them for forty years and more, and are now engaged in the business of writing its platform every four years and seeing to it that Congress carefully carries out the declarations that they have written into the platform and, in the writing of the last one, they came out boldly for themselves, something that they had not felt that they were strong enough to do before; in fact, something that they dared not do until they felt sure of their almost impregnable intrenchment. Here I read from the Chicago platform:

> In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

That means, if it means anything, that in addition to levying a tariff high enough to pay the difference in cost of wages abroad and in this country and to foster infant industries, that it shall be large enough to guarantee to every combine and trust, every manufacturing establishment and industrial institution between the two oceans such a profit as they themselves would conceive to be a reasonable return upon their investment, whether it consisted of raw or manufactured products, machinery, buildings, lands, stocks, and bonds, whether watered or not, while the poor farmer who produces everything upon which man subsists, and the toiling miner who digs everything out of the earth, and by their combined efforts produce everything that enters into manufacture, are not guaranteed a single fraction of a cent upon their investment. Coming from the South, I am necessarily more familiar with conditions there than elsewhere, and hence am better prepared to speak as to the accumulations of the farmers than I am of the miners, so I will state that there are thousands of farmers all over the South who have been toiling from boyhood until a time when they are practically standing upon the brink of the grave in order to make an ordinary living for their families, and to make for themselves a little home consisting of an humble house and 40, 80, or 160 acres of land and upon which to exist during their declining years. They have been producing cotton all that time and sending it to the manufacturers without any protection upon their raw material whatever, and while they were doing it they barely eked out an existence because their profits were so small, while the manufacturers, having been highly protected all that time by a tariff upon the cotton goods that they have manufactured, have grown immensely rich, and now, when that unequal condition exists it is proposed that these thousands of farmers that have grown old and broken from toil and who are yet poor shall be called upon to pay an additional tax upon their small investment in order that the rich manufacturers of the country may have a guaranty of a reasonable profit upon their large investment, they, the manufacturers, to say what the amount shall be themselves regardless of whether or not their investment is real or fictitious. If that is justice, then God forbid that justice should much longer find favor upon the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what the Payne bill proposes to do for the labor interests of the country and let us see how it is to help the masses. I have already stated that because of the maximum feature in the bill that the rate carried in it will be higher than that of any revenue bill since the protective tariff was fastened upon the country. I will not have time to discuss all of its provisions, in fact, but a few of them, so I will call the attention of the House to some of those that strike me as being particularly obnoxious to the best interests of the masses. Take the oil schedule; it contains a countervailing clause that practically guarantees to the Standard Oil Company that it shall be permitted to charge 75 per cent more for every bit of oil that it sells to the citizens of this country than it would otherwise be able to sell it for, and it is estimated that that advantage will guarantee to that great octopus not less than $12,000,000 more of profit for oil sold to the American people alone than it would receive if the countervailing provi-

sion was not in the law. The very thought of putting a provision in a law for the benefit of so gigantic and so brazen a combine as the Standard Oil Company is enough to cause the people to rise up in their might and strike down the party that would accord it so great a benefit. This soulless octopus has been defying the courts and robbing the people year in and year out for a generation or two. It has been having conferences with and writing letters to Senators and Representatives about legislation favorable or prejudicial to its interests and has been successful in its efforts, in some instances by reason of certain inclosures, and that success has caused it to feel that it could do as it pleased without being called to account therefor, and it is just about that way.

There is no danger of it ever being successfully called upon to account for anything that it does in violation of the law, either in the matter of influencing legislation or of disregarding it after it has been enacted, and to bolster up that suggestion it is only necessary for me to recite that about two years ago a certain judge in Chicago, who was fresh from the people, who had only been on the bench for a few months, and who thought that when he was told by the administration to try the octopus and to assess a fine against it, if it was found to be guilty, sufficiently large to warn it and all others of its kind that they must not longer willfully and premeditatedly violate the law of the land, that it meant just what it said; so when he found the octopus to be guilty, he assessed a fine of $29,240,000 against it. Most people thought that fine would put an end to the open violation of the law by it, but somehow I had no faith in the good faith of the administration in the matter and believed that it did not propose to see a single scar made upon this arrogant combine. And to convince you that my surmises and doubts were genuine, I will say that I had an occasion to address an audience of farmers, about 3,000 in number, about two days after the fine had been assessed by Judge Landis, and believing that it was all a fake, I could not help but criticise the administration for ordering a prosecution when it knew that nothing was to come out of it except a bluster that would attract the attention of the people and cause them to believe that the administration was doing big things along trust-busting lines. I told my audience that I thought it was all a hoax and that I did not believe a single cent of the $29,240,000 would ever find its way into the United States Treasury. I said to them that I might be wrong in criticising the administration, but I did not think so; but that I wanted them to watch the case closely, and if they ever heard of a single cent of the amount being paid into the Treasury that I wanted each and every one of them to telegraph me at my expense, so I could immediately wire the administration an humble apology for having unjustly criticised it. Gentlemen, I have not had to pay for a single message telling me that a single cent of the $29,240,000 had been taken from the "till" of the octopus and placed in the United States Treasury up to this good hour. [Applause.] And I will never hear of such a thing being done, for only the other day they had a second trial of the case, and a verdict was returned in favor of the trust.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that they would not even let farmers sit on the jury in the last trial?

Mr. MACON. Of course; of course, they would not let farmers sit on the jury. They never let farmers sit on the jury when they do not want honest verdicts, for they know that the dear old farmer will return an honest verdict when he is on the jury. [Applause.] If we could have free oil it would benefit the laboring people very much. A 75 per cent reduction in the cost of any necessary commodity is of vital importance and great benefit to the consumers. It would especially be helpful to the farmers of the country, for they can not have any other kind of light, unless they resort to the old tallow dip of several decades ago, or to the old grease-and-rag light of a century ago. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the Standard Oil Company has been writing letters or having some other kind of communication with Members of Congress in regard to this bill, if there is any foundation whatever for the matter contained in the newspaper clipping headed "Deal in tariff bill" that I will insert in my remarks at this point:

DEAL IN TARIFF BILL?—UGLY CHARGES RELATING TO OIL SCHEDULE AND BEER TAX.

[Washington correspondence New York Journal of Commerce.]

In connection with the apparent defects of the bill as a revenue producer, ugly charges are flying about the Capitol. It is alleged that the duty on beer was to have been increased, but that this was refrained from in return for votes cast on the side of the House organization in the rules fight. One Member of the House, who claims to have been approached by representatives of the brewers, said: "A representative of beer men told me on the eve of the contest over the organization of the House, that if Cannon rules should win, the beer tax would be unchanged. If CANNON were defeated, the tax would be put up to $1.50. He wanted me to vote for the old rules. He seemed very positive in his information, and at that time I understood it had been determined to make the tax $1.50. The inference would seem to be justified that the restoration of the tax to $1 had some relation to the fight over the rules."

The Congressman who made this statement would not permit the use of his name, but he is said to have made it to a number of Members, both Democratic and Republican, and the matter is expected to be the subject of further inquiry.

The countervailing duty on petroleum and its products was also the subject of much comment and investigation. Until the very eve of the tariff bill construction it was said with the utmost confidence that this countervailing duty was removed—that is, that petroleum was placed actually on the free list, instead of only nominally.

At noon on Tuesday a western oil man, who was in Washington in the effort to get the countervailing duty restored, made the positive statement that the duty had been stricken out and was still out. He regretted the fact on the ground that it would be a serious blow at producers in this country, because it might let in the oil of Russia and Mexico and injure the market for that product at home.

Bad as it was, however, the oil men said the countervailing duty was removed. It was expected at that time that the tariff bill would be reported within an hour or two. Instead, delay was taken for one day, the bill being held for twenty-four hours, and when it was reported, it contained the provision for the countervailing duty.

Democrats and a great many Republicans threatened to insist upon detailed explanations as to when and why these changes were made, charging that both the beer tax and petroleum duty were involved in the deal for support of the Cannon rules. Of course, there is as yet no positive evidence on any of these points, but the charges are being freely made, and are as yet uncontradicted.

If there is no foundation to the article, then somebody ought to be prosecuted for lying.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is iniquitous because it proposes to raise revenue by taxing the necessaries of life, and insures a large profit to the great industries by maintaining and increasing the cost of living for the American people. If enacted into law, it will greatly intensify the struggle for existence among industrial laborers, for it only apparently reduces a few excessive duties, while it really seizes upon the necessaries of life and raises their price by taxing them.

Take the coffee schedule, for instance; it is a striking example. All classes use it, and especially the laboring class. We have many toilers in this land who are willing to go forth in the morning and work until noon if they can but have a cup of coffee and a bit of bread. Now, in this bill it is proposed that they shall pay at least 3 cents per pound tax upon their coffee. The coffee paragraph is supposed to be upon the free list, but it has coupled with it, and it is a part of it, a countervailing provision to the effect that if any country, dependency, province, or colony shall impose an export duty or other export tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, directly or indirectly, upon coffee exported to the United States, a duty equal to such export duty, tax, or charge shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon. Brazil is the chief coffee-producing country of the world. Practically all of our coffee comes from Brazil, and that country has issued bonds based upon an export duty on her coffee, and hence she must charge an export duty to pay the interest on and to raise a sinking fund for the retiring of those bonds, no matter what kind of a revenue provision we should put in our tariff law upon the subject; so you see, gentlemen, that free coffee is a fudge, a fluke, and a fraud, as provided for in this bill.

The glass schedule as provided for in the Payne bill is also a delusion. It represents that it has lowered the rate on common window glass, something that is absolutely a necessity to the poor man if his home is ever to be blessed by the penetrating rays of God's sunshine, but when you figure it out the reduction is less than one-half of 1 per cent, and the rate is left at a prohibitive point, just as it is in the Dingley bill, and hence there will be no way for the consumer to get the benefit of even the one-half of the 1 per cent reduction. Away with such tariff revision downward; it is enough to make a person sick. [Applause.]

The bill is drawn so that it is almost impossible for even a "Philadelphia lawyer" to tell what it means or just what will have to be paid as a tariff on many articles mentioned in it if it becomes a law. Paragraph 375 is fairly illustrative of that statement. I will read it to you and let you see what you can make out of it:

On blankets and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be the same as the duty imposed by this section on 2 pounds of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem. On blankets composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at more than 50 cents per pound, the duty per pound shall be three times the duty imposed by this section on 1 pound of unwashed wool of the first class, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem. Flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, shall be classified and pay the

same duty as women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character and description provided by this section: *Provided*, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths.

The glove schedule is another fine specimen of the work of the committee in behalf of the poor people of this country. It raises the rate on the gloves of the poor woman from 58 to 133 per cent, while those worn by the "well to do" are raised from 84 to 108 per cent; that is to say, the poor woman's glove is taxed 90 per cent, while the "well-to-do" woman's glove is taxed 44 per cent, less than one-half as much as that of the poor woman. That schedule seems to have been "fixed" in the interest of somebody, if the information contained in the clipping headed "Who is benefited?" that I will incorporate in my remarks just here, has any foundation in fact beneath it:

WHO IS BENEFITED?

That, of course, can only be explained by the committee. But a bit of light will perhaps be shed on it by the following letter which Representative ADAMSON of Georgia read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a speech:

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 of tariff rates 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 would 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 now retail at $1 per 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. CUTTING & Co.

This letter is but a sample of many which have been received. It is a matter of the commonest knowledge that the Gloversville glove industry is the special beneficiary expected to gain by this remarkable schedule. How did Gloversville manage to get such excellent treatment?

GLOVERSVILLE REPRESENTED.

That, again, is one of the things that only the Ways and Means Committee, presumably, could answer. But a few things are suggestive:

Lucius N. Littauer, for many years a leading and influential Member of Congress, is the recognized head of the great Gloversville glove-making industry.

He stands for it in all its relations to public affairs. He was known in Congress as its representative. It was his special concern, and his great fortune represents investment in it.

Mr. Littauer is one of the closest personal and political intimates of the present organization which controls the House.

As a Member of Congress he was one of the recognized spokesmen of JOSEPH G. CANNON.

He was one of the men who made CANNON Speaker and one of the most effective representatives of the CANNON group in all political affairs. He is a politician of great influence in New York.

When the great fight over the election of Speaker CANNON and the readoption of the Cannon rules of the House started a few weeks ago, Mr. Littauer was early sent for. He hurried on to Washington, and was one of the group of inside managers for Speaker CANNON and the old rules throughout the fight. No longer a Member of Congress, he used his personal acquaintance and influence most effectively. To no man does the present managerial clique owe more for its retention in control. What induced Mr. Littauer to work so hard for the old control?

Nobody knows; patriotism, doubtless.

But it is on the tongue of every cynic in Congress that "Littauer got his reward in the glove schedule."

He certainly got handsome treatment.

But how will the poor woman whose gloves will, under this schedule, be controlled by Mr. Littauer's tariff-protected monopoly feel about that sort of political logrolling?

Mr. Chairman, it seems that a whole lot of people not on the Ways and Means Committee have had something to do with the making of this bill if there is any truth whatever in the suggestions contained in these newspaper clippings.

The drawback clause in the Payne bill is about as confusing as to its real meaning as the wool schedule embraced in paragraph 375 just mentioned. But as confusing as it is, it can be fairly construed to mean that the manufacturer can import all of the raw material he wants, pay a duty on it, and then be allowed a drawback that will equal the amount of duty paid on the importation of the raw material when it has been manufactured into a finished product and exported, less a legal deduction of 1 per cent, provided the exportation shall be made within three years after the importation of the foreign material. I will incorporate the section in my remarks so the people of the country can read it and construe it for themselves. It surely means all I have said.

SEC. 29. 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 imported materials are used, to the duties paid on the equivalent of imported materials, less the legal deduction of 1 per cent: *Provided*, That the exportation shall be made within three years after the importation of the foreign material used or checked against: *And provided further*, That the quantity of materials used and the amount of duties paid shall be ascertained, the facts of the manufacture or the production of such articles in the United States and their exportation therefrom, and the equality of domestic and imported materials where the former are substituted for the latter with respect to quantity and productive manufacturing quality and value shall be determined, and the drawback due thereon shall be paid to the manufacturer, producer, or exporter, to the agent of either, or to the person to whom such manufacturer, producer, exporter, or agent shall, in writing, order such drawback paid, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

It is clearly intended to allow the manufacturer to have free raw material when it is his purpose to make a finished product and sell it abroad, thus discriminating against the people of this country in favor of the manufacturer and the foreigner. Men who are capable of occupying seats in this House ought to be able to legislate more intelligently and justly than that, unless it is their purpose to "turn a legislative trick" of some sort.

There is one paragraph in the Payne bill, however, that is easily understood, but the reason for its existence can not be so easily comprehended when we consider it in the light of the great ability of the Republican party to run this Government in such an efficient and prosperous manner as they claim to have done, and that is the paragraph authorizing the issuance of $250,000,000 of 3 per cent interest-bearing bonds that the committee pleases to "dub" "certificates." When Mr. Cleveland was President of the United States he issued $60,000,000 of bonds at a time of profound peace, and every Republican voice in all the broad land was raised in righteous indignation against and condemnation of that act. The failure of his administration and his incapacity was heralded from the housetops, and now these same people are providing for the issuance of $250,000,000 of interest-bearing bonds at a time of profound peace, and they say it is a wise piece of statesmanship. They may be able to justify their action in connection with the matter, but poor Cleveland could not. Gentlemen, if the issuance of the $60,000,000 of bonds was any evidence of the inefficiency of a Democratic administration to administer the affairs of this Government, then I would like to know what the issuance of the $250,000,000 of bonds would be evidence of.

This bill is fatally deficient in that it does not admit the products of the Philippine Islands free of duty. We forced our authority upon those helpless people and are now doing our best to keep them helpless by restricting their opportunities as much as we can. We have destroyed their commerce with the rest of the world and are now restricting them in the matter of their selling their products in this country free of duty. In my judgment the trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands ought to be as free as the trade between the various States of this Union, and I do not believe that a contrary policy can be justified on any ground in the world except that of highway robbery. [Applause.]

I introduced a bill to that effect when I first came to Congress, and have kept it alive by reintroducing it at the beginning of each succeeding Congress. I will incorporate it in my remarks and leave it to the fair-minded judgment of the world as to whether its provisions are just or not:

A bill to admit the products of the Philippine Islands into all of the ports of the United States of America free of duty.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the approval of this act the products, raw, manufactured, and refined, of the Philippine Islands shall be admitted and received into all of the ports of the United States of America free of duty or tax of every kind.

SEC. 2. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed as specifically as though specified herein.

We may succeed for a time in spite of our unrighteous treatment of these poor devils, but I firmly believe that our conduct toward them will some day return to plague us.

Paragraph 462 of the Payne bill provides for the admission of works of art and paintings more than 20 years old free of duty. I am constrained to think, Mr. Chairman, that that provision was not put in the bill in the interest of labor, but was put there for the benefit of the very rich who care to adorn their drawing rooms and parlors with the most expensive ornaments to be found in the world.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MACON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. I understand that Mr. J. P. Morgan has some very valuable pictures which he refuses to bring into the United States unless they are admitted free of duty.

Mr. MACON. Yes; I have heard so.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that labor will weep copious tears if Mr. Morgan does not bring those pictures in?

Mr. MACON. Just so. [Laughter.] The Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Vanderbilts, and persons of their financial standing are the only ones that will be benefited by the paragraph. Pictures, like wine, grow more valuable with age, and after they have stood the test of twenty years they become rare and are sought after by connoisseurs the world over, and fabulous prices are generally paid for them; and they, being among the rarest of luxuries, ought to pay a fair portion of the revenue tax of this Nation when they are brought into it. [Applause.]

The Payne bill, however, does allow some articles to be brought into the country free of duty besides works of art over twenty years old.

Mr. HARDY. For labor?

Mr. MACON. Yes; if the gentleman insists that it should be that way. I am inclined to think, however, that labor will not rejoice because of their free admission, for none of them are necessaries, and all of them could bear a tariff if they were imported without injuring the interests or prejudicing the rights of a single human being in the country.

I will call your attention to paragraph 548, which admits diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut, free of duty. They are certainly not admitted free of duty in the interest of labor, for laborers hardly ever wear diamonds. The other day while the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] was speaking in the interest of the bill he became a little irritated when I interrupted him to ask what class of labor would be benefited by the importation of diamonds and rare works of art free of duty, and he actually called upon the Chair for protection against me. Now, gentlemen, there was no necessity for that; I did not intend to hurt him, and told him so at the time. [Applause.] The trouble with him was that he had been saying too much about the bill being drawn in the interest of labor, and he did not want the attention of the country called to the fact that it was drawn in the interest of almost everything else but labor; but, he said, they were rough diamonds and not prepared for use; but when we turn to paragraph 445 we find that only 10 per cent ad valorem is levied against the rarest of diamonds, rubies, sapphires, and so forth, irrespective of size, while imitations of precious stones, pearls, and so forth, composed wholly of glass or paste and not mounted or set are 20 per cent ad valorem. The first kind the very rich ornament themselves with, while the other kind are used largely by the poor colored people of the country whom the Republicans are continually calling upon for votes. A farce upon its face, gentlemen, and every one knows it.

Let us look further into the free list, gentlemen, and see what there really is in it that is in the interest of labor. Right close to the top of it I find acorns unground, balm of Gilead, blood, catgut and worm gut [laughter and applause]; then we find divi-divi, gold, silver, and copper, all for the benefit of labor [applause and laughter]; and I find that fossils are admitted free; and I want to say in that connection that if they will put the duty on fossils high enough, and arrange it in such a way as to drive a lot of old high-tariff fossils out of the country I think it would be greatly in the interest of labor. [Laughter and applause.] I also notice they have some joss sticks on the free list. I suppose they are the Chinese joss sticks.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. They burn them in front of their protection idols.

Mr. MACON. Is that it? I thought they must be in the interest of protection in some form, for it is harder for a Republican hand to write anything that does not lean toward protection than it is for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. I notice we have leeches upon the free list also, Mr. Chairman. We have a great many old protection leeches that have been residing in this country for forty years and more, and there has not been a moment of that time in which they have not had their special interests fastened to the backs of labor, sucking lifeblood from them with all their might. We also have manna on the free list. I suppose it is left over manna that the Israelites could not use during their forty-years' march through the wilderness, and now that it is too stale to eat they let it in free for labor to feast on. Then we have pulu on the free list. Now, who ever heard of pulu being good for labor? Who on earth is silly enough to think that allowing pulu to be brought into this country free of duty will benefit any class of labor to be found in it? Ah, Mr. Chairman, it is silly to put such things on the free list. They have no more business there than English sparrows or African baboons. [Applause.] If they had desired to do anything for labor, why did they not allow wool hats, shoes, domestics, jeans, cotton stripes, coffee, tea, plows, harrows, reapers, mowers, and other things of that kind to come in free? They have thought to throw this free list to the toiling masses of the country as a sop, but, sir, I believe that it will be taken as an insult when it is properly understood. There are a few articles on the free list that will be in the interest of the consumers, but they are so insignificant in number as to not be worthy of any considerable consideration. A good stiff tariff rate on our high-class ornamental and luxurious importations, such as silks, satins, the finer grade of woolens, high-grade arts, diamonds and other jewels, cigars, high wines and other beverages would produce a magnificent revenue, and the class of consumers that usually purchase them would hardly miss what they pay for them.

It is true that the wool schedule has been made high in the interest of the woolgrowers of Ohio and other States in the West, but I am happy to say that some good has come out of it for the cotton growers of the South, on the principle that "it is an ill wind that blows nobody good." The rate on wool is so high that the manufacturers are mixing cotton with it in the manufacture of what they call "woolen goods," thereby unintentionally furnishing an additional market for the cotton-growers' cotton. It is only an indirect benefit, however, and was never intended to help the cotton producers in any way.

One of the best evidences on earth of the iniquity of the protective-tariff system is to be found in the fact that its beneficiaries are importuning legislative bodies year in and year out, by day and by night, in support of their unjust cause. If it were just, if it possessed that legislative principle of equality that ought to prevail in every free Christian land, the cause would stand for itself and Representatives would not have to be importuned, coerced, and bought to pass laws perpetuating the system. They have been importuning legislative bodies from time immemorial to not only put a tariff upon everything beneath the sky that would help their particular cause, but they have even tried to poison its productions with their system. I remember to have read several years ago where the candle makers' association of France sent a petition to the Chamber of Deputies asking that a tariff be levied upon sunlight, because it came in competition with the lights of the candles that they manufactured and sold. I also remember to have read that the brewers' association of this country at an early period of its life petitioned Congress to not only lay a tariff sufficiently high to shut out all foreign competition to their business, but they insisted that Congress ought to go further and provide such means and measures as would encourage a more general use of malt liquors throughout the United States. [Laughter and applause.] Another petition was presented to Congress by the hat makers praying for a tariff on hats, in which it was stated that the failure to levy a tariff on hats would be taking meat and bread out of the mouths of themselves and their families. I heard a gambling-dive keeper on one occasion give the same reason for opposing the administration of the affairs of a certain city that had closed up his dive. He was cursing the mayor bitterly for having instructed the police to drive gambling out of the city, and said that he was taking meat and bread out of the mouths of his family. The gambler's contention was just as logical and just as that of the hat makers. He had no privilege whereby he was entitled to take money wrongfully from others in order to put bread into the mouths of his family, and the hat makers had no such privilege as to warrant them in doing so, and it was an insult to justice to even ask that such a privilege be given them. The requests contained in these petitions are no more unjust or outrageous, however, than the demand of the Standard Oil octopus that it be protected by a tariff of from 75 to 100 per cent.

The Democratic platform writers of 1900 defined the tariff of this country, as now encouraged and promoted, to be a "robber tariff," and the Republican party became indignant at it and denounced the Democratic party from one end of the country to the other for having used such a term in connection with it. Now, sir, I am not prepared to say whether all tariff is a species of robbery or not, but I have always understood that whenever a thing of value was taken from one person for the benefit of another without the consent of the person from whom it was taken, without force, that the act constituted ordinary larceny, but, if taken by force, that it was robbery; and, sirs, for the life of me I can not conceive of a greater exercise of force along that line than the enactment of a law to be upheld and enforced by courts and marshals compelling one man to give up a thing that belongs to him for the use and benefit of another. Whether that kind of proceeding is a species of robbery or not I will leave to others to say. The very name of tariff is suggestive of robbery within itself. It was taken from the city of Tariffa, the rendezvous and home of the greatest band of sea robbers that ever infested the earth. They filled their coffers with the treasure of the world by roaming the high seas and making every passenger that came their way

pay tribute to their nefarious business. The tariff barons of this country under the guise of the law are roaming over this fair land every hour and day of the year, and they are demanding tribute from its humblest citizens in order that they may fill their coffers just as the sea robbers filled theirs. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have simply told what has been done and is being done; say for yourselves whether there is any element of robbery connected with the tariff business. The protective system was conceived in greed and has been fed on avarice and deep-seated selfishness, elements of life that ought to be frowned upon at all times and throttled without mercy. The tariff has insidiously fastened itself upon this country and has grown to such an extent that it is almost impossible to realize its gigantic proportions or to estimate the great evil that it has visited upon the average consumer of the land. If the protective system was known to be what it really is, if the people really knew the great tribute that they are paying to the tariff barons of the country, if when they were required to make a purchase it was so ordered that they would deposit the tariff per cent of the purchase in one box and the commercial part in another, it would only be a question of time, coupled with an opportunity to get to an election poll somewhere, before they would cast their vote in opposition to a continuance of the great evil. [Applause.]

The steel schedule in the Payne bill reduces the tariff upon that commodity, but it still leaves it prohibitory; in other words, according to the highest authority, it can be manufactured cheaper in this country than anywhere else in the world, and hence any tariff upon it would make importations of it absolutely prohibitory. Mr. Carnegie, who has grown rich by pilfering from the people under tariff laws, himself says that there is no necessity for a tariff on steel, but it is a powerful institution and can add many sinews of war to a political campaign; and therefore it is in a position to demand tribute from the American people.

The lumber schedule purports to reduce the duty on that commodity 50 per cent, when, as a matter of fact, it has a countervailing clause in it that will prevent the reduction of the tariff on it one cent, but the schedule does not seem to please anybody. The lumber manufacturers and dealers of the country are not only clamoring for the retention of the Dingley duty, but are insisting that it ought to be raised 50 per cent, whereas those who are in favor of cheap homes for the toiling masses and who believe that the ownership of an American home is one of the greatest antidotes and panaceas for socialistic tendencies, those who believe that lumber is a prime necessity, and therefore, according to Democratic doctrine, ought not to bear a tariff, but if a tariff, just such as would make it an incidental revenue producer, and those who are opposed to trust control of any of the commodities of the country, are demanding that it be put upon the free list. Sir, the Democratic party, whose commission I have the honor to bear upon the floor of this House, has instructed me, both directly and indirectly, to vote to put lumber upon the free list. The following language in the Denver platform is the indirect instruction given me. Hear it:

> Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list.

Is there a lumber trust in this country and is it controlling the lumber products of the country? If so, then I am commanded to do what I can to put that commodity upon the free list. Every bit of evidence that has been produced upon the subject clearly shows that we have a lumber trust in America and that it is controlling our lumber products without let or hindrance. But further down in the platform we find the following specific instructions to all Democrats upon the subject. It reads:

> We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs, and that these articles be placed upon the free list.

Do Members upon this side of the House have to go any further than that to obtain information as to what their vote should be upon this subject? If so, they are indeed a hazy body of individuals. I have been importuned by friends at home—nay, I have seen in the papers that I have been instructed by a commercial club—to vote to retain the present tariff on lumber. Of course I have not paid attention to the newspaper notice, for they are not always reliable; but to all communications received, whether from individuals, companies, or other organizations interested in the lumber schedule of the bill, asking me to vote to retain the present tariff on lumber, I have promptly replied that I was nominated as a Democrat, was directed to stand upon the Democratic platform, and was elected to Congress by Democratic votes, and hence that I was commissioned by the Democratic party to do its will, and that in the platform upon which I stood for election it had directly instructed—nay, demanded—me to vote for the immediate repeal of the tariff on lumber and to place it upon the free list; and I have asked them to let me know what they would do under the circumstances. I have stated to them that I did not believe that they themselves would have any respect for or confidence in me if I were to deliberately and willfully trample the platform of my party into the earth. God knows that I would gladly, gladly do what my constituents, my friends and neighbors, want me to do if I could do so without violating the faith of my party; if I could do so without injury to others. I would be glad, doubly glad to place additional dollars in the pockets of every man, woman, and child in the First Congressional District of the State of Arkansas if I could honorably do so. But, Mr. Chairman, I have too much faith in the nobility of purpose and uprightness of character of the good people that I have the honor to represent to believe that they would ask me to either violate my party obligation or to snatch tribute from others in order that they might have gain. [Applause.] I am happy to say that I do not believe that I will lose a single friend because of the stand that I take upon this question; but if I do, it will be because I refuse to sacrifice the integrity of my party, the party that I have always loved and that has ofttimes honored me, the party that has proclaimed the cause of humanity from the day of its inception to this good hour; it will be because I refuse to be a traitor to that patriotic organization that was founded by Jefferson, sustained and supported by Jackson, by Tilden, and by Bryan; it will be because I prefer honor above privilege or place; because I prefer to hand back the proud old party banner that I have honorably waved aloft for six years to the dear souls who placed it in my hands as stainless as it was when they placed it there; it will be because I refuse to further burden the sweat-begrimed and soot-stained toilers of this country by requiring them to pay a tariff tribute upon the lumber with which they construct their humble huts, under whose friendly roofs they lie down to rest when the shadows of night have fallen about them to warn them that their day's work is done.

Mr. Chairman, I have lived in the atmosphere of the poor man all of my life. I have endured all that he endures and have partaken of that of which he is now partaking, and hence, sir, I know his condition and his necessities, and with God's help and guidance I propose to keep in sight of him and his cause as long as I am permitted to walk to and fro upon the earth.

The fathers established a duty system as the means of raising a revenue with which to support our Government, and hence it is necessary for us who are left behind to conduct its affairs to lay a duty just large enough to support it when honestly and economically administered, and no more; that far I am a protectionist, but no further. The protection of an article manufactured or produced in any community of the United States, for protection's sake, against the competition of like articles manufactured or produced in foreign countries is also a protection against a cheaper and freer use of it by the citizens of every community in the United States except the one in which it is manufactured or produced.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, it is an outrage to prejudice the welfare of all the communities of this great Nation in order that a single community, company, or individual manufacturing or producing a particular commodity may be made rich. Special interests are never satisfied with the favoritisms accorded them, no matter how great their benefits or what hardships they cause to be visited upon others because of them. The selfishness of the world has always been and will ever be its greatest blight, and it thrives when fed upon favoritism just as animals thrive when fed upon choicest food, for which reason, if I had the honor of helping to found a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, I would not provide for the raising of its revenue by a tariff tax, because as long as selfishness exists the tariff duties will be so laid and collected as to take from one for the benefit of another, and all men know that that kind of a policy is a curse to any country that has ever been, or will ever be, afflicted with its baneful influences and effects.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that my time has about expired, and hence it will be impossible for me to consider the pending bill more in detail than I have done. I think I have said enough to show that it is a tariff infamy, however, and that men who love right more than they do wrong can not afford to support it. So I will conclude my remarks by saying that I believe that when God created man and placed him upon

the earth He intended that he should have a free and unobstructed race for the prize of life, and that if he could by his own honest efforts outstrip his fellows and possess it that he ought to be permitted to do so without hindrance of any kind from them. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I ask no protection for myself or for my business except as against the highwayman and the sneak thief, and, feeling that way about it, I can not possibly be in hearty sympathy with that class of our citizens who are so paternalistic in their desires and selfish in their views as to want their Government to throw around them a bodyguard of protection as against the honest competitions of life. [Applause.]

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman, at the request of a number of Members, I ask leave to print some tables and reports on the tariff on hides and business conditions and Bradstreet's report on the panic:

WHY HIDES SHOULD BE FREE OF DUTY.

[By A. H. Lockwood, of Chicago.]

The tariff on hides differs so radically from all other duties levied upon imported merchandise that it should always be considered alone. A careful consideration of the subject will convince any fair-minded man that the tax on hides serves no useful purpose, but works serious injury to an important chain of industries that directly affect every citizen.

Of all the many items on the free and dutiable lists of the revenue law the tariff on hides is perhaps the least understood. Senators and Congressmen, newspaper editors, and the general public have little conception of the justice and importance of the demand for free hides.

The object of this book is to present in concrete form the facts and arguments in favor of the restoration of hides to the free list.

There are chapters devoted to the different phases of the subject. A study of the succeeding pages will show that the hide tariff of 15 per cent is a radical departure in revenue legislation. For twenty-five years previous to its imposition hides had been free, and there was no agitation or demand from anybody for a tax on hides. The Dingley bill as reported to the House and passed by that body retained hides on the free list. There was no protest from the farmers nor from anyone else. In the Senate, however, the tariff was put upon hides during the compromise hours just before final passage of the bill. The leather, shoe, and other leather-consuming industries had little time or chance to present their side of the case. No hearings were had before the Ways and Means Committee. Neither the Democrats nor Republicans of the National Legislature favored the hide tax. If was admitted to be an economic blunder, but it was said the Republican majority were compelled to accept the hide tariff to save the bill.

The farmers derive no benefit from the hide tax, but really are injured, for the reason that agricultural communities are the largest consumers of leather. The principle of "protection" can not be made to apply to hides, because they are not an article of manufacture made in response to demand, but result incidentally from the slaughter of cattle for food.

Free hides would protect American labor by giving increased employment to the people on the larger quantities of leather that would be manufactured into shoes, harness, belting, furniture, and other articles for the home and export trade.

Imports of cattle hides and exports of sole leather have decreased as a result of the tariff on hides. It is significant that during the same period imports of kips and skins free of duty and exports of upper leather have increased.

As a producer of revenue the hide tax is of small consequence. A little over $2,000,000 a year is all the Government derives from the hide tariff, while the cost of raw material to tanners and shoe manufacturers and the price of shoes and other leather goods consumed by the public is raised by reason of the tax.

Tanning and the manufacture of leather goods, such as shoes, harness, belting, etc., are carried on in almost every State of the Union. The demand for free hides is not a sectional issue, but is voiced in the West and South as well as in the East.

Every inhabitant of the country is a consumer of leather, and 24,000,000 of horses and mules are of no use to the people until they are harnessed with leather. The hide tax touches every man's feet and every man's head. It increases the cost of his shoes and the sweat band in his hat. It hits the pocketbook as well as its contents. Every traveling man feels the hide tax upon his suit case and bag, and every mill owner pays more for belts to transmit his power.

The domestic hide supply of every civilized country is much too small for its required quantities of leather. There is no possible way by which it can be made sufficient. Without imports of hides and skins there must be imports of leather, shoes, and other leather goods. Little argument should be necessary to convince anyone that it would be better to import hides and skins in larger quantities than to be compelled to import finished leather merchandise upon which much foreign labor is expended.

Cattle in the United States are decreasing while the the population is increasing. The demand for leather has outstripped the demand for beef. The extension of our exports of shoes depends upon equality of opportunity in respect of raw material. All manufacturing nations, including Canada, admit hides free of duty. The tariff of 15 per cent imposed upon hides coming into the United States enables Europe to convert the surplus hides of South America into articles for the export trade of the world. The manufacturers of and dealers in leather and leather goods of the United States are not soliciting a special privilege. They demand the righting of a wrong put upon them without sufficient hearing in 1897. There can be no justification for the hide tax. It is a tariff monstrosity inflicted upon one of the greatest and most important industries of the land. The burden of unjust taxation has been carried for twelve years only because it was not possible to force revision upon a single item without reopening the entire dutiable and free lists.

HIDE TARIFF NOT A POLITICAL ISSUE.

The hide tax was never a political issue. During the years after 1872, when the Republican party was in complete control of all branches of the National Government hides were on the free list. It thus appears that the most consistent advocate of the principle of protection to American industry and labor is justified in favoring the free entry of hides into our ports.

An examination of all the revenue bills shows that hides and skins were admitted free of duty for seventy-eight years, and were dutiable at various rates and for different periods amounting in all to about thirty years prior to the enactment of the present law. Hides and skins were first taxed August 30, 1842, the object of the bill being to increase the revenues. The vetoes of President Tyler of two tariff bills had caused a Treasury deficit, and hides and skins were taxed 5 per cent ad valorem. By the act of March 3, 1857, the tariff was reduced to 4 per cent. The act of March 2, 1861, put the rate back to 5 per cent, and it so remained until the act of August 5, 1861, when almost everything was taxed to produce revenue to carry on the civil war, and the duty on hides and skins was increased to 10 per cent. This duty remained in force until the act of June 6, 1872, when hides and skins were put upon the free list, where they remained undisturbed in any of the general tariff revisions until the Dingley bill became a law June 24, 1897.

It will be seen from this brief history that hides prior to 1897 were free except during short periods when the Government needed revenue, and that the tax was never more than 10 per cent and was always made to apply to all desecriptions of hides and skins. The present law, therefore, was a new departure in hide tariffs which has proved burdensome and oppressive in its operation. It made the duty 5 per cent more than it had ever been before, and taxed cattle hides only, leaving all other kinds of hides and all descriptions of skins on the free list.

Tanners, shoe manufacturers, and producers of harness, saddlery, belting, and leather goods generally are inclined to charge the Republican party with the responsibility for taxing hides, although it can be shown that the hide tariff was never a part of the Republican scheme of protection. Prior to the present law, that went into effect in 1897, hides were free of duty for twenty-five years continuously. When William McKinley was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, although personally he did not favor it, there was an abortive attempt made to put a tax on hides. At that time James G. Blaine wrote, under date of April 10, 1890, the following letter:

"DEAR MR. MCKINLEY: It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It is a slap in the face to the South Americans, with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes. It will yield a profit to the butcher only—the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end—in every form and phase. Pray stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican party into a speedy retirement.

"Yours, hastily, JAMES G. BLAINE."

The law now in force was known at its inception as the "Dingley bill," after the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. As reported from the committee, and as it passed the House, the Dingley bill left hides undisturbed on the free list. This, it should be remembered, was in the spring of 1897, immediately following the first inauguration of President McKinley. At that time the balance of power in the Senate was held by several Populist Senators from the far West, whose terms of office had not yet expired. The Populist platform had a free-trade plank, so that there was no matter of principle involved. The Republican leaders were on record for continuing free hides, and the Populists were pledged by their party platform to oppose all tariffs not for revenue only. And yet in the conference hours before the final passage of the new revenue law a tariff of 15 per cent was put upon hides. Just how it was done has always been in dispute.

HIDE TARIFF CAUSES DECREASE OF SOLE-LEATHER EXPORTS.

Under the baneful influence of the tariff of 15 per cent on heavy catle hides our exports of sole leather have declined, despite the well-known fact that the use of leather shoes has increased all over the world. In the year 1895, before the imposition of the present tax, our exports of sole leather were 45,364,349 pounds. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, exports of sole leather were only 31,189,897 pounds. Here is a loss of more than 14,000,000 pounds, notwithstanding that the law now in force permits a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty. Under the stimulus of free hides Canada, England, Germany, and other countries have developed their tanning industries, so that to-day it would be hard enough for tanners of the United States to compete for export trade, even with free access to the world's markets for raw material.

Sole-leather exports.

Year.	Pounds.	Dollars.
1895	45,364,349	6,919,372
1896	41,818,503	7,474,021
1897	38,384,314	6,510,404
1898	37,813,019	6,644,553
1899	37,120,912	6,280,904
1900	34,060,296	6,433,303
1901	35,180,266	6,577,732
1902	36,454,284	6,569,857
1903	37,428,437	6,920,467
1904	36,830,717	6,978,497
1905	44,107,054	9,444,873
1906	40,548,767	8,186,279
1907	31,900,868	7,024,313
1908	31,189,897	6,593,950

FREE RAW MATERIAL VITAL TO LEATHER-TRADE EXPANSION.

It is a curious fact that while the highly civilized nations consume the most leather and leather goods they have the smallest cattle and hide supply. In the appendix may be found tables showing the number of cattle and other farm animals in the different countries of the world.

Horses, goats, sheep, and swine furnish material for leather making,

but since the tariff only affects the hides of beef cattle, the argument may be confined to that class.

The United States, with a population of 87,189,392, has 73,246,573 cattle. Argentina, with a population of 5,410,028, has 30,000,000 head of cattle. Indeed, all the countries of South America combined have a population of only 41,116,094, while they have 72,334,623 head of cattle. The supply of cattle in the United States is less than 1 for each inhabitant, while in South America cattle are about 1¾ to each inhabitant, and the per capita consumption of leather in the South American countries is very much smaller than in the United States. Only the wealthy classes in South America can afford to buy leather shoes for themselves and leather harness for their horses.

Argentina, with her 6 head of cattle to each person and limited domestic consumption of leather, has a surplus hide supply needed by tanners of the United States for making shoes and other leather goods, not only for domestic consumption, but to develop the export trade. Unfortunately this raw material is diverted from our shores to the free ports of Europe by a foolish tariff on hides. England, France, and Germany combined have only 45,275,603 head of cattle, while their combined population is 138,546,810. In other words, these countries have less than 1 beef animal to every 3 persons. These nations are, of course, highly civilized, and, hence, large consumers of leather. In the United States, where the cattle supply is much greater in relation to population (nearly 1 head of cattle to each inhabitant), our tanners and shoe and harness manufacturers would have a natural advantage in competing for the world's trade in leather and leather goods if the tariff of 15 per cent did not discourage the entry of hides into our ports and make it easier for competing nations, with free raw material, to capture and hold a large share of the world's leather and shoe industry.

All the great labor-saving and time-shortening inventions that have revolutionized the manufacture of shoes are of American origin. The production of leather and shoes has been carried to a high plane of efficiency in the United States, but the domestic supply of hides and skins is inadequate. The American people would be compelled to import shoes and other leather goods in large quantities if foreign material were refused admission to our ports, thus closing many of our industries and shoe, harness, and belting factories for lack of raw material. As the case stands to-day their operations are greatly curtailed by the duty on hides.

FREE HIDES WOULD PROTECT AMERICAN LABOR.

With free raw material America would lead the world in the production of leather, shoes, and other leather goods. Advocates of the political theory of "protection" are prone to be suspicious of every industrial demand for free raw material. It is alleged, and with much truth, that what is raw material to one industry is finished product to another. For example, the growing of wool, the mining of minerals, and the production of lumber are, to an extent, industries susceptible of development and expansion under the fostering influence of a protective tariff.

The radical difference between these commodities and hides seems never to have been recognized by our national legislators. The slaughter of cattle in the United States is greater than the domestic demand for beef, as is shown by the exports of dressed and canned beef. On the other hand, the supply of hides and skins that results incidentally from the domestic slaughter is far too small to furnish raw material for our tanneries.

Free hides would be a very substantial measure of protection to all the industries connected with leather. No labor of consequence is expended upon hides by cattle raisers or butchers. A tremendous amount of labor, however, is put upon hides and skins by tanners, shoe manufacturers, and the men who make harness, belting, gloves, furniture, and the thousand and one articles consisting wholly or in part of leather. It is becoming more and more a vital question to the chain of leather industries how to insure adequate and unfailing supplies of raw material. Imports of hides and skins into the United States amount to about 400,000,000 pounds a year, valued at upward of $90,000,000. Of dutiable cattle hides alone we import annually about $20,000,000 worth. If we assume that the 140,000,000 pounds of heavy cattle hides we import yearly are dry and weigh 20 pounds each we have an importation of something like 7,000,000 hides, or more than the total yearly slaughter at Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Omaha, the principal packing-house centers. Does anyone in his senses suppose that a tariff of 15 per cent on hides will ever cause farmers to raise this greater number of cattle, unless there is created a similar expansion in the demand for beef?

There are certain fundamental points in this matter of the hide tariff that should be impressed upon Congressmen and Senators.

Let us state them thus:

First. The total production of hides and skins the world over is not too much to supply the world's requirements for leather.

Second. Leather is unique in that it has no substitute, and it can not be made except from the skins of animals.

Third. The quantity of leather produced in the world is measured by the number of hides and skins taken off and offered for tanners' use.

Fourth. The quantity of raw material being thus limited by natural conditions, beyond the control of the leather industries, it follows that for every hide that one nation is enabled to tan, other nations must tan one less. Any tax that diverts raw material for making leather away from our shores is surely playing into the hands of the tanners and shoe manufacturers of foreign countries. It is protecting the labor of England, France, and Germany, and discriminating against the labor of the United States.

Since this method of stating the free-hide position may not at first glance be understood, it may be well to explain what is meant when we say that the hide tariff protects foreign labor. Suppose a hundred new tanneries and shoe factories were to be built in this country, what would be the effect? The competition to buy hides and skins would be greater, but the quantity offered would not be increased, except as more raw material could be imported. If more hides and skins were to come into this country, the result would be that smaller quantities of leather would be tanned abroad and our domestic and export trade in leather and leather goods would be enlarged.

FARMERS NOT BENEFITED BY THE HIDE TAX.

It is evident to those who investigate the matter that there is an attempt to make the farmer a cat's paw to drag others' tariff chestnuts out of the fire.

Since it may be made to appear that the tariff on hides affords some protection or benefit to the farmer, it becomes necessary to consider that the farmer leads all other classes of citizens in the consumption of leather. Any tanner will testify that Texas consumes more harness leather than any other State in the Union, and everyone knows that farm work is especially destructive of shoe leather.

The farmer gets no increase in the price of the beeves he sells by reason of the tax on hides. The tariff, therefore, offers only a visionary benefit to the farmer to compensate for an actual injury in the form of higher prices for shoe and harness leather.

Admitting, for argument's sake, that the farmer, by reason of the tariff on hides, receives a higher price for his cattle, still the reduction in price of the shoes, harness, and other articles made of leather, cheapened by reason of the removal of the tariff on hides, would be of far greater consequence to him than any increase of price on his cattle by reason of the tariff. This argument may be extended further by taking into consideration the benefits of lower prices of shoes, harness, etc., to the laborer, and we would have a vast army of beneficiaries as against a few large cattle raisers who receive an imaginary benefit, and a still smaller number of packers who receive it in reality.

Cattle and hide prices are published every day in Chicago, and are thus a matter of record. Elaborate tables demonstrate that the higher or lower rates paid for hides have no relation to the prices paid for cattle on the hoof. It frequently happens that hides advance just at the time that beeves are declining. Cattle prices are regulated by the demand for beef for food and the supply offered at the several stock yards. Hides fluctuate in response to the demands of tanners for raw material to make leather. Beef is perishable, and can only be held for a limited time, and then under great expense for refrigeration. Hides, after being salted, can be stored for several years, if necessary. In 1895—two years before the hide tax was imposed—the packers paid from $6 to $6.40 per 100 pounds for native steers on the hoof at the Chicago stock yards. During that year native steer hides were sold by the packers at from 7¼ cents to 13½ cents, the latter rate only being realized during a few weeks in the year. In 1908 we find native steers on the hoof selling at from $5.30 to $6.65 per 100 pounds, while native steer hides are bringing 16 cents a pound. These examples could be multiplied, showing that the farmer does not get the benefit of any higher prices the packers may obtain for their hides.

Hides are not strictly a farm product. Farmers shear and sell their own wool, and the sheep can be turned out to raise more wool for the next shearing. The beef animal grows but one hide, and that is not taken off by the farmer, but becomes a by-product of the butchering business.

There is a duty on live cattle imported. Clause 218 of Schedule G of the present revenue law reads thus:

"Cattle, if less than 1 year old, $2 per head; all other cattle, if valued at not more than $14 per head, $3.75 per head; if valued at more than $14 per head, 27½ per cent ad valorem."

Although the domestic supply of hides and skins is far too small to furnish raw material for making leather, there is no scarcity of cattle in the country, as gauged by the consumptive demand for beef for food. This is demonstrated by the exports of cattle on the hoof. The Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for 1907 gives this table:

Imports and exports of live cattle, with average prices, 1892–1907.

Year ending June 30—	Imports.			Exports.		
	Number.	Value.	Average import price.	Number.	Value.	Average export price.
1892	2,168	$47,466	$21.89	394,607	$35,099,095	$88.95
1893	3,293	45,682	13.87	287,094	26,032,428	90.68
1894	1,592	18,704	11.75	359,278	33,461,922	93.14
1895	149,781	765,853	5.11	331,722	30,603,796	92.26
1896	217,826	1,509,856	6.93	372,461	34,560,672	92.79
1897	328,977	2,589,857	7.87	392,190	36,357,451	92.70
1898	291,589	2,913,223	9.99	439,255	37,827,500	86.12
1899	199,752	2,520,362	11.62	389,490	30,516,833	78.35
1900	181,006	2,257,694	12.47	397,286	30,635,153	77.11
1901	146,022	1,931,433	13.23	459,218	37,566,980	81.81
1902	96,027	1,608,722	16.75	392,884	29,902,212	76.11
1903	66,175	1,161,548	17.55	402,178	29,848,936	74.22
1904	16,056	310,737	19.35	593,409	42,256,291	71.21
1905	27,855	458,572	16.46	567,806	40,598,048	71.50
1906	29,019	548,430	18.90	584,239	42,081,170	72.03
1907	32,404	565,122	17.44	423,051	34,577,392	81.73

The small imports of live cattle each year are for breeding purposes and to improve the quality and quantity of beef produced or to raise the standard of stock for dairy purposes.

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN CATTLE RAISING.

It is impossible for anyone to prove that stockmen and farmers realize more money for their cattle because of the duty on hides, but assuming, for the sake of the argument, that the tariff does increase the value of the hides on the backs of all the steers, bulls, and cows on the plains and farms, the real element of "protection" still is absent. The consumers of both beef and leather, of course, greatly outnumber the producers of cattle and hides. To justify the tariff on hides it must be demonstrated that the effect of it is to foster, increase, and develop an industry that otherwise would languish because of the imports. Even at the high rates now ruling hides constitute but one-tenth of the value of the animals from whose backs they are taken. To produce a $9 hide it is necessary to raise an animal worth $100. Under these circumstances it is not possible to increase the number of cattle raised by putting a premium on the hide. There is no scarcity of beef. Cattlemen find if they ship large quantities of beeves to the stock yards that prices immediately are lowered. If the United States were a country importing great quantities of beef, then some measure of "protection" or bounty would have the effect of keeping out foreign competition, thus enabling the American stockman and farmer to increase the production of cattle.

The making of hides is not an industry to which the policy of "protection" can be applied. No one is engaged in the manufacture of hides. They are an incidental product of the butchering business. Cattle can not be raised for their hides, but are bought on the hoof by the packers and butchers under the operation of the law of supply and demand caused by the supply of cattle for slaughter and the demand for beef for consumption for food. Hides and the other by-products of the beef industry are marketed to the best advantage by the packers, each article being subject to peculiar conditions. It frequently happens that the supply of live cattle is large and the demand for beef is not very heavy at the very time that hides or other subsidiary products of cattle are in active demand at high prices, but that fact does not increase the production of hides one iota, because in this country not an animal is ever slaughtered for its hide alone. It is impossible by putting a tariff on a minor product of the meat and provision business to furnish protection to men who raise cattle thousands of miles away on the western ranges. Statistics covering a period of years show that at the times when hides have brought the highest prices cattle on the hoof have sold at the lowest prices. Cattle are raised in vast herds by large corporations, and it would seem that sufficient protection to the livestock industry is furnished by the Government in the form of free grazing lands and a tariff on the importation of live cattle from Mexico and other foreign countries.

In any case it is inevitable that the United States will have to face the problem of a foreign meat, as well as hide and skin, supply sooner or later. The ranges gradually are being taken up and are producing more wealth than before. Intensive farming now is in order. Farmers, of course, will continue to raise a certain proportion of cattle, but the great ranges of free grazing land must give way to more profitable uses. None of the great commercial nations is able to raise enough raw material to keep its tanneries and shoe and harness factories employed. As our country develops, it is certain that we shall have to depend more and more upon the semicivilized nations for hides and skins for making leather.

CATTLE AND HIDE PRICES.

In the appendix are tables giving the receipts, slaughter, and prices on the hoof for live cattle at Chicago, together with the quotations for hides. It will be seen that live beeves brought about 2 cents more per pound during 1907 than in 1896, just before the tariff of 15 per cent was put upon hides. Hide prices, on the other hand, advanced from 5 to 6 cents.

A careful study of these tables will show that the prices obtained for hides by the big packers do not affect the rates they pay for cattle on the hoof.

WORLD'S HIDE SUPPLY DECREASING.

In recent years the relatively lessened supply of hides as a world's commodity has become apparent. Of course, more hides are taken off in the world than twelve years ago, but the increase is not in proportion to the expansion of population. This is explained by the fact, patent to all, that the world is demanding more leather while consuming proportionately less beef. This condition is easily understood when it is remembered that there are many substitutes for beef for food, but practically no substitute for leather. If cattle breeding were to cease entirely and the bovine race were to become extinct, the people could be well fed with other foods. On the other hand, there would be extreme difficulty in finding raw material of which to make sole, upper, harness, belting, furniture, and automobile leather. The government census of farm animals taken as of January 1 each year shows that there were fewer cattle by 1,267,000 head January, 1908, than in 1907. Meanwhile the population of the country is a million and a half greater each year.

The supremacy of the United States in tanning was largely owing to the vast tracts of hemlock trees that followed the great Appalachian Mountains through New York and Pennsylvania to the South. The hemlock tree only grows in Canada and the United States, so that hemlock-tanned sole leather is essentially an American product. But the supply of hemlock bark is rapidly becoming exhausted, and our tanners now are without the great advantage of cheap tanning material. Chrome, quebracho, cutch, gambier, sumac, and many other foreign tanning agents are now used by American tanners because the previously unfailing supply of our native tannins is becoming exhausted.

The continued expansion of production of leather, shoes, harness, and other leather goods in the United States is dependent upon obtaining supplies of raw material from foreign countries. Imports of cattle hides are decreasing because of the obnoxious tax. During 1899, nine years ago, imports of dutiable cattle hides were 130,396,020 pounds, against 98,353,249 pounds during the fiscal year ended June, 1908. Here is a loss in nine years of 32,042,771 pounds. With our cattle supply decreasing because of the lessened demand for beef and our imports of beef hides decreasing because of the tariff, it is apparent that the great leather and shoe industries in this country are facing an insufficiency of raw material which can only be remedied by placing hides on the free list.

HIDES ARE A WORLD'S COMMODITY.

Hides, like wheat, are a world's commodity. They are taken off the backs of animals every day in the year and in almost every city and town in the world. In the leading commercial and manufacturing nations the production of leather for domestic consumption and export requires many more hides and skins than result incidentally from the cattle slaughtered for food. The international movement of hides and skins is shown by tables reproduced from the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1907. A study of these tables will show remarkable facts that are little understood.

The total exports of hides and skins from all the ports of the world amounted in 1906 to 1,570,003,744 pounds. Of this tremendous quantity of raw material, despite the tariff on cattle hides, the United States imported 370,983,815 pounds. It thus appears that almost one-fourth of all the hides and skins exported throughout the world come into this country.

During the year 1906 Germany imported 367,682,005 pounds of hides and skins, which at first glance is only about 3,000,000 pounds less than the United States, but during the same year Germany exported 119,302,674 pounds, thus leaving for consumption only 248,379,331 pounds.

Exports of hides and skins from the United States during 1906 were 15,396,806 pounds, which, deduced from the imports of 370,983,815 pounds, would leave for consumption in this country 355,587,009 pounds, thus showing that the tanners of the United States lead the next largest tanning nation by 107,207,678 pounds annually in the use of foreign hides and skins.

Belgium is an important factor in the distribution of hides and skins, largely through her port of Antwerp. Her imports in 1906 were 142,197,407 pounds, but her exports during the same period were 102,400,208 pounds, showing that while Belgium is an important trading nation she does not figure largely in tanning.

Great Britain also is a large importer of hides, taking 122,898,432 pounds in 1906, but her exports that year were 69,195,195 pounds, leaving imports for actual consumption only 53,703,237 pounds.

All the commercial nations export as well as import hides and skins, and this important fact should not be lost sight of in endeavoring to estimate the world's supply of raw material for tanning.

Hides, being a world's commodity, are, like wheat, influenced in price by international conditions. Merchandise naturally flows to the highest market. There is what may be called a world's level of values in hides and skins. When for any reason hides accumulate and decline in price in any country, the market is relieved by exports. Similarly, if hides and skins are advanced in price in any market above the world's level of values, imports are increased until the inequality is corrected.

The hide tax yields no revenue of consequence to the Government, and yet the injury it does to the growing export traffic in leather, shoes, and other leather goods is of serious importance.

HIDE TARIFF DECREASES USE OF CATTLE HIDES.

The alleged purpose of the tariff on hides imposed in 1897 was to increase the demand for and price of domestic cattle hides so that the farmer might be benefited.

During the fiscal year 1898, the first year after the imposition of the hide tax, imports of dutiable hides were 126,243,595 pounds. In 1908, ten years later, imports were only 98,353,249 pounds—a decrease of 27,890,346 pounds in ten years, notwithstanding the great growth of the country during that decade.

During 1908 imports of nondutiable hides and skins were 184,411,676 pounds. In 1898 imports of hides and skins free of duty were 119,531,021 pounds—an increase in ten years of 64,880,655 pounds.

Here is a demonstration of the fact that tanners of the United States have decreased their consumption of cattle hides because of the duty, while using more horse hides, goatskins, calf and kip skins and other raw materials that are admitted free of duty. The reduction of imports of cattle hides caused by the tariff does not inure to the benefit of the stockman and farmer, but cause a curtailment in the production of the kinds of leather made from dutiable hides.

These tables give the figures:

Imports of dutiable cattle hides.

Year.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Average per pound.
			Cents.
1898	126,243,595	13,624,989	10.79
1908	98,353,249	12,044,435	12.24
Decrease	27,890,346	1,580,554	

Imports of free hides and skins.

Year.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Average per pound.
			Cents.
1898	119,531,021	23,443,943	19.61
1908	184,411,676	42,725,701	23.16
Increase	64,880,655	19,281,758	

These tables show that dutiable hides increased in value from 1898 to 1908 14 per cent.

Hides free of duty increased in value about 18 per cent in the same time, while the imports in quantity increased 50 per cent.

No doubt, if hides were on the free list there would be world demand for them and the prices would be higher, as during the panic the dutiable hides declined from 50 to 70 per cent in value, and we exported a great many hides on account of being the lowest market in the world.

The free-of-duty hides only declined about 15 to 20 per cent, for the reason that the tanners knew that they could sell the leather in the markets of the world and their hides did not cost them any more than the tanners of other countries, which has a tendency to hold prices steadier and higher.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT DOES FOR THE FARMERS.

The tariff of 15 per cent on cattle hides that works such injury to the great leather and shoe trades is defended on the hypothesis that it benefits the farmer. In other articles facts and figures are adduced showing that the hide tax does nothing for the farmer. Packers and butchers are the only beneficiaries. But assuming that the government that "protects" manufacturing by a tariff should help the farmer, it may be well to consider the facts.

HIDE TARIFF NOT A REVENUE PRODUCER.

There are only two reasons for the imposition of a tariff—it must be shown that a duty either is intended to produce revenue for the Government or to furnish "protection" to some struggling industry. Imports of hides and skins of all kinds, dutiable and free, for the fiscal year of the Government ending June 30, 1908, were 282,764,925 pounds, valued

at $54,777,136. Of this large importation only 98,353,249 pounds, valued at $12,044,435, were dutiable. It thus appears that less than one-quarter of the total imports of hides and skins, as measured in dollars, pay an import duty. To make this point clear it should be understood that the duty only is charged upon hides of adult cattle. Calf and kip skins as well as goatskins, sheepskins, horse hides, etc., are admitted duty free. There is a drawback clause in the revenue law that provides for a refund of the duty paid if subsequently exported. Section 30, known as the "drawback clause," is as follows:

"That where imported materials on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States, there shall be allowed on the exportation of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the materials used, less 1 per cent of such duties: *Provided*, That when the articles exported are made in part from domestic materials the imported materials, or the parts of the articles made from such materials, shall so appear in the completed articles that the quantity or measure thereof may be ascertained: *And provided further*, That the drawback on any article allowed under existing law shall be continued at the rate herein provided. That the imported materials used in the manufacture or production of articles entitled to drawback of customs duties when exported shall, in all cases where drawback of duties paid on such materials is claimed, be identified, the quantity of such materials used and the amount of duties paid thereon shall be ascertained, and facts of the manufacture or production of such articles in the United States and their exportation therefrom shall be determined, and the drawback due thereon shall be paid to the manufacturer, producer, or exporter, to the agent of either or to the person to whom such manufacturer, producer, exporter, or agent shall in writing order such drawback paid, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe."

The duty paid on hides and skins ranges from $1,500,000 to $3,000,000 annually. The drawback refund ranges from $500,000 to $900,000 annually. If we take an average of five years, 1903 to 1907, inclusive, we find the total amount of duty paid on hides was $12,624,579. Drawbacks for the same five years were $3,512,604, making a net revenue resulting from five years of $9,111,875. It thus appears that the total revenue of the Government from the hide tariff is not more than $1,500,000 annually.

Duty, drawback, and net revenue on cattle hides for five years.

Year.	Duty paid.	Drawback.	Total revenue.
1907	$3,115,390.94	$907,386.83	$2,207,904.11
1906	3,284,521.11	683,992.39	2,600,528.72
1905	2,185,381.53	565,514.99	1,619,866.54
1904	1,621,827.28	631,443.91	990,383.37
1903	2,417,458.84	724,266.21	1,693,192.63
Total	12,624,579.70	3,512,604.33	9,111,875.37

DUTY ON LEATHER.

There is a reduction of 5 to 30 per cent on the following class of leather and leather articles: Band and sole leather, from 20 per cent ad valorem to 5 per cent ad valorem. Upper leather, calf skins, chamois skins, kangaroo, sheep and goat skins, and other leather not provided for, from 20 per cent to 15 per cent ad valorem. Patent leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins, from 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 10 pounds and not over 25 pounds per dozen, from 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 25 pounds, from 20 cents per dozen and 20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem, all to 20 per cent ad valorem; pianoforte leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem; boots and shoes, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem; shoe laces, from 50 cents per gross and 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem; leather cut into shoe uppers, etc., from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem; all other manufactures of leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent ad valorem, of which the American people consume about $700,000,000 worth, the average will be about 10 per cent, or a reduction of $70,000,000, which the leather manufacturers are willing to give up for a difference of 15 per cent on the hides; total production of which is $70,000,000 dutiable, or a total of $10,000,000. The consumers of leather are getting $7 saving, where the sellers of hides are losing a dollar on a hide.

Book of Estimated Revenues, Schedule N, pages 113, 114, gives the importation of leather and the amount of duty collected, but does not close the subject showing that there was a reduction in the duty on heavy leather and leather goods made out of dutiable hides, but connects gloves with it, and on page 119 closes in the grand total, showing that there is an advance from 34.25 to 39.9 per cent in the proposed bill.

It is an unjust and untrue statement to the heavy-leather boot and shoe manufacturers and tanners committee, as they attach to this statement the duty on gloves, which has nothing to do with the other class of leather, and no doubt intends to carry and impress one that there is an increased duty on leather made out of dutiable hides. The fact of the matter is that this is entirely on gloves, and we should not carry the burden of the outrageous increase of tariff in the glove schedule.

The fact is heavy leather is reduced more than hides in value.

Hides in 1888 to 1892 sold as low in Chicago as 4½ cents, and advanced to 10 cents a pound in 1896 and went up as high as 14 cents, and declined last year in panic to 6 cents a pound for No. 1 buffs, to-day are 11½ cents a pound.

HOW HIDE DUTY WORKS.

In the tariff hearings, Cowan, as attorney for the cattle raisers, should be attorney for the packers, with the stand that he takes on the hide question. Not a single argument does he present which would show that hides would sell for less money if we had no tariff act, as he does show that calfskins, which were on the free list, have advanced more than hides which were dutiable.

As there is produced, according to his figures, about 14,000,000 of hides, the fact is that about 80 per cent of the value of these hides is sold by the packers, which not only consists of the large four, so-called, but which also control the different slaughterhouses in the different large cities of the Union.

A Texas heavy steer hide, marketed about December, 1908, by the packer, weighing on an average about 80 pounds, would bring about $13. A hide taken off by a farmer in Texas and dried would average about 15 pounds and sell for 17 cents a pound, or bring about $2.55, which plainly shows that every statement he makes is misleading in a way.

He also claims that the farmer gets the benefit of the 15 per cent, and if the 15 per cent raised the price on hides in this country to that extent, claiming that these advances entirely go to the farmer and not to the packer, which is untrue, and if it was true, as we sell about sixty to seventy million dollars' worth of hides, it would increase the value of about $10,000,000.

The reduction, claiming that the farmer gets this and that the tanner loses out in this profit, which is untrue, as there has never been a time where there has been a 15 per cent margin in the tanning business, but he does not get credit for 10 per cent cut on boots and shoes, of which the people use $320,000,000 worth, and which gives the farmer, using the same argument, which, of course, is untrue, $32,000,000 more if the tariff was not reduced the 10 per cent.

We use, on the average per capita, about $4 worth of shoes and produce about 75 cents worth of hides.

There is not a State in the Union where the people of that State, on the whole, would not receive a large benefit if the duty is removed from hides, and it would give them an opportunity to buy their leather as cheap as the foreigner and also giving the cattle feeder who exported his cattle alive an opportunity to get more for his cattle than he does now, as on every head of 500,000 cattle now exported with the hides on, the hide sells in the foreign market for 15 per cent less than it does at home, which no doubt would be a loss of $2.40, and as we export 500,000 head it would be a direct loss to the farmers of this country. As it is now, about one and a quarter to one and a half million dollars, which difference goes entirely into the pockets of the packers and dressers of American beef.

As the farmer of Iowa can not buy the leather made from the hide of his steer, tanned by American labor, as cheap as the farmer of England, and this is the protection of the American farmer under the Dingley bill.

In 1888 to 1892 the low price of hides at Chicago was about 4½ cents; in 1896 they went to 10 cents; neither was it the Democratic panic nor Republican prosperity that changed the price to any great extent.

I insert a letter from the Bureau of Animal Industry, which is absolutely misleading, as, if he wants to make a correct statement, he should show the value of all the hides sold by the packers, large and small, and the value sold direct by the farmer; and if this could be obtained, I am satisfied that he would show about 80 per cent of the dutiable hides in value sold by the packer and about only 20 per cent by the farmer direct as the finished product, and I challenge anyone to deny this statement.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 24, 1909.

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives:

Regret that neither Bureau of Animal Industry nor Bureau of Statistics can give information desired. I can give exact figures only of meat inspection. During 1908 there were slaughtered under inspection 7,249,837 adult cattle, 1,918,343 calves, practically all at packing houses. Other slaughter by butchers, farmers, and a few packers roughly estimated as 6,000,000 cattle, 3,500,000 calves.

Census figures show average weight of hides about 56 pounds. Market quotation by trade journal show average Chicago price, 1908, packer hides about 11.6 cents pound, country hides, 9.9 cents.

A. D. MELVIN,
Chief, Bureau of Animal Industry.

MORE LEATHER, LESS CATTLE.

January 1, 1892, five years before the tariff was put upon hides, the number of beef cattle in the country, according to the United States Government census, was 54,067,590 head. January 1, 1908, by the same authority, the number of cattle was 71,267,000—an increase in sixteen years of only 17,199,410 head.

The population of the United States in 1892 was 62,622,250. In 1908 we have a population of 86,000,000—an increase of 24,000,000.

It thus appears that the growth of population is greater than the growth of cattle raising. In 1897, when the tax was put upon hides, the exports of fresh, canned, and dried beef were 413,068,090 pounds, valued at $30,907,877. During the fiscal year 1908 exports of beef were 272,426,639 pounds, valued at $26,126,102—a decrease in eleven years of 140,641,451 pounds, valued at $14,781,775. These facts are adduced to show that the kill of cattle is not keeping pace with the demand for leather for shoes, harness, belting, furniture, and automobile leather. The United States cattle census for forty-two years may be found on another page. This table gives the packer slaughter for twenty-two years:

Slaughter at four points for twenty-two years.

	Chicago.	Kansas City.	St. Louis.	Omaha.	Total.
1886	1,259,000	120,000	165,000	71,000	1,615,000
1887	1,591,000	186,000	211,000	134,000	2,362,000
1888	1,643,000	374,000	187,000	84,000	2,048,000
1889	1,763,000	476,000	210,000	239,000	2,688,000
1890	2,224,000	549,000	277,000	322,000	3,373,000
1891	2,184,000	532,000	315,000	325,000	3,356,000
1892	2,450,000	669,000	336,000	456,000	3,911,000
1893	2,233,000	899,000	429,000	543,000	4,104,000
1894	2,024,000	925,000	492,000	518,000	3,959,000
1895	1,803,000	894,000	579,000	314,000	3,590,000
1896	1,782,000	895,000	605,000	345,000	3,627,000
1897	1,711,000	942,000	595,000	463,000	3,711,000
1898	1,615,000	907,000	541,000	490,000	3,553,000
1899	1,702,000	993,000	542,000	549,000	3,786,000
1900	1,794,000	1,116,000	590,000	553,000	4,053,000
1901	2,000,000	1,195,000	717,000	579,000	4,491,000
1902	2,031,000	1,103,000	839,000	646,000	4,619,000
1903	2,163,000	1,029,000	871,000	770,000	4,833,000
1904	1,933,000	1,026,000	911,000	683,000	4,553,000
1905	2,000,000	1,267,000	877,000	682,000	4,826,000
1906	1,976,000	1,347,000	922,000	748,000	4,993,000
1907	1,853,000	1,264,000	897,000	797,000	4,811,000

THE POPULATION PROBLEM.

At the conference of governors called by President Roosevelt and held in Washington it was predicted that the population of the United States in 1950 will be more than 200,000,000. Some writers are asking how the human race will be supplied with food and other necessities of life when the sparsely occupied areas of the world are populated and no longer have surplus raw material to export? At the present ratio of consumption the populous nations are becoming more and more dependent upon imports for wool, lumber, beef, hides, furs, and even wheat. James J. Hill estimates that in twenty years we shall be a wheat importing nation, having passed from a nation that helps to feed the world to one that must import food to sustain life.

This point already has been reached in respect of hides and skins. The imports vary, but we have imported as much as $83,000,000 worth of hides and skins in a year. As civilization advances it becomes necessary to penetrate farther and farther into the semicivilized and barbarous countries in search of raw material to clothe, feed, and house the people. The domestic supply of hides and skins is hopelessly inadequate and imports are vital to keep our tanneries and shoe factories running. Under these circumstances the folly of imposing a tariff on hides is apparent. For years past the most inaccessible parts of the world have been searched for hides and skins. Increased demand and relatively lessened supply have caused prices to advance in all the markets of the world. The raw-material problem is becoming acute for the tanning and leather-consuming industries. For twelve years we have been heavily handicapped by an obnoxious tariff of 15 per cent on hides of cattle that discourages the importation of hides from South America and other countries, and enables the packers to charge more for their hides than they otherwise could exact.

RECIPROCITY THE REAL BASIS OF TRADE.

In the early years of the Nation imports exceeded exports and "protection" was designed to enable the development of the country's industries. This has been accomplished so successfully that our exports now exceed our imports by from $500,000,000 to $600,000,000 annually. Trade is only bartering with money as the medium of exchange. It is axiomatic that the benefits of trade must be mutual or it will not long endure. As a nation we can not indefinitely continue selling more than we buy. The balance will be forced either by larger imports or smaller exports. Already our industries are feeling the effect of retaliatory tariffs imposed by nations whose products we keep out by our badly devised tariff system.

It is admitted that the present revenue law needs revision. Every item on the dutiable list will be on trial. Since the continuance and further development of our export trade depend upon our reciprocal purchase of larger quantities of foreign merchandise, wise statesmanship would suggest that the tariff should be taken off articles that we need but can not produce in sufficient quantities at home. Hides were free for twenty-five years prior to the enactment of the present law twelve years ago. The hide tariff is an experiment in revenue legislation that is economically unsound. The inadequacy of the domestic supply of hides is so great that there is no possibility of increasing the domestic slaughter of cattle to an extent that would discourage the imports of hides and skins needed to keep our industries employed.

BEEF TRUST MONOPOLIZING THE TANNING INDUSTRY.

Since the imposition of a tariff of 15 per cent on cattle hides nearly twelve years ago there have been developments in the tanning industry that have radically changed the complexion of affairs. In recent years the big packers (sometimes called the beef trust) have extensively engaged in the tanning business. Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Nelson Morris & Co., and even some of the smaller packing firms are tanning a considerable proportion of the hides taken off the cattle they slaughter.

When tanners approach the packers to buy hides they frequently are told that "we have no hides to offer." When natural conditions of supply and demand tend to cause hides to decline, the packers send the surplus to their own tanneries, and thus sustain the prices they quote to independent tanners. The tanning industry is thus between two fires. On the one hand is a tariff of 15 per cent on imported cattle hides, while on the other are the packers, who monopolize the domestic slaughter of cattle and are refusing to sell their hides except at extreme prices, and even then only in limited quantities, because of their own extensive tanning operations.

Tanners of heavy hides and the shoe, harness, belting, furniture, and automobile manufacturers, who require quantities of the leather made from such hides, with perfect propriety protest against the tariff of 15 per cent on imported hides of cattle that enables the great packing firms to obtain a monopoly of the tanning business.

WHY CALF AND KIP SKINS ARE FREE OF DUTY.

When the present revenue law went into effect in June, 1897, the Treasury Department, through its board of general appraisers, held that calf and kip skins were dutiable as hides of cattle and not free as skins. The tanners of calf and kip paid the duty under protest, and in September, 1898, a hearing was granted tanners at the office of the collector of the port of Chicago. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury W. B. Howell listened to the arguments of those present, and upon his return to Washington issued the following circular, since which time calf and kip skins have been admitted duty free. Following is the circular:

[Circular No. 173.]

CLASSIFICATION OF CALFSKINS AND HIDES.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *September 23, 1898.*

To collectors and other officers of the customs:

In G. A. 4052 the Board of General Appraisers held that raw calfskins are not dutiable as "hides of cattle" under paragraph 437 of the tariff act of July 24, 1897, but are free of duty under the provisions in paragraph 664 for "skins of all kinds, raw (except sheepskins with the wool on)." They found as a fact that "the term 'hides' in trade covers skins of the larger animals weighing 25 pounds and over, while the term used in trade to describe the skin of a calf is 'a calfskin' weighing 25 pounds or under, and that the dividing line between dried skins and dried hides is 12 pounds—that is to say, dried hides weigh 12 pounds and over, while dried calfskins weigh 12 pounds and under."

While the department concurred in the decision that calfskins were not dutiable as cattle hides, it desired to have the question of the line of demarcation as to weights between skins and hides further considered, and therefore instructed custom officers to make up another case to submit of having the matter reviewed by the courts if deemed advisable. After a further hearing the board found as a fact, in G. A. 4215, "that commercially the dividing line between raw cowhides and calfskins in weight is 25 pounds, the term 'calfskins' including all so-called 'hides' or 'skins' which weigh less than 25 pounds. When dry the dividing line is 12 pounds, and all weighing 12 pounds being commercially known as 'skins' and all weighing 12 pounds or over as 'hides.'"

In order that this question might be further reviewed, the department directed an appeal from this decision to the circuit court, and on the recommendation of the conference of local appraisers recently held in New York adopted a table of weights, which are promulgated in circular 165, of August 27, 1898, to be followed by customs officers in classifying skins and hides.

At the request of tanners and shoe manufacturers the department has further considered the subject and carefully reviewed the testimony taken by the Board of General Appraisers, which was substantially unanimous in fixing 25 pounds as the dividing line between hides and skins in a green, or wet condition and 12 pounds when dry. The counsel for the Treasury Department in cases before the Board of General Appraisers, reports that he thinks no trade testimony can be obtained to controvert the dividing line as decided by the board.

The department concludes, therefore, to accept 25 pounds in weight as the dividing line between calfskins and hides when green salted, and 12 pounds as the dividing line between dry hides and skins. You will be governed accordingly, and hereafter assess duty as hides on such skins weighing 25 pounds or over and 12 pounds or over, respectively.

Circular No. 165 is hereby revoked.

W. B. HOWELL, *Assistant Secretary.*

USES OF LEATHER MADE FROM CATTLE HIDES.

Hides that are taken from the backs of beef cattle are used for making sole, upper, harness, belting, furniture, upholstery, automobile, and bag and strap leather.

It is sometimes made to appear that cattle hides are not used for the uppers of shoes. In a debate in Congress this year a Member from Ohio made such a statement. He probably would be astonished to learn that many of the largest tanneries in the country are devoted exclusively to making cowhide upper leather.

Harness leather never is tanned from anything but cattle hides, and, as everyone knows, the farmers are the largest consumers of harness and saddlery.

EXPORTS OF SHOES.

Notwithstanding the tariff on hides the United States is enabled to export considerable quantites of shoes. The growth of the foreign trade in footwear is a demonstration of the efficiency of our manufacturers and workmen. Shoe operatives received larger wages than in another country, but still the labor cost of American-made shoes is less.

The tariff of 15 per cent on cattle hides is a deterrent force, but thus far it has not been powerful enough to stop the exports of shoes. During the past few years, however, England, France, and Germany, under the stimulus of free hides and availing themselves of our hide-tariff handicap, are competing successfully for the export trade in shoes.

It has been found impossible to obtain the drawback of duty on hides based upon exports of shoes, for the reason that seven or eight different kinds of leather are almost invariably comprised in a single shoe and there are no means of identifying the leather made from imported dutiable hides.

Exports of boots and shoes.

Year.	Pairs.	Dollars.
1896	1,036,235	1,436,083
1897	1,224,484	1,708,224
1898	1,307,031	1,816,528
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385
1900	3,016,720	4,276,656
1901	3,492,041	5,526,290
1902	3,966,766	6,182,098
1903	4,197,566	6,665,017
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940
1905	5,315,699	8,057,697
1906	5,672,249	9,142,748
1907	5,833,914	10,666,949
1908	6,552,412	11,469,559

HIDES, LEATHER, BOOTS AND SHOES, AND THE TARIFF.

[By A. Augustus Healy, vice-president United States Leather Company, New York. In "The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science."]

As at present conducted, tanning hides into leather and manufacturing leather into boots and shoes are separate industries, but for the purposes of this article they may be considered as one. Together they form a very great industry. There is none in the United States which is naturally more capable of successful development. There is none which has been more impeded by the tariff. This great industry now calls loudly for a reduction of the tariff. Especially does it call for the abolition of the duty of 15 per cent imposed on hides by the Dingley tariff of 1897.

Hides are its raw material. Before 1897 they had always been free of duty, excepting the civil-war tax of 10 per cent, which was repealed in 1873. The effect of the duty on hides during the past ten years has been very injurious—injurious to the hundreds of thousands engaged in the industry and to the millions of consumers of boots and shoes. Here is a necessity of life whose manufacture is smitten with a blighting tax at the very point of origin. The United States does not produce more than two-thirds of the number of hides required therein for making leather. Even with a 15 per cent duty, one-third of the needed supply must be imported from various parts of the world, principally from South America. The situation, therefore, is one to make such an impost upon a raw material like hides peculiarly disastrous to the prosperity of the industry, while peculiarly advantageous to the few who benefit from it. Where so large a proportion must be imported, the effect of the duty is not only to raise the cost of the imported supplies, but to give an advanced and artificial price to hides produced within the United States. These are concentrated for the most part in the hands of a few owners, to whom this advantage inures. The farmer or cattle grower gets little or no benefit from the artificial price of hides, because, being a by-product and constituting but a small part of the value of cattle when slaughtered, the increased price of the hide does not enter perceptibly into the amount received for cattle going to market. The injury, however, to the leather and shoe industry in putting it at so great a disadvantage in competing with foreign nations in

the hide markets of the world for the acquisition of its raw material is enormous. All those engaged therein realize this too well in its retarded growth and minimized profits.

This injury was foreseen when the duty was imposed in 1897, and a delegation of leather and shoe people went to Washington, while the new tariff bill was still in committee, and strongly argued against the placing of a duty on hides at a hearing given by the Committee on Ways and Means. As the proposed duty was an entirely new feature in the tariff bill, hides having been free of duty for twenty-five years, and as there appeared to be no demand for such a duty, it was to be supposed that Congress would require cogent and positive arguments in its favor before confirming a new impost to which strenuous objection has been made. No one, however, appeared at the hearing in favor of the duty. The shoe and leather delegation were politely promised that full consideration would be given to the arguments advanced in opposition, and went away hoping and believing that they had won their case, because, as it had been developed at the hearing, it seemed to be a very clear and one-sided one in their favor. But some secret influence was at work, which did not come into the light, and the duty was imposed, without public reasons in its favor and against the protests of the representatives of the great industry which it was bound vitally to affect. That duty has been ever since a source of constant and increasing dissatisfaction to all the leather and shoe manufacturers of the United States.

In November, 1905, a delegation of more than 30 individuals, representing more than three-fourths in volume of these combined industries, visited Washington and laid their case before President Roosevelt, in the hope that he might be induced, by the urgency of the matter, to exert his official influence with Congress, at its then forthcoming session, in favor of the immediate repeal of the duty on hides. Nothing, however, resulted from this interview beyond the admission from the President of the importance of the subject and that it had given him anxious thought. Evidently he was then absorbed in other matters which he deemed of more consequence. Besides, both Preisdent and Congress seemed to fear that any tariff change, even to correct a mistake that had been made, might result in opening up the whole subject of tariff revision, which was considered by them most undesirable at that time. The duty on hides remained, and somewhat later, in consequence of greater scarcity and the impediment offered to their importation by the tariff, the price of hides soared to an unprecedented height, causing disorder and confusion in the related industries, which intensified the result of the violent reaction and adverse conditions following the panic of last year. The duty on hides still continues to exert its adverse influence upon the leather and shoe industries, and those engaged therein are now turning their eyes to the extra session of Congress, which has been suggested immediately to follow the inauguration of a new President, in the hope that relief will then be afforded by repeal.

It is the particular measure of relief which all those engaged in the manufacture of leather and boots and shoes have in mind when thinking of tariff revision in connection with their own industry. Indeed, this removal of the tax upon their raw material can not be denied them, with any justice, by Congress, when it is remembered that they are further handicapped in their business by the high duties which the tariff in general imposes upon imports. These duties have the effect of adding to their cost of production and at the same time diminish the foreign demand for their manufactured product, without giving them in return any corresponding benefit. The tariff adds to the large item of freight upon their bulky materials and upon their finished goods. It increases the cost of buildings, equipment, machinery, and general supplies. In short, it adds to the cost of the manufactured article and at the same time, like the duty on the raw material, increases the quantity of capital required for a given amount of production. Then, again, as both leather and shoes are exportable articles, the demand abroad for them is restricted by the generally high duties of the present tariff, which prevents the importation of foreign commodities that otherwise would be sent to us in exchange for a larger exportation of leather and boots and shoes. As President McKinley said, in his last public utterance at Buffalo, "We can not sell if we will not buy."

It is therefore most desirable, in the interest of this industry and its further development, that there should be a general reduction of the present very high duties on imports, supplemented by reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, that would enable us to send them larger quantities of leather and shoes, which this country is specially adapted to produce, in return for various commodities in the production of which the natural advantage is with them. The manufacture of leather and shoes, in which our people are particularly skillful, is here capable of enormous development along these lines.

On the other hand, unless tariff changes be made in the direction of liberality, there is imminent danger that we shall lose the valuable export trade in these articles which we already possess. The markets of continental Europe are gradually being closed by exclusive duties, and it is now highly probable that England, our principal foreign customer for leather and shoes, will soon shut her ports to us unless her present liberal policy be met with tariff concessions on the part of the United States. An enlightened policy, such as is here suggested, it would surely seem to be part of wisdom for Congress to adopt, rather than one which, by heavy tariff duties, the avoidance of reciprocity treaties, and a vicious tax upon raw material, tends to nullify, in part, the great advantage which the country possesses for the production of leather and its manufacture into boots and shoes.

The great oak, hemlock, and chestnut forests of the United States supply abundant material of the best kind for the tanning of leather. Improved methods, the introduction of machinery, and the employment of chemical analysis have aided greatly in reducing the cost and improving the quality of the product. Our shoe manufacturers are admitted to be the best in the world. Thorough organization, skill in making lasts adapted to all kinds of feet, and the employment of machinery to an extraordinary degree, which is operated with a perfection and speed unequaled in any other country, have given to the United States the first place among the nations in the manufacture of boots and shoes. Notwithstanding these advantages, the combined shoe and leather industry, as a whole, has not had the increase and development to which it was naturally entitled, nor has it yielded profits commensurate with those of more favored industries. The shoe and leather manufacturers have never asked for protection or governmental aid. They do ask now, however, to be relieved from the burdens which the tariff lays upon their industry.

Why should not the country be permitted to expand its industrial life along the line of least resistance, and why should not these shoe and leather industries be allowed full scope for the growth and development to which they are invited by natural conditions and the genius of our people, and thus be enabled to give profitable employment to many thousands more of our citizens?

MAGNITUDE OF THE LEATHER INDUSTRY.

The magnitude and importance of the leather and leather goods industries may be realized when it is considered that every inhabitant of the country from the cradle to the grave is a consumer of leather shoes, and that purses, gloves, belts, and many other articles of utility and adornment are made wholly or partially of leather.

According to statistics of the Government Department of Agriculture the number of horses in the country January, 1908, was 19,992,000, and of mules, 3,869,000 head. Here are upward of 24,000,000 animals of no use or service to man until they are harnessed; and harness and saddles, as everyone knows, must be made of leather.

Statistics are given, but for those who prefer broad generalizations rather than tabulations it may be said that the production of leather and leather goods in the United States amounts to about $700,000,000 annually. The capital invested is about $400,000,000 and the annual wages paid more than $100,000,000.

Table from the Twelfth United States Census, giving figures for the year 1900.

	Year.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Wage-earners.		Cost of materials used.	Value of products.
				Average number.	Total wages.		
Boots and shoes, factory product	1900	1,600	$101,975,233	142,922	$59,175,883	$169,604,054	$261,028,580
Leather, tanned, curried, and finished	1900	1,306	173,977,421	52,109	22,591,091	155,000,004	204,038,127
Saddlery and harness	1900	12,934	43,354,136	24,123	10,725,647	33,127,926	62,630,902
Leather goods, pocketbooks, trunks, and valises	1900	772	13,505,819	14,990	5,697,767	13,485,761	26,905,814
Boots and shoes, custom work and repairing	1900	23,560	9,262,134	9,698	4,128,361	8,288,664	26,550,678
Boot and shoe cut stock	1900	342	7,003,080	6,155	2,230,691	17,800,282	23,242,892
Belting and hose, leather	1900	105	7,410,219	1,667	913,937	7,500,413	10,623,177
Boot and shoe uppers	1900	132	273,796	256	125,627	401,680	700,225
Total		40,751	356,581,838	251,920	105,571,004	405,208,784	615,720,395

Some idea of the magnitude of the traffic may be realized from the imports and exports given in detail on another page. In round numbers, the tanners of this country import annually from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 worth of hides and skins. Annual exports of leather and leather goods are about $46,000,000. Sole leather is sent abroad to the amount of $8,000,000 each year; glazed kid, $2,000,000 to $4,000,000, and upper leather, $15,000,000 to $18,000,000. Shoe exports are about $11,000,000 annually.

TANNERS' PROTEST OF 1897.

When the present revenue law was framed early in 1897 by the Ways and Means Committee of the National House of Representatives, hides were not taken from the free list. In the Senate, however, the Dingley bill, as it was called, was referred to the Finance Committee. Immediately upon it becoming known that a few Populist Senators favored a tax on imported hides, a convention of tanners was called to meet in Washington. The following statement was printed at the time:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: We appear before you, representing the shoe and leather industry, to respectfully request that hides and skins be allowed to remain on the free list.

There has been no duty on hides since 1873, and nothing has occurred to render a change desirable. The government reports tell a continuous story of dwindling imports and increasing exports of leather. The imports of shoe leather were $6,138,528 in 1874 and only $2,880,314 in 1896. The exports of shoe leather other than sole leather were $232,884 in 1874 and $8,903,863 in 1896. The total exports of leather and leather goods now amount to more than $20,000,000 annually. American-made shoes are being successfully introduced into London and the cities of continental Europe. The leather and shoe trades have adjusted themselves to a system of free raw material that has existed and continuously during the past twenty-five years, and we submit that the basis upon which our great industry rests should not be disturbed without careful investigation and serious deliberation.

Leather is a material for which there is absolutely no substitute, and every man, woman, and child is to a greater or less extent a consumer of it. The imposition of a duty upon hides and skins would therefore directly affect every inhabitant of the country by increasing the cost of his shoes, his purse, his traveling bag, his bicycle saddle, the harness for his horse, and the leather-top dashboard and trimmings of his carriage. Place a duty on hides and every revolving wheel of industry throughout the land would feel the strain of a taxed belt, and every farmer would suffer the burden of a tax upon his horse's harness and his plowboy's boots. Statistics show that there are 15,000,000 horses in the United States. All these require leather to harness them for work.

The demand for a tariff on hides should be specific and not general. The vague declaration that the imposition of a duty would help the

farmer will not suffice. Let the stockman show wherein he would be benefited by an impost on hides. Cattle are not raised for their hides, but in response to the demand for beef. The meat can not be come to without first removing the hide, and thus it is that hides are produced whether they are wanted or not. They are a by-product upon which no labor is expended except what is necessary to prevent decomposition. The domestic take-off of hides and skins is inadequate, and the $12,000,000 worth, exclusive of goatskins, imported from foreign countries each year supplements but does not supplant the native supply. The prices of cattle on the hoof are determined by the demand for beef, and the quotations for hides are made by the demand for leather. At the Chicago stock yards it not infrequently happens that cattle prices are at the lowest when hide prices are at the highest point, and vice versa.

If the stock breeders on the ranges derived any revenue from hides there would soon be a reform in branding. Thousands of steers are so badly branded that the hides are almost useless for conversion into leather. In point of fact hides do not become a merchantable commodity susceptible of being benefited by a tariff until after they have been properly selected and cured and are offered in quantities from the cellars of the dressed-beef companies.

As practical manufacturers and merchants we protest against a movement that has nothing more than a mistaken sentiment back of it. The great dressed-beef firms of the West would not pay higher prices for cattle on the hoof delivered at the stock yards in Chicago and Kansas City simply because the imposition of a duty on foreign hides had caused domestic hides to advance in price. We have prepared a table showing the prices paid for cattle on the hoof by the Chicago packers during each week in 1896 and also the prices the packers obtained for the hides. This table demonstrates our position that the fluctuations in cattle and hide prices do not agree except as the general condition of business sometimes operates to cause all commodities to advance or decline at a given time.

The people have some recourse from the great western packers who are popularly supposed to control the dressed-beef business. If beef is raised in price beyond a certain point, the demand diminishes as the consumers turn to mutton, pork, poultry, and other meat foods. There would be no escape, however, from the effect of higher hide prices induced by a tariff, because, as we have shown, there is no substitute for leather. Apart from the immense exports of dry hides there is always a world's movement in green salted hides. Not one of the great industrial nations produces enough hides to supply the demand for leather, and all of them import dry hides from the semicivilized countries, but with hides admitted free there is established a world's level of prices. If the Chicago packers advance the prices of hides above the world's level, green hides are imported from England, France, Germany, and the Scandinavian peninsula; and on the other hand, if the tanners neglect the domestic hide market prices sink in the United States and an export movement is developed. Hides are admitted free at the ports of the countries we have named, and the imposition of a tariff on hides in the United States would leave the tanners, shoe manufacturers, and, indeed, the consumers of shoes and all articles of leather in this country at the mercy of the so-called "dressed-beef and hide trust."

It is sometimes erroneously made to appear that the demand for free hides comes from Massachusetts, or at least from New England. These States are first in the shoe production, but they do not lead in tanning. In Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont there are 260 tanneries, against 900 in the South and West. Pennsylvania alone has double the number of tanneries contained in all of New England. The primacy in tanning has passed from the East to the West and South. Tanneries are rapidly being established in Wisconsin and Michigan, where hemlock forests abound, and tanneries using oak bark are multiplying in the Southern States to draw their bark supplies from the immense forests of Virginia, Tennessee, and the Carolinas. The tanning industry is also established on a large and prosperous scale on the Pacific coast, where the supply of tan bark is almost unlimited.

The principle of protection can not be applied to hides, because they are not a manufactured article. It would be impossible to make a tariff high enough to cause cattle to be raised for their hides. To bring one hide to market that will sell for $5, it is necessary to forward at the same time $50 worth of beef. Sheep can be sheared many times; cattle can be skinned but once.

Canada is a keen competitor of the United States in the production of sole leather. The hemlock forests extend into the British possessions and hides are admitted free. If the ports of the United States were closed to the free entry of hides our export trade in leather would pass over the Canadian border. The hide tariff offers a visionary and mythical advantage to the farmer, while dealing a deadly blow at one of the greatest American industries.

The protest was made March, 1897, nearly twelve years ago, and is substantially the attitude of tanners to-day.

APPENDIX A.

UNITED STATES CATTLE CENSUS.

Number and value of milch cows and other cattle, 1867–1908.

January 1—	Milch cows.			Other cattle.			January 1—	Milch cows.			Other cattle.		
	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.		Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
1867	8,348,773	$28.74	$239,946,612	11,730,952	$15.79	$185,253,850	1888	14,856,414	$24.65	$366,252,173	34,378,363	$17.79	$611,750,520
1868	8,691,568	26.56	230,816,717	11,942,484	15.06	179,887,797	1889	15,298,625	23.94	366,226,376	35,032,417	17.05	597,236,812
1869	9,247,714	29.15	269,610,021	12,185,385	18.73	228,183,001	1890	15,952,883	22.14	353,152,133	36,840,024	15.21	560,625,137
1870	10,095,600	32.70	330,175,234	15,388,500	18.87	290,400,588	1891	16,019,591	21.62	346,397,900	36,875,648	14.76	544,127,908
1871	10,023,000	33.89	339,700,528	16,212,200	20.78	336,859,017	1892	16,416,351	21.40	351,378,132	37,651,239	15.16	570,749,155
1872	10,303,500	29.45	303,438,398	16,389,800	18.12	296,931,664	1893	16,424,087	21.75	357,299,785	35,954,196	15.24	547,882,204
1873	10,575,900	26.72	282,559,051	16,413,800	18.06	296,448,036	1894	16,487,400	21.77	358,998,661	36,608,168	14.66	536,789,747
1874	10,705,300	25.63	274,325,680	16,218,100	17.55	284,705,983	1895	16,504,629	21.97	362,601,729	34,364,216	14.06	482,999,129
1875	10,906,800	25.74	280,700,645	16,313,400	16.91	275,871,664	1896	16,137,586	22.55	363,955,545	32,085,409	15.86	508,928,416
1876	11,085,400	25.61	283,878,869	16,785,300	17.00	285,387,123	1897	15,941,727	23.16	369,239,993	30,508,408	16.65	507,929,421
1877	11,260,800	25.47	286,775,030	17,956,100	15.99	287,155,528	1898	15,840,886	27.45	434,813,826	29,264,197	20.92	612,296,634
1878	11,300,100	25.74	290,897,809	19,223,300	16.72	321,345,691	1899	15,990,115	29.66	474,233,925	27,994,225	22.79	637,931,135
1879	11,826,400	21.71	256,720,779	21,408,100	15.38	329,253,631	1900	16,292,360	31.60	514,812,106	27,610,054	24.97	689,486,260
1880	12,027,000	23.27	279,899,420	21,231,000	16.10	341,761,154	1901	16,833,657	30.00	505,093,077	45,500,213	19.93	906,644,003
1881	12,368,653	23.95	296,277,060	20,938,710	17.33	362,861,509	1902	16,696,802	29.23	488,130,324	44,727,797	18.76	839,126,073
1882	12,611,632	25.89	326,489,310	23,280,238	19.89	463,009,501	1903	17,105,227	30.21	516,711,914	44,659,206	18.45	824,054,902
1883	13,125,685	30.21	396,575,405	28,046,077	21.81	611,549,109	1904	17,419,817	29.21	508,841,489	43,629,498	16.32	712,178,134
1884	13,501,206	31.37	423,486,649	29,046,101	23.52	683,229,054	1905	17,572,464	27.44	482,272,203	43,669,443	15.15	661,571,308
1885	13,904,722	29.70	412,903,093	29,866,573	23.25	694,382,913	1906	19,793,866	29.44	582,788,592	47,067,656	15.85	746,171,709
1886	14,235,388	27.40	389,985,523	31,275,242	21.17	661,956,274	1907	20,968,265	31.00	645,496,980	51,565,731	17.10	881,557,398
1887	14,522,083	26.08	378,789,589	33,511,750	19.79	663,137,926	1908	21,194,000	30.67	650,057,000	50,073,000	16.89	845,938,000

International trade in hides and skins.

[Substantially the international trade of the world. This table gives the classification as found in the original returns, and the summary statements for "All countries" represent the total for each class only as far as it is disclosed in the original returns.]

EXPORTS.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
			Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Argentina	Jan. 1	Cattle, dried	58,550,351	51,239,825	50,466,002	53,457,674	51,149,435
		Cattle, salted	77,917,955	63,424,770	64,809,273	90,230,588	72,476,948
		Goat	3,025,215	3,113,899	3,961,693	4,205,350	4,164,487
		Horse, dried	4,354,053	2,870,826	2,152,791	2,801,828	680,007
		Horse, salted	4,187,878	4,921,984	4,591,961	1,731,726	3,507,359
		Kid	1,075,505	815,695	1,049,508	971,729	944,222
		Sheep	91,282,374	92,442,005	81,571,014	66,535,492	52,428,116
Austria-Hungary	Jan. 1	Calf, dried	8,363,895	6,681,327	6,139,211	6,855,933	12,382,700
		Calf, salted	3,299,437	5,505,382	6,623,787	9,100,680	
		Cattle, dried	7,717,941	6,801,038	6,274,354	5,676,240	16,000,926
		Cattle, salted	10,025,959	12,569,873	9,172,109	13,682,766	
		Goat	2,079,840	2,004,442	2,542,591	1,977,987	2,542,150
		Horse, dried	1,802,940	1,313,514	1,033,747	2,297,437	5,281,392
		Horse, salted	869,062	2,162,293	2,495,853	3,808,485	
		Kid	1,362,015	1,431,241	2,120,626	1,836,009	[a] 1,836,009
		Lamb	5,084,079	4,232,874	3,187,442	3,535,111	3,518,356
		Sheep	3,073,243	4,034,017	3,575,676	4,251,393	5,056,962
Belgium	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	90,233,439	91,087,316	90,367,454	101,081,934	102,406,208

[a] Year preceding.

International trade in hides and skins—Continued.

EXPORTS—continued.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
			Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Brazil	Jan. 1	Deer	339,935	265,401	262,167	176,295	.....
		Goat	3,271,247	4,193,246	5,556,633	3,361,740	3,842,815
		Hides, dried, n. e. s. [a]	14,334,210	16,401,080	23,845,672	17,328,272	21,667,230
		Hides, salted, n. e. s. [a]	44,873,097	46,006,347	48,004,782	42,135,260	50,567,124
		Horse	(b)	88,194	245,716	28,936	18,660
		Lamb	33,881	67,298	289,196	5,143	64,218
		Sheep	615,134	598,573	1,042,429	959,755	809,285
		Other	8,426	9,262	28,911	33,113	.....
British India	Apr. 1	Hides and skins	102,390,604	104,922,115	120,635,178	166,161,155	174,292,118
Canada [c]	July 1	do	23,096,000	23,647,000	29,418,000	31,760,000	33,019,183
Cape of Good Hope	Jan. 1	Calf	13,710	69,317	90,391	96,562	.....
		Cattle	2,587,990	1,189,172	2,049,386	2,970,438	2,884,161
		Goat	4,491,204	5,217,449	4,928,951	5,461,295	18,750,766
		Sheep	14,204,556	12,602,310	11,602,058	11,713,890	
		Hides, n. e. s. [a]	13,940	8,545	637	.....	.....
China	Jan. 1	Hides	39,360,667	32,309,600	37,330,133	51,043,990	56,615,924
Cuba	Jan. 1	Cattle	3,605,188	2,351,012	2,438,844	4,622,643	6,757,223
		Other	10,453	84,032	52,482	198,299	207,823
Denmark	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	14,895,515	15,520,748	16,166,351	19,345,629	18,442,353
Dutch East Indies	Jan. 1	do	13,530,863	13,729,290	13,940,625	14,039,571	[d] 14,039,571
Egypt	Jan. 1	Cattle and calf	4,337,137	4,331,513	6,841,357	4,547,315	5,748,384
		Sheep and goat [e]	681,118	697,529	1,084,797	2,620,849	5,075,462
France	Jan. 1	Calf	(b)	(b)	21,348,790	17,430,187	23,497,700
		Goat	(b)	(b)	7,613,556	10,333,449	8,400,500
		Kid	1,014,770	1,198,100	875,649	626,944	937,800
		Lamb	903,981	1,146,708	1,096,486	1,446,190	1,325,000
		Large	61,585,683	48,863,350	53,066,971	61,880,962	69,136,300
		Sheep	9,624,639	8,517,409	9,047,394	10,009,143	11,967,300
		Other	27,562,511	27,052,872	3,035,932	7,776,412	6,723,900
Germany [f]	Jan. 1	Calf, green	10,596,516	9,076,870	8,618,308	10,235,619	15,596,157
		Calf, dried	11,096,965	7,410,396	9,228,989	9,504,125	1,269,421
		Cattle, green	73,594,692	65,404,300	65,279,298	65,859,114	78,564,351
		Cattle, dried	10,400,084	9,406,240	9,416,161	11,561,258	1,870,181
		Goat, with hair on	3,516,593	3,350,364	4,021,451	3,744,110	3,162,310
		Goat, without hair	11,023	12,566	15,432	19,401	36,597
		Horse, green	9,690,416	10,715,124	8,345,156	16,149,958	17,739,050
		Horse, dried	1,488,561	1,711,448	1,782,878	1,629,216	316,804
		Sheep	585,548	811,521	385,147	823,206	137,568
		Other	711,432	607,814	698,865	604,507	610,235
Italy	Jan. 1	Cattle and calf	20,757,839	24,070,283	23,639,941	19,357,463	25,858,232
		Sheep and goat	4,583,409	4,329,437	4,125,950	4,616,038	4,502,500
		Other	571,658	765,665	695,338	2,737,700	910,729
Korea	Jan. 1	Cattle	3,981,600	5,525,600	4,755,000	2,273,200	2,209,733
		Skins	3,954,667	5,421,200	4,660,533	5,507,867	[d] 5,507,867
Mexico	July 1	Alligator	343,013	263,545	176,853	131,074	147,093
		Cattle	14,808,550	11,692,993	13,122,915	15,690,473	19,715,538
		Deer	723,398	627,292	583,367	636,765	843,980
		Goat	6,518,637	5,798,853	5,934,593	7,098,334	7,705,458
		Horse	41,213	35,020	28,418	50,243	.....
		Sheep	2,273	2,657	1,466	16,885	27,655
Netherlands	Jan. 1	Hides, dried	20,012,580	20,607,052	23,647,466	22,724,931	24,050,349
		Hides, fresh	271,541	414,482	301,548	236,435	237,965
		Hides, salted	32,387,467	33,893,118	31,865,968	32,383,298	34,507,035
		Sheep	3,227,362	2,309,591	2,708,125	1,664,492	1,322,985
New Zealand	Jan. 1	Calf [c]	50,152	23,136	29,862	103,286	276,056
		Hides [c]	855,722	1,013,593	1,041,637	1,926,182	2,554,873
		Sheep	13,795,190	15,074,406	12,833,612	12,599,222	14,364,574
Peru	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	5,324,480	6,009,920	6,717,760	6,954,866	[d] 6,954,866
Russia	Jan. 1	Hides, large	9,601,743	12,774,759	16,666,202	14,284,165	[f] 31,093,121
		Hides, small	19,764,247	19,949,000	24,406,908	24,540,778	[f] 26,326,231
		Sheep and goats	15,289,329	17,884,900	22,220,675	19,206,232	[f] 35,462,770
Singapore	Jan. 1	Hides	6,216,267	8,694,400	6,919,733	7,268,133	[d] 7,268,133
Spain	Jan. 1	Goat	3,158,648	2,628,269	2,014,515	1,748,702	1,017,973
		Sheep	5,714,217	5,210,152	6,305,843	8,383,804	8,042,360
		Other	2,355,431	4,248,659	5,965,921	9,359,902	12,536,488
Sweden	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	11,427,951	13,025,348	12,647,729	15,709,468	16,247,694
Switzerland	Jan. 1	Hides	12,836,632	12,201,260	11,750,194	12,095,438	13,414,023
		Skins	4,976,493	5,041,530	5,544,404	6,062,490	5,744,584
United Kingdom	Jan. 1	Hides	21,075,264	17,451,168	21,128,464	29,427,328	31,359,776
		Skins [c]	32,681,620	44,795,145	49,864,593	46,964,937	37,835,419
United States	July 1	Hides and skins	12,859,549	32,727,643	10,268,722	10,752,827	15,396,806
Uruguay	July 1	Calf	2,083,720	2,967,990	2,074,655	1,795,344	[d] 1,795,344
		Cattle, dried	22,575,437	15,019,462	13,852,273	14,056,903	[d] 14,056,903
		Cattle, salted [e]	33,994,970	35,823,436	41,159,472	30,875,494	[d] 30,875,494
		Goat	1,277	1,414	9,539	34	[d] 34
		Horse, dried [e]	483,696	397,568	1,607,872	515,104	[d] 515,104
		Horse, salted [e]	1,946,505	1,751,352	504,196	124,608	[d] 124,608
		Lamb	358,738	608,383	406,598	346,719	[d] 346,719
		Sheep	14,670,201	19,397,852	16,033,901	14,990,823	[d] 14,990,823
Venezuela	July 1	Cattle	4,346,829	8,366,624	[g] 6,356,726	7,929,730	[d] 7,929,730
		Deer	100,654	.....	.....	349,459	[d] 349,459
		Goat	1,412,091	1,650,675	[g] 1,531,383	1,479,815	[d] 1,479,815
		Sheep	28,997	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other countries		Hides:					
		Cattle	16,437,548	17,486,222	12,706,880	46,832,873	[f] 46,343,144
		Horse	33,486	80,026	348,784	471,232	[b] 384,143
		Large (not otherwise classified)	1,611,336	3,148,588	6,198,614	303,172	[b] 245,841
		Small (not otherwise classified)	501,523	1,352,037	1,915,667	.....	.....
		Unclassified	14,424,497	14,085,945	8,906,979	14,384,816	[f] 20,335,396
		Skins:					
		Calf	2,392,438	1,799,084	2,183,255	2,435,640	[f] 2,448,174
		Deer	1,745,289	1,303,750	1,372,926	859,467	.....
		Goat	3,948,484	6,536,130	4,427,066	8,010,735	[f] 4,897,210
		Kid	66,932	21,786	40,836	1,040,412	[f] 1,634,845
		Sheep	3,173,604	3,313,301	2,942,913	11,014,904	[f] 12,771,969
		Sheep and goat, mixed	7,500,393	6,048,093	8,084,693	19,280,233	[f] 17,082,052
		Unclassified	147,072	73,145	66,311	5,805,481	[f] 1,381,611
		Hides and skins, unclassified	5,471,773	6,441,858	5,393,110	8,597,283	[f] 7,849,669
Total			1,313,009,102	1,318,431,233	1,342,565,755	1,516,304,852	1,570,003,744

[a] N. e. s.=not elsewhere specified.
[b] Not separately stated.
[c] Estimated.
[d] Year preceding.
[e] Number of pounds computed from stated number of hides or skins.
[f] Preliminary.
[g] Average, 1902 and 1903.

International trade in hides and skins—Continued.

RECAPITULATION.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
		Hides:	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
		Cattle	340,545,094	306,300,567	301,859,293	365,728,394	351,033,767
		Cattle and calf, mixed	25,094,976	28,401,796	30,481,298	23,904,778	31,606,616
		Horse	24,897,810	26,047,349	23,137,372	29,608,773	28,567,167
		Large (not otherwise classified)	72,798,762	64,786,697	75,931,787	76,468,299	100,475,262
		Small (not otherwise classified)	20,265,770	21,301,037	26,322,575	24,540,778	26,326,231
		Unclassified	206,661,884	203,086,590	214,743,213	230,954,083	261,949,137
		Skins:					
All countries		Alligator	343,013	263,545	176,853	131,074	147,093
		Calf	37,896,833	33,533,502	56,337,248	57,557,376	57,265,552
		Deer	2,909,276	2,196,443	2,218,460	2,021,986	1,193,439
		Goat	31,434,259	34,507,307	42,557,403	47,441,252	37,249,349
		Kid	3,519,222	3,466,822	3,210,970	4,475,094	5,352,876
		Lamb	6,380,679	6,055,263	5,855,371	5,333,163	5,254,293
		Sheep	159,997,338	164,313,794	148,049,578	142,963,009	121,979,597
		Sheep and goat, mixed	28,054,249	28,959,959	35,516,115	45,723,352	80,873,550
		Unclassified	41,759,852	55,331,020	60,135,841	64,340,775	50,469,481
		Hides and skins, unclassified	310,450,085	339,879,542	316,032,378	395,112,666	410,260,334
Total			1,313,009,102	1,318,431,233	1,342,565,755	1,516,304,852	1,570,003,744

IMPORTS.

		Calf, dried	942,035	1,245,171	1,496,718	1,056,896	3,415,400
		Calf, green	1,066,155	1,716,078	1,449,759	994,505	
		Cattle, dried	22,938,651	22,300,192	29,398,855	25,180,311	75,516,461
		Cattle, green	18,459,961	18,503,392	27,347,454	17,540,414	
		Goat	1,027,354	1,100,547	1,588,430	1,410,076	1,243,407
Austria-Hungary	Jan. 1	Horse, dried	679,685	583,784	560,856	360,676	992,521
		Horse, green	75,178	125,223	153,662	224,871	
		Kid	776,688	844,591	1,046,093	723,557	[a] 723,557
		Lamb	9,869,872	9,627,600	12,328,434	8,602,435	10,548,675
		Sheep	5,477,163	5,391,403	5,041,309	5,061,592	6,856,374
Belgium	Jan. 1	Hides, raw	115,127,382	128,694,622	122,539,211	135,911,437	142,197,407
British India	Apr. 1	Hides and skins	10,407,488	12,729,808	12,456,304	17,574,316	17,962,909
Denmark	Jan. 1	do	8,013,801	5,766,189	6,962,196	7,848,454	10,294,482
		Hides, dried	714,805	1,560,180	1,869,515	1,898,433	2,631,124
Finland	Jan. 1	Hides, green	3,789,873	5,907,507	5,780,115	4,263,421	5,529,891
		Sheep	23,420	45,380	89,521	56,061	68,050
		Calf	([b])	([c])	7,090,953	7,980,756	9,035,400
		Goat	([b])	([c])	17,899,172	23,110,243	23,276,400
		Kid	5,300,740	4,714,701	4,372,843	4,544,123	4,935,700
France	Jan. 1	Lamb	212,442	441,758	370,533	378,553	374,600
		Large	80,509,184	89,049,162	85,214,688	98,515,340	106,831,100
		Sheep	3,848,128	3,032,612	2,630,226	2,532,200	3,201,300
		Other	28,625,723	28,990,427	2,063,720	3,209,189	1,674,900
		Calf, dried	23,886,198	18,793,521	21,104,405	22,145,869	18,811,819
		Calf, green	16,023,193	22,039,386	24,738,945	32,244,140	38,531,942
		Cattle, dried	46,048,822	60,664,363	63,954,541	70,228,234	77,797,583
		Cattle, green	122,198,450	146,242,719	152,057,850	143,851,586	177,694,958
Germany [d]	Jan. 1	Goat, with hair on	8,591,191	9,266,908	11,272,453	11,042,952	14,541,907
		Goat, without hair	153,001	25,794	61,068	38,140	1,543
		Horse, dried	3,721,181	4,427,101	4,666,964	4,592,889	6,688,823
		Horse, green	28,144,866	30,128,805	27,629,866	25,891,742	30,573,918
		Sheep	562,840	737,005	1,126,562	746,485	882,510
		Other	2,207,268	3,032,017	3,515,711	3,340,443	2,157,002
Greece	Jan. 1	Hides	5,565,407	5,674,975	7,004,659	6,055,809	5,286,284
		Cattle and calf	33,054,118	32,555,653	42,876,591	39,240,949	44,294,383
Italy	Jan. 1	Sheep and goat	9,236,484	9,197,903	9,997,520	8,740,884	11,596,532
		Other	287,703	136,687	89,287	181,881	277,782
		Cattle	4,395,787	4,516,054	9,871,720	7,402,046	5,450,564
Japan	Jan. 1	Deer	353,188	437,982	373,908	426,217	700,708
		Hides, dried	26,123,950	28,746,002	28,190,550	29,700,509	30,643,584
		Hides, fresh	14,218	3,486	1,080	15,141	5,404
Netherlands	Jan. 1	Hides, salted	21,767,787	24,734,682	25,207,165	21,586,003	27,913,694
		Sheep	2,578,768	1,631,356	2,084,239	2,367,808	2,094,329
Norway	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	5,880,102	5,555,934	6,890,458	8,722,279	10,507,626
		Hides, dried	6,659,709	6,188,733	5,829,003	4,216,487	[a] 4,216,487
Portugal	Jan. 1	Hides, green	1,455,366	507,616	243,906	181,630	[a] 181,630
		Hides, n. e. s.	2,222	990	825	414	[b] 414
		Buffalo	422,935	160,214	39,361	83,987	[a] 83,987
		Calf	29,674	65,731	13,406	13,728	[a] 13,728
		Cattle	5,045,606	3,468,799	2,444,346	2,252,952	[a] 2,252,952
Roumania	Jan. 1	Horse	2,491	8,014	22	3,490	[b] 3,490
		Sheep, lamb, and goat	722,428	610,125	400,000	157,536	[a] 157,536
		Other	820,025	158,376	163,773	132,822	[a] 132,822
		Hides, dry	12,831,961	12,279,363	10,412,368	12,668,515	[e] 7,764,252
Russia	Jan. 1	Hides, green	52,627,183	55,754,913	48,126,842	51,753,326	[e] 45,538,241
Singapore	Jan. 1	Hides	10,275,333	10,258,000	10,554,133	8,191,200	[a] 8,191,200
Spain	Jan. 1	Hides and skins	25,794,130	22,716,150	17,857,559	14,247,484	17,280,965
Sweden	Jan. 1	do	15,676,710	15,172,306	19,782,796	18,939,762	21,290,081
		Goat [f]	3,546,428	3,557,151	5,517,464	3,756,596	9,329,915
United Kingdom	Jan. 1	Hides	73,656,912	62,491,856	61,636,848	60,628,848	70,661,696
		Sheep [f]	44,636,946	44,909,414	34,490,368	34,694,106	42,124,265
		Other	1,054,534	3,124,408	1,386,550	377,900	782,536
		Cattle	131,640,325	85,370,168	113,177,357	156,155,300	134,671,020
United States	July 1	Goat	85,114,070	86,338,547	97,803,571	111,079,391	101,201,596
		Other	102,340,303	103,024,752	126,893,934	158,045,419	135,111,199
		Hides:					
		Cattle	5,100,292	5,441,221	7,289,141	7,143,387	[e] 3,667,039
		Large (not otherwise classified)	412,785	438,504	1,054,916	328,180	[e] 5,190
		Small (not otherwise classified)	1,499	7,011	17,289	9,368,570	[e] 14,679,557
Other countries		Unclassified	5,590,463	8,100,685	4,932,465		
		Skins:					
		Calf	135,079	13,933	153,261	128,604	.....
		Deer	5,670	9,886	21,014	.....	.....
		Goat	142,253	423,808	452,838	665,581	[e] 127,892

[a] Year preceding.
[b] Average, 1902 and 1903.
[c] Not separately stated.
[d] Not including free ports prior to March 1, 1906.
[e] Preliminary.
[f] Number of pounds computed from stated number of hides or skins.

International trade in hides and skins—Continued.

IMPORTS—continued.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kinds of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
		Skins—Continued.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Other countries		Sheep	397,783	1,533,850	1,534,647	741,964	[a] 646,355
		Sheep and goat, mixed	25,854	22,447	10,416	3,849	[a] 61,619
		Unclassified	1,249,139	1,348,347	1,277,800	2,003,073	[a] 1,850,918
		Hides and skins, unclassified	2,365,315	3,330,259	1,321,133	839,318	[a] 903,410
Total			1,268,461,682	1,287,754,237	1,365,305,461	1,466,343,284	1,556,494,545
		RECAPITULATION.					
All countries		Hides:					
		Buffalo	422,935	160,214	39,361	83,987	[b] 83,987
		Cattle	355,827,894	346,506,908	405,541,264	429,754,230	476,850,577
		Cattle and calf, mixed	33,054,118	32,555,653	42,876,591	39,240,949	44,294,383
		Horse	32,623,401	35,272,927	33,011,370	31,073,668	38,258,752
		Large (not otherwise classified)	80,921,969	89,487,666	86,269,604	98,843,520	106,836,290
		Small (not otherwise classified)	1,499	7,011	17,289	346,439,743	365,440,865
		Unclassified	336,202,580	350,903,610	332,328,685		
		Skins:					
		Calf	42,082,334	43,873,820	56,047,447	64,564,498	69,808,289
		Deer	353,188	437,982	373,908	426,217	700,708
		Goat	98,574,297	100,712,755	134,594,996	151,102,970	149,722,660
		Kid	6,077,428	5,559,292	5,418,936	5,267,680	5,659,257
		Lamb	10,082,314	10,069,358	10,698,967	8,980,988	10,923,275
		Sheep	57,525,048	57,281,020	46,996,872	46,200,216	55,873,183
		Sheep and goat, mixed	9,984,766	9,830,475	10,407,936	8,902,269	11,815,687
		Unclassified	1,249,139	1,348,347	1,277,800	2,003,073	1,850,918
		Hides and skins, unclassified	203,473,102	203,737,313	199,383,421	233,459,267	218,375,714
Total			1,268,461,682	1,287,754,237	1,365,305,461	1,466,343,284	1,556,494,545

[a] Preliminary. [b] Year preceding.

Receipts and prices of cattle and hides at Chicago.

Saturday.	Cattle at the Chicago stock yards during week.		Top price per 100 pounds for cattle on the hoof for each week.			Hides.							
	Receipts.	Slaughter.	Native steers.	Texas steers.	Cows.	Number 1 packers' native steers.	Number 1 packers' Texas steers.	Number 1 packers' Colorado steers.	Number 1 packers' heavy butt-branded steers.	Number 1 packers' heavy native cows.	Number 1 packers' light native cows.	Number 1 packers' branded cows.	Number 1 country buffs.
1907.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January 5	61,005	37,953	7.20	5.75	5.75	16½	15½	14½	14½	15½	15½	14½	13
January 12	71,475	44,604	7.15	5.75	5.25	16½	15½	14½	14½	15½	15	14½	13
January 19	77,266	47,841	7.30	5.75	5.85	16½	15½	14½	14½	15	15	14½	13
January 26	73,163	41,802	6.90	5.75	5.50	16½	15½	14½	14½	15½	15	14½	12¾
February 2	59,989	31,498	6.90	5.75	5.00	16½	15½	14½	14½	15½	15	14½	13
February 9	68,207	41,275	7.25	5.75	5.40	16½	15½	14½	14½	15⅛	14¾	14½	13
February 16	61,491	32,744	6.90	5.75	5.25	16½	15½	14½	14½	15	14¾	14½	13
February 23	61,826	32,708	6.75	5.60	5.10	15½	15½	14½	14½	14¾	14½	14½	13
March 2	57,528	30,033	6.85	5.60	5.35	15¾	15½	14½	14½	14¾	14½	14½	12¾
March 9	56,068	30,833	6.85	5.60	5.60	15½	15½	14½	14½	14½	14	14½	12¾
March 16	64,855	34,180	6.75	5.50	5.50	15½	15½	14½	14½	14½	14	14½	12½
March 23	61,755	32,665	6.90	5.50	5.35	15	15½	14	14	13½	13½	14	11¾
March 30	46,088	23,134	6.60	5.50	5.40	14½	15½	14	13½	13½	13½	14½	11½
April 6	52,708	27,948	6.60	5.50	5.40	14½	15½	13¾	13¾	14½	13¾	14½	11½
April 13	56,569	31,196	6.75	5.50	5.75	14½	15	14	14	13½	13	14	11
April 20	68,020	38,673	6.70	5.50	5.50	14½	15	14	13½	13½	12¾	14	10½
April 27	72,847	44,942	6.60	5.50	5.40	14½	15	13¾	13½	13	12	13½	10½
May 4	58,339	31,978	6.25	5.40	5.35	14½	15	14	13¾	13½	13	13½	10½
May 11	53,392	27,850	6.50	5.40	5.60	14¾	15	14	13¾	13½	13½	13½	11
May 18	60,316	34,782	6.50	5.40	5.60	15	15½	14	14	14	14	13½	12½
May 25	60,580	32,924	6.40	5.40	5.30	15	15½	14	14	14	14	13½	11
June 1	49,267	26,014	6.50	6.15	5.50	15	15½	14	14	13¾	13¾	13½	11
June 8	64,716	35,424	6.75	6.25	5.75	15	15½	14	14	13¾	13¾	13½	10¾
June 15	69,028	39,793	6.90	6.25	5.30	15	15½	14	14	13¾	13½	13½	10¾
June 22	53,892	28,334	7.00	6.25	5.60	15	15½	14	14	13¾	13½	13½	10¾
June 29	47,366	27,211	7.10	5.80	5.60	15	15	13¾	13¾	13½	13½	13	10¾
July 6	40,142	21,337	7.25	5.75	5.90	15	15	13¾	13¾	13½	13½	13	11
July 13	57,631	33,199	7.30	5.80	6.15	14½	15	13½	13⅝	13½	13	12¾	11
July 20	67,686	43,414	7.35	5.75	6.00	14¾	15	13½	13½	13½	13	12¾	11
July 27	57,138	34,869	7.35	5.15	6.00	14¾	14¾	13	13½	13½	13	12½	11
August 3	45,928	26,715	7.50	6.50	6.25	14½	14½	13	13½	13½	12½	11¾	11
August 10	54,437	34,986	7.60	6.75	6.25	14	14½	12½	13	13	12½	12	10¾
August 17	64,417	40,255	7.45	6.25	5.65	14	14	12	12½	12½	12	11	10½
August 24	54,424	31,067	7.35	5.80	5.00	14	13¾	11½	12	12½	12	10½	10½
August 31	56,516	32,764	7.35	6.00	5.25	14	13	11	12	12½	12	10	10½
September 7	70,280	39,934	7.25	6.00	5.40	14	13	11	12	12½	11¾	10	10½
September 14	73,895	42,845	7.35	5.75	6.00	14	12¾	10¾	11¾	12½	11¾	9½	10
September 21	79,691	46,537	7.15	6.60	5.75	14½	12¾	11	12	12½	12	9½	10½
September 28	64,251	33,886	7.25	6.20	5.50	14½	13	11	12	12½	12	9½	10½
October 5	76,769	43,080	7.30	6.20	5.30	14¾	13	11	12	12½	12	9¾	10½
October 12	87,950	49,746	7.35	6.20	5.40	14¾	13¼	11¼	12¼	12¾	12¼	9¾	10¼
October 19	90,486	49,909	7.45	6.20	5.00	14¾	13¼	11	12⅛	12¾	12¼	9¾	10¼
October 26	93,110	53,100	7.35	4.60	4.00	14¾	13	11	12	12½	12	9¾	10½
November 2	58,208	27,879	7.00	5.45	4.75	14½	13	11	12	12¼	12	9½	9¾
November 9	51,448	30,337	7.25	5.35	5.00	14	12¾	10¾	11½	12	11½	9	9½
November 16	74,489	41,951	6.70	5.40	5.50	13½	12¼	10½	11¼	10¾	10½	8½	8½
November 23	67,652	38,712	6.65	5.50	4.50	12½	12¼	9¾	10½	10½	10	8	8
November 30	72,178	38,695	6.50	5.15	5.25	12	11½	9½	10	10	9½	7½	7
December 7	66,224	31,016	6.35	5.75	5.25	11½	11	9¼	9¾	10	9	7½	7
December 14	83,534	47,049	6.35	5.25	5.60	12	11½	9½	9¾	9½	9	8	7½
December 21	58,795	28,310	6.15	5.70	5.00	11¾	11¼	9½	9¾	9½	9	7¾	7¼
December 28	46,061	22,935	6.30	5.80	4.75	11½	11	9½	9¼	9	8¾	7½	7¼

Receipts, slaughter, and prices of cattle, and the quotations of hides for each week in 1896.

Fifty-two weeks of 1896.	Cattle at the stock yards.		Top price per 100 pounds for cattle on the hoof for each week.			Packers' native steers.	Packers' Texas steers.	Packers' Colorado steers.	Packers' heavy butt-branded steers.	Packers' heavy native cows.	Packers' light native cows.	Packers' branded cows.	Number 1 country buffs.	Number 1 country extreme light hides.	Number 1 country calfskins.
	Receipts.	Slaughter.	Native steers.	Texas steers.	Cows and heifers.										
January 1 to 4	22,062	8,287	$4.75	$3.75	$3.75	8¾	7½	6½	7½	7¼	7¾	6¼	7½	8	9½
Week ending January 11	56,769	40,537	5.00	4.30	4.00	8½	7½	6½	7½	7¾	8	6½	7	7½	9
Week ending January 18	62,025	44,617	4.85	4.25	3.75	8½	7¼	6¼	7	7¾	8	6¼	7	7¼	9
Week ending January 25	50,036	33,923	4.80	4.13	4.10	8¼	7	6¼	7	7½	7¾	6¼	6½	7	9
Week ending February 1	47,675	22,272	4.70	3.85	4.00	8	7	6	7	7½	7½	6	6¼	6¾	9
Week ending February 8	39,475	23,387	4.75	4.00	4.00	8¼	7	6¼	7	7½	7½	6¼	6¼	7	8½
Week ending February 15	50,532	30,832	4.65	3.95	3.85	8¼	6¾	6¼	7	7¼	8	6¼	7	7¼	8½
Week ending February 22	56,778	37,340	4.50	3.90	3.85	8¼	6¾	6½	7	8	8	6¼	6¾	7	8¼
Week ending February 29	44,908	28,365	4.65	3.75	3.80	8¼	6¾	6	7	8	8	6¼	6¾	7	8½
Week ending March 7	44,116	26,802	4.75	4.10	3.80	7¾	6½	5¾	6¼	7½	7½	6¼	6½	6¾	8
Week ending March 14	43,413	28,215	4.70	4.15	3.85	7½	6¼	5¾	6¼	7	7¼	6¼	6¼	6¼	8
Week ending March 21	55,565	37,250	4.70	4.40	3.85	7	6	5½	6	6½	6½	6	6	6¼	8
Week ending March 28	46,143	26,933	4.50	4.00	3.85	6¾	6	5¼	5¾	6¼	6¼	6	6	6¼	8
Week ending April 4	28,883	18,307	4.50	3.95	3.95	6¾	6	5½	5¾	6½	6½	6	6	6½	7¾
Week ending April 11	43,006	27,741	4.75	4.00	3.80	6¾	6	5½	5¾	6½	6¾	6	6	6¼	7¼
Week ending April 18	44,536	28,811	4.75	4.10	3.95	6¾	6	5½	6	6½	6¾	6	6	6¼	7¼
Week ending April 25	50,309	32,643	4.20	3.80	4.00	6¾	6¼	5¾	6	6½	6¾	6	5¾	6¼	7¾
Week ending May 2	39,913	19,892	4.25	3.55	3.90	7	6½	5¾	6½	6½	6¾	6¼	5¾	6¼	7¾
Week ending May 9	56,202	38,702	4.55	4.10	4.10	7½	6¾	5½	6¾	6½	6¾	6¼	5¾	6¼	8
Week ending May 16	43,310	30,573	4.40	4.15	3.90	8	8	6½	7	7	7	6½	6½	7	8½
Week ending May 23	47,492	31,827	4.30	3.90	4.10	8¼	8¼	7	7¼	7¼	7½	7	6½	7¼	8¼
Week ending May 30	52,803	41,381	4.40	4.25	4.25	8½	8¼	7	8	7¼	7½	7	6½	7¼	9
Week ending June 6	47,428	33,683	4.50	3.85	4.00	8½	8¼	7	8	7¼	7½	7	6½	7¼	8¾
Week ending June 13	44,296	31,951	4.45	3.85	4.00	8½	8¼	7	8	7¼	7¾	7½	6½	7¼	8½
Week ending June 20	48,963	36,782	4.50	3.75	4.00	8½	8½	7¼	8	7	7½	7¼	6¾	7	8½
Week ending June 27	48,947	34,365	4.55	4.08	4.10	8¾	8¾	7½	8¼	7¼	7½	7¼	6¾	7¼	8½
Week ending July 4	48,719	32,884	4.65	4.10	4.10	8¾	8¾	7¾	8½	7½	7½	7½	6¾	7¼	8¾
Week ending July 11	43,915	1,659	4.50	3.75	4.35	9	8¾	7¾	8½	7½	7½	7¾	6¾	7¼	8¾
Week ending July 18	51,994	37,247	4.55	3.50	4.00	8¾	8½	7½	8¼	7½	7½	7¾	6¾	7½	8¾
Week ending July 25	53,442	39,131	4.45	3.50	3.90	8	8	7	7½	7	7	7	6¾	7½	8½
Week ending August 1	46,542	31,827	4.60	3.15	4.25	7	7	6	6½	7	7	6	6½	7	9
Week ending August 8	51,411	35,338	4.65	3.25	4.15	7	7	5¾	6¼	7	6¾	5¾	5¾	7	9
Week ending August 15	52,339	36,671	4.75	3.15	4.25	6¾	6¾	5¼	6	6½	6¼	5¼	5½	7	9
Week ending August 22	57,469	40,966	4.85	3.60	3.90	6¾	6½	5¼	5¾	6	6	5	5½	6½	8¼
Week ending August 29	56,002	39,085	4.90	3.50	4.25	7½	6¾	5½	6	6¼	6¼	5½	5½	6½	7½
Week ending September 5	63,079	42,902	5.00	3.25	3.60	8½	6¾	6¼	7	7½	7½	6¼	6¾	7½	7¾
Week ending September 12	59,233	40,040	5.30	3.06	3.85	8½	7¼	6¼	7¼	7½	7½	6½	7	7½	8
Week ending September 19	61,000	40,357	5.10	3.00	3.25	8½	7½	6½	7½	8	8	6¾	7	7¾	8¾
Week ending September 26	44,980	28,991	5.10	3.00	3.50	8¾	7	6½	7½	8	8	6¾	7½	8	9¼
Week ending October 3	57,683	41,282	5.10	3.30	4.05	9	7¾	6¾	7¾	8¼	8¼	7	7¾	8	9½
Week ending October 10	55,833	38,413	5.15	3.10	3.70	9	8	7	8	8½	8½	7	8	8¼	10
Week ending October 17	57,883	39,919	5.25	3.15	4.25	9¼	8¼	7¼	8	9	9	7¼	8	8¼	10¼
Week ending October 24	55,608	39,350	5.15	4.10	3.35	9¼	8¼	7¼	8¼	9	8¾	7¼	8	8¼	9¾
Week ending October 31	42,714	23,848	5.15	3.50	3.30	10½	9¼	8½	9½	10	10	8½	9¼	9½	10½
Week ending November 7	36,857	27,440	5.25	3.95	3.85	10¼	8½	8	8¾	9½	9½	8	8¾	9¼	11
Week ending November 14	53,876	40,576	5.35	4.50	3.85	10½	9	8	7	9¼	9¼	8	9	9½	10½
Week ending November 21	62,061	43,859	5.10	4.25	3.85	10¼	8½	8	8¾	9½	9¼	8	9	9¼	11½
Week ending November 28	42,390	28,936	5.35	4.25	3.90	9¾	8¼	7¾	9	8¼	8¼	7¾	8¼	8½	11
Week ending December 5	54,950	38,637	5.60	4.40	3.75	9¼	8¼	7½	8¼	8½	8½	7½	8	8¼	10½
Week ending December 12	55,950	40,187	5.90	4.25	3.70	9	8	7	8	8¼	8¼	7¼	7½	8	10¼
Week ending December 19	42,156	26,774	5.85	4.95	4.15	9	8	7	7¾	8¼	8¼	7¼	7¾	8¼	10½
Week ending December 26	35,432	23,311	5.50	4.25	4.00	9½	8½	7¾	8¾	9	9	8	8	8¼	10¾
December 26 to December 31, 1896	41,354	27,622	5.35	4.15	3.80	9½	8¾	7¾	8½	9	9¼	8	8¼	8½	10½

Total 1896, receipts of cattle at the stock yards, 2,600,746; slaughter, 1,782,420. Total 1895, receipts of cattle at the stock yards, 2,588,558; slaughter, 1,803,466.

Farm animals and their products.

[Figures furnished by the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Agriculture, except where otherwise credited. All prices on gold basis.]

LIVE STOCK OF COUNTRIES NAMED.

[Africa incompletely represented, through lack of statistics for large areas. Number of animals in China, Persia, Afghanistan, Korea, Bolivia, Ecuador, Salvador, and several less important countries unknown. For Brazil, number of cattle alone estimated, but roughly. In general, statistics of cattle, horses, sheep, and swine much more complete than those of other animals, as statements for the world.]

Country.	Year.	Cattle.		Horses.	Mules.	Sheep.	Swine.
		Total.	Dairy cows.				
NORTH AMERICA.							
United States:							
Contiguous—							
On farms	1908	71,267,000	21,194,000	19,992,000	3,869,000	54,631,000	56,084,000
Not on farms	1900	1,616,422	973,033	2,936,881	173,908	231,301	1,818,114
Noncontiguous—							
Alaska[a]	1900	18	13	5	.....	.....	10
Hawaii[a]	1900	102,908	4,028	12,982	6,506	102,098	8,057
Porto Rico	1899	260,225	73,372	58,664	6,985	6,363	66,180
Total United States (except Philippine Islands)	.....	73,246,573	22,244,446	23,000,532	4,056,399	54,970,762	57,976,361
Bermuda	1905	.....	.....	[b] 1,246	.....	.....	.....
New Brunswick	1906	229,000	[c] 111,084	63,000	.....	188,000	52,000
Ontario	1907	2,889,503	1,106,984	672,781	.....	1,324,153	1,906,460
Manitoba	1906	521,112	170,143	215,819	.....	28,975	200,509
Saskatchewan	1906	472,854	112,618	240,566	.....	121,290	123,916
Alberta	1906	950,632	101,245	226,534	.....	154,266	114,623
Other	1901	2,123,932	1,033,295	531,249	.....	1,178,872	561,866
Total Canada	.....	7,187,033	2,635,369	1,949,949	.....	2,995,556	2,959,374

[a] On farms. [b] Including mules and asses. [c] Data for 1905.

Farm animals and their products—Continued.

LIVE STOCK OF COUNTRIES NAMED—continued.

Country.	Year.	Cattle.		Horses.	Mules.	Sheep.	Swine.
		Total.	Dairy cows.				
NORTH AMERICA—continued.							
Central America:							
Guatemala	1898	196,768		50,343		77,593	29,784
Honduras	1907	600,000		45,000	15,000	15,000	120,000
Nicaragua		1,200,000					
Panama	1906	156,569		30,863	1,500		28,000
Costa Rica	1905	308,160	[a] 93,155	54,974	2,987	250	79,730
Mexico	1902	5,142,457		859,217	334,435	3,424,430	616,139
Newfoundland	1901	32,767		8,851		78,052	34,679
West Indies:							
British—							
Barbados	1906			2,441			
Dominica	1906	[b] 1,437		568		[b] 1,088	
Grenada	1901	1,908		1,074		1,975	
Jamaica	1906	110,258		68,056		16,029	29,000
Montserrat	1906			286			
Turks and Caicos Islands	1906	800		105		125	
Virgin Islands	1906	2,000		255		300	
Cuba	[c] 1906	2,176,178	[d] 1,053,847	342,568	45,559	[e] 9,982	[e] 358,868
Dutch	1905	3,567		741	164	21,720	3,990
Guadeloupe	(*f*)	30,560		8,819	6,311	11,731	32,656
Total North America		90,397,035		26,425,888	4,462,355	61,624,593	62,268,581
SOUTH AMERICA.							
Argentina	1907	25,844,800		5,374,170	544,870	77,582,100	2,844,000
Brazil		30,000,000					
British Guiana	1906	85,000		2,420		24,500	15,650
Chile	1906	2,477,064	124,657	698,880	[h] 27,936	2,405,584	287,612
Colombia		2,800,000		341,000	257,000	746,000	2,300,000
Dutch Guiana	1905	8,535		230	81	138	2,662
Falkland Islands	1906	4,500		3,000		702,696	100
Paraguay	1900	2,283,039		182,789	3,490	214,058	23,887
Uruguay	1900	6,827,428		561,408	22,992	18,608,717	93,923
Venezuela	1899	2,004,257		191,079	89,186	176,668	1,618,214
Total South America		72,334,623		7,354,976	945,555	100,460,461	7,186,048
EUROPE.							
Austria-Hungary:							
Austria	1900	9,511,170	[d] 4,749,152	1,716,488	20,323	2,621,026	4,682,654
Hungary	1895	6,605,365	[i] 3,499,724	2,308,457	1,911	8,122,682	7,330,343
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1895	[j] 1,417,341		[k] 239,626		3,230,720	662,242
Total Austria-Hungary		17,533,876		4,264,571	22,234	13,974,428	12,675,239
Belgium	[c] 1906	1,788,328	889,125	245,212	[l] 6,915	[m] 235,722	1,046,519
Bulgaria	1905	[n] 1,596,267	[o] 442,866	536,616	11,828	8,081,816	463,241
Denmark	1903	1,840,406	[d] 1,089,073	486,935		876,830	1,456,699
Faroe Islands	1903	3,950		632		91,034	15
Finland	1905	1,480,692	[d] 1,097,198	323,514		937,565	220,357
France	1906	14,315,552	[d] 7,515,564	3,169,224	198,865	17,783,209	7,558,779
Germany	1904	19,331,568	[d] 10,456,137	4,267,403		7,907,173	18,920,666
Gibraltar	1905			400			
Greece	1902	406,744		159,068	88,869	4,568,158	79,716
Iceland	1904	30,498		47,545		[p] 495,170	
Italy	1905	5,672,000		804,913	341,910	[q] 10,877,000	2,224,000
Luxemburg	1901	92,381		19,777	[r] 10	16,611	91,799
Malta	1907	6,022		3,669	3,302	19,901	5,132
Montenegro		60,000	[d] 20,000	3,000		400,000	8,000
Netherlands	1904	1,690,463	[s] 973,098	295,277		606,785	861,840
Norway	1900	950,201	[d] 689,563	172,999		998,819	165,348
Portugal		817,000		90,000	59,100	3,064,100	1,200,000
Roumania	1900	2,545,051	380,720	864,324	515	5,655,444	1,709,205
Russia:							
Russia proper	1906	31,994,849		21,260,061		[t] 49,114,500	10,372,036
Poland	1906	2,414,618		1,309,640		[t] 2,817,000	800,470
Northern Caucasia	1906	3,157,358		1,265,100		[q] 6,957,954	698,335
Total Russia, European		37,566,825		23,834,801		58,889,454	11,870,841
Servia	[c] 1906	943,967	[n] 153,359	172,278	130	3,066,444	875,537
Spain	1905	2,075,142		498,157	767,570	13,025,512	1,743,863
Sweden	1905	2,549,928	[d] 1,763,857	554,999		1,074,386	829,888
Switzerland	1906	1,497,904	[d] 785,577	135,091	3,136	209,243	548,355
Turkey		1,000,000	[d] 300,000	600,000		10,000,000	
United Kingdom:							
Great Britain	1907	6,912,067	[u] 2,759,246	[v] 1,556,369		26,115,455	2,636,766
Ireland	1907	4,674,834	[u] 1,560,801	[v] 523,007		3,815,995	1,316,729
Isle of Man and Channel Islands	1907	41,582	[u] 18,039	[v] 9,556		79,769	13,329
Total United Kingdom		11,628,483	4,338,086	2,088,932		30,011,219	3,966,824
Total Europe		127,423,308		43,639,337	1,504,384	192,866,023	68,521,843
ASIA.							
British India [w]	1906	[x] 89,033,810	[d] 26,223,557	1,445,069	55,684	[y] 21,554,456	
Ceylon	1906	1,542,909		3,743		95,389	99,495
Cochin China	1903	109,000		11,243			709,400

[a] Cows in 1904.
[b] Data for 1903.
[c] On December 31 of preceding year.
[d] Cows.
[e] Census for 1899.
[f] Official estimate furnished by the French embassy to the United States, under date of May 4, 1905.
[g] Data for 1904.
[h] Data for 1902.
[i] Cows over 1 year old, including buffalo cows.
[j] Including buffaloes.
[k] Including mules and asses.
[l] Including asses; data for 1895.
[m] Data for 1895.
[n] Census, December 31, 1900.
[o] Cows, census, December 31, 1900.
[p] Excluding lambs.
[q] Including goats.
[r] Including asses.
[s] Including cows kept for breeding purposes.
[t] Data for 1905.
[u] Cows and heifers in milk and with calf.
[v] Used for agriculture and also unbroken.
[w] Including native States, as far as officially shown. Statistics cover only 7 districts of Bengal, collected between 1890 and 1900.
[x] Including buffalo calves.
[y] Of which 373,003 in Alwar include goats.

Farm animals and their products—Continued.

LIVE STOCK OF COUNTRIES NAMED—continued.

Country.	Year.	Cattle.		Horses.	Mules.	Sheep.	Swine.
		Total.	Dairy cows.				
ASIA—continued.							
Cyprus	1907	55,282	.....	[a] 59,645	.....	[b] 258,959	45,688
Hongkong	1906	1,077	.....	175	.....	3	.....
Japanese Empire:							
Japan	[c] 1906	1,171,074	33,154	1,372,422	.....	3,590	228,204
Formosa	[c] 1905	[e] 98,528	[d] 39,295	68	.....	.....	976,327
Total Japanese Empire	.....	1,269,602	72,449	1,372,490	.....	3,590	1,204,531
Java	1900	2,654,809	.....	418,400	.....	.....	.....
Labuan	1906	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Philippine Islands	1903	127,559	.....	144,171	290	30,428	1,179,371
Russia:							
Central Asia (4 provinces)	1906	1,813,653	.....	1,909,391	.....	[e] 9,113,000	87,842
Siberia (4 provinces)	1906	3,798,010	.....	3,032,863	.....	[e] 3,773,000	767,079
Transcaucasia	1902	2,304,977	.....	388,936	.....	6,302,258	309,479
Other	1903	2,343,000	.....	1,624,000	.....	5,443,000	186,400
Total Russia, Asiatic	.....	10,259,640	.....	6,955,190	.....	24,631,258	1,350,800
Siam	.....	1,104,751	.....	35,812	.....	.....	.....
Straits Settlements	1906	29,331	.....	3,513	.....	1,707	[f] 102,000
Turkey, Asiatic	.....	3,000,000	.....	800,000	.....	45,000,000	.....
Total Asia	.....	109,189,770	.....	11,249,451	55,974	91,575,790	4,691,285
AFRICA.							
Algeria	1906	1,064,685	.....	226,152	171,608	8,801,117	96,012
Basutoland	1904	213,361	.....	64,621	[g] 26	[g] 2,794	[g] 476
British Central Africa	1907	48,877	.....	19	22	14,697	2,177
British East Africa	1905	297,000	.....	[h] 186	.....	2,100,000	.....
Cape of Good Hope	1904	1,954,390	540,310	255,060	64,433	[i] 14,848,795	385,945
Egypt	1900	350,000	.....	80,000	10,000	.....	.....
German East Africa	1905	523,052	.....	73	79	1,560,000	1,447
German Southwest Africa	1907	52,189	[d] 18,471	2,141	1,234	111,595	1,202
Madagascar [j]	1905	2,867,612	[d] 1,118,162	1,074	464	333,454	522,021
Mauritius [k]	1906	10,177	.....	636	[l] 264	1,110	4,565
Mayotte	(m)	47,894	.....	21	15	124	.....
Natal	1906	634,547	[d] 252,496	50,240	2,206	800,090	71,764
Orange River Colony	1905	525,372	.....	93,984	.....	4,194,247	134,782
Reunion	(m)	4,720	.....	1,780	4,534	4,583	.....
St. Helena	1901	1,014	.....	120	.....	2,094	280
Seychelles	1906	1,000	.....	150	.....	200	6,000
Sierra Leone	1906	1,055	.....	30	.....	463	183
Southern Nigeria Colony (Lagos)	1902	1,522	.....	108	.....	1,610	2,426
Sudan (Anglo-Egyptian) [n]	1905	314,996	.....	9,314	.....	1,421,721	.....
Transvaal	1905	800,000	350,000	52,159	[f] 44,153	1,200,000	400,000
Tunis	[c] 1905	183,748	.....	35,596	15,995	1,094,761	15,357
Total Africa	.....	9,897,211	.....	873,473	315,033	36,493,455	1,644,637
OCEANIA.							
Australia:							
Queensland	[c] 1907	3,413,919	.....	452,916	.....	14,886,438	138,282
New South Wales	[c] 1907	2,549,944	[i] 644,164	537,444	.....	44,132,421	243,370
Victoria	1907	1,804,323	701,309	406,840	.....	12,937,440	220,452
South Australia	1907	680,095	[o] 93,069	224,447	.....	6,661,217	112,277
Western Australia	[c] 1907	690,011	[p] 27,724	104,922	[l] 840	3,340,745	56,203
Tasmania	1907	211,117	.....	38,299	.....	1,729,394	42,985
Total Australia	.....	9,349,409	.....	1,764,868	840	83,687,655	813,569
British New Guinea	1906	450	.....	100	.....	.....	.....
Fiji	1906	34,793	.....	[a] 5,031	.....	1,595	4,260
New Caledonia	(m)	73,862	.....	2,938	12	9,442	2,438
New Zealand [q]	1906	1,851,750	543,927	342,608	[r] 451	20,108,471	242,273
Total Oceania	.....	11,310,264	1,366,029	2,115,545	1,303	103,807,163	1,062,540
Grand total	.....	420,552,211	.....	91,658,670	7,284,604	586,827,485	145,374,934

Country.	Year.	Asses.	Buffaloes.	Camels.	Goats.	Reindeer.
NORTH AMERICA.						
United States:						
Contiguous—						
On farms	1900	94,165	.....	.....	1,870,599	.....
Not on farms	1900	15,847	.....	.....	78,353	.....
Noncontiguous—						
Hawaii [s]	1900	1,438	.....	.....	653	.....
Porto Rico	1899	1,085	.....	.....	15,991	.....
Total United States (except Philippine Islands)	.....	112,535	.....	.....	1,965,596	.....

[a] Including mules and asses.
[b] Not less than 1 year old, 30 per cent may be added for those less than 1 year old.
[c] On December 31 of preceding year.
[d] Cows.
[e] Data for 1903.
[f] Data for 1904.
[g] Excluding animals owned by natives.
[h] Excluding the province of Jubaland.
[i] Data for 1906.
[j] Not including animals in the public service.
[k] On sugar estates only.
[l] Including asses; data for 1905.
[m] Official estimate furnished by the French embassy to the United States, under date of May 4, 1906.
[n] Animals assessed for tribute and tax.
[o] Not including northern territory; data for 1906.
[p] Data for 1905.
[q] Including animals owned by Maoris.
[r] Including asses.
[s] On farms.

Farm animals and their products—Continued.

LIVE STOCK OF COUNTRIES NAMED—continued.

Country.	Year	Asses.	Buffaloes.	Camels.	Goats.	Reindeer.
NORTH AMERICA—continued.						
Central America:						
Costa Rica	1905	100			906	
Panama	1906	47			1,989	
Mexico	1902	287,991			4,206,011	
Newfoundland	1901				17,355	
West Indies:						
British—Jamaica	1904				14,000	
Cuba	[a] 1906	2,530			[b] 18,564	
Dutch	1905	4,861			54,655	
Guadeloupe	([c])	4,394			13,902	
Total North America		412,458			6,292,978	
SOUTH AMERICA.						
Argentina	1907				1,566,300	
British Guiana	1906				15,500	
Chile	1906	[d] 17,574			461,908	
Colombia					361,000	
Dutch Guiana	1905	568			1,807	
Paraguay	1900	4,067			32,334	
Uruguay	1900				20,428	
Venezuela	1899	312,810			1,667,272	
Total South America		335,019			4,126,549	
EUROPE.						
Austria-Hungary:						
Austria	1900	46,324			1,019,664	
Hungary	1895	23,855	133,000		308,810	
Bosnia-Herzegovina	1895				1,447,049	
Total Austria-Hungary		70,179	133,000		2,775,523	
Belgium	[a] 1905				257,669	
Bulgaria	1905	124,216	[e] 431,487		1,370,201	
Denmark	1903				38,984	
Faroe Islands	1903				10	
Finland	1905				6,276	141,811
France	[a] 1906	365,181			1,476,957	
Germany	1904				3,329,881	
Greece	1902	141,179			3,339,409	
Iceland	1904				401	
Iatly	1890	1,000,000			1,800,000	
Luxemburg	1901				14,203	
Malta	1907	3,905			19,231	
Montenegro					100,000	
Netherlands	1904				165,497	
Norway	1900				214,594	108,784
Portugal		146,500			998,680	
Roumania	1900	7,186	43,475		232,515	
Russia:						
Russia proper	1905			224,500	1,100,500	347,000
Poland				1,000	13,500	
Total Russia, European				225,500	1,114,000	347,000
Servia	[a] 1906	1,271	7,710		495,955	
Spain	1905	663,004		1,800	2,385,664	
Sweden	1905				66,560	
Switzerland	1906	1,652			359,913	
Total Europe		2,524,273	615,672	227,300	20,562,123	597,595
ASIA.						
British India [f]	1906	[g] 1,336,868	14,914,554	435,930	28,555,809	
Ceylon	1905				148,288	
Cochin China	1903		241,750			
Cyprus	1906			1,169	[h] 250,546	
Hongkong	1905				160	
Japanese Empire:						
Japan	[a] 1906				72,121	
Formosa	[a] 1905		226,620		117,214	
Total Japanese Empire			226,620		189,335	
Java	1900		2,436,031			
Philippine Islands	1903		[i] 640,871		124,334	
Russia:						
Central Asia (4 provinces)	1903			365,000	775,000	
Siberia (4 provinces)	1903			500	230,000	38,700
Transcaucasia	1902	122,312	338,042	17,122	745,086	
Other	1903	58,500		296,000	802,000	20,000
Total Russia, Asiatic		180,812	338,042	678,622	2,552,086	58,700
Siam [f]			1,144,478			
Turkey, Asiatic		2,500,000			9,000,000	
Total Asia		4,017,680	19,942,346	1,115,721	40,820,558	58,700
AFRICA.						
Algeria	1906	287,950		201,752	3,959,854	
Basutoland	1904	[k] 10			[k] 1,625	
British Central Africa	1907	190	8		78,511	

[a] On December 31 of preceding year.
[b] Census for 1899.
[c] Official estimate furnished by the French embassy to the United States under date of May 4, 1906.
[d] Data for 1902.
[e] Census data December 31, 1900.
[f] Including Native States, as far as officially shown. Statistics cover only 7 districts of Bengal, collected between 1890 and 1900.
[g] Of which 58,663 in Bengal, Alwar, Gwalior, and Marwar includes mules.
[h] Not less than 1 year old; 30 per cent may be added for those less than 1 year old.
[i] Carabaos.
[j] Number of domesticated elephants returned as 2,036.
[k] Excluding animals owned by natives.

Farm animals and their products—Continued.

LIVE STOCK OF COUNTRIES NAMED—continued.

Country.	Year.	Asses.	Buffaloes.	Camels.	Goats.	Reindeer.
AFRICA—continued.						
British East Africa	1906				1,150,000	
Cape of Good Hope	1904	100,470			[a] 7,826,965	
Egypt	1900	120,000	300,000	40,000		
German East Africa	1905	8,777		24	1,820,000	
German Southwest Africa	1907	1,630		28	103,259	
Madagascar [b]	1905	411			66,747	
Mauritius [c]	1905				6,348	
Mayotte	(d)	58			1,508	
Natal	1906	1,759			724,428	
Orange River Colony	1903	3,096			308,920	
Reunion	(d)	1,916			4,156	
St. Helena	1901	774			1,001	
Southern Nigeria Colony (Lagos)	1902				2,600	
Sudan (Anglo-Egyptian) [e]	1905	[f] 92,272		132,116	1,329,711	
Transvaal	1904	33,013			949,876	
Tunis	[g] 1905	97,990		147,229	574,281	
Total Africa		750,316	300,008	521,149	18,909,790	
OCEANIA.						
Australia:						
New South Wales	[g] 1905			853	37,716	
South Australia	1905				26,948	
Western Australia	[g] 1905			1,953	17,980	
Tasmania	1905				1,694	
Total Australia				2,806	84,338	
Fiji	1905				16,782	
New Caledonia	(d)				6,111	
New Zealand [h]	1891				9,055	
Total Oceania				2,806	116,286	
Grand total		8,039,746	20,858,026	1,866,976	90,828,284	656,295

[a] Data for 1906.
[b] Not including animals in the public service.
[c] On sugar estates only.
[d] Official estimate furnished by the French embassy to the United States under date of May 4, 1906.
[e] Animals assessed for tribute and tax.
[f] Including mules.
[g] On December 31 of preceding year.
[h] Including animals owned by Maoris.

FAILURES AND THEIR CAUSES.

[From Bradstreet's Journal, January 23, 1909.]

For many years past Bradstreet's has published weekly, monthly, and yearly the results derived from and the lessons taught by its statistics of commercial failures, the aim being to supply the business community with necessary, if not exactly palatable, information regarding what have been termed the "decrees of the courts of last resort in the business world." In bringing together this vast mass of information many valuable data regarding the impelling causes of these trade disasters have been compiled and published for the benefit of those who are willing to learn from the experience of others and profit by the lessons taught therein.

Investigations by Bradstreet's over a period of years have demonstrated that tendencies present within the individual himself are largely responsible for four-fifths of all business failures, the remaining one-fifth being due to extraneous conditions over which he has little, if any, control. It has also been brought out that the amount of capital employed bears a direct relation to the success or failure of the individual traders, those with limited resources having the smallest chance of survival, as attested by the preponderance in the number having very low, if any, ratings at the time of failure. By bringing down these compilations of the causes of failure, the capital employed, the ratings assigned, and the liabilities of those failing to include the records of 1908, the value of this investigation has naturally been enhanced. Believing that last year's happenings along these lines have special interest for the business community, attention is directed to a few leading facts, some of them already published, regarding the failure records of the year following the panic of 1907.

Nineteen hundred and eight, like its immediate predecessor, was a year of extremes, but differed therefrom in that, after a very poor beginning, recuperation and repair asserted themselves, with a natural effect upon failures and failure damage. The number of casualties and the liabilities were alike the third largest on record, the number exceeding all years but 1893 and 1896, while the liabilities were smaller only than in 1907 and 1893. The opening month of the year witnessed the largest number of failures, while September saw the smallest number of suspensions and November the smallest liabilities. Every section of the country reported an increase in the casualties as compared with 1907, but the West and the Northwest only reported larger liabilities. The percentages of assets to liabilities indicated a partial return to normal, and while the commercial death rate advanced and was the highest in ten years, it was considerably below the records of years preceding 1898. One conclusion is that compromise and enlightened consideration, alike for debtors' and creditors interests, mitigated the worst after-effects of the panic of 1907.

There were 14,044 failures of individuals, firms, and corporations reported to Bradstreet's in 1908, with liabilities of $295,901,940 and assets of $168,438,090. This marked an increase of 36.8 per cent in the number over 1907 and of 49.6 per cent over 1906, but was a decrease of 7 per cent from 1896, and of 9.4 per cent from 1893. The liabilities were 22 per cent smaller than in 1907 and 1893, but 133 per cent larger than in 1906 and 20 per cent larger than in 1896. The proportion of assets to liabilities in 1908 was only 56.9 per cent, as against 75 per cent in the preceding year, 59.9 per cent in 1896 and 60.6 per cent in 1893. As there were 1,487,813 individuals, firms, or corporations in business during the year, while 14,044 failures occurred, the commercial death rate was ninety-four hundredths of 1 per cent, an increase over 1907, when the percentage was seventy hundredths, and over 1906, when the percentage was sixty-six hundredths. The increase in the number in business over 1896, however, was 37 per cent, while the death rate was forty-six hundredths of 1 per cent lower, and the increase in number in business as compared with 1893 was 40 per cent, while the death rate was over half of 1 per cent lower. Certainly there is lack of evidence here that the yearly increase in the number in business is bringing a proportionate gain in friction resulting in failure.

Several suggestions as to the causes for this shrinkage in the death rate from other years of stress may be advanced. One is, that with the greater relative enlargement of the number in business a permanent lowering of the business death rate is taking place. Working toward this end, of course, was the unquestioned fact that extensions of time and compromises were influential in averting failure in 1907 and 1908 to an extent unknown in earlier years of stress. Of course, improved agency reporting, resulting in conservative credit granting, must be given due weight, because publicity will have failed of its purpose if the improvements along this line are not to be credited with making commercial life safer and longer. In this connection, the suggestion made in these columns in previous years may again be advanced, viz, that these and other improved conditions in the business world make for a permanently lower commercial death rate, just as discoveries in science, in medicine, and in surgery make for a smaller human mortality. Whatever the cause, however, the fact that the annual commercial death rate in years like 1908 and 1907 was less than 1 per cent and has never been above 1½ per cent in any year completely discredits the tradition that the larger number of persons entering business ultimately fail.

A FAILURE DEFINED.

Here it should be said that Bradstreet's definition of a commercial failure is that there must be some loss to creditors of individuals, firms, or corporations engaged in legitimate mercantile occupations. Under this classification failures of professional men—such as physicians, lawyers, and actors—as well as farmers, stockbrokers, real-estate dealers, and old bankruptcies passing through the United States courts, have no place. Any or all of the foregoing may be, in fact are, dissociated from the recognized commercial life of the country, and are not included in Bradstreet's failure data. On the other hand, it should be clearly borne in mind that these statistics do cover and include all suspensions of banks and other strictly financial institutions, even if these suspensions prove only temporary. For these and other reasons comparisons of the commercial-failure reports made up by Bradstreet's with those issued by other concerns can not be properly made. Failures merely to succeed, without loss to creditors, are not embraced in our data, because these are devoted to cases of insolvency alone.

WHY MEN FAILED IN 1908.

Many years of experience have shown that eight leading causes are subjective and attributable to those who fail, while three others exert their influence from circumstances superior to the individuals themselves. These causes are grouped as follows:

A.—DUE TO FAULTS OF THOSE FAILING.

Incompetence (irrespective of other causes).
Inexperience (without other incompetence).
Lack of capital.
Unwise granting of credits.
Speculation (outside regular business).
Neglect of business (due to doubtful habits).
Personal extravagance.
Fraudulent disposition of property.

B.—NOT DUE TO FAULTS OF THOSE FAILING.

Specific conditions (disaster, etc.).
Failure of others (of apparently solvent debtors).
Competition.

In 1908 the eight factors first mentioned caused 77.5 per cent of all the failures, as against 81.1 per cent in 1907 and 79.7 per cent in 1906. The three influences beyond individual control accounted for 22.5 per cent of all the failures, as against 18.9 per cent in 1907 and 20.3 per cent in 1906. These percentages on their face indicate that the causes outside of the individuals themselves were more fatal last year than in the panic year; but in this connection it needs to be borne in mind that the panic did not become acute until the last quarter of 1907, leaving the fullest effects of the disturbance, as regards the number of casualties, to be exerted in the year just closed. As regards the liabilities, it is found that 62 per cent were due to the individual, as against 44.6 per cent in 1907 and 72.9 per cent in 1906, while 38 per cent were from causes beyond control, as against 55.4 per cent in 1907 and 27.1 per cent in 1906. It will be recalled that very large suspensions in the last quarter of 1907 swelled the aggregate of failure damage very largely. In 1893 73.6 per cent of the failures and 43.7 per cent of the liabilities were due to the faults of those failing, while 26.4 per cent of the number and 56.3 per cent of the liabilities were attributed to outside influences.

Failures, assets, liabilities, and number in business yearly since 1881.

Year.	Number failures.	Per cent increase or decrease.	Actual assets, millions.	Total liabilities, millions.	Per cent assets to liabilities.	Number in business.	Per cent failing.
1908	14,044	+36.8	$168.4	$295.9	56.9	1,487,813	.94
1907	10,265	+ 9.3	287.9	383.7	75	1,447,680	.70
1906	9,385	− 5.9	63.1	127.2	50	1,401,085	.66
1905	9,967	− 4.3	65.0	121.8	53.3	1,352,947	.73
1904	10,417	+ 6.5	75.7	143.6	52.7	1,307,746	.79
1903	9,775	− 1.9	84.1	154.3	54.5	1,272,909	.76
1902	9,973	− 6.3	50.4	105.5	47.7	1,238,973	.80
1901	10,648	+ 7.4	61.1	130.1	46.9	1,201,862	.88
1900	9,912	+ 2.8	60.1	127.2	47.2	1,161,639	.85
1899	9,642	−16.9	60.1	119.8	50.1	1,125,873	.85
1898	11,615	−11.2	73.1	141.6	51.6	1,093,373	1.06
1897	13,083	−13.3	86.5	158.7	54.5	1,086,056	1.20
1896	15,094	+16.4	147.8	246.9	59.9	1,079,070	1.40
1895	12,958	+ 1.8	87.6	158.7	55.2	1,053,633	1.23
1894	12,724	−17.9	83.2	151.5	54.9	1,047,974	1.21
1893	15,508	+51	231.5	382.1	60.6	1,059,014	1.46
1892	10,270	−17.1	54.7	108.6	50.3	1,035,564	.99
1891	12,394	+16.1	102.9	193.1	53.3	1,018,021	1.21
1890	10,673	− 9	92.7	175.0	52.9	989,420	1.07
1889	11,719	+10.7	70.5	140.7	50	978,000	1.20
1888	10,587	+ 9.7	61.9	120.2	52	955,000	1.10
1887	9,740	− 7.8	64.6	130.6	50	933,000	1.04
1886	10,568	− 4.9	55.8	113.6	49	920,000	1.15
1885	11,116	− 4½	55.2	119.1	46	890,000	1.25
1884	11,620	+13	134.0	248.7	54	875,000	1.32
1883	10,299	+34	90.8	175.9	52	855,000	1.20
1882	7,635	+28	47.4	93.2	51	820,000	.93
1881	5,929	----------	35.9	76.0	47	780,000	.76

Lack of capital was, as usual, the most notable predisposing cause of failure, 34.2 per cent of the number being attributed to this cause, as against 37.1 per cent in 1907 and 35.9 per cent in 1906. Incompetence, with 21.6 per cent of the number; inexperience, with 4 per cent; neglect, with 2.2 per cent; and unwise credits, with 2 per cent, all claimed relatively fewer victims than in the actual panic year, while specific conditions, which cover extraneous and extraordinary circumstances, produced 18.9 per cent of the failures, as against 16.3 per cent in 1907 and 17.3 per cent in 1906. Failures of others and undue competition also claimed a slightly larger percentage of the suspensions. While lack of capital was the most important cause of suspension, it was not, however, as hurtful as regards liabilities as were specific conditions, which accounted for 31.3 per cent of the aggregate failure damage, as against 27.2 per cent due to lack of capital. This percentage marked a decrease of the liabilities due to specific conditions from 1907, when the proportion was 51.7 per cent, but it was still heavily in excess of the proportion of liabilities in 1906, when the percentage was 17.9. Lack of capital, on the other hand, claimed a larger percentage of liabilities than in 1907, but a slightly smaller proportion than in 1906. The smaller proportion of liabilities than of number, due to incompetence and inexperience, was in itself a test alike of credit reporting and of credit granting. Fraud, the fourth most notable cause of suspension, accounted for 11.5 per cent of all the failures in 1908, as against 10.1 per cent in 1907; but the proportion of liabilities due to this cause was only 6.9 per cent, which may be taken as indicating that knowledge of character may have limited money loss to some extent. In 1906, 10 per cent of the failures, but 16 per cent of the liabilities, were due to this reason, and in this connection it may be recalled that dishonesty caused a number of suspensions of large financial institutions in the latter year.

Of the 15,759 failures in the United States and Canada in 1908, 91.3 per cent had only very moderate or no credit ratings at all. Those failing rated in good credit made up 8 per cent of all the failures, and those in very good credit or higher made up only seven-tenths of 1 per cent of all the failures. Compared with 1907, a slightly larger proportion of the lower-rated concerns failed, these figures pointing to the wider distribution of the strain in 1908 affecting the smaller traders. It is found, also, that 90.2 per cent of all those who failed had $5,000 capital or less, the remaining 9.8 per cent being distributed throughout the higher-capital grades, these percentages also pointing to slightly larger proportion of the smaller traders suspending than in 1907. The latter year, it will be recalled, saw some very large institutions hurt by the acute stringency and complications of the latter part of that year. Of those failing in the United States and Canada, 57.3 per cent had less than $5,000 liabilities, the smallest percentage there is record of. The figures indicate that the chief strain came upon the traders who had over $5,000 but less than $20,000 liabilities, and also to the fact that events of the two years made for a closer drawing of the lines of credit among the smaller traders.

IN CANADA.

Three-fourths of the 1,715 failures reported in Canada and Newfoundland in 1908 were from causes inherent in or proceeding from the individual, while one-fourth were due to causes beyond the subject's control. Of the liabilities, totaling $17,582,304 in 1908, 86.8 per cent proceeded from the failing trader himself, while 13.2 per cent were beyond his control. In 1907 the proportion of failures due to faults of those failing was 86 per cent, and the share of liabilities so caused was 92.4. In other words, after-panic stress was felt more strongly in Canada than in the United States in 1908, and outside conditions beyond the failing trader's control seems to have had freer sway. Among the causes of failure lack of capital was preeminent, with 43.2 per cent of the failures and 59 per cent of the liabilities proceeding therefrom, as against 52.5 per cent of the failures and 60.6 per cent of the liabilities in 1907. Specific conditions, the next most destructive cause, was responsible for 22.9 per cent of the casualties and 11.2 per cent of the liabilities, as against 12.7 and 7 per cent, respectively, in 1907. Incompetence, the third most important cause, accounted for 18.2 per cent of the failures and 15.6 per cent of the liabilities, a larger proportion in each case than was recorded in 1907.

The information upon which the foregoing data are based was procured and distributed by the Bradstreet Company while acting in its capacity as an authority through whose instrumentality credit is not only determined but fostered and its extension promoted wherever commerce engages the activities of men. It should not be forgotten, however, that the source of that information is the business community itself, without whose cooperation the results attained could not have been achieved; and the nature and extent of that cooperation reflect in a striking way the confidence of the commercial community in the integrity of purpose of the institution, in the character of its administration, and in the discharge of the functions which have been assumed by it in relation to the business world. That confidence and that cooperation have grown with the growth of this organization itself in the more than half century of its existence, until the offices of the Bradstreet Company, once confined to a few large eastern cities of the United States, now extend not only throughout the territory of the great Republic, not omitting its latest acquisitions, in so far as they are commercially cognizable, but into the Dominion of Canada, Mexico, Cuba and other islands, the United Kingdom, Australasia, and, through its association with the Institute W. Schimmelpfeng, throughout the entire continent of Europe. In a word, this institution exercises its functions as a guardian of solvency and disseminator of commercial information wherever a condition of settled order marks the secure extension of the sphere of civilization, of law, and of commercial credit.

Proportion of failures to those in business for the past four years.

	1908.		1907.		1906.		1905.	
	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.
Middle	393,114	4,801	384,139	3,383	372,517	2,920	360,387	2,878
Eastern	120,222	1,332	118,291	1,314	115,485	1,261	112,919	1,491
Southern	293,684	3,462	263,948	2,213	250,207	1,927	238,618	2,123
Western	409,318	2,452	401,435	1,874	390,818	1,837	380,214	1,819
Northwestern	170,082	763	166,624	697	163,201	658	158,529	747
Far western	95,117	1,195	88,835	653	87,028	653	80,870	780
Territories	6,276	39	24,408	131	22,729	129	21,410	129
Total United States	1,487,813	14,044	1,447,680	10,265	1,401,985	9,385	1,352,947	9,967
Canada	118,875	1,715	116,202	1,365	112,362	1,239	114,335	1,430
Total United States and Canada	1,606,688	15,759	1,563,882	11,630	1,514,347	10,624	1,467,282	11,397

Failures in the United States and Canada, classified according to credit ratings, to liabilities, and to capital employed.

	1908.		1907.		1906.		1905.		1904.		1903.		1902.		1901.	
	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
CREDIT RATINGS OF THOSE WHO FAILED.																
Total number failures United States and Canada	15,759	100	11,630	100	10,624	100	11,397	100	11,592	100	10,733	100	11,068	100	12,027	100
Number failing which had very moderate or no credit rating	14,388	91.3	10,573	90.9	9,615	90.5	10,447	91.7	10,598	91.4	9,290	86.6	9,905	89.5	10,705	89
Number failing rated in good credit	1,253	8	914	7.9	933	8.8	863	7.6	888	7.7	1,269	11.8	1,064	9.6	1,214	10.1
Number failing rated in very good credit or higher	118	.7	143	1.2	76	.7	87	.7	106	.9	174	1.6	99	.9	108	.9
LIABILITIES OF THOSE WHO FAILED.																
Total number failures United States and Canada	15,759	100	11,630	100	16,624	100	11,397	100	11,592	100	10,733	100	11,068	100	12,027	100
Total with less than $5,000 liabilities	9,028	57.3	6,933	59.6	6,660	62.7	7,426	65.2	7,281	62.8	6,817	63.5	7,480	67.6	8,009	66.6
Total with $5,000 liabilities and over	6,731	42.7	4,697	40.4	3,964	37.3	3,971	34.8	4,311	37,2	3,916	36.5	3,588	32.4	4,018	33.4
Total with $5,000 to $20,000 liabilities	4,929	31.3	3,360	28.9	2,978	28	3,008	26.4	3,143	27.1	2,787	26	2,699	24.4	2,995	24.9
Total with $20,000 to $50,000 liabilities	1,152	7.3	751	6.5	642	6	609	5.4	725	6.3	649	6	586	5.3	663	5.5
Total with $50,000 to $100,000 liabilities	357	2.3	276	2.3	193	1.8	199	1.6	230	2	224	2.1	192	1.7	182	1.5
Total with $100,000 to $500,000 liabilities	238	1.5	257	2.2	131	1.3	128	1.1	182	1.6	225	2.1	101	.9	157	1.3
Total with $500,000 to $1,000,000 liabilities	55	.3	53	.5	20	.2	27	.3	31	.2	31	.3	10	.1	21	.2
Total with $1,000,000 liabilities and over	34	.2	35	.3	6	.06	12	.1	11	.1	12	.1	5	.05	7	.06
CAPITAL EMPLOYED BY THOSE WHO FAILED.																
Total number failures United States and Canada	15,759	100	11,630	100	10,624	100	11,397	100	11,592	100	10,733	100	11,068	100	12,027	100
Total with $5,000 capital or less	14,219	90.2	10,469	90	9,723	91.5	10,449	91.7	10,488	90.5	9,668	90.1	10,289	93	11,022	91.6
Total with over $5,000 and less than $20,000	1,089	7	764	6.6	642	6	678	6	722	6.3	681	6.3	527	4.7	760	6.3
Total with $20,000 and less than $50,000	305	1.9	225	1.9	173	1.7	166	1.4	237	2	209	2	161	1.5	156	1.3
Total with $50,000 and less than $100,000	78	.5	83	.7	50	.5	53	.5	84	.7	89	.8	51	.5	54	.4
Total with $100,000 and less than $500,000	52	.3	75	.7	34	.3	48	.4	59	.5	75	.7	39	.3	34	.3
Total with $500,000 and over	16	.1	14	.1	2	.02	3	.02	2	.02	11	.1	1	.01	1	.01
Total with $1,000,000 and over	6	.03	12	.1	2	.02	--------	--------	2	.02	2	.02	--------	--------	1	.01

Business failures classified as to causes.

EASTERN STATES.

Failures due to—	Number.				Assets.				Liabilities.			
	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	155	206	218	243	$494,213	$487,913	$545,065	$590,661	$1,259,860	$1,157,374	$1,143,402	$1,411,032
Inexperience	31	116	142	145	42,037	283,150	148,721	217,200	109,096	670,422	481,271	527,899
Lack of capital	892	769	657	686	2,913,199	5,452,074	2,757,947	3,251,077	7,230,262	10,011,460	5,790,471	8,717,768
Unwise credits	33	39	38	83	348,768	460,066	100,194	180,242	774,704	641,493	237,360	475,701
Failures of others	8	13	15	21	74,777	892,012	504,529	182,545	135,374	1,480,375	929,639	416,672
Extravagance	6	9	7	11	12,924	32,100	5,100	36,025	59,528	74,039	53,000	89,032
Neglect	21	20	18	47	54,663	26,602	111,483	74,839	118,212	74,733	202,165	211,748
Competition	8	13	16	44	39,399	57,000	29,647	118,900	68,430	147,900	61,601	219,228
Specific conditions	122	52	65	102	3,590,522	20,522,965	1,270,198	1,562,191	7,088,272	24,002,147	2,013,657	2,362,562
Speculation	6	15	14	13	462,420	1,071,975	145,000	56,663	690,817	2,366,671	560,467	201,778
Fraud	50	62	71	96	130,204	175,188	316,465	188,320	410,491	949,008	783,423	548,257
Total	1,332	1,314	1,261	1,491	8,163,126	29,461,045	5,934,349	6,458,663	17,945,046	41,575,622	12,256,456	15,181,677

MIDDLE STATES.

Incompetence	570	418	351	437	$3,806,854	$9,739,020	$2,004,248	$2,825,065	$14,300,945	$14,105,614	$5,196,214	$6,800,062
Inexperience	126	100	32	40	414,222	400,143	582,550	68,775	1,065,539	1,676,646	853,231	289,057
Lack of capital	1,245	941	895	799	14,891,291	19,345,521	6,152,364	4,325,953	27,850,997	33,741,495	12,917,416	8,936,857
Unwise credits	64	57	21	30	2,586,584	7,187,658	42,640	599,756	2,960,660	8,121,335	140,188	1,126,250
Failures of others	134	59	39	65	1,611,790	1,675,120	4,891,727	513,990	5,614,976	4,999,279	7,317,239	1,239,346
Extravagance	53	20	17	34	94,545	64,805	96,317	183,688	577,481	258,473	346,956	485,099
Neglect	93	69	53	62	304,318	578,609	296,483	98,139	743,096	1,006,255	718,323	276,953
Competition	174	72	14	36	846,245	212,450	23,012	212,860	4,130,328	542,367	79,482	425,018
Specific conditions	1,173	1,006	1,002	937	45,199,805	112,227,798	3,537,257	3,501,432	65,117,082	124,391,026	10,692,263	8,861,755
Speculation	104	26	11	27	4,580,113	441,400	88,638	2,489,087	11,308,077	1,288,528	257,974	5,428,215
Fraud	1,065	615	485	411	3,273,465	3,016,575	5,348,082	1,120,773	14,235,562	14,402,210	11,747,616	4,406,182
Total	4,801	3,383	2,920	2,878	77,609,232	154,889,099	23,083,318	15,939,518	147,904,743	204,533,228	50,266,902	38,274,794

Business failures classified as to causes—Continued.

SOUTHERN STATES.

Failures due to—	Number.				Assets.				Liabilities.			
	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	828	549	488	557	$3,620,274	$2,601,344	$1,774,406	$5,496,908	$5,993,136	$4,309,482	$3,579,325	$6,664,101
Inexperience	183	138	93	88	532,319	7,328,734	202,898	355,344	902,387	8,637,443	379,634	599,563
Lack of capital	954	802	622	618	9,893,257	7,974,933	3,035,649	3,039,193	14,832,081	11,265,031	5,962,970	5,388,536
Unwise credits	120	68	126	128	1,681,266	2,562,852	784,672	1,230,904	2,301,163	2,694,210	1,369,543	1,556,714
Failures of others	49	30	114	91	1,119,059	832,981	567,756	877,720	2,256,959	1,148,042	955,419	1,342,481
Extravagance	44	34	27	25	405,235	437,932	160,609	82,388	813,615	642,302	381,572	256,362
Neglect	87	61	49	51	265,573	166,884	264,065	122,459	577,498	342,725	375,563	235,406
Competition	34	21	30	29	172,484	178,728	104,792	100,275	259,313	296,895	185,608	181,521
Specific conditions	907	298	184	311	8,679,815	7,472,305	3,776,596	1,942,884	12,721,268	7,958,880	5,138,762	3,188,333
Speculation	18	16	20	15	194,367	2,712,772	352,245	1,166,894	570,439	3,468,928	565,680	2,422,190
Fraud	238	193	174	210	1,272,511	889,429	735,832	945,075	2,648,235	1,747,991	1,521,422	1,747,296
Total	3,462	2,213	1,927	2,123	27,836,160	33,158,894	11,759,520	15,360,044	43,876,094	42,511,929	20,415,801	23,582,503

WESTERN STATES.

Failures due to—	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	697	678	562	667	$5,827,750	$4,468,206	$3,865,941	$5,464,190	$9,816,044	$7,951,914	$7,024,685	$8,195,042
Inexperience	111	66	61	50	1,809,331	304,333	193,271	343,420	2,354,397	677,398	370,302	546,306
Lack of capital	1,097	737	771	664	12,940,368	5,166,917	5,276,927	6,687,116	21,569,277	8,977,080	9,934,248	11,336,609
Unwise credits	51	48	31	63	2,026,951	258,850	321,577	1,245,519	4,602,803	368,065	689,172	1,781,110
Failures of others	46	37	13	30	5,218,458	1,900,933	934,765	1,689,762	6,634,281	2,974,231	1,668,022	2,282,783
Extravagance	30	12	16	10	283,269	443,810	116,345	83,750	788,192	945,581	216,657	142,255
Neglect	47	28	24	48	178,417	97,316	192,789	151,279	384,924	181,327	351,460	275,326
Competition	35	18	16	7	193,825	56,603	25,282	40,539	445,707	320,104	45,810	101,175
Specific conditions	203	172	226	176	1,922,690	28,412,129	1,164,846	777,288	3,273,396	27,003,488	2,293,358	1,308,456
Speculation	13	6	17	7	297,192	384,000	486,725	651,300	634,230	976,700	3,022,233	975,588
Fraud	122	72	100	97	565,397	587,277	2,713,254	963,220	1,865,582	1,203,654	5,870,783	1,956,121
Total	2,452	1,874	1,837	1,819	31,263,648	42,080,374	15,291,722	18,107,381	52,368,833	51,579,542	31,486,730	28,910,771

NORTHWESTERN STATES.

Failures due to—	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	250	232	234	266	$8,906,004	$1,091,407	$1,006,304	$878,976	$10,612,492	$1,955,976	$1,714,018	$1,458,008
Inexperience	74	62	65	70	210,623	283,010	286,723	162,695	383,131	523,708	484,111	262,924
Lack of capital	231	210	213	238	1,253,806	1,283,326	1,551,073	2,119,126	2,287,552	2,375,260	2,877,219	3,296,375
Unwise credits	9	12	8	13	45,883	58,202	37,803	70,136	66,911	79,576	82,720	113,408
Failures of others	3	5	5	8	108,019	371,522	113,964	184,509	158,225	757,100	256,576	266,391
Extravagance	6	8	7	9	17,106	16,500	19,441	294,348	29,187	43,308	27,949	480,958
Neglect	43	54	38	27	121,529	178,664	59,838	92,409	259,511	400,392	159,802	179,923
Competition	1	5	4	3	3,000	38,320	36,270	14,866	4,500	100,878	67,861	27,800
Specific conditions	80	51	41	56	952,556	5,151,994	1,239,806	1,928,911	1,494,780	6,256,250	1,733,557	2,999,420
Speculation	6	3	4	2	250,551	510,000	89,500	65,000	423,424	1,110,000	159,000	97,800
Fraud	60	55	39	55	229,777	273,425	84,929	263,591	488,138	572,684	289,551	634,451
Total	763	697	658	747	12,098,854	9,256,370	4,525,651	6,074,558	16,207,851	14,175,132	7,852,364	9,837,458

FAR WESTERN STATES.

Failures due to—	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	514	185	190	224	$3,288,424	$2,913,037	$415,064	$848,508	$5,419,796	$3,873,949	$663,741	$1,515,785
Inexperience	44	16	56	76	139,319	23,816	93,549	175,306	258,900	65,376	171,683	314,937
Lack of capital	375	317	193	283	2,974,642	2,838,589	753,928	1,116,116	6,527,839	3,899,164	1,779,076	2,230,726
Unwise credits	5	10	15	28	78,309	32,325	69,504	62,676	126,149	52,242	100,907	133,365
Failures of others	5	2	4	3	32,205	26,000	46,485	1,221	76,981	20,766	69,298	8,121
Extravagance	7	3	19	12	92,873	4,500	15,910	17,723	122,330	6,300	56,493	59,037
Neglect	8	13	22	47	14,550	41,438	24,511	56,339	41,216	81,281	36,740	151,759
Competition	4	6	19	28	18,700	16,400	32,259	64,895	61,174	52,333	90,458	126,216
Specific conditions	159	79	92	40	4,153,254	7,398,448	600,241	83,285	3,810,400	8,689,308	958,738	154,186
Speculation	4	1	4	9	19,200	3,509,210	4,525	15,465	34,300	9,595,036	11,380	42,922
Fraud	70	21	39	30	380,847	173,574	39,268	61,443	637,580	330,857	114,895	148,317
Total	1,195	653	653	780	11,192,323	16,977,337	2,095,244	2,502,977	17,116,665	26,666,712	4,053,409	4,885,371

TERRITORIES.

Failures due to—	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	16	50	48	34	$90,020	$273,756	$132,652	$121,478	$144,676	$467,895	$336,523	$229,497
Inexperience	5	5	8	12	32,400	106,000	12,408	20,505	54,700	178,500	20,002	44,172
Lack of capital	10	31	19	41	96,755	110,216	49,925	107,659	198,454	188,614	80,984	237,926
Unwise credits	-------	2	5	1	-------	5,500	25,300	2,200	-------	16,000	32,700	4,400
Failures of others	-------	1	-------	-------	-------	1,275,000	-------	-------	-------	1,250,000	-------	-------
Extravagance	1	1	2	4	2,000	85	9,800	9,400	6,000	737	12,000	12,381
Neglect	-------	6	2	3	-------	23,963	6,778	4,700	-------	33,607	11,428	7,700
Competition	-------	2	2	5	-------	3,600	2,400	7,919	-------	7,400	6,650	14,947
Specific conditions	5	16	13	7	12,072	106,705	65,900	19,808	17,878	142,940	94,637	31,650
Speculation	1	2	-------	2	40,000	22,000	-------	26,700	55,000	46,000	-------	26,700
Fraud	1	15	30	20	1,500	218,000	151,362	274,475	6,000	337,800	246,876	489,995
Total	39	131	129	129	274,747	2,144,825	456,525	594,844	482,708	2,669,493	841,830	1,099,368

SUMMARY—UNITED STATES.

Failures due to—	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	3,030	2,318	2,091	2,428	$26,033,539	$21,574,683	$9,743,680	$16,225,783	$47,546,940	$33,822,204	$19,657,908	$26,273,527
Inexperience	574	503	457	481	3,180,251	8,729,186	1,520,516	1,343,245	5,128,150	12,429,493	2,760,234	2,604,858
Lack of capital	4,804	3,807	3,370	3,329	44,963,318	42,171,576	19,577,813	20,646,240	80,496,462	70,458,104	39,342,381	40,144,797
Unwise credits	282	236	244	346	6,767,761	10,565,453	1,381,690	3,391,433	10,832,390	11,973,021	2,652,590	5,190,948
Failures of others	245	147	190	218	8,164,308	6,973,568	7,068,226	3,449,738	14,876,796	12,629,793	11,196,193	5,555,794
Extravagance	147	87	95	105	907,952	999,732	423,522	707,322	2,396,333	1,970,740	1,094,927	1,525,124
Neglect	299	251	206	285	939,050	1,113,476	955,947	600,164	2,124,457	2,120,320	1,855,484	1,338,815
Competition	256	137	101	152	1,273,653	563,101	253,662	560,254	4,969,452	1,467,877	537,470	1,095,905
Specific conditions	2,649	1,674	1,623	1,629	64,510,714	181,292,344	11,674,844	9,815,797	93,523,076	198,444,039	22,925,002	18,903,362
Speculation	152	69	70	75	5,843,843	8,651,357	1,166,633	4,481,109	13,716,287	18,851,883	4,576,734	9,195,193
Fraud	1,606	1,036	938	919	5,853,701	5,333,468	9,389,192	3,816,897	20,291,588	19,544,204	20,574,566	9,940,619
Total	14,044	10,265	9,385	9,967	168,438,090	287,967,944	63,146,329	65,037,985	295,901,940	383,711,658	127,173,492	121,771,942

Business failures classified as to causes—Continued.

SUMMARY—DOMINION OF CANADA, NEWFOUNDLAND, AND ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON.

Failures due to—	Number.				Assets.				Liabilities.			
	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	312	204	203	257	$1,457,792	$958,655	$878,185	$1,633,436	$2,749,349	$1,790,069	$1,528,086	$3,330,019
Inexperience	48	50	41	50	156,912	223,560	250,238	1,045,935	383,224	420,112	527,620	1,336,226
Lack of capital	740	717	626	790	4,375,096	3,142,275	2,266,775	2,787,080	10,374,146	7,105,795	5,089,314	6,297,446
Unwise credits	18	11	13	6	105,962	91,717	90,100	47,500	176,725	156,746	158,227	105,100
Failures of others	21	12	14	12	106,200	18,300	101,200	76,300	248,254	58,900	346,385	130,790
Extravagance	7	8	9	14	74,425	19,900	52,175	49,692	116,314	62,578	29,285	77,341
Neglect	56	63	41	64	219,565	166,410	52,064	145,676	395,888	433,379	111,901	678,147
Competition	9	5	9	11	57,950	4,500	12,213	11,550	106,100	11,152	27,426	28,172
Specific conditions	394	174	168	104	939,295	374,416	392,766	526,060	1,973,934	825,660	934,261	1,049,700
Speculation	9	16	7	4	114,000	103,200	26,600	19,000	241,780	221,606	77,254	110,543
Fraud	101	105	108	118	163,010	173,765	182,760	241,962	816,590	649,275	620,334	736,216
Total	1,715	1,365	1,239	1,430	7,770,207	5,276,698	4,305,076	6,584,191	17,582,304	11,735,272	9,450,093	13,879,700

Percentages of number of failures and liabilities in the United States and Canada in 1908, 1907, 1906, and 1905, classified as to causes.

Failures due to—	United States, per cent.								Canada, per cent.							
	Number.				Liabilities.				Number.				Liabilities.			
	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.
Incompetence	21.6	22.6	22.3	24.4	16	8.9	15.5	21.6	18.2	14.9	16.4	18	15.6	15.3	16.2	24.1
Inexperience	4	4.9	4.9	4.8	1.8	3.2	2.2	2.1	2.8	3.7	3.3	3.5	2.2	3.6	5.6	9.6
Lack of capital	34.2	37.1	35.9	33.4	27.2	18.4	30.9	33	43.2	52.5	50.6	55.2	59	60.6	53.9	45.4
Unwise credits	2	2.3	2.6	3.5	3.7	3.1	2.1	4.2	1	.8	1	.4	1	1.3	1.6	.7
Failures of others	1.8	1.4	2	2.2	5	3.3	8.8	4.5	1.5	.9	1.1	.8	1.4	.5	3.7	.9
Extravagance	1	.9	1	1.1	.9	.5	.9	1.2	.4	.6	.7	1	.7	.5	.3	.5
Neglect	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.9	.8	.5	1.5	1.1	3.2	4.6	3.3	4.5	2.3	3.7	1.1	4.9
Competition	1.8	1.2	1	1.5	1.7	.4	.4	.9	.5	.4	.7	.8	.6	.1	.3	.2
Specific conditions	18.9	16.3	17.3	16.3	31.3	51.7	17.9	15.5	22.9	12.7	13.6	7.3	11.2	7	9.9	7.6
Speculation	1	.7	.8	.7	4.7	4.9	3.6	7.7	.5	1.2	.6	.3	1.4	1.9	.8	.8
Fraud	11.5	10.1	10	9.2	6.9	5.1	16.2	8.2	5.8	7.7	8.7	8.2	4.6	5.5	6.6	5.3

CAUSES OF FAILURES.

[From Bradstreet's Journal, January 25, 1908.]

For many years past Bradstreet's has published very fully the results derived from its statistics of commercial failures, the aim being to supply the community which it serves with necessary, if not exactly palatable, information regarding what might be termed the "decrees of the courts of last resort in the business world." In bringing together this vast mass of information much valuable data regarding the impelling causes of business disaster have been compiled, and likewise published, for the benefit of those who are willing to learn from the experience of others and profit by the lessons taught.

Investigations by Bradstreet's over a long period have demonstrated that tendencies present within the individual himself are responsible for four-fifths of all business failures, the remaining one-fifth being due to extraneous conditions over which he has no control. It has also been brought out that the amount of capital employed bears a direct relation to the success or failure of the individual traders, those with limited resources having the smallest chance of survival, as attested by the preponderance in the number having inconsiderable ratings, if any, at the time of failure. By bringing down these compilations of the causes of failure, the ratings assigned, and the liabilities of those failing to include the records of 1907, the value of this investigation has been very greatly enhanced by the special incidents of that year. Believing that last year's happenings have special interest for the business community, attention is directed to a few leading facts regarding 1907.

A GLANCE BACKWARD.

Last year was a period of extremes—of immense activity in trade at the beginning, but with financial stringency, panic, depression, and industrial stagnation marking the last quarter. During the year 10,265 individuals, firms, or corporations demonstrated their inability or their indisposition to pay their creditors in full, this being an increase of 9.3 per cent over 1906 and of 2.9 per cent over 1905, but a decrease of 1.5 per cent from the total of 1904. The number of failures, therefore, did not show any sharp divergences from the number reported in recent previous years. Compared with the preceding panic year 1893, a decrease of 34 per cent was shown; but the liabilities, owing to the occurrence of a number of large suspensions in the closing months of the year, aggregated $383,700,000, a sum three times that reported in 1906, and slightly exceeding the total recorded in 1893, hitherto the record year in this respect. That special strain was exerted upon otherwise apparently solvent concerns by the events of the year, especially as it neared the end, is made plain by the fact that the assets of the involved concerns totaled $287,900,000, or 75 per cent of the liabilities, as against a percentage of 50 in 1906, of 59.9 in 1896, and of 60.6 in 1893.

BRADSTREET'S BUSINESS MORTALITY TABLES.

Despite the stress in 1907, and the fact that there were 1,447,680 individuals, firms, or corporations in business then—a gain of 3.3 per cent over 1906 and of 32 per cent over 1898—only seventy hundredths of 1 per cent of these failed, as against sixty-six hundredths in 1906 and seventy-three hundredths in 1905. Up to 1907 the mortality had dropped steadily year by year from 1896, but leaving out 1906 the commercial death rate in 1907 was the lowest recorded. Reasons for this are not far to seek. The full force of the convulsions of 1907, especially upon the smaller concerns, could hardly have been exercised in that year, and the harvest of small and large failures alike since January 1, 1908, lends color to this view. Among the apparent causes for a decreasing commercial death rate is the fact that improved credit reporting, resulting in conservatism in the extension of credit, worked for a smaller possible mortality; in addition, the suggestion made in these columns in previous years may again be advanced, namely, that these and other improved conditions in the business world act as an effective check on the commercial death rate, just as discoveries in science, in medicine, and in surgery are constantly accomplishing a reduction in the rate of human mortality. Moreover, the fact that the annual commercial death rate is less than 1 per cent, and has never been above 1½ per cent, disproves the tradition that the larger number of persons entering business ultimately fail, and consequently this tradition can be pronounced both untrue and misleading.

A FAILURE DEFINED.

Here it should be said that Bradstreet's definition of a commercial failure is that there must be some loss to creditors of individuals, firms, or corporations engaged in legitimate mercantile occupations. Under this classification, failures of professional men, like physicians, lawyers, and actors, as well as farmers, stockbrokers, real-estate dealers, and old bankruptcies passing through the United States courts, have no place. Any or all of the foregoing may be, in fact are, dissociated from the recognized commercial life of the country, and are not included in Bradstreet's failure data. On the other hand, it should be clearly borne in mind that these statistics do cover and include all suspensions of banks and other strictly financial institutions, even if these suspensions prove only temporary. For these and other reasons, comparisons of the commercial failure reports made up by Bradstreet's with those issued by other concerns can not be properly made. Failures merely to succeed, without loss to creditors, are not embraced in our data, because these are devoted to cases of insolvency alone.

WHY MEN FAILED IN 1907.

Many years of experience have shown that eight leading causes are subjective and attributable to those who fail, while three others exert their influence from circumstances not made by the individuals themselves. These causes are grouped as follows:

A.—DUE TO FAULTS OF THOSE FAILING.

Incompetence (irrespective of other causes).
Inexperience (without other incompetence).
Lack of capital.
Unwise granting of credits.
Speculation (outside regular business).
Neglect of business (due to doubtful habits).
Personal extravagance.
Fraudulent disposition of property.

B.—NOT DUE TO FAULTS OF THOSE FAILING.

Specific conditions (disaster, etc.).
Failure of others (of apparently solvent debtors).
Competition.

In 1907 the eight factors above mentioned caused 81.1 per cent of the failures, as against 79.7 per cent in 1906, while the three causes beyond control of the individual induced 18.9 per cent of the failures, as against 20.3 per cent in 1906. Thus the individual was apparently more to blame in 1907 than in 1906, so far as the actual casualties were concerned; but when the figures of liabilities are considered it is found that the three causes grouped in the second classification were responsible for 55.4 per cent of the failure damage, as against only 27.1 per cent in 1906. In 1903, 26.4 per cent of the failures and 56.3 per cent of the liabilities were due to these three causes. When it is considered that the depression of 1893 was distributed throughout the year from the spring onward, while that of 1907 occurred and became wide-

spread late in the year, the variation from 1893 as regards the percentages of the number of casualties is easily understood.

Failures, assets, liabilities, and number in business yearly since 1881.

Year.	Number failures.	Per cent increase (+) or decrease (−).	Actual assets, millions.	Total liabilities, millions.	Per cent assets to liabilities.	Number in business.	Per cent failing.
1907	10,265	+ 9.3	$287.9	$383.7	75.0	1,447,680	.70
1906	9,385	− 5.9	63.1	127.2	50.0	1,401,085	.66
1905	9,967	− 4.3	65.0	121.8	53.3	1,352,947	.73
1904	10,417	+ 6.5	75.7	143.6	52.7	1,307,746	.79
1903	9,775	− 1.9	84.1	154.3	54.5	1,272,909	.76
1902	9,973	− 6.3	50.4	105.5	47.7	1,238,973	.80
1901	10,648	+ 7.4	61.1	130.1	46.9	1,201,832	.88
1900	9,912	+ 2.8	60.1	127.2	47.2	1,161,639	.85
1889	9,642	−16.9	60.1	119.8	50.1	1,125,873	.85
1898	11,615	−11.2	73.1	141.6	51.6	1,093,373	1.06
1897	13,083	−13.3	86.5	158.7	54.5	1,086,053	1.20
1896	15,094	+16.4	147.8	246.9	59.9	1,079,070	1.40
1895	12,958	+ 1.8	87.6	158.7	55.2	1,053,633	1.23
1894	12,724	−17.9	83.2	151.5	54.9	1,047,974	1.21
1893	15,508	+51.0	231.5	382.1	60.6	1,059,014	1.46
1892	10,270	−17.1	54.7	108.6	50.3	1,035,564	.99
1891	12,394	+16.1	102.9	193.1	53.3	1,018,021	1.21
1890	10,673	− 9.0	92.7	175.0	52.9	989,420	1.07
1889	11,719	+10.7	70.5	140.7	50.0	978,000	1.20
1888	10,587	+ 9.7	61.9	120.2	52.0	955,000	1.10
1887	9,740	− 7.8	64.6	130.6	50.0	933,000	1.04
1886	10,568	− 4.9	55.8	113.6	49.0	920,000	1.15
1885	11,116	−4⅓	55.2	119.1	46.0	890,000	1.25
1884	11,620	+13.0	134.6	248.7	54.0	875,000	1.32
1883	10,299	+34.0	90.8	175.9	52.0	855,000	1.20
1882	7,635	+28.0	47.4	93.2	51.0	820,000	.93
1881	5,929	----------	35.9	76.0	47.0	780,000	.76

Lack of capital, as usual, was the most notable predisposing cause of failure, 37.1 per cent of all the casualties being due to this. It is worth noting that this cause has shown a steady rise year by year since 1904, and the percentage covered by it is, in fact, the highest reported since 1891. However, the liabilities due to this cause were not so large as in the preceding year, and, indeed, this cause fell to second place as regards liabilities resulting therefrom, being supplanted by specific conditions, which, while inducing only 16.3 per cent of the failures, as against 17.3 per cent in 1906, were responsible for 51.7 per cent of the liabilities, as against only 17.9 per cent in 1906. The liabilities due to lack of capital aggregated only 18.4 per cent of the 1907 total, as against 30.9 per cent in 1906. Incompetence, which was credited with causing 22.6 per cent of the casualties, was responsible for only 8.9 per cent of the liabilities, as against 15.5 per cent in 1906. The unsettling events of the last quarter may here be said to have warped the proportions of the liabilities assignable to the various causes, while leaving the percentages as regards number of failures at about the normal. Fraud, the cause fourth in relative prominence, brought about 10.1 per cent of the failures—a proportion, by the way, which changes little from year to year—but resulted in only 5.1 per cent of the liabilities. The large proportion of liabilities due to this cause in 1906—15.1 per cent—was occasioned by dishonesty, affecting the suspensions of some large financial institutions; and it may be said with apparent truth that, taking normal years, the loss from fraud is smaller relatively than the number of failures ascribed to it. The other less important causes showed few changes, as will be seen by reference to the accompanying tabular exhibit.

SOME TESTS OF CREDIT GRANTING AND REPORTING.

The collated figures of the capital employed by those who failed in the United States and Canada in 1907 show that 10,469 out of 11,630 failures, or 90 per cent, were of those with $5,000 capital or less. This compares with 91.5 per cent in 1906, and it is the smallest proportion reported since 1897. Those with over $5,000 and less than $20,000 capital numbered 764, or 6.6 per cent, the largest percentage reported in eleven years, though closely approached in 1904; and those with over $20,000 but under $50,000 capital failing numbered 225, or 1.9 per cent of all, a percentage not equaled since 1904. These figures indicated that the larger concerns were hit relatively harder by the troubles of 1907 than were the smaller ones; and it may be said that business mortality in that year, figuratively speaking, chose shining marks. This becomes clearer when the large number of concerns failing with a capital of $1,000,000 or over is considered. Of these there were 12, a number not equaled since 1893. It is also found that there were 10,573 failing concerns, 90.9 per cent of all in this country and Canada, which had only a very moderate or no credit rating at all, while those in good credit made up 7.9 per cent of all failing, and 1.2 per cent were rated in very good or a still higher credit. The compilation as to the liabilities of those who failed shows that 59.6 per cent owed less than $5,000, as against 62.7 per cent in 1906, while 40.4 per cent of those failing had liabilities of $5,000 or over, as against 37.3 per cent in 1906. This indicates the percentage of those with minimum liabilities to have been the smallest reported since 1893, when 58.9 per cent in that class failed. These latter statistics again point to what has already been indicated, viz, that the small trader and the one possessing the least ability to obtain credit escaped, in 1907 at least, the fullest effects of the convulsions.

IN CANADA.

There were 1,365 failures in Canada, Newfoundland, St. Pierre, and Miquelon in 1907, with liabilities of $11,735,272 and assets of $5,276,698. This marked an increase of 10 per cent in number and of 24 per cent in liabilities as compared with 1906, and the percentage of assets to liabilities was 44.9, as against 45.5 per cent in 1906. Lack of capital caused 52.5 per cent of these failures, as against 50.6 per cent in 1906, and accounted for 60.6 per cent of the liabilities, as against 53.9 per cent in the preceding year. Incompetence, the next cause in point of fatality, provided 14.9 per cent of the number and 15.3 per cent of the liabilities. These two causes, both faults of those failing, therefore effected 67.4 per cent of the failures and 75.9 per cent of the liabilities. Specific conditions, the third cause in order—one, however, beyond control of the individual—accounted for 12.7 per cent of the number and 7 per cent of the liabilities, but this cause, like incompetence, was not so fatal or so damaging as in the year 1906.

The information upon which the foregoing data are based was procured and distributed by the Bradstreet Company while acting in its capacity as an authority through whose instrumentality credit is not only determined but fostered and its extension promoted wherever commerce engages the activities of men. It should not be forgotten, however, that the source of that information is the business community itself, without whose cooperation the results attained could not have been reached. The nature and extent of that cooperation reflect in a striking way the confidence of the commercial community in the integrity of purpose of the institution and the character of its administration in the discharge of the functions which have been assumed by it in relation to the business world. That confidence and that cooperation have steadily grown with the growth of the organization itself in the more than half century of its existence until the offices of the Bradstreet Company, once confined to a few large eastern cities in the United States, now extend not only throughout the territory of the great Republic, not omitting its latest acquisitions in so far as they are commercially cognizable, but into the Dominion of Canada, Mexico, Cuba, and the islands of the sea, the United Kingdom, Australasia, and, through its association with the Institute W. Schimmelpfeng, throughout the entire Continent of Europe. In a word, the institution exercises its functions as a guardian of solvency and disseminator of commercial information wherever a condition of settled order marks the secure extension of the sphere of civilization, law, and commercial credit.

Proportion of failures to those in business for the past four years.

	1907.		1906.		1905.		1904.	
	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.	Number in business.	Number failing.
Middle	384,139	3,383	372,517	2,920	360,387	2,878	348,663	3,041
Eastern	118,291	1,314	115,485	1,261	112,919	1,491	109,919	1,691
Southern	263,948	2,213	250,207	1,927	238,618	2,123	229,084	1,767
Western	401,435	1,874	390,818	1,837	380,214	1,819	368,830	2,237
Northwestern	166,624	697	163,201	658	158,529	747	154,885	785
Pacific	88,835	653	87,028	653	80,870	780	74,585	764
Territories	24,408	131	22,729	129	21,410	129	21,780	132
Total, United States	1,447,680	10,265	1,401,985	9,385	1,352,947	9,967	1,307,746	10,417
Canada	116,202	1,365	112,362	1,239	114,335	1,430	110,615	1,175
Total, United States and Canada	1,563,882	11,630	1,514,347	10,624	1,467,282	11,397	1,418,361	11,592

APPENDIX B.

EXHIBIT A.

LEATHER SCHEDULE IN THE DINGLEY TARIFF BILL.

437. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That upon all leather exported, made from imported hides, there shall be allowed a drawback equal to the amount of duty paid on such hides, to be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

438. Band of belting leather, sole leather, dressed upper, and all other leather, calfskins tanned or tanned and dressed, kangaroo, sheep, and goat skins (including lamb and kid skins), dressed and finished, chamois and other skins, and bookbinders calfskins, all the foregoing not specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem; skins for morocco, tanned but unfinished, 10 per cent ad valorem; patent, japanned, varnished, or enameled leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen hides or skins, 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; if weighing over 10 pounds and not over 25 pounds per dozen, 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; if weighing over 25 pounds per dozen, 20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; pianoforte leather and pianoforte action leather, 35 per cent ad valorem; leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, 50 cents per gross pairs and 20 per cent ad valorem; boots and shoes made of leather, 25 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms, suitable for conversion into manufactured articles, shall be classified as manufactures of leather and pay duty accordingly.

GLOVES.

439. Gloves made wholly or in part of leather, whether wholly or partly manufactured, shall pay duty at the following rates, the lengths stated in each case being the extreme length when stretched to their full extent, namely:

440. Women's or children's "glace" finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length, $1.75 per dozen pairs; over 14

inches and not over 17 inches in length, $2.25 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $2.75 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, Schmaschen (sheep), $3 per dozen pairs.

441. Women's or children's "glace" finish, lamb or sheep, not over 14 inches in length, $2.50 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.50 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.50 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, lamb or sheep, $4 per dozen pairs.

442. Women's or children's "glace" finish, goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, not over 14 inches in length, $3 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.75 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.75 per dozen pairs; men's "glace" finish, kid, goat, or other leather than of sheep origin, $4 per dozen pairs.

443. Women's or children's, of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, not over 17 inches in length, $2.50 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $3.50 per dozen pairs; men's, of sheep origin, with exterior surface removed, by whatever name known, $4 per dozen pairs.

444. Women's or children's kid, goat, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, not over 14 inches in length, $3 per dozen pairs; over 14 and not over 17 inches in length, $3.75 per dozen pairs; over 17 inches in length, $4.75 per dozen pairs; men's goat, kid, or other leather than of sheep origin, with exterior grain surface removed, by whatever name known, $4 per dozen pairs.

445. In addition to the foregoing rates, there shall be paid the following cumulative duties: On all leather gloves when lined, $1 per dozen pairs; on all pique or prix seam gloves, 40 cents per dozen pairs; on all gloves stitched or embroidered with more than three single strands or cords, 40 cents per dozen pairs.

446. Glove tranks, with or without the usual accompanying pieces, shall pay 75 per cent of the duty provided for the gloves in the fabrication of which they are suitable.

447. Harness, saddles, and saddlery, or parts of either, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, 45 per cent ad valorem.

EXHIBIT B.

THE DINGLEY TARIFF CUSTOM RATES UNDER ACT OF 1897.

Alcohol, amylic, or fusel oil, one-fourth cent per pound.
Barley, bushel of 48 pounds, 30 cents per bushel.
Beads, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Beef, mutton, and pork, 2 cents per pound.
Beer, porter, and ale, 20 to 40 cents per gallon.
Bindings, cotton and flax, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Bindings, wool, 50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Blankets, 22 to 23 cents per pound and 30 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Books, charts, maps, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Bronze, manufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Brushes, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Butter, and substitutes for cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Button, sleeve and collar, gilt, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Canvas for sails, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Carpets, 22 to 60 cents per square yard and 40 per cent ad valorem.
Cattle (over 1 year old), 27½ per cent ad valorem.
Cigars and cigarettes, $4.50 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Clocks, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Clothing, ready-made, 50 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Coal, bituminous, 67 cents per ton.
Confectionery, all sugar (if more than 15 cents per pound), 50 per cent ad valorem.
Copper, maufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton gloves and handkerchiefs, 45 to 55 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton hosiery, 50 cents to $2 per dozen pairs and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton shirts and drawers, 60 cents to $2.25 per dozen and 15 to 50 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton plushes, unbleached, 9 cents per square yard and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Cotton curtains and cotton webbing, 50 and 45 per cent ad valorem.
Cutlery, 16 to 20 cents each, plus 15 to 45 per cent.
Diamonds, 10 cents and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Drugs, not crude, one-fourth cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Dyewoods, extract of, seventh-eights cent per pound.
Earthenware, 25 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Eggs, 5 cents per dozen.
Extracts, meat, 35 cents per pound.
Fish, smoked, dried, three-fourths cent per pound.
Flannels, 22 to 23 cents per pound, 30 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Flax, manufactures of, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Flowers, artificial, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Fruits, 1 cent per pound, 25 cents per bushel, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Fur, manufactures of, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Furniture, wood, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Glassware, plate, silvered, and bottles, 60 per cent ad valorem, 8 to 11 cents per square foot, 1 cent per pound.
Glucose, 1½ cents per pound.
Glue, value not over 7 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound.
Gc'd, manufactures of, not jewelry, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Hair, 10 to 35 per cent ad valorem.
Hams and bacon, 5 cents per pound.
Hay, $4 per ton.
Hemp cordage, 2 cents per pound.
Hides, 15 per cent ad valorem.
Honey, 20 cents per gallon.
Hoops, iron or steel, baling, 5 to 10 cents per pound.
Hops, 12 cents per pound.
Horn, manufactures of, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Horses, mules, $30 per head.
India rubber, manufactures of, vulcanized, 30 and 35 per cent ad valorem.
Instruments, metal and musical, 45 per cent ad valorem.
Iron, manufactures of, screws, tinned plates, 45 per cent ad valorem, 12 cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound.
Jewelry, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Lard, 2 cents per pound.
Lead, pigs, bars, type metal, 2½ cents, 1½ cents per pound.
Leather manufactures, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Linen manufactures, wearing apparel, 45 to 60 per cent ad valorem.
Macaroni, 1½ cents per pound.
Malt, barley, 45 cents per bushel.
Matches, friction, boxed, 8 cents per gross.
Matting, cocoa and rattan, 6 cents per square yard.
Molasses, 3 to 6 cents per gallon.
Nails, cut, horseshoe, 6 to 10 cents, 2¼ cents per pound.
Oilcloth, value over 25 cents, 8 to 20 cents per square yard.
Oil, olive, whale, and seal, foreign, 40 to 50 cents, 8 cents per gallon.
Onions, 40 cents per bushel.
Opium, 40 per cent ad valorem and $1 per pound.
Paintings and marble statuary, engravings, 20 to 25 per cent ad valorem.
Paper manufactures, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Pepper, cayenne, unground, 2½ cents per pound.
Perfumery, alcoholic, 60 cents per pound and 45 per cent ad valorem.
Photograph albums, slides, 33 per cent, 25 per cent ad valorem.
Pickles, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Pins, metallic, 35 per cent ad valorem.
Pipes of clay, common, 15 cents per gross.
Poultry, dressed, 5 cents per pound.
Pulp wood for paper makers, 1 to 12 cents per pound.
Quicksilver, 72 cents per pound.
Railroad ties, cedar, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Rugs, oriental, 10 cents per square foot plus 40 per cent.
Salt, 8 to 12 cents per 100 pounds.
Sauces, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Sausages (except bologna), 25 per cent ad valorem.
Silk, in skeins, laces, wearing apparel, 35 per cent, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Skins, tanned and dressed, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Slates, manufactures of, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Smokers' articles, except clay and meerschaum pipes, 60 per cent ad valorem.
Soap, castile, toilet, perfumed, 1¼ cents, 15 cents per pound.
Spirits, except bay rum, $2.25 per gallon.
Straw manufactures, 30 per cent ad valorem.
Sugar (raw, 96°), 1.68 cents per pound.
Sugars (refined), 1.95 cents per pound.
Tin plates, 1½ cents per pound.
Tobacco, 35 cents to $2.50 per pound.
Umbrellas, silk or alpaca, 50 per cent ad valorem.
Vegetables, natural, preserved, 25 per cent, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Velvets, silk, $1.50 per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Watches, and parts of, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Wheat, bushel of 60 pounds, 25 cents per bushel.
Willow, for basket makers, manufactures of, 20 per cent, 40 per cent ad valorem.
Wines, 50 cents per gallon.
Wines, champagne, $2 to $8 per dozen.
Wool, 7 to 11 cents per pound.
Worsted yarns, 27½ to 38½ cents plus 40 per cent.
Woolen or worsted clothing, 44 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.

APPENDIX C.

[From the Shoe and Leather Reporter of January 18, 1906.]

DUTIES ON HIDES, SOLE LEATHER, AND SHOES—EXPRESSION OF OPINION FROM SHOE MANUFACTURERS REGARDING THE REMOVAL IN WHOLE OR IN PART OF THE DUTIES AFFECTING THE RAW MATERIAL AND FINISHED PRODUCT.

Early in December the Shoe and Leather Reporter sent a copy of the following letter and questions to the leading shoe manufacturers of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: We would respectfully call your attention to the inclosed letter from Mr. Charles H. Jones, president of Commonwealth Shoe and Leather Company, Boston, which appeared in the Shoe and Leather Reporter of December 7, and believe that you will be interested in reading his views on a subject of vital importance to the shoe and leather trade. In order to ascertain the present views of the shoe manufacturers of the United States on the hide and sole leather duties, we ask the following qestions. An expression of opinion is desired from every manufacturer, and we request the favor of an early reply:

Are you in favor of the repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides and the 20 per cent duty on sole leather?

If you answer "yes," are you willing to offer in exchange for these benefits to the shoe manufacturer the whole or any part of the 25 per cent duty on shoes?

As a result of the canvass, 231 replies were received, as follows:

In reply to the first question:

Yes	199
No	4
Yes on hides, but only partial reduction sole leather	9
Noncommittal, and those not using leather in shoe making	19

In reply to the second question:

Yes—remove the whole duty if necessary	140
No	20
A part of the duty, ranging from 10 to 15 per cent	38
Noncommittal	33

Of these replies 96 were from New England shoe manufacturers and the remainder from those in the other States.

Quite a number commented on the topic, and believing that their views will be of interest, we publish some of the comments herewith:

Snedicor & Hathaway, Detroit, Mich.: "Our idea would be, first get hides free, after that sole leather, and then take duty off shoes."

The Haynes-Webb Shoe Manufacturing Company, Denver, Colo.: "We certainly believe that the duty on hides, especially, should be abandoned. We would like to see a new bill put in effect."

Fargo Shoe Manufacturing Company, Belding, Mich.: "Am satisfied with condition that is best for the majority, only so it is settled and not brought up every little while to keep everyone guessing."

Andrews & Co., Everett, Mass.: "We have made no answer to the second question. The 'benefits' are all for the public and not the manufacturer."

Wichert & Gardiner, Brooklyn, N. Y.: "We have your circular letter of the 8th instant, relative to the repeal of duties, but are disinclined to express a lengthy opinion on this matter, as we have not gone sufficiently deep into its details. Our position would naturally incline us to favor a repeal of the 15 per cent on hides and 20 per cent duty on sole leather, believing that these measures would not be of very great disadvantage to those concerned in this line of business.

"With regard to the offering in exchange a surrender of the whole or any part of the 25 per cent duty on shoes, we should hesitate to

express an opinion on a matter of so grave an import until some of the figures connected with it, and also some of the facts, were before us, on which a competent opinion might be based.

"It seems to us from the very fact that the United Shoe Machinery Company is placing its newest types of shoe machines in large quantities in all parts of the civilized world, that this fact, taken into consideration with the low price of labor prevalent in foreign countries, might be a good reason why the duty on shoes should remain undisturbed."

John A. Frye Shoe Company, Marlboro, Mass.: "We do not believe a reduction or repeal of the duty would benefit us at all, and so long as all shoe manufacturers are running to their fullest capacity with good profits, as they evidently are at the present time, we are in favor of 'letting the tariff alone.'"

The Pingree Company, Detroit, Mich.: "We are bending our energies to getting hides on the free list, and feel that at this time it is unwise to take up the question of free sole leather or free shoes, both of which would entail considerable inquiry. We do not feel competent to answer your questions concerning this without more information than we have at hand."

M. F. Hammond, Pleasantville, N. Y.: "With cheap material we can make a fair profit; with high material we stand a chance to get part of it back, but a very small proportion. The condition of the shoe trade to-day could hardly be worse, so far as the manufacturers are concerned."

The Comfort Slipper Company, New York: "A reduction of duty on slippers, especially on cloth and felt slippers, which are classified under shoes, will practically ruin our business, no matter how cheap sole leather may be. Therefore, if the reduction of duty can only be reached by a reduction of duty on shoes, we must be against it."

Jerolemon-Oliver Company, Rochester, N. Y.: "I should not be in favor of taking the duty off shoes coming to this country."

Hanan & Son, Brooklyn, N. Y.: "If the duty of 15 per cent on hides is removed and the duty on sole leather reduced to 10 per cent and duty for shoes reduced to 10 per cent, I believe it would meet with all the requirements and necessities of the situation."

The Rich Shoe Company, Milwaukee, Wis.: "We favor most emphatically the repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides, which, in our opinion, is nothing more nor less than an arbitrary tax on the American boot and shoe manufacturer, and is a protection only to the meat packer and incidentally to the foreign boot and shoe manufacturer, who receives a drawback on American-made leather of imported hides.

"We would further say that, while we favor the removal of the 20 per cent duty on sole leather, we would not object, as a fair compromise with the tanner, to return to the McKinley 10 per cent duty on sole leather instead of demanding the repeal of the entire present duty of 20 per cent.

"In consideration of the above we would be willing to take our chances to compete with the world in the sale of shoes without any protective duty whatever. We believe that with the exception of a small proportion of fancy slippers, etc., in which a good deal of hand work is utilized, the American manufacturer, in spite of higher labor, can produce goods of superior fit and style that would give the American goods such preference as to command the trade of the world; at least so it appears to us at the present time."

Pontiac Shoe Manufacturing Company, Pontiac, Ill.: "We believe it would be a good thing for the people to have free hides. We are a part of the people."

William Eastwood & Son Company, Rochester, N. Y.: "We are in favor of the repeal of the duty on hide and sole leather, and, in further response to your inquiry, would state that we are in favor of such a revision of the duty on shoes as can be consistently made without jeopardizing the interests of shoemakers in a general way—say to such an extent as the proposed repeal of the duty on hide and sole leather would enter into the cost of shoes."

Giesecke-D'Oench-Hays Shoe Company, Jefferson City, Mo.: "If our industries are to be encouraged, it seems to us that the Government would better not add additional burdens in the shape of revenue taxation on raw material. This is surely no encouragement to manufacturing enterprises. Our own Government handicaps us in our efforts to establish export trade by giving foreigners the opportunity to buy American leather cheaper than citizens of this country can purchase it. This, of course, is due to the rebate which the Government grants on export leather. This means the encouraging of one industry at the expense of another."

Neenah Shoe Company, Neenah, Wis.: "If the 25 per cent duty on shoes, or any portion of that duty, would prevent the removal of the duty on hides, we would say, Remove all of the duty from shoes, as we need not at present fear competition from foreign countries in the manufacture of shoes. The removal of the duty on hides we believe to be essential, and should not have been placed there in 1897."

Isaac Ferris, jr., Company, Camden, N. J.: "I fully concur in the opinion expressed by Charles H. Jones in Shoe and Leather Reporter."

Tappan Shoe Manufacturing Company, Lynn: "Shoes need no protection. Foreign shoes could not be given away in this country. They are ill shaped and not fitted for the trade in this country. Besides, shoes can not be produced in any country as cheaply as here."

The D. M. Jones Shoe Manufacturing Company, Columbus, Ohio: "Yes, we are in favor of the repeal of all duties pertaining to the leather industry, and are willing to do what we can to that end."

Florsheim & Co., Chicago: "We are unqualifiedly in favor of the immediate repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides, and also the 20 per cent duty on sole leather.

"It is a fact patent to almost all people identified with the shoe or leather industries that the repeal of the duty on hides without the repeal of the duty on sole leather would be more or less ineffective. It is absolutely essential that both the duty on hides and the duty on sole leather should be repealed in order to conserve the future of the shoe, leather, and harness business of the United States.

"In exchange we would be more than pleased to see the entire 25 per cent duty on shoes taken off. We require no protection as far as shoes are concerned. There should be none. It is a mere makeshift and sop. It does no good.

"We should have lower tariffs and more reciprocity, particularly with Canada and South American republics."

Noyes-Norman Shoe Company, St. Joseph, Mo.: "If hides and leather should go much higher, would favor free list for hides, leather, and shoes. If a steady leather market now continues on about present basis, would be opposed to revision; shoes, leather, and hides are high enough; not much too high."

Racine Shoe Manufacturing Company, Racine, Wis.: "We believe the repeal of duty on hides is almost unanimous with shoe manufacturers. As to the duty on shoes, our trade is growing, with every country under the sun in open competition, and it does not seem that a duty on shoes is necessary."

Roberts, Johnson & Rand Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "The repeal of the duty on hides will help. It is just as important that the duty on leather be also repealed."

Craddock-Terry Company, Lynchburg, Va.: "We heartily concur in Mr. Jones's forceful views on this subject."

Wertheimer-Swarts Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "We favor the repeal of the duty on hides and sole leather. Lowering the cost of making of shoes, competition will take care of prices."

Churchill & Alden Company, Campello: "Am anxious to have the duty taken off." (This firm replied "yes" to both questions.)

M. D. Wells Company, Chicago, Ill.: "If we can have free hides, would be willing to allow shoes to come free of duty."

A. B. Noyes & Co., Georgetown, Mass.: "If we have free raw material, we will risk all competition."

J. S. Zulick & Co., Orwigsburg, Pa.: "Haven't studied the question carefully, but Mr. Jones's views on the subject seem right and are plausible."

F. M. Hodgdon, Haverhill, Mass.: "It would seem that possibly in the far-distant future a duty of 10 per cent might be an advantage to equalize difference in cost of labor on shoes, but believe the probability is to the contrary."

Friedman Brothers Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo.: "The duty off hides and sole leather will benefit everyone. The duty on shoes very few at present, and with the advantage of free hides the American manufacturer can meet any conditions that may arise through foreign competition."

H. R. Ford & Co., Lynn, Mass.: "We are heartily in favor of repealing the duty on hides and sole leather, and are willing to have the whole duty on shoes taken off, as we do not fear competition on cheap shoes. We know that the manufacturers of this country can hold their own in this line."

J. G. Hynds Shoe Manufacturing Company, Nashville, Tenn.: "The shoe duty does not help us any, and we do not believe it helps any other shoe manufacturer in the United States.

"The hide duty enables the beef trust, Big 4, to dictate prices on hides in the United States. Abolish the hide tariff and the beef and hide monopoly will not be enabled to 'hold up' tanners as they now do."

THE PROBLEM OF FUTURE PRICES.

As the old year draws to a close and will soon sink into history and as the new year looms on the horizon, thoughtful men in our trade are mingling with their holiday rejoicing serious conjectures as to what may be in store for the leather and leather-consuming industry. Everyone, from the hide dealer to the consumer of shoes, harness, etc., realizes that 1905 was a year of advancing prices.

WILL PRICES DECLINE OR ADVANCE?

The past is an open book that all may read, but the future is a blank page. Will prices stick or will they decline? These are pertinent questions, but a more sensational interrogation presses for an answer—will the advance continue and will present prices look small and cheap a year hence?

It is difficult to set aside self-interest and consider trade movements dispassionately, but it would seem necessary at this time seriously to decide whether the higher prices already established resulted from natural causes that will continue operative or whether the advance movement has reached its apex. If the disruption in leather values logically resulted from world-wide conditions, why should it not continue?

NO AX TO GRIND.

Hide and Leather has no interest except to hold the mirror up to a great industry and faithfully to reflect things as they are. We do not venture to predict, but we do call attention to world-wide conditions that are likely to affect future prices. For two years Hide and Leather has been printing articles demonstrating that the per capita consumption of beef is not keeping pace with the per capita consumption of leather, with the result that hides and skins under the operation of the law of supply and demand are increasing in cost in all the markets of the world.

MORE SHEEP, LESS BEEF.

With a view to further substantiating or disproving this postulate we have interview M. F. Horine, official statistician of the Union Stock Yards and Transit Company, Chicago. He tells us that his company does not expect any considerable increase in the cattle supply, for the reason that the demand for beeves on the hoof and the prices paid do not furnish any incentive to stock raisers to increase their herds. Mr. Horine gives a variety of reasons why the cattle and beef industries are not expanding proportionately with the population of the country. He deplores the widespread daily newspaper attacks upon the so-called "beef trust," and says that these, together with the stories about embalmed beef printed during the Spanish-American war, prejudiced the American public against dressed beef. In this connection he adduces the fact that receipts and slaughter of sheep have increased in much greater degree than those of cattle. In 1888 receipts of cattle at the great stock yards of Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and St. Louis were 4,477,470 head. In 1904 the entry at these centers amounted to 7,274,110. Receipts of sheep at the four points in 1888 were 2,307,050 head, and in 1904, 8,050,900 head. From these figures it will be seen that receipts of cattle have not quite doubled in sixteen years, while receipts of sheep have almost quadrupled.

NO BEEF FOR BREAKFAST.

The introduction of cereal breakfast foods has probably not been sufficiently considered as a factor in revolutionizing the food supply of the American people. There are said to be sixty-two manufacturers of cereal foods at Battle Creek, Mich., alone. It is only necessary to visit any one of the thousands of small grocery stores and glance at the shelves to form some idea of the tremendous consumption of prepared cereals.

EFFECT OF IRRIGATION AND REFRIGERATION.

Irrigation has become an important factor in the food supply. Thousands of acres that formerly were used for cattle feeding are now yielding cereals and table vegetables. The refrigerator car has made possible the transportation of perishable articles from long distances, and the cold-storage plant enables dealers to hold such merchandise for sale, so that eggs, poultry, fish, fruit, and fresh vegetables are obtainable by the American people practically during every month of the year. All these circumstances tend to lessen the per capita consumption of beef, and this reduces the supply of hides and skins available for making leather.

MORE LEATHER, BUT LESS RAW MATERIAL.

Coincident with this limitation of raw material is the greatly expanding consumption of leather. In recent years leather has come into great favor for upholstering fine furniture, as well as for mural decorations. A tanner of leather for automobiles recently told us that the sales of his company were just fifteen times greater than one year ago. Foot gear has been made for so many years at such reasonable prices that the per capita consumption of leather has increased by reason of the fact that nearly everyone possesses a number of pairs of shoes. There are shoes for every vocation and sport, and fashionable ladies have foot gear to match every gown.

CHEAP BEEF—DEAR HIDES.

Hides and skins are in less supply and gerater demand in all the markets of the world, a condition that is faithfully reflected in the markets. The increasing demand for hides and the decreasing demand for beef are reflected in the selling prices of hides and cattle on the hoof. During 1893 native steer hides ranged from 5½ to 9 cents in price, while the steers themselves brought from $5.25 to $6.50 per hundred pounds. To-day we find beeves on the hoof bringing about the same prices as twelve years ago, while the hides are closely sold up at 16 cents. Years ago hides sold for little more and sometimes for even less than beef, but to-day steers that sell for 5½ cents per pound on the hoof yield hides that easily bring 16 cents per pound.

It must be admitted that the increasing cost of leather has a substantial basis in conditions affecting the quantity of raw material available. As we said at the outset, the question for every thoughtful man in the trade to endeavor to answer for himself is, Will the upheaval in prices during 1905 continue in the same or greater degree during 1906?

APPENDIX D.

[From the Shoe and Leather Reporter.]

BRITISH POLITICIANS ON AMERICAN SHOE TRADE—EFFECTS OF OUR TARIFF AS SEEN THROUGH ENGLISH SPECTACLES.

As I have said, opinions on the tariff question are much divided, even among manufacturers; as far as the operatives are concerned, however, I fancy the vote will go solid for free trade at the election. British shoemakers have always been advocates of liberal principles, and it seems most unlikely they will be won over by any arguments in favor of protection. Speaking at a small army-shoemaking center called Raunds recently, F. A. Channing, the late member for the division, dealt extensively with the aspect of the American shoe trade and its position under a protective tariff. The speech appears to me to be so directly interesting to your readers that I am tempted to give rather copious extracts from it. Mr. Channing prefaced his remarks by observing that he had only recently returned from a tour of the United States, which included an inspection of the shoe industry of Massachusetts—"the Northamptonshire of the United States." He said this district was exactly in the same position, and had been for the past ten years, in which Mr. Chamberlain wanted to place the whole of this country. He went on to say Massachusetts resembled England in the sense that the greater portion of its food and raw material came from outside. She had been placed under a complete scientific tariff protecting every industry in the country. They had had ten years of protection, and what was the result? The whole of the workmen and nine-tenths of the manufacturers of that State engaged in the shoe industry were eagerly demanding a complete and absolute withdrawal of the system. The feeling was of the strongest possible kind against protection, because it was felt its burdens were far greater than any advantage the duty gave them. Mr. Channing went on to say that whilst he was in the State an election was in progress, and that turned on the question which of the two parties—Republicans and Democrats—were the most in earnest in getting rid of protection from that highly protected State. Until the Dingley tariff was adopted the boot and shoe industry was going up by leaps and bounds. The increase was 80 or 90 per cent in the ten years before the tariff, but now the growth of the industry was almost suspended and the number of employees and the amount of wages had decreased. They got the advantage of 25 per cent duty yet they had to pay an enormous duty on coal, although they could otherwise have coal for very little by sea from Canada. They were prevented from getting steel and timber at terms reasonable enough for the construction of factories and machinery, and the raw materials, hides, or finished leather, were subject to a heavy duty, which largely increased the cost of production.

TRUSTS FROM A BRITISH STANDPOINT.

This champion of the British shoemakers was particularly caustic in his observations on American trade combinations. Alluding to the beef trust he said it had bribed the legislators to impose a duty of 15 per cent on raw hides, and were thus enabled to impose a blackmail of £2,000,000 on every industry of which leather was the raw material. Passing to the leather trust, he said that no sooner did it become powerful than the beef trust bought them up. The leather trust had a duty of 20 per cent on all leather imported into the United States, and got a rebate of 90 per cent on the rawhide, which they converted into leather and exported to England. The result was that English manufacturers, with their happy system of free trade, got the American leather 15, 20, to 25 per cent cheaper than the American manufacturers could get their leather, which was manufactured in America. At the conclusion of his speech to these British army shoemakers, Mr. Channing said these precious tariffs handicapped the American manufacturers and gave the English command of the markets of the world. "They need not be afraid," he added, "that these poor American manufacturers were going to slip out of the toils and compete with them in the near future, for no toad under the harrow was half so badly off as the American shoe industry under the combined forces of the gigantic trusts which used protection as their weapons."

I give the above opinions for what they are worth; they are, however, from two representative men, and show that American shoes and leather are playing an important part in shaping the destiny of British economic policy. Mr. Channing may be "playing to the gallery," as we say in England, but his opinions are given with a frankness which leaves no doubt as to his opinions. Whether his probably superficial inspection of American industrial conditions was sufficient to make him an authority on the effects of protected leather it is difficult to say, and I leave American readers to form their own opinions.

APPENDIX E.

LEATHER TRUSTS.

The United States Leather Company, a corporation formed under the laws of New Jersey, February 25, 1893, acquired the properties of a large number of companies and firms engaged in the manufacture of leather. The property consists of real estate, tanneries, bark lands, hides, bark, etc.; stock, par $100; authorized, common, $64,000,000; preferred, $64,000,000; issued, common, $62,882,300; preferred, $62,282,300; total, $125,164,600.

The preferred stock is 8 per cent cumulative. Stock is transferred at the office of the company, New York. Registrar, Central Trust Company, New York.

The amount of stock originally authorized was $60,000,000 each of preferred and common. In July, 1895, an increase of $4,000,000 in each class was authorized to provide for purchase of bark lands, etc.

During 1895 6 per cent was paid on preferred, and in 1896 1 per cent. In 1897 4 per cent was paid on preferred, and in 1898 4¾ per cent. In April, 1898, dividend was increased from 1 to 1½ per cent. In 1895 5 per cent was paid on the preferred. In 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904 6 per cent was paid. The dividend paid January, 1905, was 1½ per cent, being also on the 6 per cent annual basis. The amount of dividends overdue on the preferred January 1, 1904, was about 41 per cent. Dividends on the preferred are paid quarterly, in January (1), April, July, and October. (See below regarding details of the reorganization plan dated December 17, 1904.)

On December 17, 1904, a committee—P. Anderson Valentine, chairman; Edward C. Hoyt, A. Augustus Healy, W. G. Garritt, Eugene Horton, Samuel P. Davidge, Lewis H. Lapham, Frederic P. Olcott, Alvin W. Krech, and George Foster Peabody—submitted a plan of reorganization. It provided for a new company to acquire the assets of the old one, or to control it through a majority of the stock, the new company to have $45,000,000 twenty-year 5 per cent bonds, $40,000,000 7 per cent, cumulative, preferred stock, and $40,000,000 common stock.

Under the plan, holders of the old preferred were to exchange it for 50 per cent in new preferred, 50 per cent in new bonds, and 23½ per cent in new common, and the old common stock was to be exchanged for the new in the proportion of one share of new for three of the old common stock. The old 6 per cent debentures were left undisturbed. The capitalization of the new company would be as follows, if all holders of the stock accepted the plan: Five per cent bonds, $31,141,150; new preferred, $31,141,150; new common, $14,636,340, the latter including $6,200,000 of stock to be given to new interests in the company for cooperation and for all services and expenses in carrying out the plan.

The depositary of the committee was the Central Trust Company, New York, and deposits of the old stock were to be made over before February 15, 1905, the plan having been declared operative.

FUNDED DEBT.

Debentures, 6 per cent, due May, 1913, May and November, $5,280,000.

The issue of debentures was to provide the company with working capital. The bonds are subject to redemption by a sinking fund of 4 per cent annually, and bonds can be drawn for it at 110. There were, on December 31, 1904, $600,000 of the bonds in the company's treasury.

Report for the year ending December 31, 1902, gave profits $4,702,384. In 1903, profits, $4,784,998.

Balance sheet December 3, 1904.

ASSETS.

Cash	$2, 420, 667
Due by customers	5, 757, 802
Bills receivable	549, 117
Doubtful debtors, valued at	10, 735
Sundry other debtors and book accounts	141, 906
Hides and leather on hand and in process of tanning	9, 814, 944
Drawbacks due	559, 485
Bark at tanneries	2, 262, 860
Sundry personal property	595, 987
Advances to other companies	343, 696
Tannery plants and lands	6, 696, 069
Stocks of other companies	50, 515, 442
Bonds of Central Pennsylvania Lumber Company	9, 035, 000
Bonds of Susquehanna and New York Railroad Company	879, 888
Railroad mortgage	100, 000
Treasury stock	100, 000
Unexpired insurance policies	56, 570
Good will, account, etc	62, 832, 300
Total	152, 672, 468

LIABILITIES.

Accrued interest	26, 254
Current accounts	285, 261
Bills payable	2, 100, 000
Exchange not due	1, 098, 297
Bonds	5, 880, 000
Less in treasury	600, 000
	5, 280, 000
Reserve for fire insurance	517, 685
Preferred stock	62, 282, 300
Common stock	62, 882, 300
Surplus January 1, 1905	18, 200, 011

American Hide and Leather Company, a corporation formed under the laws of New Jersey in August, 1899. The company acquired the plants and business of 22 different establishments engaged in the manufacture and sale of upper leathers, particulars of which are given in the manual for 1901.

The establishments acquired represented 75 per cent of the business in upper leather in the United States. In each case the properties acquired were taken in fee clear of all incumbrances. The aggregate annual net earnings of the separate concerns before consolidation were $1,585,748. Stock, par, $100; authorized, common, $17,500,000; preferred, $17,500,000. Issued, common, $11,274,100; preferred, $12,548,300; total, $23,822,400.

The stock preferred is 7 per cent, cumulative, and has a preference as to assets. At the beginning of 1905 the accumulated unpaid dividends amounted to about 35 per cent.

Transfer agents, North American Trust Company, New York; Colonial Trust Company, New York.

The first dividend on the preferred stock was 1 per cent, paid February 15, 1905. It was understood that this was a quarterly dividend, and that the stock had been placed on a 4 per cent basis.

FUNDED DEBT.

First mortgage, 6 per cent, due September, 1919, March and September, $7,837,000.

The first mortgage is for $10,000,000. Of the bonds outstanding, $2,445,000 were accepted by vendors of the property acquired by the company in payment for same, $3,200,000 were disposed of privately, and $2,800,000 were sold in January, 1900, by public subscription. Of the bonds held in the treasury, $1,000,000 only can be issued for the acquisition of new properties, which shall become subject to the mortgage. The trustee of the mortgage is the Colonial Trust Company, New York, interest being paid at that institution. There is a sinking fund of $172,500 per annum. Bonds may be bought for the sinking fund at not over 115, but are not subject to compulsory retirement. On June 30, 1903, there were $494,000 bonds in the sinking fund.

In the year ending June 29, 1901, the surplus over charges was $377,139. In the year ending June 30, 1902, the total profits were $1,411,511; interest and deductions for depreciation, etc., $1,004,634; balance, $406,877. In 1902–3 profits were $886,114; interest, deductions, etc., $965,748; balance, deficit, $79,634. In 1903–4, profits, $1,204,601; deductions, $913,329; balance, surplus, $291,272. Total surplus, June 30, 1904, $838,155.

APPENDIX F.

TABLES SHOWING AVERAGE ANNUAL PRICES OF STAPLE PRODUCTS IN ST. LOUIS, MILWAUKEE, AND CINCINNATI FOR ABOUT TWENTY YEARS.

Quotations of No. 2 corn, No. 2 oats, and native steers at St. Louis for twenty years.

[Furnished by George H. Morgan, secretary of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange.]

Year.	No. 2 corn, per bushel.	No. 2 oats, per bushel.	Native steers, per 100 pounds.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	
1905	41½ to 58½	25½ to 34½	$5.25 to $7.10
1904	42½ to 57	30½ to 44	4.90 to 6.65
1903	38½ to 55	32½ to 54	5.00 to 6.00
1902	40½ to 69½	26½ to 59	5.15 to 8.75
1901	37½ to 70	26 to 50	4.75 to 8.25
1900	30½ to 42¾	21 to 30	4.00 to 6.50
1899	29½ to 36½	20 to 26½	4.00 to 6.10
1898	25½ to 36¾	22 to 33½	3.90 to 5.65
1897	19½ to 29½	16¾ to 23½	3.25 to 5.25
1896	18 to 27¾	15 to 21	3.00 to 5.10
1895	23½ to 53	16¾ to 31	2.90 to 6.25

Quotations of No. 2 corn, No. 2 oats, and native steers at St. Louis for twenty years—Continued.

Year.	No. 2 carn, per bushel.	No. 2 oats, per bushel.	Native steers, per 100 pounds.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	
1894	31½ to 56	27½ to 45	$3.00 to $5.80
1893	31¾ to 41½	23 to 33	3.75 to 6.00
1892	34½ to 50½	28 to 34¾	3.70 to 6.10
1891	47 to 73	27 to 56	3.50 to 6.30
1890	24¾ to 54	19¾ to 45	3.00 to 6.50
1889	25½ to 33¾	17½ to 25¾	2.00 to 4.85
1888	30½ to 56	21 to 37½	2.10 to 6.10
1887	33½ to 49¾	25½ to 32½	2.75 to 5.00
1886	30½ to 40¾	25 to 31	2.85 to 5.65

Yearly range of leading grades of cash prices of corn and oats in the Milwaukee market for the past twenty years.

Year.	Corn, No. 3.	Oats, No. 3 white.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	40 to 59½	26 to 43½
1904	40 to 58½	28½ to 45
1903	39 to 55	31½ to 42
1902	43 to 67	29 to 61
1901	34½ to 65½	25 to 43¾
1900	30½ to 45½	22¾ to 28½
1899	29½ to 36	21¾ to 31
1898	24 to 38	20¾ to 33¾
1897	18½ to 31½	16 to 25½
1896	20 to 30	14 to 21½
1895	24½ to 55	17½ to 33
1894	32½ to 60½	27 to 52
1893	33½ to 44½	24 to 36½
1892	34¾ to 53½	27½ to 37
1891	36 to 75	27½ to 60
1890	26 to 55	[a] 21½ to 48½
1889	28 to 37½	[a] 20 to 30
1888	30 to 58½	27 to 39
1887	.....	27½ to 34
1886	34 to 46	[a] 25½ to 37
1885	33 to 53	[a] 24¾ to 39

[a] No. 2 white.

Average annual prices of staple products at Cincinnati, Ohio.

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1904.]

Year	Cattle, gross, per 100 pounds.	Sheep, gross, per 100 pounds.	Hogs, gross, per 100 pounds.	Pork, barrels, each.	Ohio River salt, per barrel.	Leaf tobacco, per 100 pounds.	Cotton, middling, per 100 pounds.	Tallow, per 100 pounds.	Hides, per 100 pounds.	Leather, per 100 pounds.	Wool, per 100 pounds.
1884–85	$3.53	$3.99	$4.44	$0.82	$1.00	$9.50	$10.42	$6.18	$9.22	$29.87	$28.52
1885–86	3.24	4.13	3.82	.83	.97	8.00	9.17	4.82	9.70	29.46	30.07
1886–87	2.98	4.10	4.28	.81	.87	10.80	9.72	4.22	9.17	30.78	31.10
1887–88	3.04	4.58	5.18	.78	.94	15.00	9.83	4.56	7.98	29.25	27.37
1888–89	2.84	4.46	5.15	.85	.93	10.25	10.24	5.12	7.00	29.49	29.55
1889–90	2.90	4.81	3.74	.83	.90	9.25	11.04	4.52	6.77	27.82	30.15
1890–91	3.28	4.83	3.64	.79	.93	9.00	9.25	4.90	5.75	27.70	29.67
1891–92	3.17	4.79	3.90	.70	.92	9.75	7.60	4.67	4.66	26.87	25.87
1892	3.22	4.86	5.05	.71	.92	10.09	7.73	4.65	4.44	26.31	26.50
1893	3.61	4.20	6.90	.76	.89	11.85	8.38	5.56	4.00	23.84	25.70
1894	3.85	3.10	5.10	.79	.84	10.05	6.93	5.15	3.66	22.44	19.60
1895	3.85	3.30	4.35	.78	.84	9.40	7.04	4.67	6.02	26.60	18.53
1896	3.40	3.15	3.50	.81	.75	6.95	7.57	3.75	5.52	23.96	17.81
1897	3.54	3.78	3.30	.80	.75	8.05	6.96	3.59	7.73	25.92	24.45
1898	3.70	3.87	3.85	.80	.77	9.10	5.69	3.90	8.71	25.96	24.95
1899	3.85	3.77	4.65	.71	.82	7.95	6.30	4.71	8.57	27.27	21.85
1900	4.00	3.72	5.10	.70	1.04	8.52	9.38	5.13	7.99	29.11	25.64
1901	3.78	3.34	5.95	.78	1.03	7.90	8.38	5.56	7.63	30.14	23.35
1902	4.10	3.80	6.80	.92	.80	8.10	8.65	6.75	7.70	30.50	23.50
1903	3.50	3.80	6.05	.99	.83	8.35	10.95	5.05	7.00	28.10	25.50
1904	3.40	3.70	5.25	1.03	.90	10.05	11.60	4.80	8.25	30.10	30.00

Year	Butter, dairy, per pound.	Butter, creamery, per pound.	Butterine, per pound.	Cheese, factory, per pound.	Eggs, selected, per dozen.	Potatoes, standard, per bushel.	Apples, green, per barrel.	Apples, dried, per 100 pounds.	Peaches, dried, per 100 pounds.	Sugar, hards, per 100 pounds.	Molasses, New Orleans, per gallon.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*					*Cents.*
1884–85	16.45	25.34	14.56	9.24	16.59	50	$2.15	$3.31	$7.29	$7.00	48.70
1885–86	14.12	20.07	11.93	9.41	13.58	48	1.35	2.40	3.20	7.16	43.03
1886–87	18.82	24.52	14.50	11.19	14.60	53	2.59	3.99	5.58	6.51	42.31
1887–88	17.49	23.99	15.19	10.39	15.84	88	2.20	6.03	6.97	7.40	41.50
1888–89	14.66	22.01	16.29	9.69	13.50	40	1.54	3.01	2.82	8.49	41.21
1889–90	13.50	20.81	15.50	9.00	13.54	52	2.82	3.73	3.11	7.39	40.39
1890–91	14.98	22.89	16.23	9.60	16.30	97	3.49	9.07	8.16	6.12	34.60
1891–92	16.53	23.92	17.25	10.17	15.77	45	2.14	3.40	2.74	4.89	34.31
1892	17.03	24.27	18.09	10.00	15.66	55	2.50	3.35	3.10	5.04	31.73
1893	19.00	25.00	16.90	10.18	16.30	74	2.90	5.04	4.88	5.64	33.27
1894	12.88	18.92	14.97	9.75	12.41	66	3.30	5.55	5.65	5.06	32.11
1895	10.54	17.13	14.25	9.00	13.79	49	2.02	4.52	7.40	5.03	28.97
1896	8.60	14.50	12.50	8.85	10.75	28	1.80	2.25	6.25	4.73	31.86
1897	9.65	15.45	12.80	9.05	10.79	48	1.97	2.64	7.13	5.29	26.13
1898	11.03	16.46	13.75	8.68	12.14	57	2.76	4.31	8.05	5.74	31.82
1899	12.56	18.60	14.08	10.66	13.55	49	2.59	4.81	10.22	5.57	32.00
1900	13.99	19.90	16.02	10.98	13.43	43	2.54	3.44	8.85	6.15	38.46
1901	11.97	19.36	13.25	10.28	14.98	62	2.73	3.31	8.18	5.82	34.25
1902	15.52	21.83	16.80	11.60	18.00	62	2.90	4.20	8.36	5.22	33.46
1903	13.65	20.95	13.80	11.40	17.80	59	2.40	4.50	7.00	5.53	32.62
1904	11.40	20.70	13.00	9.40	19.60	78	2.30	4.45	7.85	5.80	32.66

Yearly range and average prices of grain, in cents, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1904.]

Year.	Wheat.		Corn.		Oats.		Rye.		Barley.
	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Range.	Average.	Average.
1893	52 - 75	64	35½-51	44	20 -36	32	48 -68	55	64
1894	48 - 60	54	32½-59½	45	29¾-54	35	41½-56	52	60
1895	53 - 90	66	24½-56	41	19 -34½	27	40 -75	53	56½
1896	55 - 97	72	18½-33	27	15½-23	20	26½-44	38	36
1897	79 -100	89	20 -33	26	16¾-25	21	33 -52	41	39
1898	64 -145	86	27½-41	34	21½-34½	27	40 -80	51	47
1899	68 - 77	72	29 -40	36	21½-31½	27	56 -68	62	52
1900	70 - 89	75	34 -47	41	21 -28	25	51½-67	59	53
1901	64 - 90	77	39 -74½	52	25 -50¾	34	45 -73	60	64
1902	68 - 92	30	44 -69	61	27 -57	41	51 -71½	58	64
1903	74½- 92	81	40 -54¼	47	31½-43½	37	54 -63	58	62
1904	92½-125	108	45½-59	51	31 -44½	38	61 -87	77	62

Average price of live hogs, winter seasons, at Cincinnati, Ohio.

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1905.]

1888–89	$5.15
1889–90	3.75
1890–91	3.65
1891–92	3.90
1892–93	6.60
1893–94	5.35
1894–95	4.35
1895–96	3.80
1896–97	3.35
1897–98	3.60
1898–99	3.55
1899–1900	4.40
1900–1901	5.05
1901–2	6.00
1902–3	6.50
1903–4	4.90
1904–5	4.80

Average annual prices of staple products at Cincinnati, Ohio.

[From the report of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 1905.]

Year.	Clover seed, per 100 pounds.	Timothy seed, per bushel.	Flax seed, per bushel.	Hay, timothy, per ton.	Bran, per ton.	Middlings, fine, per ton.	Middlings, coarse, per ton.	Coal, afloat, Pittsburg, per bushel.	Coal, afloat, Kanawha, per bushel.	Coal, delivered, Pittsburg, per ton.	Coal, delivered, Kanawha, per ton.	Coal, anthracite, per ton.
								Cents.	*Cents.*			
1884–85	$8.02	$1.41	$1.31	$12.81	$12.96	$16.18	$14.49	8.04	7.43	$3.03	$2.98	$7.05
1885–86	9.27	1.83	1.06	12.16	11.76	14.84	13.26	6.58	6.24	2.79	2.68	6.62
1886–87	7.05	1.87	.97	11.17	12.85	14.62	13.21	9.55	7.26	3.06	3.01	6.78
1887–88	6.77	2.44	1.14	14.79	15.66	17.71	16.56	10.01	9.75	3.68	3.68	7.63
1888–89	7.78	1.50	1.25	12.74	12.07	13.86	12.66	6.71	6.10	2.76	2.68	7.00
1889–90	5.64	1.30	1.26	10.56	11.16	12.76	11.49	6.78	6.37	2.69	2.69	6.46
1890–91	6.88	1.30	1.18	10.58	16.64	19.57	18.27	7.28	6.75	2.84	2.84	6.36
1891–92	8.43	1.27	.92	11.25	14.25	16.20	15.55	7.63	7.09	2.87	2.87	6.41
1892	9.70	1.47	.95	11.10	13.67	15.11	13.94	7.49	.....	2.88	2.88	6.79
1893	10.67	1.68	1.05	12.55	13.35	14.76	13.18	7.58	7.20	3.07	2.94	7.23
1894	8.80	2.10	1.16	10.95	13.15	14.10	13.40	6.34	6.69	2.53	2.55	6.35
1895	7.64	2.07	1.08	12.70	13.25	14.60	13.30	6.00	5.42	2.51	2.49	6.16
1896	6.74	1.39	.80	12.20	8.90	9.50	9.00	5.73	5.28	2.34	2.34	6.44
1897	5.82	1.20	.73	9.80	9.55	10.55	10.10	5.70	4.91	2.25	2.26	6.42
1898	5.08	1.11	.87	8.67	11.92	12.52	13.23	5.66	4.89	2.23	2.27	6.20
1899	5.48	1.05	.94	10.10	12.70	13.75	13.20	5.30	5.58	2.64	2.63	6.50
1900	7.75	1.37	1.19	13.95	14.60	15.90	15.35	7.50	7.48	2.03	3.05	6.90
1901	9.27	2.21	1.31	13.60	16.75	18.15	17.45	7.50	7.15	2.82	2.78	6.70
1902	7.92	2.20	1.30	13.35	17.35	19.50	18.60	7.92	7.86	3.25	3.25	9.00
1903	9.66	1.45	1.08	15.40	17.00	19.00	18.00	9.25	9.25	3.66	3.66	8.00
1904	9.75	1.25	1.00	13.00	18.65	21.20	19.60	8.50	8.50	3.20	3.20	7.30

EXHIBIT G.

[From the Statistical Abstract for 1904.]

In 1891 the average farm value of hogs was $4.15. January 1, 1893, under Democratic rule, was $6.41, and January, 1894, was $5.98, two Democratic years, against January 1, 1904, of $6.15, and January 1, 1905, $5.99, in these prosperous years. How much more are the farmers' hogs worth than they were before, and how much did the tariff add to their value, when the price of corn had increased wonderfully?

How much better off is the farmer selling a bushel of timothy seed that he was able to get for in 1893 an average price of $3.85 and in 1894 $4.80, in 1895 $4.84, in 1896 $3.04, against $2.88 last year, under these prosperous times?

How much better off are the farmers who owned, according to the agricultural report, January 1, 1893, 35,954,196 head of cattle other than milch cows, at a value of $547,882,204, an average of $15.25, than the farmers who owned January 1, 1905, 43,669,443 head of cattle other than milch cows, valued at $661,571,308, an average of $15.15?

How much better off are the farmers who in 1893 had 16,424,087 milch cows, at a value of $357,299,785, or an average of $22 per head, against 16,292,360 in 1900, at a value of $514,812,106, which averaged about $31.50, and against the farmers that had in 1905 17,572,464 head, at a value of $482,272,203, or an average of $27.50?

The price of sheep, of which there was 47,273,553 in 1893, valued at $125,909,000, an average of $2.70, against 41,883,065 in 1900, valued at $122,665,913, an average of about $2.90, and in 1905, the most prosperous year, 45,174,423, valued at $127,331,850, an average of about $2.80.

In 1893 we had 16,206,202 horses, worth $992,225,185, an average of $62 per head, and in 1900, a prosperous year, had 13,537,524, valued at $603,969,442, an average of $45, and in 1905 we had 17,057,702, at an average of about $70. Was it Republican prosperity that made the price $45 in 1900 and $62 in 1893, and $70 in 1905, or was it due to the wars all over the world that created an extra demand for them, that they sold for an average price of $80.72 in 1906, or was it because the horses are better, as most of them are sold for working on the farms, no doubt?

Monthly range of prices at Chicago for 1,200 to 1,800 pound native beef cattle during 1904, with yearly prices.

[From Yearbook of Live Stock Figures, published by Chicago Daily Drovers' Journal, February, 1905.]

	Steers, 1,200 to 1,350 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,350 to 1,500 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,500 to 1,800 pounds, average.
Month.			
January	$3.65 to $5.85	$4.10 to $5.75	$4.55 to $5.90
February	3.50 to 5.90	3.80 to 6.00	4.35 to 6.00
March	3.65 to 5.80	4.10 to 6.00	4.50 to 5.80

Monthly range of prices at Chicago for 1,200 to 1,800 pound native beef cattle during 1904, with yearly prices—Continued.

	Steers, 1,200 to 1,350 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,350 to 1,500 pounds, average.	Steers, 1,500 to 1,800 pounds, average.
Month.			
April	$3.80 to $5.60	$4.25 to $5.70	$4.45 to $5.80
May	3.90 to 5.90	4.25 to 5.90	4.60 to 5.90
June	4.50 to 6.65	5.20 to 6.65	5.60 to 6.70
July	4.40 to 6.65	5.00 to 6.55	5.40 to 6.50
August	3.80 to 6.40	4.25 to 6.40	4.75 to 6.40
September	3.65 to 6.35	4.25 to 6.55	4.90 to 6.50
October	3.50 to 7.00	4.10 to 6.90	5.10 to 7.00
November	3.50 to 7.10	4.00 to 7.25	4.70 to 7.30
December	[a]3.35 to 12.25	[a]4.00 to 9.00	[a]4.40 to 10.50
Year.			
1904	3.35 to 12.25	3.80 to 9.00	4.35 to 10.50
1903	3.35 to 6.80	3.75 to 7.50	4.10 to 7.55
1902	3.60 to 9.00	4.00 to 9.00	4.25 to 14.50
1901	3.60 to 8.75	4.30 to 12.00	4.80 to 9.30
1900	3.90 to 8.50	4.30 to 11.00	4.70 to 15.50
1899	4.00 to 7.30	4.30 to 8.25	4.60 to 8.25
1898	3.80 to 5.90	3.90 to 6.15	4.10 to 6.25
1897	3.35 to 5.60	3.65 to 6.00	4.00 to 6.00
1896	2.90 to 5.85	3.20 to 6.50	3.40 to 6.25
1895	2.90 to 6.25	3.20 to 6.40	3.60 to 6.60
1894	2.90 to 6.40	3.10 to 6.40	3.50 to 6.00
1893	2.90 to 5.80	3.10 to 6.05	4.00 to 6.75
1892	2.85 to 5.85	3.25 to 6.35	3.75 to 7.00
1891	2.70 to 6.20	3.00 to 6.50	4.00 to 7.15
1890	2.75 to 5.10	3.25 to 5.00	3.75 to 6.40
1889	2.60 to 4.70	2.85 to 5.40	3.40 to 6.10
1888	2.75 to 6.40	3.30 to 6.75	4.00 to 7.00
1887	2.60 to 6.25	3.20 to 6.25	3.60 to 6.50
1886	3.00 to 5.80	3.50 to 6.10	4.25 to 6.50
1885	3.50 to 6.10	3.90 to 6.00	4.75 to 6.80
1884	4.10 to 7.00	4.50 to 7.25	5.35 to 8.00
1883	4.10 to 7.00	4.80 to 7.12½	5.35 to 7.25
1882	4.25 to 9.00	4.70 to 9.00	5.40 to 9.30
1881	3.80 to 7.00	4.10 to 7.20	5.30 to 8.00
1880	4.50 to 5.50	4.30 to 6.00	5.00 to 7.00
1879	3.20 to 5.00	3.90 to 6.50	4.00 to 6.00
1878	3.00 to 4.70	3.50 to 5.00	4.00 to 5.50

[a] International show cattle. Highest on open market, $7.65.

Monthly average prices for 1,200 to 1,500 pound native beef cattle at Chicago for seven years.

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January	$4.90	$4.90	$6.20	$5.10	$5.40	$5.35	$4.70
February	4.75	4.75	6.05	5.10	4.95	5.20	4.80
March	4.85	4.80	6.20	5.15	5.00	5.10	4.70
April	4.80	5.00	6.80	5.35	5.10	5.05	4.60
May	5.00	4.85	7.00	5.40	5.20	5.20	4.55
June	5.95	5.00	7.45	5.70	5.30	5.25	4.60
July	5.60	5.00	7.90	5.35	5.35	5.50	4.95
August	5.20	5.10	7.85	5.30	5.55	5.80	5.10
September	5.35	5.15	7.45	5.75	5.50	5.90	5.10
October	5.60	4.90	7.10	5.70	5.40	5.85	5.10
November	5.05	4.70	5.80	5.70	5.35	5.80	5.00
December	4.75	4.80	5.30	5.90	5.20	5.95	5.05
Yearly average	5.10	4.90	6.75	5.45	5.30	5.50	4.85

Monthly range of prices at Chicago for 900 to 1,200 pound native beef cattle and distillery-fed steers during 1904, with yearly comparisons for ten years.

	Steers, 1,050 to 1,200 pounds average.	Steers, 900 to 1,050 pounds average.	Distillery-fed steers.
Month.			
January	$3.15 to $5.75	$3.00 to $5.75	.....
February	3.20 to 5.50	3.00 to 5.35	.....
March	3.25 to 5.60	3.00 to 5.40	$3.65 to $4.50
April	3.35 to 5.65	3.10 to 5.15	.....
May	3.60 to 5.70	3.35 to 5.50	4.25 to 5.65
June	4.00 to 6.40	3.80 to 6.25	4.75 to 6.30
July	3.95 to 6.40	3.80 to 6.10	5.00 to 6.25
August	3.35 to 6.30	3.00 to 6.25	5.15 to 5.90
September	3.00 to 6.15	2.85 to 6.05	4.65 to 5.85
October	2.75 to 6.60	2.40 to 6.35	4.50 to 5.30
November	2.60 to 7.75	2.40 to 6.25	4.75 to 5.10
December	[a] 2.80 to 8.00	[a] 2.50 to 8.00	4.80 to 4.90
Year.			
1904	2.60 to 8.00	2.40 to 8.00	3.65 to 6.30
1903	3.00 to 8.35	2.90 to 6.05	3.50 to 5.70
1902	3.15 to 8.60	2.90 to 8.15	3.80 to 8.20
1901	3.30 to 9.50	3.30 to 8.70	3.90 to 6.25
1900	3.50 to 7.30	3.25 to 6.50	3.50 to 5.65
1899	3.85 to 6.75	3.75 to 6.50	3.80 to 6.25
1898	3.70 to 5.85	3.60 to 5.60	3.75 to 5.50
1897	3.35 to 5.60	3.25 to 5.25	3.70 to 4.90
1896	2.90 to 5.75	2.90 to 4.90	3.50 to 4.40
1895	2.75 to 6.20	2.70 to 5.85	4.25 to 5.75
1894	2.70 to 6.00	2.70 to 5.50	3.45 to 4.75

[a] International show cattle.

Monthly average prices of native beef cattle at Chicago during 1904, with the yearly average for ten years.

	1,500 to 1,900 pounds.	1,350 to 1,500 pounds.	1,200 to 1,350 pounds.	1,050 to 1,200 pounds.	900 to 1,050 pounds.	900 to 1,900 pounds.
Month.						
January	$5.30	$5.10	$4.65	$4.40	$4.15	$4.65
February	5.25	4.95	4.50	4.10	3.85	4.50
March	5.30	5.05	4.60	4.25	3.90	4.60
April	5.15	4.95	4.60	4.30	4.05	4.65
May	5.35	5.15	4.85	4.65	4.30	4.85
June	6.25	6.10	5.80	5.35	4.95	5.60
July	6.10	5.85	5.40	5.05	4.60	5.40
August	5.85	5.35	5.05	4.55	4.15	5.10
September	5.95	5.50	5.20	4.50	4.25	5.10
October	6.25	5.90	5.30	4.50	4.05	5.20
November	6.10	5.40	4.70	4.10	3.75	4.95
December	5.60	5.00	4.50	3.70	3.40	4.40
Year.						
1904	5.70	5.45	4.95	4.45	4.10	4.95
1903	5.20	5.05	4.80	4.45	4.15	4.80
1902	7.25	6.80	6.25	5.65	5.05	6.20
1901	5.95	5.65	5.25	4.85	4.50	5.25
1900	5.55	5.40	5.15	4.90	4.70	5.15
1899	5.75	5.55	5.25	4.95	4.70	5.30
1898	5.05	4.85	4.65	4.45	4.30	4.65
1897	4.95	4.70	4.45	4.25	4.10	4.50
1896	4.40	4.30	4.05	3.90	3.70	4.05
1895	5.20	4.85	4.40	4.10	3.95	4.50
1894	4.75	4.55	4.20	3.95	3.75	4.25
1893	5.35	4.75	4.40	4.10	3.85	4.45

Monthly receipts of Texas cattle at Chicago for 1904, wih comparisons.

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
January	500	413	8,600	14,175	19,150
February	1,673	6,684	8,919	9,208	14,200
March	1,902	2,809	4,031	8,517	18,400
April	492	2,702	3,473	5,423	7,100
May	1,870	4,478	7,640	2,316	6,000
June	25,135	22,299	26,076	12,510	11,300
July	16,705	35,398	37,695	26,075	20,859
August	14,375	22,130	23,714	17,600	32,127
September	9,983	29,411	25,900	25,105	23,324
October	3,210	17,428	22,575	26,510	25,410
November	900	4,622	13,246	6,780	9,178
December	200	2,000	8,400	7,000	7,500
Total	76,945	150,374	190,269	161,219	194,726

Monthly prices at Chicago for Texas steers, cows, heifers, and bulls for 1904, with yearly comparisons for twelve years.

	Steers.	Bulk of sales.	Cows and bulls.
Month.			
February	$3.10 to $4.65	$3.40 to $4.00	$2.60 to $3.55
March	3.20 to 5.00	4.20 to 4.90	3.00 to 3.60
April	4.25 to 4.80	4.40 to 4.75	3.20 to 4.20
May	3.65 to 5.10	4.10 to 4.75	2.75 to 3.50
June	3.00 to 5.95	4.00 to 5.50	2.25 to 4.00
July	2.90 to 5.35	4.00 to 5.00	1.75 to 4.00
August	2.75 to 4.85	3.25 to 4.25	2.00 to 3.40
September	3.00 to 3.50	3.40 to 3.50	.....
October	3.75 to 3.45	3.10 to 3.45	.....
December	4.30 to 4.65	4.30 to 4.65	.....
Year.			
1904	2.75 to 5.95	3.25 to 5.50	1.75 to 4.20
1903	2.40 to 5.10	3.25 to 4.60	1.50 to 4.15
1902	2.55 to 7.65	3.25 to 6.50	1.85 to 6.35
1901	2.85 to 5.60	3.25 to 5.30	1.50 to 4.85
1900	3.10 to 5.90	3.40 to 5.00	2.35 to 4.45
1899	3.00 to 3.75	3.50 to 5.00	2.10 to 4.65
1898	3.15 to 5.40	3.40 to 4.75	2.00 to 4.54
1897	2.75 to 4.80	3.00 to 4.50	1.75 to 4.25
1896	2.10 to 5.50	2.75 to 4.25	1.25 to 3.65
1895	1.90 to 5.75	2.75 to 4.20	1.40 to 5.15
1894	1.50 to 4.50	2.60 to 4.00	1.00 to 3.80
1893	1.60 to 6.00	3.00 to 4.25	1.25 to 4.30

Monthly average prices for straight Texas steers at Chicago for seven years.

[From the same source.]

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January	.....	$4.30	$4.85	$4.35	$4.50	$4.45	$4.20
February	$3.65	3.95	5.10	4.15	4.30	4.20	4.15
March	4.50	4.10	5.40	4.45	4.30	4.50	4.25
April	4.55	4.55	5.70	4.75	4.65	4.50	4.20
May	4.50	4.10	5.65	4.65	4.65	4.70	4.15
June	4.80	3.95	5.65	4.65	4.40	4.70	4.20
July	4.50	4.10	5.00	4.10	4.25	4.60	4.45
August	3.75	4.00	4.30	4.15	3.95	4.20	4.00
September	3.45	3.65	3.85	3.80	3.85	4.00	3.60
October	3.20	3.30	3.75	3.45	3.65	3.75	3.65
November	.....	3.25	3.50	3.55	3.95	3.85	3.75
December	4.40	3.85	4.50	4.55	3.90	4.30	3.80
Average	4.10	3.95	4.80	4.20	4.20	4.35	4.05

Monthly top prices for straight Texas cattle (steers) at Chicago for seven years.

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
January	.....	$4.75	$6.25	$4.85	$5.90	$5.25	$4.65
February	$3.65	4.35	6.00	5.05	5.15	5.05	4.65
March	5.00	4.65	6.65	4.95	5.40	6.00	5.40
April	4.80	5.10	6.50	5.40	5.40	5.35	4.55
May	5.10	4.80	6.85	4.90	5.05	5.00	4.65
June	5.95	4.75	7.65	5.60	5.35	5.15	4.75
July	5.25	5.10	6.60	5.20	5.40	5.65	5.00
August	4.85	5.00	5.62	5.25	4.90	5.35	4.50
September	3.50	4.70	4.25	4.70	4.85	5.15	4.00
October	3.45	4.25	5.45	4.10	4.50	4.65	4.25
November	.....	3.65	4.00	4.75	5.00	6.75	4.30
December	4.65	4.00	5.00	5.20	5.90	5.50	5.00
Top	5.95	5.10	7.65	5.60	5.90	6.75	5.40

A load of show Texas fed in Ohio sold in December, 1901, at $12, the highest Texas-bred cattle on record.

Monthly average prices for straight Texas, native-fed Texas steers, and native corn-fed western steers for 1904, with yearly averages.

	Straight Texas steers.	Texas bulls, cows, and heifers.	Native corn-fed Texas steers.	Native corn-fed westerns.
Month.				
January	.....	.....	$4.40	$4.90
February	$3.65	$2.95	4.30	4.75
March	4.50	3.30	4.65	4.90
April	4.55	3.65	4.70	4.90
May	4.50	3.25	4.90	5.10
June	4.80	2.70	5.45	6.05
July	4.50	2.95	5.30	5.85
August	3.75	2.80	4.95	5.35
September	3.45	.....	4.80	5.35
October	3.20	.....	4.50	5.50
November	.....	.....	4.45	5.10
December	4.40	.....	4.50	4.85
Year.				
1904	4.10	3.10	4.75	5.20
1903	3.95	2.95	4.70	4.95
1902	4.80	3.35	6.20	6.60
1901	4.20	3.10	5.05	5.55
1900	4.20	3.30	4.75	5.30
1899	4.35	3.25	4.90	5.35

Top prices for grass western range cattle at Chicago for seven years.

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
July	$5.00	$4.60	$6.90	.....	$5.00	.....	.....
August	4.75	4.75	7.15	$5.05	5.35	$5.40	$4.90
September	5.10	5.00	7.25	5.55	5.35	5.40	4.75
October	5.65	5.05	7.40	5.75	5.05	5.30	5.00
November	5.40	4.50	6.50	5.45	5.00	5.70	4.55
December	5.00	3.85	5.20	5.00	.....	4.75	4.25
Top	5.65	5.05	7.40	5.75	5.35	5.70	5.00

Monthly average prices for grass western steers at Chicago for seven years.

Month.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.	1899.	1898.
July	.....	$3.90	$5.80	.....	$4.45	.....	.....
August	$3.80	3.85	5.55	$4.60	4.40	$4.65	$4.30
September	3.85	3.70	4.85	4.55	4.40	4.60	4.30
October	3.50	3.55	4.80	4.55	4.25	4.55	4.25
November	3.50	3.40	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.60	4.00
December	3.80	3.50	4.25	.....	.....	4.50	4.00
Average	3.65	3.65	4.95	4.55	4.35	4.60	4.20

During 1904 Chicago received 2,882,185 head of so-called "native" cattle, being the second largest run of natives on record. Receipts of straight Texas during 1904 were the smallest in over twenty-five years, while western range receipts were over 90,000 larger than in 1903.

Classified receipts of cattle at Chicago for the last eighteen years.

Year.	Natives.	Texas.	Westerns.	All kinds.
1904	2,882,185	77,000	300,000	3,259,185
1903	3,072,386	150,300	209,800	3,432,486
1902	2,441,990	190,269	309,300	2,941,559
1901	2,729,499	161,419	140,478	3,031,396
1900	2,387,320	194,726	147,000	2,729,046
1899	2,159,524	171,222	173,700	2,514,446
1898	2,154,943	130,408	195,546	2,480,897
1897	2,118,696	202,697	233,531	2,554,924
1896	2,005,279	323,422	271,775	2,600,476
1895	1,798,389	359,643	430,526	2,588,558
1894	2,215,465	384,469	374,429	2,974,363
1893	2,148,887	670,099	314,420	3,133,406
1892	2,583,516	717,153	271,127	3,571,796
1891	2,190,829	689,187	370,343	3,250,359
1890	2,597,733	657,053	229,494	3,484,280
1889	2,246,128	616,757	160,396	3,023,281
1888	1,796,864	547,185	267,494	2,611,543
1887	1,635,205	485,528	261,275	2,382,008
1886	1,404,550	320,830	238,520	1,963,900

Monthly and average prices for all grades of hogs and pigs at Chicago during 1904, with comparisons.

	Mixed.	Heavy.	Light.	All grades.	Pigs.
Month.					
January	$4.85	$4.95	$4.80	$4.90	$4.30
February	5.15	5.25	4.95	5.15	4.45
March	5.40	5.50	5.25	5.35	4.75
April	5.10	5.15	5.05	5.10	4.55

Monthly and average prices for all grades of hogs and pigs at Chicago during 1904, with comparisons—Continued.

	Mixed.	Heavy.	Light.	All grades.	Pigs.
Month.					
May	$4.65	$4.75	$4.60	$4.65	$4.25
June	5.05	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.65
July	5.40	5.35	5.45	5.40	5.20
August	5.30	5.25	5.45	5.30	5.30
September	5.75	5.70	5.85	5.75	5.40
October	5.45	5.35	5.40	5.40	5.00
November	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.80	4.40
December	4.50	4.55	4.45	4.50	4.10
Year.					
1904	5.15	5.15	5.10	5.15	4.70
1903	6.00	6.00	5.95	6.00	5.70
1902	6.80	6.95	6.70	6.85	5.90
1901	5.85	5.90	5.80	5.85	4.95
1900	5.05	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.50
1899	4.05	4.05	4.05	4.05	3.75
1898	3.85	3.85	3.80	3.85	3.45
1897	3.70	3.65	3.75	3.70	3.40
1896	3.50	3.40	3.60	3.50	3.40
1895	4.30	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.90
1894	5.00	5.05	5.05	5.05	4.25
1893	6.60	6.55	6.60	6.60	6.05

Monthly prices at Chicago for western sheep and export sheep and yearlings during 1904, with yearly comparisons.

	Western sheep.	Bulk of westerns.	Export sheep and yearlings.
Month.			
January	$2.25 to $4.75	$3.75 to $4.50	$3.85 to $4.75
February	2.40 to 4.75	3.95 to 4.60	4.25 to 4.75
March	2.75 to 5.45	4.40 to 5.15	4.70 to 5.45
April	3.50 to 5.80	5.00 to 5.75	5.00 to 5.75
May	2.75 to 5.80	5.00 to 5.60	5.00 to 5.80
June	2.25 to 5.50	4.25 to 5.20	5.25 to 5.50
July	2.00 to 4.65	3.50 to 4.40	3.75 to 5.25
August	2.00 to 4.25	3.35 to 4.00	3.80 to 4.50
September	2.00 to 4.35	3.00 to 4.10	4.00 to 4.50
October	2.00 to 4.75	3.15 to 4.35	3.90 to 4.75
November	2.00 to 4.85	3.60 to 4.60	4.10 to 5.00
December	3.00 to 5.60	4.20 to 5.00	4.35 to 5.60
Year.			
1904	2.00 to 5.80	3.50 to 5.20	3.75 to 5.80
1903	1.25 to 7.00	3.00 to 5.50	3.15 to 6.50
1902	1.25 to 6.30	3.00 to 6.25	3.40 to 6.25
1901	1.25 to 5.25	3.00 to 5.00	3.25 to 5.25
1900	2.50 to 6.50	3.40 to 6.30	3.75 to 6.00
1899	2.40 to 5.55	3.35 to 5.50	3.85 to 5.25
1898	2.75 to 5.25	3.50 to 5.00	.....
1897	2.15 to 5.35	3.00 to 5.50	.....
1896	1.15 to 4.30	2.40 to 3.85	.....
1895	1.35 to 5.55	2.00 to 4.75	.....
1894	1.10 to 5.40	1.75 to 4.50	.....
1893	1.25 to 6.40	2.50 to 5.25	.....

APPENDIX H.

Range of prices of No. 1 buffs and calfskins since 1892 in Milwaukee.

Year.	No. 1 buffs.				No. 1 calfskins.			
	High.		Low.		High.		Low.	
	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.	Price.	Month.
	Cents.		*Cents.*		*Cents.*		*Cents.*	
1892	5¼	Jan	4½	Sept	9½	Dec	7½	June.
1893	5	Mar	3¾	Nov	10½	Mar	6½	Aug.
1894	6	Dec	3½	June	9¾	Dec	7	Apr.
1895	9¾	July	5⅝	Feb	14¾	July	8	Dec.
1896	9½	Oct	5½	Aug	11½	Nov	7¾	Apr.
1897	10	Sept	7¾	May	14	Nov	9¾	May.
1898	10½	June	9	Apr	13⅛	Feb	11½	Apr.
1899	11¾	Dec	9½	Apr	13½	Dec	12	June.
1900	11	Jan	8½	Aug	13½	Jan	9⅛	Aug.
1901	9¾	Oct	7¾	Apr	12⅛	Oct	11⅛	Mar.
1902	9¾	Sept	7¾	Mar	12¾	Dec	11	July.
1903	9½	June	8	Nov	13	Dec	11½	June.
1904	10¾	Nov	8¾	Feb	14¾	Dec	13	Apr.
1905	13¾	Nov	10	Mar	16	Nov	14½	June.

This table plainly shows that calfskins, which are upon the free list, advanced and declined at different times, depending solely upon the supply and demand and not the tariff.

Green hide prices since 1854 in St. Louis.

Year.	Highest.	Lowest.	Year.	Highest.	Lowest.
	Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1854	6½	4½	1880	10	6¾
1855	6½	4½	1881	9½	8¾
1856	8	6	1882	9½	8½
1857	11	4	1883	8½	7
1858	7½	4½	1884	9½	8½
1859	8¾	6	1885	9¾	7¾
1860	7	6	1886	9½	8½
1861	6	2½	1887	8	6½
1862	7½	4½	1888	7½	6½
1863	9½	7	1889	6	4½
1864	11½	8	1890	8	4½
1865	9	5	1891	6½	4½
1866	10½	6½	1892	4¾	3¾
1867	12	8	1893	4½	2¾
1868	12	10	1894	5½	3½
1869	12	9	1895	9	5
1870	10	7½	1896	8½	4½
1871	10	9	1897	9½	7½
1872	11	10	1898	9½	8
1873	11½	7	1899	10¾	8½
1874	9½	8½	1900	9	7½
1875	9¾	7	1901	8½	6¾
1876	9¾	6	1902	8½	7½
1877	9½	7½	1903	8	7¾
1878	8¾	5¾	1904	9½	7¾
1879	10¼	6¼	1905	13¼	9¼

Prices of hides at Chicago, with comparisons of previous years.

CHICAGO PACKER HIDES, 1905.

Date.	Heavy native steers.	Butt branded steers.	Heavy Texas steers.	Light Texas steers.	Colorado steers.	Heavy native cows.	Light native cows.	Branded cows.	Native bulls.	Branded bulls.	Average price.
Jan	$13.80	$12.50	$13.81	$12.87	$12.37	$12.03	$11.75	$11.05	$10.50	$9.25	$11.993
Feb	13.49	12.47	13.81	12.93	12.27	11.81	11.65	11.75	10.50	9.25	11.993
Mar	13.00	12.41	13.96	13.10	12.32	11.62	11.62	11.92	10.37	9.37	11.969
Apr	13.11	12.65	14.75	13.76	12.62	12.00	12.06	12.12	10.25	9.50	12.282
May	13.45	13.25	15.11	14.25	13.16	12.37	12.50	12.50	10.37	9.62	12.658
June	13.42	13.08	14.63	14.15	13.12	12.55	12.55	12.65	10.25	9.46	12.586
July	14.13	13.11	14.50	13.12	13.10	13.20	13.17	12.96	10.27	9.56	12.712
Aug	15.25	13.65	14.73	14.37	13.59	14.15	14.00	13.50	10.82	9.95	13.401
Sept	15.19	13.75	14.30	14.47	13.54	14.24	14.09	13.50	11.25	10.00	13.433
Oct	15.34	13.75	14.41	14.50	13.50	14.50	14.41	13.50	11.25	10.04	13.520
Nov	15.66	13.91	14.57	14.60	13.65	14.69	14.62	13.65	11.65	10.50	13.750
Dec	15.77	14.00	14.75	14.75	13.75	14.75	14.75	13.75	11.70	10.67	13.864
Average:											
1905	14.30	13.21	14.44	13.91	13.08	13.16	13.10	12.74	10.77	9.76	12.847
1904	11.66	10.89	12.65	11.67	10.81	10.60	10.52	10.28	9.10	8.15	10.633
1903	11.69	10.57	12.64	11.19	10.54	10.07	9.64	9.19	9.61	7.69	10.283
1902	13.38	12.33	14.41	12.42	12.10	11.12	10.12	10.01	10.50	9.10	11.549
1901	12.37	11.46	12.88	11.53	11.21	10.66	10.07	9.87	10.19	8.54	10.878
1900	11.94	11.04	11.99	11.09	10.49	10.62	10.44	10.18	9.93	8.42	10.614
1899	12.34	11.44	12.07	11.55	10.70	11.27	10.40	10.90	10.01	8.50	11.021
1898	11.50	10.08	10.74	10.43	9.24	10.84	11.02	9.72	9.56	7.32	10.045
1897	9.96	9.14	9.33	8.94	8.28	9.35	9.74	8.74	8.27	6.36	8.810
1896	8.14	7.25	7.44	6.94	6.45	7.51	7.53	6.66	6.63	5.25	6.980
1895	10.20	8.97	9.48	8.60	8.39	8.76	8.52	8.00	7.41	6.42	8.475
1894	6.38	5.73	6.39	5.41	5.31	4.95	4.67	4.53	4.38	3.81	5.156
1893	7.31	6.28	6.45	5.49	5.59	5.21	4.74	4.71	5.20	4.07	5.505
1892	8.79	7.40	7.46	6.50	6.36	5.94	5.38	5.17	5.87	4.31	6.318

Average prices of Chicago packer and country hides for 1908 with comparisons.

PACKER HIDES.

	Native steers, heavy.	Butt branded steers.	Texas steers, heavy.	Texas steers, light.	Colorado steers.	Native cows, heavy.	Native cows, light.	Branded cows.	Native bulls.	Branded bulls.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
January	11.31	9.46	11.25	9.75	9.47	9.09	8.53	7.78	9.62	7.69
February	10.75	9.88	11.40	10.20	10.00	8.08	8.40	8.45	8.97	7.45
March	9.36	8.97	10.75	9.81	9.06	8.34	7.81	8.31	8.37	6.96
April	10.68	10.31	12.08	10.93	10.37	9.18	8.93	9.08	8.93	7.58
May	11.45	11.15	13.60	12.00	11.15	9.60	9.30	9.40	8.90	7.75
June	13.50	12.56	14.93	13.87	12.68	10.82	10.82	10.82	9.18	8.18
July	15.06	13.81	15.25	13.81	13.87	12.75	12.37	11.50	10.07	9.00
August	15.75	14.17	15.45	13.95	14.00	13.70	13.25	11.95	10.75	9.70
September	15.81	14.31	15.50	14.00	14.21	13.96	13.43	12.00	11.25	9.68
October	15.65	14.15	15.25	13.75	13.90	13.60	12.90	11.75	10.95	9.70
November	15.87	14.44	15.43	14.06	14.00	13.81	13.12	12.06	11.31	10.00
December	16.00	14.43	15.81	14.43	14.37	14.12	13.43	12.81	11.75	10.50
Average:										
1908	13.43	12.30	13.89	12.55	12.26	11.42	11.02	10.40	10.00	8.69
1907	14.56	12.20	14.09	13.23	11.82	13.12	12.72	11.88	11.85	9.99
1906	15.43	13.99	14.88	14.85	13.66	14.96	14.88	14.11	12.20	10.59
1905	14.36	13.26	14.45	13.91	13.13	13.18	13.10	12.90	10.80	9.78
1904	11.77	10.93	12.67	11.71	10.84	10.62	10.47	10.27	9.12	8.13
1903	11.72	10.62	12.71	11.14	10.47	9.92	9.59	9.19	9.61	7.68
1902	13.37	12.33	12.45	12.46	12.09	11.21	10.14	10.02	10.62	9.15
1901	12.40	11.46	12.93	11.52	11.23	10.68	10.12	9.91	10.17	8.52
1900	12.00	11.08	12.09	11.16	10.54	10.68	10.59	10.24	9.93	8.46

Average prices of Chicago packer and country hides for 1908 with comparisons—Continued.

CHICAGO COUNTRY HIDES, 1905.

Date.	No. 1 heavy steers.	Branded steers, flat.	No. 1 heavy cows.	Branded cows, flat.	No. 1 buffs.	No. 1 extremes.	No. 2 buffs.	Bulls, flat.	No. 1 calfskins.	No. 1 kips.	Average price.
Jan	$11.50	$11.18	$10.37	$10.01	$10.22	$10.32	$9.31	$8.50	$14.33	$11.82	$10.756
Feb	11.17	11.50	10.37	10.14	10.15	10.35	9.20	8.50	14.43	11.36	10.717
Mar	11.35	11.03	10.36	9.71	10.35	10.50	9.44	8.50	14.55	11.39	10.718
Apr	11.37	11.25	10.50	9.92	10.52	10.60	9.64	8.53	14.70	10.89	10.792
May	11.42	11.42	10.94	10.25	11.00	10.94	9.95	8.78	14.66	10.96	11.032
June	11.60	11.58	11.35	10.56	11.31	11.44	10.34	9.06	14.17	11.22	11.263
July	12.25	11.58	12.33	10.62	12.33	12.53	11.39	9.25	14.44	12.00	11.872
Aug	13.07	12.10	12.96	11.26	12.96	13.25	12.07	9.57	14.86	13.22	12.532
Sept	13.50	12.42	13.25	11.87	13.25	13.75	12.38	9.84	15.19	14.40	12.985
Oct	13.94	12.45	13.42	11.95	13.38	13.98	12.58	10.31	15.19	14.67	13.187
Nov	14.25	12.78	13.65	12.28	13.65	14.25	12.78	10.67	15.85	14.88	13.504
Dec	14.21	13.05	13.55	12.56	13.40	13.75	12.52	11.12	15.71	14.20	13.407
Average:											
1908	10.54	.....	9.34	.....	9.19	9.70	8.19	7.84	14.43	9.91	.....
1907	11.77	.....	10.99	.....	10.83	10.06	9.83	9.86	15.81	11.41	.....
1906	13.76	.....	13.44	.....	13.41	13.44	12.45	11.07	15.76	13.73	.....
1905	12.47	11.86	11.92	10.93	11.88	12.14	10.96	9.39	14.84	12.58	11.897
1904	10.03	9.42	9.47	8.42	9.45	9.75	8.49	7.87	13.37	11.08	9.734
1903	9.71	8.82	8.66	7.85	8.59	8.87	7.63	7.75	12.05	10.16	9.009
1902	10.99	9.45	9.41	8.55	8.74	8.83	7.78	8.73	11.89	9.67	9.404
1901	10.50	8.84	9.25	8.56	8.73	8.77	7.73	8.43	11.93	9.36	9.210
1900	10.29	8.75	9.30	8.73	9.11	9.52	8.26	8.05	11.91	10.16	9.409
1899	10.79	9.69	10.13	9.56	10.08	10.43	9.58	8.71	12.84	10.95	10.276
1898	10.25	8.85	9.90	8.85	9.94	10.49	9.43	8.46	12.49	11.20	9.986
1897	9.00	7.77	8.65	7.88	8.86	9.55	8.35	7.45	12.08	10.50	9.009
1896	7.20	6.16	6.86	6.21	6.85	7.43	6.36	5.83	9.10	7.96	6.996
1895	8.79	8.07	7.97	7.26	7.86	8.07	7.36	6.51	11.23	8.93	8.205
1894	5.30	4.89	4.41	4.02	4.21	4.76	3.73	3.89	7.84	6.12	4.917
1893	6.09	4.82	4.57	3.91	4.26	4.49	3.65	4.37	8.35	6.21	5.072
1892	7.61	5.64	5.30	4.49	4.86	6.28	4.28	5.05	8.15	6.00	5.764

Antwerp prices of South American salted ox hides.

Year.	Price.	Year.	Price.
	Cents.		*Cents.*
1905	14½	1895	13¾
1904	14½	1894	10½
1903	14	1893	10
1902	13½	1892	9¾
1901	12¾	1891	10½
1900	13	1890	11¼
1899	12¾	1889	11
1898	12¾	1888	10¾
1897	11½	1887	13½
1896	11	1886	12¼

The price of hides is, after all, the best index of supply and demand. It will be observed that South American hides were dearer in 1905 and 1904 than at any time in twenty years. It should be interesting and instructive to readers of Hide and Leather to discover that conditions affecting the supply and cost of hides are substantially the same in South America as in our own country.

THE SUPPLY OF PACKER HIDES.

The actual slaughter of cattle at five leading western packing points for 1905 shows an increase of 295,090 head from 1904, but a decrease of 127,772 head from 1903. This table gives the detailed figures:

Slaughter of cattle at five points for three years.

	1905.	1904.	1903.
Chicago	2,002,273	1,939,152	2,163,031
Kansas City	1,244,775	1,012,665	1,033,384
Omaha	681,757	642,277	766,870
St. Joseph	367,916	406,467	404,937
St. Louis	765,162	766,232	821,433
Total	5,061,883	4,766,793	5,189,655

It is evident from this showing that the supply of packer hides is not keeping pace with the increased consumption of leather caused by the increased population and prosperity of the country.

APPENDIX I.

EXHIBIT A.

[Letters from harness manufacturers showing quantity and value of leather used in heavy harness.]

ST. LOUIS, *January 18, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your kind favor of 15th to hand. In response to same we give you herewith weight of the leather used on the heavy farm-team harnesses. Weight of same would be from 35 to 45 pounds, according to the grade. The value of the leather would be 45 cents per pound for cut stock, based on to-day's prices of harness leather. In order to make one dozen heavy full-leather horse collars it would take from 85 to 90 feet of collar leather, which is worth to-day 19 cents per foot.

Trust information is satisfactory. If anything further is required, we shall be pleased to furnish same, and remain,

Yours, very truly,

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 19, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your communication of the 15th, would state the amount of leather used in a heavy team harness ranges, according to the style and dimensions, from 35 to 60 pounds. Think the average for this section is about 45 pounds per set, for two horses, and costs (cut stock), not counting labor for cutting, if average good stock is used, $22.50 at the present price of leather. The labor on an average-priced team harness, by hand, about $6.50 per set. A good ordinary team horse collar has 85 feet of leather, and which is worth $17 per dozen. Labor, from $5.50 to $6.50 per dozen.

It seems to the writer, when we consider, according to the best statistics at hand, there is a world shortage on hides, and especially when the price of cattle is not at all based on the value of the hide, which is considered a by-product only and really benefits only the large packers, who control both the hide and leather market to-day, the tariff ought to come off. There is no considerable number of people benefited by high-priced hides, as the percentage of country hides taken off is very small indeed compared to a few years ago, before the time when large packers inaugurated their present system of furnishing dressed beef to all the small markets throughout the country, thereby cutting off the local killing by the small butchers. The heavy increased demands for different kinds of leathers has, during the past two years, made it very difficult for manufacturers to secure sufficient quantity of certain kinds of leather to supply their needs. Tanners outside of what is ordinarily called the "trust" claim that they are unable to secure hides at a price sufficient to run their tanneries at a full capacity.

Very truly, yours,

——— ———.

CHICAGO, *January 17, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to yours of 15th instant, the cost of leather in producing heavy farm team harness is from $10 to $20 per set; the labor from $3 to $6 per set. For heavy full-leather horse collars cost of leather is from $15 to $20 per dozen, and labor from $4 to $10 per dozen.

This information is not definite, but there is considerable difference as to both cost of materials and labor, depending upon the grade and heft of the harnesses and collars.

Very truly, yours,

——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 19, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 15th, will say that in a single set of heavy farm team harness there is about 40 pounds of leather, at about a valuation of 45 cents per pound. In a dozen full-leather horse collars there are about 100 feet of collar leather, at 21 cents per foot.

Trusting this will be satisfactory, we remain,

Yours, very truly,

——— ———.

EXHIBIT B.

[Letters from manufacturers of plow shoes and plow boots, showing quantity of leather used and its value per pair.]

MILWAUKEE, WIS., U. S. A., *January 20, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Sheboygan Falls, Wis.

DEAR SIR: We have your favor of the 15th instant, inquiring as to the amount of leather used in producing heavy grain-leather plow shoe and boot.

It takes fully 2½ feet to cut a regular height (6 inches) plow shoe, and for the lowest plow boot we make, which is 14 inches, it takes fully 4¼ feet of leather. The leather we are using now costs 19 cents a foot.

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

CHICAGO, *January 18, 1906.*

Mr. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 15th, figures such as you ask for necessarily will vary in different institutions, according to the size of the last, height of shoe, and quality. Those we give below are the ones in use in our establishment, and apply to standard height, last, and quality made for workingmen.

Six and one-half to 7 ounce western oil grain is used, for which we are asked 18½ cents per foot, with the usual discount. It requires about 2¼ feet per pair; about quarter of a foot for the gusset, or tongue, which is cut out of 7-cent leather. The strap on leather is usually got out of scrap which falls from the cutting of the sides. On shoes made plain, without any trimmings, the above constitute all the leather in the upper.

In sole leather it is hard to give any idea of the amount, for different stocks are used for outsoles, slip soles, counter, and heels, and the total weight in the shoe can only be arrived at by footing up the estimates for these different parts and dividing by the average cost of the leather. In this way we arrive at about 2¾ pounds. As to cost, there is considerable variation, according to the quality of the leather used. An outsole cut from leather tanned from South American dry hides, at 24½ cents per pound, to-day's market, would cost about 24 cents per pair on our dies; inner soles, about 7½ cents; slip soles, 6½ cents; the counter, at 7½ cents; the heel and top lift, 10 cents; total of 56 cents. If domestic-slaughter sole leather is used, about 2½ cents should be added to the allowance for the outsole.

The amount of stock used in boots varies according to the height. We have made boots which take only 5¼ feet per pair, and from that up to 6. These would be cut from 7½-ounce oil grain sides, which are to-day quoted at 20 cents per foot, with the usual discount. This brings the cost of the upper from $1.05 to $1.20. To the sole-leather estimates about 12 to 15 per cent should be added on account of the heavier weight required for boots.

Trusting that this information will be satisfactory, and ready to serve you further,

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

APPENDIX K.

EXHIBIT A.

[Telegrams showing weights of western hides.]

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 17, 1906.*

CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Three thousand October hides shipped by one dealer average 50 pounds, including all selections 25 pounds and up.

——— ———.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 15, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Shipments of hides received from small packer in Montana to-day. After sorted 25 pounds and up, the hides, 1,055 green salted, averaged 56½ pounds.

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *January 16, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The hides sold in Kansas City during the month of October and September, this year, 25 pounds and up, averaged 48 to 50 pounds.

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

DAYTON, OHIO, *January 16, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE.

DEAR SIR: Our hide collections in September, 1905, averaged 52 pounds for 25 and upward. Indianapolis collections averaged about the same.

——— ———.

EXHIBIT B.

[Letters quoting freight rates of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway on green and dry hides.]

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Denver, Colo., to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$1.25
C. L., per 100 pounds	.70
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	2.05
C. L., per 100 pounds	.95

——— ———.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Butte, Mont., to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$2.10
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.15 7/10
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	3.10
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.80

——— ———.

CHICAGO, MILWAUKEE AND ST. PAUL RAILWAY,
Chicago, January 20, 1906.

Confirming my telephone message of this date, following are present rates from Salt Lake City, Utah, to Chicago, Ill.:

Hides, green:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	$2.20
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.38
Hides, dry:	
L. C. L., per 100 pounds	3.30
C. L., per 100 pounds	1.57

——— ———.

EXHIBIT C.

[Letters showing ocean freight rates on green and dry hides, loose and baled.]

NEW YORK, *January 22, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your esteemed favor of the 20th instant we beg to quote you the following freights:

Dry hides from Mexico, loose, 20 cents each and 5 per cent primage.

Dry hides from Mexico, when baled up, three-fourths cent per pound plus 5 per cent.

W. S. hides from Mexico, three-eighths cent per pound plus 5 per cent.

Dry hides from Central America, in bales, 1½ cents per pound net.

Dry hides from South American ports, 12½ cents each plus 5 per cent, and light-house dues 86 cents per ton, wharfage 12 cents per ton. These are export entry charges.

If we can get you any further information, please command us.

Yours, truly,

——— ———.

NEW YORK, *January 23, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your previous inquiry about freight rates, we give you below the following quotations which we received this morning, and which we hope will be of service to you:

From Calcutta: Buffalo hides, 60s. per 14 hundredweight; goatskins, 70s. per 14 hundredweight.

——— ———.

NOTE.—Sixty shillings equal $14.75; 70s. equal $17.20.

NEW YORK, *January 17, 1906.*

Hon. CHARLES H. WEISSE,
Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our communication regarding the freight rates, our freight agent gets us the following:

London to New York, goatskin hides, 15s. plus 10 per cent for 2,240 pounds (on deck).

New York to Milwaukee, goatskin hides, 30 cents per 100 pounds, minimum 30,000 pounds; less than carload, 35 cents per 100 pounds.

London to New York, dry hides, loose, 27.6s. plus 10 per cent; in bales, 22.6s. plus 10 per cent.

New York to Milwaukee, dry hides, loose, 50 cents per 100 pounds; in bales, 35 cents per 100 pounds; minimum, 20,000 pounds.

If we can be of any service to you here, please command us.

We are importing dry Batavia cowhides, very spready, about 8 pounds average, which we have sold very extensively in your neighborhood, and we expect some in next month, and can offer you about 1,000 of them, subject to previous sale, at 36 cents per pound.

If you are interested in them, kindly advise us.

Hongkong-New York rates are not obtainable here, but we estimate 25 per cent for green salted.

Yours, truly, ——— ———.

[According to the above letter of January 17, the rate on green salted hides from London to New York is 15s. plus 10 per cent for 2,240 pounds (on deck), which is about 33 cents per hundred, or 68 cents per hundred to Milwaukee in less than carload lots, against a rate of $2.10 for less than carload lots from Butte, on green salted hides to Chicago, and a rate of $2.20 on less than carload lots on green salted hides from Salt Lake City, making a difference in the stock about the same as the difference in the tariff, or, according to the average country hide prices since the duty has been on, making a difference in the value of hides from there about the same as the duty, and the man from Butte, Mont., doesn't receive any more for his hides if he ships them to Chicago than the man from London, England, who ships to Chicago, which is the greatest hide market in the world. How does the 15 per cent duty protect the man in Butte, and is it not the railroads that fix the price?]

APPENDIX L.

A COMPARISON OF THE WORLD'S CATTLE STATISTICS—TABULATION OF OFFICIAL RETURNS.

[By Alfred Seymour Jones in the London (England) Leather Trades Review. Reprinted in Hide and Leather, issue of January 27, 1906.]

WHY HIDES ARE DEARER.

"I am inclined to say that the increase in cattle has not kept pace with the constantly increasing demand for leather brought about by increase in population, new industries, factories, and wealth." (Alfred Seymour Jones, English leather trade authority.)

Much has been said and written to explain the cause of, or causes for, the advance in the values of hides during recent times. Among the causes advanced the following have been especially urged: That the birth rate of cattle has not kept pace with the birth rate of human beings. That when a country becomes a manufacturing area it does so at the expense of the depletion of the head of cattle. That rinderpest and drought have caused serious losses. That more people to-day buy leather than formerly. That war, during recent years, has, at least in two countries, accounted for large declines in local herds.

In order to ascertain whether these causes are good, we must take the official returns for all those countries which at present furnish them and, at the same time, compare in a relative sense the demands of the population for leather.

In all cases I give the maximum head first, then the minimum, and when necessary the latest returns. The figures are extracted from official returns during the past twenty-five years. The comments following each are my own.

THE UNITED KINGDOM.

1905	11,674,026
1882	9,832,417

The progress of increase has been steady for over twenty-five years, and the total head has never been so large as it is to-day.

It is interesting to note and to remember when comparing the figures for the United States that the British board of agriculture say: "The live imports of cattle for 1904 numbered nearly 550,000 head, or 27,000 more than for 1903. The increase came from the United States, whence 100,000 more cattle were received than in 1903, equal to 72 per cent."

We will now turn our attention to the four leading continental countries.

Russia in Europe, including Poland and Caucasia.

RUSSIA.

1900	32,913,228
1883	23,628,031
1903	32,791,700
1904 (estimated)	30,858,410

POLAND.

1888	3,013,392
1903	2,887,400
1904 (estimated)	2,349,524

CAUCASIA.

1903	3,625,600
1900	3,515,590
1904 (estimated)	2,892,841

The official Russian returns for 1904 show a decline, and from my knowledge of that country I should put the reduction down to the unsatisfactory political situation which has existed there for some years past, but with the establishment of good government the total head of cattle should be largely augmented. The country is especially suited to the rearing of cattle.

GERMANY.

1900 (latest)	18,939,692
1873	15,776,702

I have gone back thirty years in the case of Germany to ascertain if there is any justification for the plea that "when a country has become a manufacturing area it does so to the depletion of the head of cattle."

I think no one will deny that the Fatherland, since the war of 1870, which brought her unity, has become a large manufacturing country. Yet from 1873 up to date each year shows a steady and progressive increase in her cattle.

FRANCE.

1902	14,928,550
1885	13,104,970
1903	14,103,090

The increase has been continuous up to 1902.

AUSTRIA.

1900 (last)	9,506,626
1869	7,425,212

HUNGARY.

1895 (last)	6,783,365
1870	5,279,193

In the instance of Austria I had to go as far back as 1869 to find the minimum. It is regrettable that both countries afford no later dates than those given, but each country shows a remarkable and steady increase.

In referring to the above countries, the British board of agriculture says: "So far as the head of the five leading European countries are concerned, viz, Russia in Europe, Germany, United Kingdom, France, and Austria, there would appear to have been a general advance in numbers. The combined heads are greater by nearly 22 per cent than they were some thirty years ago. If the older figures may be trusted, the percentage of rise in Austria was the greatest, or something like 28 per cent, as against 20 per cent in France and Germany and 13 per cent in our own country."

UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA.

1900	67,822,336
1870	23,820,608
1905	61,241,907

"The heads of the United States have, according to the official data, shown no growth whatever since this country began," say the British board of agriculture.

It will perhaps be of interest if I give the statistics since 1870:

1870	23,820,608
1880	29,675,533
1890	57,648,792
1900	67,822,336

The above are census figures. The census of 1900 included spring calves, a procedure, it is explained, adopted in only a few instances in the enumerations of 1890, 1880, and 1870.

1902	61,424,599
1903	61,764,433
1904	61,049,315
1905	61,241,907

It appears to me that had the annual census been taken on 1900 basis there would have been no falling off, but a fairly steady total during the past five years.

CANADIAN DOMINION.

1901 (last)	5,576,451
1891	4,120,586

The data collected at the census for the following provinces do not agree with those published by the provincial governments, consequently are not comparable with above:

ONTARIO.

1904	2,776,104
1881	1,702,167

The increase has been constant annually.

MANITOBA.

1903	310,577
1902	282,343
1904	306,943

NORTHWEST TERRITORY.

1901 (last)	591,739
1891	231,827

NEW BRUNSWICK.

1901 (last)	227,196
1891	204,692

NEWFOUNDLAND.

1901 (last)	32,767
1891	23,828

NOVA SCOTIA.

1891	324,772
1901 (last)	316,174

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

1901 (last)	112,779
1881	90,722

QUEBEC.

1901 (last)	1,365,829
1891	969,312

With the exception of two Provinces, Canada as a whole has steadily, year by year, increased her store of cattle.

Australian commonwealth.

NEW SOUTH WALES.

1895	2,150,057
1902	1,741,226
1903	1,880,578

This State every three years reaches 2,000,000 head, and in subsequent two years loses ground. Drought possibly has something to do with it.

VICTORIA.

1891	1,782,881
1881	1,286,267
1901	1,602,384

Census taken every ten years.

QUEENSLAND.

1895	6,822,401
1903 (last)	2,481,717

This State has reduced her head of cattle steadily since 1895, and appears to be going out as a live-stock producer.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA, EXCLUDING NORTHERN TERRITORY.

1891	359,938
1903	213,343
1904	244,610

This State has been declining in head of cattle for some years, falling below 300,000 in 1897.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

1903 (last)	497,617
1887	93,544

This State shows an annual increase since 1887.

TASMANIA.

1904 (last)	185,938
1890	150,004

This State shows a steady annual increase.

NEW ZEALAND.

1904	1,736,850
1898	1,203,024

Here, too, the increase has been year by year.

It can scarcely be maintained that the vast area of Australia, 1,902,447,000 acres, and of New Zealand, 67,041,000 acres, are cattle-raising countries; yet, excepting Queensland, the total head of cattle has been fairly maintained in spite of the drought, etc.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

1896	2,303,582
1899 (last)	1,077,044

The returns of 1899 do not include Vryburg division of Bechuanaland. Since 1899 war has undoubtedly diminished the head of cattle, but it is anticipated that when enumeration is resumed the figures of 1896 will be approached.

NATAL.

1903 (last)	626,727
1898	278,558

This colony shows a continuous increase since 1898.

RHODESIA.

1905	114,592
1903	94,544

A new colony with great promise.

TRANSVAAL.

1903	200,000
1902	50,000

These are official estimates.

URUGUAY.

1900	6,827,428
1894	5,205,272
1901	6,326,601

Returns show a fairly continuous advance up to 1900.

ARGENTINA.

1888	21,961,657
1895 (last)	21,701,526

Unfortunately this important cattle-raising state provides no regular or recent statistics, but we may reasonably expect a further decline, because as agriculture increases it is the invariable rule for live stock to make way for the plow.

ALGERIA.

1891	1,233,051
1898	1,004,175
1901	1,035,104

MEXICO.

1902	5,142,457

JAPAN.

1901 (last)	1,282,341
1890	1,044,976

It is doubtful whether Japan, in spite of her 94,499,000 acres, will ever be a serious cattle-raising country. The area of the pasture land is limited, and the prevalence of bamboo grass a constant source of danger to live stock; nor is she likely, in my opinion, for many years yet, to become, outside of her army and navy requirements, a large user of leather.

SIBERIA AND STEPPES.

1903	4,946,800
1900	4,154,450
1904	4,483,585

Latter is an official estimate.

SERVIA.

1900 (last)	942,087
1890	819,251

Increase continuous.

SPAIN.

1891	2,217,659

ROUMANIA.

1900 (last)	2,588,526
1897	2,138,315

Increase erratic.

BULGARIA.

1893	1,767,974

Including 342,193 buffalo.

ITALY.

1890	5,000,000
1875	3,489,125
1882	4,783,232

1890 estimated by authorities.

SWITZERLAND.

1901 (last)	1,340,375
1876	1,035,856

Steady annual increase.

SWEDEN.

1901	2,594,359
1880	2,227,757
1903	2,586,204

Increase fairly steady.

NORWAY.

1875	1,016,617
1900 (last)	950,201

Steady decrease.

HOLLAND.

1903 (last)	1,667,100
1894	1,504,300

Increase annually.

BELGIUM.

1903 (last)	1,720,150
1866	1,242,445

Increase slow, but steady throughout.

INDIAN EMPIRE.

India plays no small part in influencing hide values. The number of bovine animals is so large that I give the totals for the past five years of enumeration returns:

1899	87,069,789
1900	87,737,930
1901	87,288,933
1902	85,295,210
1903	85,135,600

In comparing these figures we must bear in mind that in 1899 Sind was not included, and in 1902 and 1903 the largest province of Bengal was not included. Had it been enumerated I think it would have been found that India shows little or no decline in numbers.

CEYLON.

1901	1,476,747
1902	1,347,827
1904	1,421,533

CONCLUDING SUMMARY.

The foregoing official returns, though not up-to-date, will furnish us with some indication of the position of the cattle herds of the major portion of the world. It omits such important countries as China, Korea, Manchuria, Malay States, Africa (general), and many South American states. A careful study of the figures will show that the herds have been fairly maintained, if not increased, in many important instances, and that when a country becomes a manufacturing area the tendency is to increase the herds. If that is true, what are the causes for the apparent scarcity? I am inclined to say that the increase in herds has not kept pace with the constantly increasing demand for leather brought about by increase in population, new industries, factories, and wealth.

This increased demand has been met somewhat in the past by the splitting machine, which made a hide or skin go from two to four times as far as formerly, but even that limit has been passed. The introduction of electricity was heralded as the abolitionist of leather belting, yet more belting is being made to-day in leather, textile, and rubber than ever, and electric works have become large users of leather. In boots and shoes we have become extravagant. Our forefathers were not content if a boot did not last a few years; it had to be soled and heeled until the upper was done. Where are the boot-repairing shops, the cobbler, to-day? Clogs in Lancashire and Yorkshire are giving place to boots. On the Continent sabots no longer find favor. Increased facilities of locomotion—electric cars, motor cars, palatial steamers, etc.—all make for increased consumption of leather, even to alteration in style of footwear.

We have, in my opinion, to recognize that the social and mechanical revolution during the past two decades accounts for a very large share of the increased demand.

The wars in South Africa and Manchuria must have depleted the world's accumulation of leather, and while raging brought grist to the suppliers; but war always leaves evil effects on commerce which time alone can repair.

In conclusion, the foregoing statistics do not in all cases bring us up-to-date; but looking at the various countries in the light of their history and over the events of the past few years, especially where we have no returns, I think that we may reasonably sum up the situation: "The herds of the world have increased in proportion to demand in a declining ratio."

APPENDIX M.

Imports of cattle.

Year.	Free, for breeding.		Dutiable.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
1895	14,956	$99,114	134,825	$666,749
1896	734	15,091	217,092	1,494,765
1897	204	24,360	328,773	2,565,497
1898	577	76,631	291,012	2,836,592
1899	624	95,353	199,128	2,225,009
1900	1,045	202,615	179,961	2,055,079
1901	1,249	273,728	144,773	1,657,705
1902	1,928	375,096	94,099	1,233,626
1903	1,481	225,875	64,694	935,673
1904	684	79,986	15,372	230,751

Exports of cattle.

[From Agricultural Year Book, 1904.]

Year.	Number.	Value.	Average price.
1892	394,607	$35,099,095.00	$88.95
1893	237,094	26,032,428.00	90.68
1894	359,278	33,461,922.00	93.14
1895	331,722	30,603,796.00	92.26
1896	372,461	34,560,672.00	92.79
1897	392,190	36,357,451.00	92.70
1898	439,255	37,827,500.00	86.12
1899	389,490	30,516,833.00	78.35
1900	397,286	30,635,153.00	77.11
1901	459,218	37,566,980.00	81.81
1902	392,884	29,902,212.00	76.11
1903	402,178	29,848,936.00	74.22
1904	593,409	42,256,291.00	71.21

The tariff of 27½ per cent added to the price of these cattle, no doubt, according to the man from Iowa's idea, in the home market, and the duty of 15 per cent on hides added to the price of these cattle when the hides are sold in the foreign market and must pay 15 per cent duty to get back in the United States. Won't the hide be worth less the duty and freight in the foreign market; and then don't the cattle sell for less here than they would if hides came back here free, we being the largest tanning country in the world, and use them? Or was it because we imported 328,773 head in 1897 and only 15,372 in 1904 that caused these large exports and the difference in price of $21.50 lower in 1904?

Imports of hides and skins.

Year.	Pounds.	Value.	Dutiable.
1905	240,071,391	$64,763,146	$14,949,518
1904	274,733,467	52,006,070	10,989,035
1903	319,094,698	58,031,613	16,159,902
1902	326,169,103	58,006,618	17,474,039
1901	280,809,837	48,220,013	14,647,413
1900	345,934,778	57,935,698	19,408,217
1899	267,090,750	41,988,043	13,621,945
1898	245,774,616	36,068,932	13,624,989
1897	206,100,844	27,863,026	Free.
1896	210,398,011	30,520,177	Free.
1895	226,575,745	26,122,942	Free.
1894	.....	16,784,152	Free.
1893	.....	28,347,896	Free.
1892	.....	26,850,218	.....
1891	.....	27,930,759	.....

In 1898 we tanned 126,243,595 pounds of imported hides, with the duty on. In 1904 we tanned 85,370,168, or a decrease of over 50 per cent of hides that we pay a duty on, which shows that in the tanning business this class of stock has been decreasing because we can't get the raw material free. In 1898 we tanned hides that come in free, or so-called "skins," to the extent of 54,607,534 pounds, and in 1904 103,024,752 pounds, an increase of almost 100 per cent, showing plainly that when we have the raw material free we can compete with the world in producing leather, and if we have free hides will tan sufficient leather to supply the needs of the whole world, employing American capital and American labor.

Export of hides.

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1904	32,727,643	$3,246,887
1903	12,859,949	1,224,409
1902	9,372,947	906,504
1901	11,161,749	1,064,952
1900	7,486,256	804,674
1899	10,140,840	929,117
1898	11,536,073	1,015,032
1897	31,119,166	2,338,530
1896	39,545,324	3,858,946
1895	36,002,859	2,310,323

Export of hides is caused by the use of different grades of hides for different purposes, as, in order to make the different grades of shoes, they must have leather made out of different kinds of hides to produce the shoe at the lowest possible price.

Imports of all kinds of leather and kid gloves and all other manufactures of leather.

Year.	Leather.	Kid gloves, etc.
1905	$12,952,519	$6,571,344
1904	4,909,231	6,190,984
1903	5,173,566	6,120,601
1902	5,021,846	6,295,939
1901	5,701,193	6,185,819
1900	6,519,172	6,073,024
1899	5,237,707	5,878,940
1898	5,625,145	5,788,980
1897	6,337,664	6,945,507
1896	6,098,005	7,362,137
1895	6,863,343	6,959,695

Imports of leather consist mostly of fine kid, manufactured kid shoes, and fancy gloves, and fine English rein and saddle leather, which is mostly used for the fine trade in the large cities, and costs a great deal more than the American goods, and could not be produced in America on account of the difference in tanning and currying. Enameled leather, which we have never been able to make successfully on account of our tanning, Germany and France having the quality of bark that is necessary to make these goods, which we can not secure except by going over there and buying it from them.

Exports of leather and manufactures of leather.

1905	$37,936,745
1904	33,980,615
1903	31,617,389
1902	29,798,323
1901	27,923,653
1900	27,293,010
1899	23,466,985
1898	21,113,640
1897	$19,161,446
1896	20,242,756
1895	15,615,407
1894	14,283,492
1893	11,912,154
1892	12,084,781
1891	13,278,847

Exports of leather increased about 90 per cent in the four years from 1893 to 1896, so-called "dull and panic years," and from 1897 to 1905, such prosperous years, only increased about 95 per cent, showing plainly that when hides were on the free list the exports of manufactures of leather increased more rapidly.

Statistics of boot and shoe manufacture in the United States.

[From the Census Report of 1900.]

	Year.	Establishments.	Capital.	Wage-earners.
United States	1900	1,600	$101,795,233	142,922
	1890	2,082	95,282,611	133,690
California	1900	30	1,257,746	994
	1890	56	1,740,175	2,280
Connecticut	1900	15	789,618	719
	1890	20	683,100	995
Illinois	1900	55	5,351,482	5,553
	1890	56	3,781,476	3,992
Kentucky	1900	7	254,382	207
	1890	11	280,166	296
Louisiana	1900	12	289,345	397
	1890	17	293,244	786
Maine	1900	48	5,148,278	6,432
	1890	53	4,804,946	6,382
Maryland	1900	19	499,609	896
	1890	28	863,965	1,182
Massachusetts	1900	640	37,577,630	58,645
	1890	1,057	44,567,702	67,374
Michigan	1900	13	1,135,961	1,117
	1890	12	972,534	1,309
New Hampshire	1900	67	8,123,481	12,007
	1890	64	3,956,774	7,912
New Jersey	1900	84	3,153,255	4,421
	1890	109	2,811,098	5,162
New York	1900	223	11,983,239	15,796
	1890	257	11,960,891	15,361
Ohio	1900	81	7,549,142	12,718
	1890	63	3,176,318	5,743
Pennsylvania	1900	146	6,860,480	9,144
	1890	158	5,394,799	7,616
Wisconsin	1900	40	2,473,626	2,507
	1890	32	2,621,606	2,036

Exports of boots and shoes.

Year.	Pairs.	Value.
1905	5,315,699	$8,057,697
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940
1903	4,197,566	6,665,017
1902	3,966,766	6,182,098
1901	3,494,041	5,526,290
1900	3,016,720	4,726,656
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385
1898	1,307,031	1,816,538
1897	1,224,484	1,708,224
1896	1,036,235	1,436,686
1895	822,412	1,010,228
1894	647,318	777,354
1893	493,027	590,754
1892	745,112	914,974
1891	551,735	651,343

Boots and shoes, from 1893 to 1896, increased about 100 per cent, and from 1901 to 1904 increased only about 30 per cent, showing that the percentage of gain was much larger when we had free hides than when we had the duty on.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINE DOLLARS A YEAR IS WHAT ILLINOIS MINERS GET—BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS REPORT SHOWS THIS WAS AVERAGE PAY FOR 1905—199 WERE KILLED AND 535 INJURED AT WORK—WHILE THE OPERATORS CRY "OVERPRODUCTION," THEY ARE OPENING NEW MINES.

[By W. C. Roberts.]

SPRINGFIELD, *April 8, 1906.*

The bureau of labor statistics demonstrates in glaring figures why the Illinois miners are seeking an advance in wages. The 53,366 employees who work underground in the mines earned an average of only $379 last year. They received an average of only one hundred and seventy-five days' work. They earned an aggregate of $20,214,344.

The value at the mouths of the pits of the coal they mined was $38,689,514. What the operator received for his coal in the different markets to which it was shipped is not given. The figures are taken from reports made by the operators and the amount for which the coal was sold omitted by them.

Another feature of the report that establishes the danger of the miners' employment is that 199 were killed, or 1 to every 186,851 tons of coal mined, and 535 were injured. Children left fatherless number 231. This was before the shot-firers law was enacted. Since the law went

into effect there have been fewer violent deaths. The operators do not like the law, because the miners in their new agreement demand that the operators pay the shot firers. The miners claim that it is the duty of the operators to make employment in mines as safe as possible, and therefore they should pay the shot firers, who, the legislature believed, were necessary for that purpose.

WHAT THE REPORT SHOWS.

Advance sheets of the coal report of 1905 have been furnished by Secretary David Ross. The following table gives many interesting facts regarding the miners:

Table showing mining statistics for 1905 and 1904.

	1905.	1904.
Number of counties producing coal	56	54
Number of mines and openings of all kinds	990	932
New mines or old mines reopened during the year	168	106
Mines closed or abandoned since last report	110	109
Total output of all mines in tons of 2,000 pounds	37,183,374	37,077,891
Number of shipping or commercial mines	397	380
Total output of shipping mines.....tons	35,956,543	35,779,517
Number of mines in local trade only	593	352
Output of local mines.....tons	1,226,831	1,298,580
Total tons of mine-run coal	9,248,558	10,627,904
Total tons of lump coal	16,819,321	16,888,010
Total tons of egg coal	1,716,219	1,014,700
Total tons of nut coal	2,036,152	1,602,380
Total tons of pea coal	6,247,511	5,751,570
Total tons of slack coal	1,115,613	1,193,334
Total tons shipped	31,667,073	31,778,260
Tons supplied to locomotives at the mines	1,178,237	1,223,099
Tons sold to local trade	2,600,808	2,521,612
Tons consumed or wasted at the plant	1,737,256	1,554,926
Average days of active operation for shipping mines	198	213
Average days of active operation for all mines	175	197
Average value per ton, all grades, at the mines	$1.041	$1.10
Average value per ton of mine-run coal at mines	$1.062	$1.03
Average value per ton of lump coal at the mines	$1.291	$1.37
Average value per ton of egg coal at the mines	$1.237	$1.39
Average value per ton of nut coal at the mines	$0.865	$1.0494
Average value per ton of pea or screenings coal at the mines	$0.48	$0.5613
Average value per ton of slack coal at the mines	$0.301	$0.5336
Aggregate home value of total product	$38,689,858	$40,774,223
Number of mines in which mining machines are used	78	66
Number of mining machines in use	784	609
Number of tons undercut by machines	8,202,066	7,400,345
Number of tons mined by hand	28,981,308	26,677,554
Average number of miners employed during the year	41,202	37,987
Average number of other employees underground	10,694	9,812
Average number of boys employed underground	1,540	1,562
Average number of employees above ground	5,794	5,413
Total employees	59,230	54,774
Number of men at work underground	53,436	49,361
Number of men on surface	5,794	5,413
Average price paid per gross ton for hand mining, shipping mines	$0.5782	$0.5933
Average price paid per gross ton for machine mining	$0.4432	$0.4659
Number of kegs of powder used for blasting coal	938,500	923,418
Number of kegs of powder used for other purposes	4,158	3,717
Number of men accidentally killed	199	157
Number killed inside of mines	197	148
Number killed outside of mines	2	9
Number of wives made widows	102	87
Number of children left fatherless	231	239
Number of men injured so as to lose a month or more of time	535	507
Number of gross tons mined to each life lost	86,851	236,165
Number of employees to each life lost	298	349
Number of deaths per 1,000 employed	3.4	2.87
Number of gross tons mined to each man injured	69,502	73,132
Number of employees to each man injured	111	108

NEW MINES BEING OPENED.

Many new mines are being opened in Illinois, notwithstanding the operators say that too much coal is being mined. At the Indianapolis convention the operators declared they could not pay an advance because of overproduction. Now they are discrediting their own claims by preparing to increase the production when they sign up with the miners, after getting rid of the vast quantities of coal they stored in anticipation of a strike.

While the miners lived last year upon an average of $379, they increased this during the months of February and March. They were given all the work they could do, but they received no more per ton. They simply mined more coal. But for the next sixty days they are not likely to have any employment, and the average for this year will be as low as that of the last.

Mining is different from almost every other occupation. The miners work out in the country, far from factories and large towns. When not employed in the mines they can not get work at any other calling. They must remain idle. They are therefore slaves to their trade. The operator knows this, and he can take advantage of the miner by throwing him out of employment whenever the whim strikes him.

There are several thousand miners in Sangamon County. They are nearly all idle. A number of small mines are working. But the miners who are waiting the pleasure of the operators declare they intend to stand out for the advance in wages. They have no doubt they will get it. Even the operators admit this. But not now.

"Let us sell our coal first," they say.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, 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 had under consideration the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. JOYCE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of important legal business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

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. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5153) to provide for the erection of a public building at Punxsutawney, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5154) prohibiting the issuance and operation of federal liquor licenses in communities where state or local laws forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 5155) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5156) to provide for the improvement of the Appomattox River, in Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) to provide for the improvement of Willis River, in Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Staunton, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) to repair a portion of the roadway to the national cemetery at Staunton, Va., and to keep said portion of said road in repair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) to constitute a commission to investigate the purchase of American-grown tobacco by the governments of foreign countries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5163) to construct a highway from the station in the town of Appomattox, Va., to the battlefield of Appomattox and other points of interest near said battlefield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) providing for the erection of a public building in the town of Waynesboro, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) to create a commission to prepare a code of laws for the regulation and control of insurance companies doing business within the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 5166) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Winona, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grenada, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5168) to authorize a survey of the Yalobusha River, Mississippi, with the view to making same navigable—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 5169) to regulate the interstate-commerce shipment of intoxicating liquor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5170) to regulate corporations, joint stock companies, and other associations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce in food and fuel supplies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 5171) for the relief of officers of the navy retired for disability incident to the service, employed on active duty—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 5172) to amend an act to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg in the service, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) to provide for the erection of a public building at Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5174) to regulate corporations, joint stock companies, and other associations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5175) for the erection of a monument to Admiral Esek Hopkins—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COCKS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5176) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of motor vehicles engaged in interstate travel—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5177) for the purpose of exempting lime nitrogen, an agricultural fertilizer, from import duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Florence, Ala., to Gen. John Coffee—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) to regulate the removal of causes from the state courts to the federal courts on account of prejudice or local influence—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) to make it unlawful for certain federal officeholders to serve as delegates in a convention called to nominate a President of the United States or other elective United States officers—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5181) to create in the War and Navy departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the civil war officers' annuity honor roll, to authorize placing thereon with pay certain surviving officers who served in the Volunteer or Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the civil war and who are not now on the retired list of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 5182) to amend an act to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States, approved March 2, 1903—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5183) for the continued improvement of Caney Fork River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fayetteville, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 5185) to provide for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington, in recognition of the services of regular and volunteer enlisted men in all the wars of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 5186) to provide for the construction of a federal building at Petoskey, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) for the purpose of constructing a breakwater in Lake Huron at Rogers City, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) for dredging the inland water route in Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) to dredge a channel in the Saginaw River, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190) for the construction of a dredge for use on the western shore of Lake Huron, State of Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5191) to provide for opening a channel at Rogers City, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) to create a third federal district court in Michigan, to be known as the northern district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 5193) for the erection of a public building at Pulaski, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) authorizing the Secretary of War to have erected at Hohenwald, Tenn., a monument in honor of Meriwether Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) establishing the Franklin National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Hickman, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 5463) to amend an act approved September 30, 1890, providing for the building of a bridge across the Arkansas River at Dardanelle, Ark.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 5464) fixing the return days in the circuit court of the United States for Connecticut—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5465) for the erection of a public building at McAlester, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ardmore, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DRAPER: Memorial of the legislature of Wyoming, in opposition to any reduction in the present tariff on wool or hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 5197) granting a pension to Franklin Barbour—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to William H. Scheer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting an increase of pension to James Helme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Skaggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) granting an increase of pension to Edward Condon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5203) granting an increase of pension to William Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Jefferies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5205) granting an increase of pension to William J. Byerley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5206) granting an increase of pension to Christian Schaick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) granting a pension to Sue C. Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Jane Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) for the relief of John T. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) for the relief of Frank B. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 5211) granting an increase of pension to John A. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Hildebrant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) granting a pension to Jonathan F. Titus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5214) granting an increase of pension to Theodore D. Risser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5215) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Vanbuskirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) granting an increase of pension to James G. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5217) granting an increase of pension to William H. McGuire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) granting a pension to Martha J. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5219) to correct the military record of Otis B. Vanfleet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5220) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5221) for the relief of Luther H. Potterfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of James K. Skinker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5223) for the relief of Mason Shipman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5224) for the relief of John Mann—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of John W. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5226) for the relief of George M. Fry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) for the relief of James W. Ficklin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) for the relief of Richard K. Hughlett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) for the relief of the estate of Robert Brockett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) for the relief of the estate of William Fletcher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) for the relief of the estate of Sina Hughlett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Newlon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Bailey Shumate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) for the relief of the estate of Henry S. Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) for the relief of the estate of James P. Yancey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Shumate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Binns, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of the estate of Adelaide Withers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) for the relief of the estate of Harriet Sudduth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5240) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Dulin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5241) for the relief of Elias E. Conner, sole heir of Mary C. Conner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) for the relief of Gordon Jones, administrator of the estate of William M. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) for the relief of legal representatives of James M. Streshley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Rawlings, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 5246) granting an increase of pension to Franklin King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5248) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Hoover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to Enos D. Messimore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 5250) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Bard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 5251) for the relief of Susan D. Frame—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of Rufus L. King—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5253) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie L. Minter, formerly widow of C. L. Campbell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5254) granting a pension to James Manning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) granting a pension to Walter English—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) granting a pension to Myers Fertig—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5257) granting a pension to Emma L. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting a pension to Louis H. Pennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5259) granting a pension to Luther M. Southall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5260) granting an increase of pension to Susan Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) for the relief of J. Terry Dillard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) for the relief of J. D. Rodgers, deputy United States marshal for the western district of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) for the relief of Bolser H. Pullin, of McDowell, Highland County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) for the relief of Virgil A. Fitzgerald, of Montebello, Nelson County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) for the relief of the estate of John Gibson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) to reimburse the estate of Gen. George Washington for certain lands of his in the State of Ohio lost by conflicting grants made under the authority of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5267) granting a pension to Mary E. T. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5268) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Shirey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) for the relief of Alexander Everhart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Elisha S. Singer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5271) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sydney W. Moss—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 5272) for the relief of the Bridgeport National Bank, Bridgeport, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pitner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5274) granting a pension to William F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5275) granting a pension to Cornelia Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5276) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand H. Wurdemann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5277) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Worthley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5278) granting an increase of pension to Alexander A. Yard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) granting an increase of pension to Pierson Hendrickson, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5280) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) granting an increase of pension to Augustus J. Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5282) granting an increase of pension to William H. Salmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5283) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 5284) granting an increase of pension to John Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5285) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Keefer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5286) granting an increase of pension to William M. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5287) granting an increase of pension to Adam Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5289) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Burkholder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5290) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5291) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5292) granting an increase of pension to George H. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5293) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McMurry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5294) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Sober—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5296) granting an increase of pension to Carrier Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5297) granting an increase of pension to George W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5298) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Leasure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Gillespie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5300) granting an increase of pension to John D. Harbison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) granting an increase of pension to William L. De Haven—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Geissenhainer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) granting an increase of pension to William Jellison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) granting an increase of pension to Amos Feathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dewalt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) granting an increase of pension to Robert Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) granting an increase of pension to Charles Roques—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) granting an increase of pension to John Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5311) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5312) granting an increase of pension to John V. S. Minerd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5313) granting an increase of pension to John W. Park—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5314) granting an increase of pension to William S. Doutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5316) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Spence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) granting an increase of pension to John Schiermann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5319) granting an increase of pension to John S. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) granting an increase of pension to William Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5322) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Burkhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) granting an increase of pension to William J. Carns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5324) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hazlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) granting an increase of pension to George M. Hobaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5326) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Humes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Neighly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5328) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Peer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Beatty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) granting an increase of pension to William Eberhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) granting a pension to Samuel S. Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting a pension to Ernest W. Hilliard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) granting a pension to James Emmett Lawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5335) granting a pension to James H. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5336) granting a pension to Edith Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) for the relief of Joseph M. Cochran—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) to correct the military record of James Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5339) to correct the military record of Joseph R. Berg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5340) to correct the military record of Aaron Loughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5341) granting an honorable discharge and a pension to W. Scott King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5342) granting an honorable discharge and a pension to William Conner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) granting an honorable discharge and a pension to Daniel Foust—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) granting an honorable discharge and a pension to Jacob Gaffney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) granting an honorable discharge to Milton Vandevort—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 5346) granting an increase of pension to James Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 5347) for the relief of the estate of Q. K. Underwood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 5348) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Dershimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 5349) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Horner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) granting an increase of pension to John R. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) granting an increase of pension to James K. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5352) granting an increase of pension to Walter C. Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5353) granting an increase of pension to Louis M. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5354) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Beiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Pritchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Freudenthal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting an increase of pension to Robert McNeal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5359) granting a pension to Stephen Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5360) to correct the military record of Edward W. Gobble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Merida Mealor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) to remove the charge of desertion against W. A. Kilburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) to remove the charge of desertion against J. W. Teas—to the Committtte on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) for the relief of J. S. Woody, Martins Mills, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) for the relief of S. H. Bailey, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) for the relief of Thomas J. Lawson, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) for the relief of George Pillow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) for the relief of James P. Sprott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) for the relief of H. J. Brewer, of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) for the relief of P. H. Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) for the relief of W. T. Kinkaide, alias Kincade—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) for the relief of Holly Prater, alias Plater—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) for the relief of Capt. J. W. Hanner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) for the relief of William Montgomery—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) for the relief of W. H. Francis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of William M. Beasley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) for the relief of William G. Tidwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Mrs. Jane Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) for the relief of Henry Harris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) for the relief of N. F. Cheairs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) for the relief of Jonathan Amis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) for the relief of Marcus Stevens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) for the relief of Richard Workman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) for the relief of the estate of Mitchell J. Childress—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) for the relief of the estate of William B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) for the relief of the estate of Blythe Sprott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) for the relief of estate of E. C. Overton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of the estate of B. H. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Bolton, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) for the relief of the estate of J. A. Milhous, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5391) for the relief of the estate of Nathan Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) for the relief of the estate of Robert Thompson Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) for the relief of the estate of F. T. McLaurine—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Mills—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) for the relief of the estate of David H. Hays, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of the estate of John W. McKissock, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Martha B. Skillern, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) for the relief of the estate of John H. Birdsong, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) for the relief of the estate of Daniel Foresee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) for the relief of the estate of John W. Neely—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) for the relief of the estate of Banks C. Wells, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Brison, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) for the relief of the estate of Nancy P. Garrison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of the estate of S. J. Stockard, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) for the relief of the estate of N. E. Perkins, deceased, late of Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) for the relief of the estate of John H. Grimes, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) for the relief of the estate of Henry Kelly, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) for the relief of the estates of Bolling Gordon and Richard Gordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 5410) for the relief of the estate of Sarah Pewitt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) for the relief of the estate of Edwin Grant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5413) for the relief of the estate of N. M. Buyers—to the Committtee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Henly Patton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) for the relief of the estate of James H. Huey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased—to the Committtee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) for relief of heirs of Joseph W. Baugh, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) for the relief of heirs of Amasa Ezell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) for the relief of the heirs of James Henderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5424) for the relief of the heirs of Michael Holoran—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Hiram Gailey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Mary E. Haygood, heir of John M. Lawson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Woodson H. Webb, administrator of the estate of Harriet Day (late Litteral), deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) for the relief of the trustees of Mount Olivet Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Nolensville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) for the relief of Mumford Smith, executor of James H. Cecil, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) for the relief of John D. Reed, administrator of J. P. C. Reed, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) for the relief of Randall Buck, formerly called Randall Conn, of Williamson County, for services as blacksmith during the civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) for relief of James W. Hardin, and to remove charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) for the relief of G. M. D. Alexander, administrator of the estate of R. M. Alexander, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. B. Long, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of W. S. Reid, administrator of Mrs. F. M. Harris, deceased, late of Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) for relief of Missionary Baptist Church, of Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) to pay Thomas S. Truett the sum of $340, the value of property taken from him by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) to pay to the heirs of Nathan Curry, deceased, the sum of $1,503, for property taken and used by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) to pay to the heirs of Pleasant Hines, deceased, the sum of $1,000, the value of property taken from him by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) to pay Josephine O. Anderson the sum of $175, the value of property from her taken and used by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) to pay the heirs of James Ramsy, deceased, the sum of $250, the value of property from him taken and used by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 5443) granting a pension to Herman Beyland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5444) for the relief of Oliver P. Boyd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) for the relief of J. P. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) for the relief of John H. Claiborne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) for the relief of William H. Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of F. P. Brower—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of C. W. Reid and Sam Daube—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5450) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Dickins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5452) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Dickins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5453) for the relief of the legal representatives of M. N. Swofford, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5454) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Ezell, feme sole, and only heir at law of Eli Splawn, deceased, of Clarksville, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) for the relief of the estate of W. C. York—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of the estate of Ransom Cunningham, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to Carlos B. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 5458) granting an increase of pension to Peter Scherschel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) granting an increase of pension to Adam Stenger—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of New York: A bill (H. R. 5461) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5462) to correct the military record of Andrew Gaffney—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. ALEXANDER of New York: Petitions of Charles E. Hayes and others, and Dunston Lithographic Company and others, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring higher tariff duties on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of the Cincinnati Boot and Shoe Makers' Association, to abolish all duties on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Defiance and Henry counties, Ohio, against duty on teas and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of business men, of Altoona, Kans., against proposed increased duty on zinc ore—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Bryant—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wyoming state legislature, against repeal of duty on wool or hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cincinnati Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Piercefield Local, No. 65, of International Brotherhood of Paper Workers, against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Louis Walker and others, of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK: House joint resolution of the legislature of Wyoming, against tariff reduction on wool or hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of employees of the Angola Dyeing Company, Pilling & Madeley, E. G. Chester, Bower & Kaufmann, John Blood & Co., all of Philadelphia, Pa., for retention of the duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of voters of the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David H. Cook and others, of the Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for federal aid in construction and improvement of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. J. Heffman and other citizens of Pennsylvania, for national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petitions of E. A. Elderkin, Ed Taylor, Robert Orme, W. H. Webb, and N. G. Eadus, of Racine, Wis., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Petitions of Common Council of Tell City and Tell City (Ind.) Improvement Association, favoring inland waterways improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky: Petition of General Federation of Women's Clubs, of Louisville, Ky., expressing disapproval of attacks on Dr. H. W. Wiley, Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Z. G. Merchants and other citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of Kentucky, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Lewiston (Pa.) Lodge, No. 663, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petitions of citizens of Huntington County, and S. S. Woods and others, of Lewiston, Pa., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. D. Byron & Sons and others, of Mercersburg, Pa., for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Merick & Co., of New York, against reduction of duty on salicylic acid—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Machine Printers, Local Assembly No. 1, of North America, and Machine Printers and Color Mixers of the United States, American Federation of Labor, favoring increase of duty on wall paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Coffee and Tea Association, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of committee of wholesale grocers, favoring protection of the beet-sugar industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elisha S. Singer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

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

Also, petition of Erickson & Strong, of Morris, Ill., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturing Association, of Chicago, for admission of 300,000 tons of Philippine sugar per year free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Casein Manufacturing Company, of New York, favoring removal of lactarine and casein from the free list and placing a duty thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Schifflisticker Union, No. 12768, of American Federation of Labor, favoring increase of duty on embroideries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Lawton, Mich., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Niles, Mich., urging a duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of citizens of San Francisco and San Jose, Cal., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Jefferson County (Ohio) Wool Growers' Association, for retention of present tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petitions of residents of Monmouth County and New Brunswick, N. J., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Jeannette (Pa.) Business Men's Association, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Paul Taylor Brown Company, of New York, and the Porto Rico Canning Company, against increase of duty on preserved pineapples—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Casein Manufacturing Company, favoring a duty on casein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOYCE: Petition of C. J. Tullins and other citizens of Lowell, Ohio, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of citizens of Reynoldsville, Pa., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of William L. Sanson, of Clarion, and other voters of the Twenty-seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of G. W. Snyder, of New Mayville, and E. S. Gilmore, of Blairsville, Pa., favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. F. Irvine, favoring parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petition of citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of Illinois, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of residents of the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: Petition of various residents of Utica, N. Y., against a tariff on tea, coffee, cocoa, or spices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of residents of Sutton, Nebr., against legislation for parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REID: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. King, Udora E. Moore, and Noah Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. H. Sykes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of R. C. Robison (H. R. 5119)—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Petition of Jonesville (Ky.) American Society of Equity, favoring a national highways commission and appropriation for federal aid in construction and improvement of highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petitions of Seth B. Rubert and 37 others, of Howell, and 26 citizens and business men of the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Adirondack Lumber Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, against reduction of the duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, for legislation to deepen and widen, in the plan of river and harbor improvements, the Hudson River up to Troy—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring provisions of bill for buildings for diplomatic and consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of legislature of Wyoming, against removal of duty on wool and hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bellevue and allied hospitals, favoring removal of tariff from medical and surgical instruments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wyoming legislature, for legislation enabling settlers to prove up land when they have reclaimed a portion, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Subordinate Association No. 1, Lithographers' International Protective and Beneficial Association of the United States and Canada, favoring adjustment of equalization of rates to bring the specific duty to a uniform ad valorem equalization to conform with amendments as submitted to the Ways and Means Committee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. Behlen & Bro., against raise of duty on steel, wool, and steel shavings—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petitions of citizens of Denver and Durango, Colo., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 27, 1909.*

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the daily hour of the meeting of the House be 10 o'clock a. m. until further order of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the daily hour of the meeting of the House be 10 o'clock a. m. until further ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, because so many men ask me, can he give us any idea about how long the general debate will run?

Mr. PAYNE. Unfortunately, I can not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The reason I ask is that everybody asks me.

Mr. PAYNE. I know, and I am trying to answer the gentleman, but unfortunately I can not do so. I am told that there is a list of forty or fifty on the list of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole of gentlemen who desire to speak. I wish to accommodate as many as I can, and I would like next week, or as long as general debate lasts, to commence at 10 o'clock a. m. and run until 6 o'clock p. m., and then take a recess for a couple of hours.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are you asking for both? I have no earthly objection to it.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to make progress on this bill and pass it as soon as possible.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A man asks me how long the debate is going to run, and when I can not tell him half the time he will not believe me.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to tell the gentleman that I am embarrassed the same way. I add to the request that the daily hour of meeting be 10 o'clock a. m. and run until 6 o'clock p. m., and then that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock in the evening and run until 10.30 p. m.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE TARIFF.

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 motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1438—the tariff bill.