PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of F. J. McCarthy, administrator of the estate of Martin F. McCarthy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of New York against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Porto Rico, favoring 5 cents per pound on coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Also, petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of New York, favoring increase of duty on post cards, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John Kissell, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring reduction of duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many importers of paper, favoring decrease of duty on various paper products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring a very low duty on Guinness's stout—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pittsburg Marble Mosaic Company and D. J. Kennedy Company, against increase of duty on Keene's cement—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Charles E. Thorne, of Wooster, Ohio, favoring the placing of all fertilizing material on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of grocers of Hamilton, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Way and Means.

Also, petition of the Thresher-Varnish Company, against a duty on China nut oil—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of General Assembly of Ohio, favoring repeal of duty on all forms of lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stomps & Burkhardt Company, against a duty on rattan—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hamilton Iron and Steel Company, Hamilton, Ohio, against a duty of 50 cents on scrap iron—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Holbrock Brothers Company and the Elder & Johnston Company, against increase of duty on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Third Congressional District of Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Traverse City, Mich., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH: Petitions of sundry citizens of West Ghent, of sundry citizens of Hudson, and of sundry citizens of Kinderhook, N. Y., against a duty on tea, coffee, cocoa, or spices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Prattsville, favoring a duty on lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Casein Manufacturing Company, of New York, favoring a duty on casein and lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wolf Brothers' Shoe Company, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring placing shoes on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of importers and jobbers of tea in the city of Boston, Mass., against a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Gehring, general president of the Lithographic International Protective and Beneficial Association of the United States and Canada, favoring increase of duty on post cards and lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Endres, N. Dak., against reduction of duty on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of employees of Joseph Black & Sons Company, of York, Pa., against any change in schedule on hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of Indiana and Reynoldsville (Pa.) Lodges, Nos. 931 and 519, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, favoring a reserve for the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of A. F. Allemand, of Nebraska, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY W. PALMER: Petition of citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Tim J. Pettit, Ernest Gibbs, and others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of H. Brown and others, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Mr. W. M. Cole, Samuel Garner, and many others, of Columbus, Ohio, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petitions of Frank Plestinger, of Greenville, and T. D. and G. E. Leist, of Kempton, Ohio, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ohio, against a tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 15 ladies of Bluffton, Ohio, against increase of duty on gloves, hosiery, cotton goods, woolen goods, ribbons, tea, and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of Chalkley Styer, of Narcissa, and 30 other residents of Montgomery County; of 50 residents of Schwenksville; of John L. Kulp, of Bedminster, and 75 other residents of Bucks County, all of the State of Pennsylvania, for an amendment to the tariff bill removing casein and lactarene from the free list and imposing a duty of 2¾ cents per pound on unground casein or lactarene, and 2½ cents per pound on ground casein or lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: Petition of citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District of Michigan, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Munising, Mich., and citizens of Marinette, Wis., favoring retention of tariff on wood pulp, pulp, and paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 5, 1909.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

The Vice-President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

Mr. SAMUEL D. MCENERY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States is about to consider the revision of the law relating to the tariff on imports; and

Whereas the country is committed to the principle of a protective tariff, which shall also produce a large proportion of the necessary revenues of the Government: Be it

Resolved, That the following facts be laid before Congress for consideration by it in connection with said proposed revision of the tariff law, viz:

1. At the time the present tariff law was enacted the United States owned no coffee-producing territory, necessitating no duty on coffee as a protective measure, and the current revenue was sufficient without imposing a tariff on coffee for revenue only; consequently coffee is now on the free list.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

2. Since the enactment of the present tariff law the United States has acquired a large area of coffee-producing territory, viz, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Hawaii.

3. It is our understanding and belief that, with a protective duty on coffee of, say, 6 cents per pound, these three groups of islands could profitably produce coffee enough eventually to supply a large proportion, if not the entire consumption, of the United States.

4. We ask that, from a protective-tariff standpoint, consideration be given to protecting those industries which are peculiar to the tropcal portion of the United States, as well as to those which are the products of the mainland exclusively.

5. Aside from the purely protective feature of the suggested duty, we submit that no single item among the whole list of imports presents a better opportunity for securing so large a revenue with so small a tax on individuals as will a duty on coffee. A duty of 6 cents a pound on coffee would produce a revenue of between fifty and sixty million dollars per annum.

We submit, however, that there is every reason to believe that imposing the suggested import duty upon coffee would not result in raising the price of coffee to the consumer, or would result in but a slight increase.

Under these circumstances we submit that, as additional revenue is needed from some source, the foregoing facts show that a duty on coffee would result:

1. In a very large revenue to the United States Treasury, with only a slight, if any, increase in price of coffee.

2. In incidentally protecting a now small and unprotected industry, with the ultimate prospect of its becoming a large and prosperous one, and provide a suitable means of agricultural development by small landowners, in which the people of these islands of small means can take a large part.

Resolved further, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, at Washington, D. C.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 16, 1909.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. L. HOLSTEIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
EDWARD WOODWARD,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 19, 1909.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted in the senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

WILLIAM O. SMITH,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM SAIRDGE,
Clerk of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

(Certificate of comparison.)

I, Nathan Jaffa, secretary of the Territory of New Mexico, do hereby certify that there was filed for record in this office at 11.55 o'clock p. m., on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1909, council joint memorial No. 7, Mr. President, and also that I have compared the following copy of the same with the original thereof now on file and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the Territory of New Mexico, at the city of Santa Fe, the capital, on this 27th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

NATHAN JAFFA,
Secretary of New Mexico.

Council joint memorial 7. By Mr. President.

Memorializing Congress for an appropriation of money or land script for the purpose of relieving the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, in the Territory of New Mexico, from the burden imposed upon them respectively by former congressional statutes confirming and validating certain bonds of each of the said counties issued without lawful authority.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas the county of Santa Fe, N. Mex., is overburdened and distressed by the weight of a bonded indebtedness now approximating in amount $1,000,000, based on illegal railroad-aid bonds, converted into illegal refunding bonds, which, although such bonds could not be successfully enforced in the courts after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pima County case, below more particularly referred to, were, in avoidance of that decision, confirmed and validated by Congress in and by an act entitled "An act approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, and for other purposes," the same having become a law, without the approval of the President, January 16, 1897. (See Stat. L., vol. 29, pp. 487, 488, 489, chap. 30.)

Whereas the said indebtedness originated in the following manner and under the following circumstances, to wit:

1. The said indebtedness results, to an amount exceeding one-half thereof, from the issue by the county of Santa Fe, in February, 1880, of bonds in the principal sum of $150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad (now part of the Santa Fe Route), so far as that railroad extends in the said county, including a branch line of about 20 miles in tortuous length from Lamy Junction to the city of Santa Fe, and the remainder of the said indebtedness results from the issue by the said county, at a later date, of bonds in the principal sum of $150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad (now part of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad system) from the city of Santa Fe to Espanola, the southern termination at that time of the railroad of the late Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company.

2. The total assessed valuation of the property subject to taxation in the county of Santa Fe is about $2,200,000.

3. All the aforesaid railroad-aid bonds, with one judgment for interest on a part of the said first bond issue, were, before the rendering of the decision in the Pima County case (Oct. 29, 1894, Lewis *v.* Pima County, 155 U. S., 54), refunded under the provisions of a territorial refunding act, chapter 79 of the Sessions Laws of 1891, found in the compiled laws of New Mexico of 1897, as sections 340 to 348, both inclusive, which refunding act it is evident, does not authorize the refunding of bonds void on their face.

4. Over and above the said railroad-aid indebtedness, the said county has a legitimate interest bearing bonded indebtedness of about $200,000.

5. All of the said railroad-aid bonds were issued under the supposed authority of chapter 30 of the New Mexico Session Laws of 1872, still found in the said compiled laws as sections 3898 to 3901, both inclusive, which statute of 1872 could, under the doctrine announced in the Pima County case, no longer legally operated after the passage of the act of Congress, approved June 8, 1878 (20 Stat. L., 101), which prohibited every "municipal corporation" in a Territory from incurring "any debt or obligation other than such as shall be necessary to the administration of its internal affairs."

6. The bonds in aid of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company were, under the belief that the said territorial act of 1872 was still in force, and pursuant to its provisions, voted for on the 4th day of October, 1879, in two concurrent elections, one upon the proposition to aid, to the extent of $71,000, in the construction of the main line crossing the said county, and the other upon the proposition to aid, to the extent of $79,000, in the construction of a branch line connecting the city of Santa Fe with the main line at Lamy Junction.

The votes cast on the first proposition numbered only 259, of which 192 were in the affirmative and 67 in the negative; and the total vote cast on the second proposition numbered only 266, of which 190 were in the affirmative and 76 in the negative.

8. At that time (1879) the total number of voters qualified to vote in the county of Santa Fe at general elections, including resident owners of taxable property as well as residents not such owners, exceeded 1,000, but, by the terms of the said railroad-aid statute of 1872, very few of the general electors were qualified to vote at the special elections believed to be thereby authorized, because such elections were determined under that statute by the votes exclusively of "the electors of the various precincts of said county who own taxable property." (N. Mex. Compiled Laws of 1897, p. 3899.)

Under the exemption statutes in force at the time of the said railroad-aid elections, respectively, every resident was immune from taxation of property to the amount of $300, not to speak of other exemptions from taxation more specific in character, and the great majority of such residents at the time of each of the said special elections had severally no property subject to taxation. This fact, taken in connection with the general ignorance then prevailing in the county, of the English language and of the method of American corporate business, accounts for the apparent passivity of the great majority of its residents on the occasions of the special elections concerning the said railroad aids. Railroads were still unsolved mysteries to the great majority of the territorial population. Most of those of Mexican ancestry were characteristically simple in their habits, confiding in their nature, attentive to religious duties, and devoted to pastoral and agricultural pursuits after the ancient manner of their forefathers. The first influence of the incoming railroads was prejudicial a generation ago to the native population of New Mexico, for it diminished by eastern competition their accustomed home markets, and was subversive of old-time social conditions.

This first influence of the railroads was felt conspicuously by the county of Santa Fe. The main line of the "Santa Fe Route" did not come nearer to the city of Santa Fe than 20 miles, although from time immemorial that city had been the emporium and distributing point of New Mexico and, under the Spanish, Mexican, and American rule, the seat of an important and money-distributing military, as well as civil, government. The advent of the first railroad destroyed the "Santa Fe trail" and the commerce which over that trail had centered in Santa Fe for generations. Santa Fe's importance was temporarily impaired, her old trade distributed among other places more favored by railroad communication; and yet, as consideration for the burden of the first aid by the county bonds, voted at the two-headed election of 1879, she was, in respect of railroad transportation, accorded only the small favor of the railroad branch from Lamy Junction, and even that supposed benefit was conditioned on the county's contribution to the construction of the main line, a contribution not, it is believed, exacted of any other county, since the main line was to be built at all events.

9. In fact, it was a great detriment to the city of Santa Fe to be thus sidetracked on a branch line of railroad, and naturally her commercial residents looked forward to the advantages apparently in prospect from the incoming of the main line of the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company under its chartered right and duty to construct its main line into New Mexico as far south as Santa Fe, conformably to the acts of Congress requiring such construction to be completed as early as June 10, 1882. But, although chartered and subsidized by Congress, the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company failed to meet that statutory requirement, and even entered into a compact with its rival, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company (the indirect beneficiary of the said first railroad aid), by which, early in 1880, further construction of the Denver and Rio Grande Railway south of Espanola was inequitably pretermitted for the period of ten years from that date. In view of this new disappointment, and for the immediate purpose of bridging the gap in railroad communication between the city of Santa Fe and the Denver and Rio Grande Railway at Espanola, from which point that railway was in operation to the north through Pueblo, Denver, and other business centers, the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company was incorporated and the second county aid voted as aforesaid.

10. But, nothwithstanding these efforts for amelioration of the evil conditions flowing from the innovation of railroads in a community accustomed to the simple life of the old Spanish and Mexican days, the property and business interests of the inhabitants of the county became almost stagnant, and so continued for a whole generation. It was absolutely impossible for the county to pay the interest on the railroad-aid bonds, still less any part of the principal. Indeed, the accumulated interest is now a heavier burden than the principal, and is subject to increase by compounding under judgments and future re-

fundings, because Congress has confirmed and validated the county's void indebtedness.

11. All these railroad-aid bonds appear to have been negotiated by the respective companies concerned and to have come into the hands of purchasers for value, and, since their conversion into refunding bonds, the county is confronted by present holders of the new bonds, who bought them in reliance on the confirmatory acts of Congress.

12. In the year 1887 the board of county commissioners of the county of Santa Fe was sued upon a large number of interest coupons clipped from the bonds issued as aid to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and there followed in that and collateral legal proceeding a most energetic litigation, finally resulting in a decision of the supreme court of New Mexico, August 12, 1891, adjudging the validity of the coupons, which decision is reported in 6 New Mexico Reports (Gild.), 88.

13. Prior to this decision the legislative assembly of New Mexico passed said chapter 79 of the session laws of 1891, looking to the refunding of all outstanding valid indebtedness of counties and municipalities.

14. After that decision of the supreme court of New Mexico, not only the judgment in which the interest coupons involved were merged (with interest compounded on those coupons), but also the outstanding principal indebtedness evidenced by the railroad-aid bonds and all arrears of interest not merged in that judgment, and, furthermore, the principal and interest evidenced by the aid bonds and coupons issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, all coming within the doctrine so announced by the supreme court of New Mexico, were converted into refunding bonds of the county under the said chapter 79.

15. It is true that, in a dissenting opinion in that case, Mr. Justice Freeman took the ground that all the said railroad-aid bonds were void ab initio under a proper construction of the said act of Congress of June 8, 1878 (20 Stats., 101). But was then the opinion of the majority of the justices, as well as of some of the leading lawyers of the Territory, that the congressional prohibition could not be extended to a county, although governed by a board of county commissioners, by any proper interpretation of the words "or other municipal corporation." Therefore, the county failed to sue out a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for review of the said judgment, and took it for granted that no relief could be had in the courts from the burden of the railroad-aid indebtedness.

16. However, in the year 1894, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the above-mentioned Arizona case, Lewis *v.* Pima County (155 U. S., 54), distinctly held, without any dissent, that the prohibition in the act of Congress above cited extends to railroad-aid bonds, issued by counties in the Territories, although so issued strictly in conformity with the provisions of a general act of the territorial legislative assembly. For that reason the Pima County bonds involved in that case were held to be void.

17. Later, Congress, in view of the Pima County case, passed the aforesaid act of 1897, expressly validating all bonds of the county of Santa Fe, which had been refunded under the terms of the above-cited chapter 79 of the New Mexico Session Laws of 1891. This confirmatory act of Congress, by its broad terms, absolutely excluded the county of Santa Fe from any relief whatever in the courts from the oppression of the said railway-aid indebtedness, no matter how great its original invalidity, and thus the present generation of Santa Fe County's inhabitants, including numerous worthy settlers recently from the East, are face to face with a demon of poverty, for whose invocation they are in no respect responsible.

18. Notwithstanding the failure of the county of Santa Fe to secure, within the space of time allowed by law, a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for a review of the aforesaid decision, Congress probably had, in its tutelar relation to the Territories, constitutional power, even after the promulgation of the decision in the Pima County case, to authorize a review by that high tribunal of the New Mexico judgment. At all events, that territorial decision could not debar a review by the Supreme Court of the United States of future territorial decisions affecting railroad-aid indebtedness for the principal, or for later-maturing interest coupons of any such railroad-aid bonds, or resulting county refunding bonds.

19. That territorial judgment could not in any view be deemed res judicata except as to those privy to the litigation, and there were many outstanding bondholders, including all holders of bonds issued in aid of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, who were in no sense whatever entitled to invoke that judgment as an estoppel.

The want of power in the county to issue the railway-aid bonds, as declared in the Pima County case, was constructively imputable to every holder of such bonds, since the bonds all originated after the prohibitive act of Congress considered in that case, every purchaser of a municipal bond issued either in a State or in a Territory being put on inquiry as to the power of the municipality to issue it, and no recital saving him from the duty of such inquiry.

20. Again, until the passage in 1897 of the confirmatory act of Congress before mentioned, every holder of a refunding bond which showed on its face that the debt funded was absolutely void in its inception and, whatever the form of the refunding bonds, every original refunder and every original purchaser of a refunding bond knew that the indebtedness refunded by that bond was within the class of municipal indebtedness denounced by the act of Congress of 1878, discussed in the Pima County case, was powerless to enforce such bond in the courts, notwithstanding the most "binding" recitals appearing on its face.

21. But, in 1897, before the county of Santa Fe was advised of its right and opportunity under the decision of the court of last resort in the Pima County case, Congress passed the above-cited confirmatory act, which operated on the one hand to protect every bondholder of the void railroad-aid bonds as refunded and on the other hand to deprive the county of Santa Fe of its right of defense against the bondholders and almost of its right to exist on a political plane comportable with the civic merit of its citizens and worthy of its ancient dignity as the capital of the vast subkingdom out of which the States of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada have since, in great part, sprung, New Mexico and Arizona only remaining as Territories.

Whereas the county of Grant, N. Mex., is aggrieved and burdened in like manner, although not so egregiously, by the validation by the said act of Congress of her void railroad aid indebtedness; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislative assembly that, on the eve of New Mexico's emergence out of the territorial condition into the full dignity of statehood, Congress ought, on grounds of political equity, to relieve the county of Santa Fe from the hard plight in which it has been left by adverse national legislation in which the Territory of New Mexico had no representative vote: Therefore be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested, by an appropriation of money or assignable landscrip, to enable the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, N. Mex., to compromise, satisfy, and discharge so much of their respective bonded indebtedness (principal, with accrued and accruing interest), validated and confirmed by the act of Congress of January 16, 1897, as was originally embraced in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interset of its railroad-aid bonds issued to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and in the judgment mentioned in the said act of 1897, as well as in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interest of its railroad-aid bonds issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, and also as was originally embraced in the issue by the county of Grant of its railroad-aid bonds under the supposed authority of the territorial railroad-aid act of 1872, but after its repeal by the act of Congress of 1878; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Territory be, and hereby is, directed to make and transmit seven copies of this memorial to our Delegate in Congress, one for himself and the others to be transmitted by him, one to the President of the Senate, one to the Speaker of the House, one to Senator ELKINS, two to the Senators from Colorado, respectively, two to the chairmen, respectively, of the proper Senate and House committees.

CHAS. A. SPIESS,
President of the Council.

WM. F. BROGAN,
Chief Clerk Council.

E. A. MIERA,
Speaker House of Representatives.

E. H. SALAZAR,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved this 18th day of March, 1909.

GEORGE CURRY,
Governor of New Mexico.

Filed in office of the secretary of New Mexico, March 18, 1909, 11.55 p. m.

NATHAN JAFFA, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the repeal of the duty on soy beans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Dirigo Local Union, No. 84, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Augusta, Me., and a memorial of Local Union No. 146, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Woodland, Me., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Field & Start, of the William Trimbey Company, of T. R. Thomas & Co., of W. E. Owen & Son, and of Griffin & Hoxie, all of Utica; of J. W. Mitchell, of Olean; and of R. C. Albro, of Olean, all in the State of New York, praying for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Socialist Labor Party of New York, remonstrating against the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia in imposing a jail sentence on Messrs. Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a petition, in the form of resolutions, adopted at a public meeting in the State of Michigan, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Payne bill now before Congress provides for free iron ore; and

Whereas the principal industry and largest part of the wealth of the upper peninsula lies in its iron-ore mines; and

Whereas the largest part of the taxable wealth of the State of Michigan is in the iron-ore resources; and

Whereas free iron ore means that the independent, well fed, well-clothed labor of Michigan must compete with the cheap labor of Cuba and will therefore mean idle mines and deserted villages in the upper peninsula and affect every taxpayer in the State of Michigan: Therefore be it

Resolved by this mass meeting of all the people of the village of Iron River (within the vicinity of which are upward of 10 producing iron-ore mines), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their utmost endeavors to have the present duty on iron ore retained, and to the end that the same be not changed in any particular: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this mass meeting be instructed to send a copy of these preambles and resolutions to Senator BURROWS, Senator SMITH, and Hon. H. O. YOUNG.

P. O'BRIEN, *Chairman.*
M. S. MCCONOUGH, *Secretary.*

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a petition in the form of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Iron County, Mich., relative to a reduction of the present duty on iron ore. I ask that the petition be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of Iron County, Mich., March 27, 1909.

Whereas the mining and shipment of iron ore is the principal industry of Iron County, in which a vast amount of capital has been invested, and forms the basis of its industrial welfare; and

Whereas the mining development of Iron County is yet in its early stages, and has progressed to its present state by the fostering and

encouragement of reasonable protection against the importations of iron ore from foreign countries; and

Whereas there is abundant iron ore in Iron County, but it is of such a low grade as to make it unprofitable to mine the same in competition with such imported foreign ores; and

Whereas it is now proposed in the tariff bill introduced in the House of Representatives at Washington to place iron ore on the free list, chiefly for the benefit of the iron mines of Cuba, by reason of which the miners of this county will be brought into competition with the cheap and poorly paid labor of Cuba, which competition will surely tend to lessen the wages of our miners, if our iron mines are not closed entirely, as we fear they will be in case that iron ore is so placed on the free list; and

Whereas the development of the iron industry of Cuba or other foreign countries will tend to discourage the investment of capital in the Lake Superior district, and especially in Iron County, where the iron ore is of low grade, as aforesaid: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of Iron County, Mich., hereby protest against the provision in the tariff bill placing iron ore on the free list as being injurious and detrimental to the iron mining industry of Michigan, and particularly in Iron County, and as contrary to the best interests of the country as a whole: And be it further

Resolved, That we urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use every means in their power to oppose placing iron ore on the free list and endeavor to restore it to its former position.

W. J. RICHARDS, *Chairman.*
JOHN WALL, *Clerk.*

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of supervisors of Iron County, Mich., on the 27th day of March, 1909.

[SEAL.] JOHN WALL, *Clerk of the Board.*

Mr. SMITH of Michigan presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Holland, Mich., praying for the repeal of the duty on raw hides, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Marinette, Wis., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Munising, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Berlin, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, and lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Winnipiseogee Mill Company, of Franklin, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the imposition of a tax on tea, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the legislative committee of the New Hampshire Pharmaceutical Association, of Nassau, N. H., remonstrating against the imposition of the proposed stamp tax on proprietary medicines, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Dirigo Local Union, No. 84, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Augusta, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT presented a memorial of the legislature of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that the mining and the live-stock industry of the State of Utah are the greatest industries and more capital is invested therein than in any other of the industries of this State; and

Whereas even under the present tariff on lead in ores a majority of the lead mines of Utah can not be operated at a profit on account of the low metal prices; and

Whereas if the present tariff is reduced at all our labor in the lead mines would be compelled to compete with Mexican peon labor, making the production of lead in Utah prohibitory; and

Whereas the raising of stock and the shipping of hides to be used in the manufacture of leather have built up a large industry, and the shipping of hides to the eastern market to be used in the manufacture of leather has greatly increased the live-stock industry of this State:

Therefore your memorialists respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to maintain the present tariff on lead, wool, and hides, and that no change be made in the tariff revision affecting these articles; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to our Senators and Representative in Congress, to be by them presented to the Senate and House of Representatives.

HENRY GARDNER,
President of the Senate.
E. W. ROBINSON,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 22, 1909.

WILLIAM SPRY, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH, *Office of the Secretary of State, ss:*

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of certified copy of senate joint memorial No. 2, "Protesting against the removal or reduction of the tariff on lead, wool, and hides," approved March 22, 1909, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 29th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SMOOT presented a memorial of the legislature of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint resolution requesting the Senators and the Representative in Congress from Utah to endeavor to secure an amendment to the interstate-commerce act to prohibit the shipment of alcoholic liquors in certain cases.

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Utah:

That the Senators and the Representative in Congress from the State of Utah be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to use their best endeavors to secure an amendment to the interstate-commerce act, so that the same will prohibit the shipment of alcoholic liquors into States which by law prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors;

That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to each Senator and the Representative in Congress from this State.

HENRY GARDNER,
President of the Senate.
E. W. ROBINSON,
Speaker of the House.

Approved March 22, 1909.

WILLIAM SPRY, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH, *Office of Secretary of State, ss:*

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 6, approved March 22, 1909, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 29th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an appropriation be made to place a suitable memorial in Statuary Hall to James Rumsey, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of California, praying for an increase in the duty on lithographic products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the board of trustees of the state library of Sacramento; of the executive committee of the California Library Association, of Sacramento; of the California Association, of Sacramento; of the regents of the University of California, of Berkeley; and of the academic council of the Leland Stanford, Junior, University, of Palo Alto, all in the State of California, praying for the repeal of the duty on books and other printed matter imported into the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the board of directors of the State Agricultural Society, of Sacramento, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction of the present duty on wool, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., and a petition of the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the transportation in American bottoms of all Philippine products imported into the United States free of duty, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the California Tariff Revision Committee, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the repeal of the duty on sulphate and muriate potashes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Nevada Sulphur Company, of San Francisco, Cal., praying that the meaning of the word "refined," as applied to sulphur, be defined in the proposed tariff law, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the repeal of the countervailing duty on petroleum, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of California, remonstrating against a reduction in the duty on sugar imported from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on blasting caps, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against any change being made in the duty on plain and mercerized cotton piece goods, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Chula Vista Lemon Growers' Association, of San Diego, Cal., praying for an in-

crease of the duty on lemons to 1½ cents, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on bituminous coal and asphaltum, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of San Francisco, Cal., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Bakersfield, Cal., remonstrating against the imposition of the proposed duty on tea, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, of sundry banking institutions of Santa Rosa, and of the board of directors of the Bank of San Francisco, all in the State of California, praying for an increase of the duty on hops, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sutton, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a per diem pension to the surviving soldiers and sailors of the civil and Mexican wars, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bayley, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a petition, and as it is a legislative act of Minnesota, I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolution.

Whereas the Payne tariff bill as drawn reduces the import duty on barley from 30 cents per bushel to 15 cents per bushel; and

Whereas the States of Minesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Montana, and Iowa produce nearly all of the barley grown east of the Rocky Mountains, large quantities of which barley is used in the eastern part of the United States; and

Wherease the Provinces of eastern Canada are able to produce an excellent quality of barley, grown on cheaper lands and worked with cheaper labor, and much nearer our large eastern cities than barley grown in our Northwestern States; and

Whereas the farmers of the Northwest have in the past carried by far the heaviest burden of a high protective tariff on lumber, machinery, and other articles of general use, and receiving but a very small, if any, benefit from the tariff on grain because the price has been fixed by the price received for the surplus exported to other countries; and

Whereas we have now reached a point where home consumption has nearly reached our ability to produce, and consequently a protective tariff on grain has become of actual and not merely an imaginary benefit to the farmers of this State: Be it

Resolved, That the proposed reduction of the duty on imported barley is against the interests of all growers of barley in all of our Northwestern States and against the interests of the western terminal cities of Minneapolis, Duluth, Milwaukee, and Chicago: And be it further

Resolved, That we ask our Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Minnesota at Washington, and also Senators and Congressmen representing our sister States at Washington, to use their influence and votes to maintain the present duty on imported barley.

Adopted March 26, 1909.

A. J. ROCKNE, *Speaker.*
ARCHIBALD H. VERNON,
Chief Clerk.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed duty on hosiery and gloves, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Brainerd and Cloquet, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of Local Lodges Nos. 1102, 1083, 318, 1082, 287, 228, 353, and 823, of Ellensburg, Centralia, North Yakima, Hoquiam, Walla Walla, Spokane, Port Angeles, and Vancouver, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of the Journeymen Bricklayers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the imposition of any duty on tea, coffee, cocoa, and spices, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Valley Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millville, Pa., praying for the removal of the duty on sugar, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polgyamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry paper-box manufacturers of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the proposed increase of duty on surface-coated papers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Butler, Pa., praying for the removal of the duty on works of art, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Green Brier Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rebuck, Pa., praying for the removal of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 931, of Indiana; Local Lodge No. 455, of Monongahela; Local Lodge No. 983, of Ambridge; Local Lodge No. 1106, of Bangor; Local Lodge No. 540, of Washington; Local Lodge No. 776, of Washington; Local Lodge No. 319, of East Stroudsburg; and of Local Lodge No. 650, of Homestead, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. TAYLOR presented the petition of E. W. Foster and sundry other citizens of Tennessee, praying for an increase of the duty on lithographic products, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Shoe Dealers' Association, of Nashville, Tenn., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Sherman Council, No. 20, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of East Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Nashville, Tenn., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against any increase of the duty on hosiery and gloves, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Nashville, Sweetwater, Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Niota, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of the clause in the so-called "Payne tariff bill" relating to the duty on hosiery, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Berlin, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the duty on print paper, wood pulp, and lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

(Certificate of comparison.)

I, Nathan Jaffa, secretary of the Territory of New Mexico, do hereby certify that there was filed for record in this office at 11.55 o'clock, p. m., on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1909, council joint memorial No. 7 by Mr. President; and also that I have compared the following copy of the same with the original thereof now on file, and declare it to be a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the Territory of New Mexico, at the city of Santa Fe, the capital, on this 27th day of March, A. D. 1909.

[SEAL.]

NATHAN JAFFA,
Secretary of New Mexico.

Council joint memorial 7. By Mr. President.

Memorializing Congress for an appropriation of money or land scrip for the purpose of relieving the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, in the Territory of New Mexico, from the burden imposed upon them, respectively, by former congressional statutes confirming and validating certain bonds of each of the said counties issued without lawful authority.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Whereas the county of Santa Fe, N. Mex., is overburdened and distressed by the weight of a bonded indebtedness now approximating in amount $1,000,000, based on illegal railroad aid bonds, converted into illegal refunding bonds, which, although such bonds could not be successfully enforced in the courts after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Pima County case, below more particularly referred to, were, in avoidance of that decision, confirmed and validated by Congress in and by an act entitled "An act approving certain acts of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, authorizing the issue of certain bonds of said Territory, and for other purposes," the same having become a law, without the approval of the President, January 16, 1897. (Stat. L., vol. 29, pp. 487, 488, 489, ch. 30.)

Whereas the said indebtedness originated in the following manner and under the following circumstances, to wit:

1. The said indebtedness results to an amount exceeding one-half thereof, from the issue by the county of Santa Fe, in February, 1880, of bonds in the principal sum of $150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad now part of the "Santa Fe route"), so far as that railroad extends in the said county, including a branch line of about 20 miles in tortuous length from Lamy Junction to the city of Santa Fe, and the remainder of the said indebtedness results from the issue by the said county, at a later

date, of bonds in the principal sum of $150,000, bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, in aid of the construction of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad (now part of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad system), from the city of Santa Fe to Espanola, the southern termination at that time of the railroad of the late Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company.

2. The total assessed valuation of the property subject to taxation in the county of Santa Fe is about $2,200,000.

3. All the aforesaid railroad-aid bonds, with one judgment for interest on a part of the said first bond issue, were, before the rendering of the decision in the Pima County case (Oct. 29, 1894, Lewis v. Pima County, 155 U. S., 54), refunded under the provisions of a territorial refunding act, chapter 79 of the Session Laws of 1891, found in the Compiled Laws of New Mexico of 1897 as sections 340 to 348, both inclusive, which refunding act, it is evident, does not authorize the refunding of bonds void on their face.

4. Over and above the said railroad-aid indebtedness, the said county has a legitimate interest-bearing bonded indebtedness of about $200,000.

5. All of the said railroad-aid bonds were issued under the supposed authority of chapter 30 of the New Mexico Session Laws of 1872, still found in the said Compiled Laws as sections 3898 to 3901, both inclusive, which statute of 1872 could, under the doctrine announced in the Pima County case, no longer legally operate after the passage of the act of Congress approved June 8, 1872 (20 Stat. L., p. 101), which prohibited every "municipal corporation" in a Territory from incurring "any debt other than such as shall be necessary to the administration of its internal affairs."

6. The bonds in aid of the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company were, under the belief that the said territorial act of 1872 was still in force, and pursuant to its provisions, voted for on the 4th day of October, 1879, in two concurrent elections—one upon the proposition to aid, to the extent of $71,000, in the construction of the main line crossing the said county, and the other upon the proposition to aid, to the extent of $79,000, in the construction of a branch line connecting the city of Santa Fe with the main line, at Lamy Junction.

The votes cast on the first proposition numbered only 259, of which 192 were in the affirmative and 67 in the negative; and the total vote cast on the second proposition numbered only 266, of which 190 were in the affirmative and 76 in the negative.

8. At that time (1879), the total number of voters qualified to vote in the county of Santa Fe, at general elections, including resident owners of taxable property as well as residents not such owners, exceeded 1,000, but, by the terms of the said railroad-aid statute of 1872, very few of the general electors were qualified to vote at the special elections believed to be thereby authorized, because such elections were determined under that statute by the votes exclusively of "the electors of the various precincts of said county who own taxable property." (N. Mex. Compiled Laws of 1897, p. 3899.)

Under the exemption statutes in force at the time of the said railroad-aid elections, respectively, every resident was immune from taxation of property to the amount of $300, not to speak of other exemptions from taxation more specific in character, and the great majority of such residents at the time of each of the said special elections had severally no property subject to taxation. This fact, taken in connection with the general ignorance then prevailing in the county of the English language and of the methods of American corporate business, accounts for the apparent passivity of the great majority of its residents on the occasions of the special elections concerning the said railroad aids. Railroads were still unsolved mysteries to the great majority of the territorial population. Most of those of Mexican ancestry were characteristically simple in their habits, confiding in their nature, attentive to religious duties, and devoted to pastoral and agricultural pursuits after the ancient manner of their forefathers. The first influence of the incoming railroads was prejudicial, a generation ago, to the native population of New Mexico, for it diminished by eastern competition their accustomed home markets, and was subversive of old-time social conditions.

This first influence of the railroads was felt conspicuously by the county of Santa Fe. The main line of the "Santa Fe route" did not come nearer to the city of Santa Fe than 20 miles, although from time immemorial that city had been the emporium and distributing point of New Mexico, and, under the Spanish, Mexican, and American rule, the seat of an important and money-distributing military as well as civil government. The advent of the first railroad destroyed the "Santa Fe trail," and the commerce which over that trail had centered in Santa Fe for generations. Santa Fe's importance was temporarily impaired, her old trade distributed among other places more favored by railroad communication, and yet, as consideration for the burden of the first aid by the county bonds voted at the two-headed election of 1879, she was, in respect of railroad transportation, accorded only the small favor of the railroad branch from Lamy Junction, and even that supposed benefit was conditioned on the county's contribution to the construction of the main line, a contribution not, it is believed, exacted of any other county since the main line was to be built at all events.

9. In fact it was a great detriment to the city of Santa Fe to be thus sidetracked on a branch line of railroad, and naturally her commercial residents looked forward to the advantages apparently in prospect from the incoming of the main line of the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company under its chartered right and duty to construct its main line into New Mexico, as far south as Santa Fe, conformably to the acts of Congress requiring such construction to be completed as early as June 10, 1882. But, although chartered and subsidized by Congress, the old Denver and Rio Grande Railway Company failed to meet that statutory requirement, and even entered into a compact with its rival, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Company (the indirect beneficiary of the said first railroad aid), by which, early in 1880, further construction of the Denver and Rio Grande Railway south of Espanola was inequitably pretermitted for the period of ten years from that date. In view of this new disappointment and for the immediate purpose of bridging the gap in railroad communication between the city of Santa Fe and the Denver and Rio Grande Railway at Espanola—from which point that railway was in operation to the north through Pueblo, Denver, and other business centers—the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company was incorporated and the second county aid voted as aforesaid.

10. But, notwithstanding these efforts for amelioration of the evil conditions flowing from the innovation of railroads, in a community accustomed to the simple life of the old Spanish and Mexican days, the property and business interests of the inhabitants of the county became almost stagnant and so continued for a whole generation. It was absolutely impossible for the county to pay the interest on the railroad-aid bonds, still less any part of the principal. Indeed, the accumulated interest is now a heavier burden than the principal, and is subject to increase by compounding under judgments and future refundings, because Congress has confirmed and validated the county's void indebtedness.

11. All these railroad-aid bonds appear to have been negotiated by the respective companies concerned and to have come into the hands of purchasers for value, and since their conversion into refunding bonds the county is confronted by present holders of the new bonds, who bought them in reliance on the confirmatory acts of Congress.

12. In the year 1887 the board of county commissioners of the county of Santa Fe was sued upon a large number of interest coupons clipped from the bonds issued as aid to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and there followed in that and collateral legal proceedings a most energetic litigation, finally resulting in a decision of the supreme court of New Mexico, August 12, 1891, adjudging the validity of the coupons, which decision is reported in 6 New Mexico Reports (Gild), 88.

13. Prior to this decision the legislative assembly of New Mexico passed said chapter 79 of the session laws of 1891, looking to the refunding of all outstanding valid indebtedness of counties and municipalities.

14. After that decision of the supreme court of New Mexico not only the judgment in which the interest coupons involved were merged, with interest compounded on those coupons, but also the outstanding principal indtebtedness evidenced by the railroad-aid bonds and all arrears of interest not merged in that judgment; and, furthermore, the principal and interest evidenced by the aid bonds and coupons issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, all coming within the doctrine so announced by the supreme court of New Mexico, were converted into refunding bonds of the county under the said chapter 79.

15. It is true that, in a dissenting opinion in that case, Mr. Justice Freeman took the ground that all the said railroad-aid bonds were void ab initio under a proper construction of the said act of Congress of June 8, 1878 (20 Stat., 101). But it was then the opinion of the majority of the justices, as well as some of the leading lawyers of the Territory, that the congressional prohibition could not be extended to a county, although governed by a board of county commissioners, by any proper interpretation of the words "or other municipal corporation." Therefore the county failed to sue out a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for review of the said judgment, and took it for granted that no relief could be had in the courts from the burden of the railroad-aid indebtedness.

16. However in the year 1894 the Supreme Court of the United States in the above-mentioned Arizona case, Lewis v. Pima County (155 U. S., 54), distinctly held without any dissent that the prohibition in the act of Congress above cited extends to railroad-aid bonds issued by counties in the Territories, although so issued strictly in conformity with the provisions of a general act of the territorial legislative assembly. For that reason the Pima County bonds involved in that case were held to be void.

17. Later Congress, in view of the Pima County case, passed the aforesaid act of 1897, expressly validating all bonds of the county of Santa Fe which had been refunded under the terms of the above-cited chapter 79 of the New Mexico Session Laws of 1891. This confirmatory act of Congress by its broad terms absolutely excluded the county of Santa Fe from any relief whatever in the courts from the oppression of the said railway-aid indebtedness, no matter how great its original invalidity, and thus the present generation of Santa Fe County's inhabitants, including numerous worthy settlers recently from the East, are face to face with a demon of poverty for whose invocation they are in no respect responsible.

18. Notwithstanding the failure of the county of Santa Fe to secure within the space of time allowed by law a writ of error from the Supreme Court of the United States for a review of the aforesaid decision, Congress probably had in its tutelar relation to the Territories constitutional power, even after the promulgation of the decision in the Pima County case, to authorize a review by that high tribunal of the New Mexico judgment. At all events, that territorial decision could not debar a review by the Supreme Court of the United States of future territorial decisions affecting railroad-aid indebtedness for the principal or for later maturing interest coupons of any such railroad-aid bonds or resulting county refunding bonds.

19. That territorial judgment could not, in any view, be deemed res judicata except as to those privy to the litigation; and there were many outstanding bondholders, including all holders of bonds issued in aid of the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, who were in no sense whatever entitled to invoke that judgment as an estoppel.

The want of power in the county to issue the railway-aid bonds, as declared in the Pima County case, was constructively imputable to every holder of such bonds, since the bonds all originated after the prohibitive act of Congress considered in that case, every purchaser of a municipal bond issued either in a State or in a Territory being put on inquiry as to the power of the municipality to issue it and no recital saving him from the duty of such inquiry.

20. Again, until the passage, in 1897, of the confirmatory act of Congress, before mentioned, every holder of a refunding bond which showed on its face that the debt funded was absolutely void in its inception, and, whatever the form of the refunding bonds, every original refunder and every original purchaser of a refunding bond who knew that the indebtedness refunded by that bond was within the class of municipal indebtedness denounced by the act of Congress of 1878, discussed in the Pima County case, was powerless to enforce such bond in the courts, notwithstanding the most binding recitals appearing on its face.

21. But in 1897, before the county of Santa Fe was advised of its right and opportunity, under the decision of the court of last resort in the Pima County case, Congress passed the above-cited confirmatory act, which operated, on the one hand, to protect every holder of the void railroad-aid bonds as refunded, and, on the other hand, to deprive the county of Santa Fe of its right of defense against the bondholders and almost of its right to exist on a political plane comportable with the civic merit of its citizens and worthy of its ancient dignity as the capital of the vast subkingdom out of which the States of Colorado, Utah, and Nevada have since in great part sprung, New Mexico and Arizona only remaining as Territories.

Whereas the county of Grant, N. Mex., is aggrieved and burdened in like manner, although not so egregiously, by the validation of the said act of Congress of her void railroad-aid indebtedness; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislative assembly that, on the eve of New Mexico's emergence out of the territorial condition into the full dignity of statehood, Congress ought, on grounds of political equity,

to relieve the county of Santa Fe from the hard plight in which it has been left by adverse national legislation in which the Territory of New Mexico had no representative vote: Therefore be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested, by an appropriation of money or assignable land scrip, to enable the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, N. Mex., to compromise, satisfy, and discharge so much of their respective bonded indebtedness (principal, with accrued and accruing interest), validated and confirmed by the act of Congress of January 16, 1897, as was originally embraced in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interest of its railroad-aid bonds issued to the New Mexico and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, and in the judgment mentioned in the said act of 1897, as well as in the refunding by the county of Santa Fe of the principal and interest of its railroad-aid bonds issued to the Texas, Santa Fe and Northern Railroad Company, and also as was originally embraced in the issue by the county of Grant of its railroad-aid bonds under the supposed authority of the territorial railroad-aid act of 1872, but after its repeal by the act of Congress of 1878; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Territory be, and hereby is, directed to make and transmit seven copies of this memorial to our Delegate in Congress, one for himself and the others to be transmitted by him, one to the President of the Senate, one to the Speaker of the House, one to Senator ELKINS, two to the Senators from Colorado, respectively, and two to the chairmen, respectively, of the proper Senate and House committees.

CHAS. A. SPIESS,
President of the Council.

WM. F. BROGAN,
Chief Clerk Council.

E. A. MIERA,
Speaker House of Representatives.

E. H. SALAZAR,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved this 18th day of March, 1909.

GEORGE CURRY,
Governor of New Mexico.

Filed in office of secretary of New Mexico March 18, 1909, 11.55 p. m.

NATHAN JAFFA, *Secretary.*

Mr. DU PONT presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Trade of Wilmington, Del., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a joint meeting of the trade and commerce and the legislative committees of the Wilmington (Del.) Board of Trade was called by the president March 30, 1909, for the purpose of considering the Payne tariff bill; and

Whereas in view of the possible operation of the maximum and minimum provision of the Payne tariff bill now before the House of Representatives, and in view further that the large industries of this city engaged in the manufacture of morocco from imported raw skins would be seriously affected by the operation of the so-called maximum and minimum provisions of the proposed bill under which imported raw skins would be subject to a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That these committees in joint session enter their most earnest protest against the maximum and minimum provisions as proposed, and urge upon our Senators and Representative in Congress to oppose these provisions by every honorable means in their power.

Unanimously adopted March 30, 1909.

THE WILMINGTON BOARD OF TRADE.

Attest:
GEO. H. MCGOVERN,
Secretary.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of Local Union No. 4, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Palmer; of the Business Men's Association of Corinth, and of the Business Men's Association of Luzerne, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of North Tonawanda, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on dressed and rough lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 66, Patrons of Husbandry, of Orwell, N. Y., and a petition of Lombard Grange, No. 714, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westfield, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ROOT presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of North Tonawanda, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on lumber, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the repeal of the duty on Canadian barley, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 33, of Utica; of Local Lodge No. 922, of Dunkirk; of Local Lodge No. 772, of Ogdensburg; of Local Lodge No. 621, of Plattsburg; and of Local Lodge No. 1005, of Hoosick Falls, all of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a national reserve in the State of Wyoming, for the care and maintenance of the American elk, which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Addison, Brooklyn, Newburgh, New York City, Poughkeepsie, and Syracuse, all in the State of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Niagara Falls, Deferiet, Fort Edward, Ticonderoga, Watertown, Morrisonville, Luzerne, and Corinth, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Naples, Olean, Clinton Corners, Delmar, Arlington, Barker, Clyde, Chemung, Moravia, Ripley, Groton, Lebanon, South Hannibal, Ashville, Solsville, Castile, Yorktown, Edmeston, Deer River, Peekskill, Fillmore, Interlaken, East Chatham, Orwell, Nunda, Oswego, Syracuse, Beekman, Greenwich, and De Peyster, all in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Binghamton, Lyons, Corning, Auburn, Elmira, Rochester, Le Roy, Warsaw, Geneva, Hornell, Canandaigua, Penn Yan, Waverly, Ithaca, Cortland, Canastota, Oneida, Fulton, Rome, Herkimer, Utica, Oneonta, and Norwich, all in the State of New York, praying for a modification of the present duty on oilcloth and linoleum, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Local Union No. 146, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Woodland, Me., and a petition of Dirigo Local Union, No. 84, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Augusta, Me., praying for the retention of the present rate of duty on print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial to the selectmen of West Enfield, Me., remonstrating against the reduction of the duty on news print paper and the free importation of ground wood pulp, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, South Boston, Hyde Park, Somerville, Waltham, Cambridge, Ashland, Ware, Falkner, Everett, East Somerville, Plymouth, East Boston, Tully, Revere, Medford, Roxbury, Lawrence, Reading, Haverhill, Andover, Brockton, Newton, Northampton, Belmont, Fall River, Dorchester, Holyoke, Lynn, Edgartown, Hyannis, Roslindale, West Newton, North Cambridge, Clinton, Worcester, Lowell, Quincy, Dracut, Marblehead, Falmouth, Salem, Newburyport, Chicopee Falls, Somerset, Brookline, Melrose, Maldèn, Mattapan, Jamaica Plain, Peabody, Stoughton, Taunton, Allston, North Easton, Campbello, Lakeville, Littleboro, Charlestown, Brighton, Beverly, North Adams, Pittsfield, Dalton, Dedham, Winthrop, Waltham, Westfield, Chicopee, Adams, Ashland, Ayer, Winchester, Fitchburg, North Plymouth, Swampscott, North Andover, Greenfield, Gloucester, Elmwood, Wakefield, Orange, Provincetown, Orleans, Springfield, and Turners Falls, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the duty on tea, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HEYBURN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 15) to amend the military record of Jonas O. Johnson, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE presented memorials of Livermore Falls Local Union, No. 8, of Chisholm; of Local Union No. 22, of Solon; of Dirigo Local Union, No. 84, of Augusta; of Local Union No. 146, of Woodland; and of Local Union No. 14, of Lisbon Falls, all of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on wood pulp and print paper, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Orient Grange, No. 60, Patrons of Husbandry, of East Corinth, Me., and the petition of Lowell & Whitten, of West Farmington, Me., praying for the repeal of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 179, Cigarmakers' International Union of America, of Bangor, Me., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Gardiner, Me., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Auburn, Me., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

PACIFIC COAST STEAMERS.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 428) directing the Secretary of War to

establish and operate a line of steamers along the Pacific coast, and making provision therefor, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, which was agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution 11, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 25th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 11.

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution 15, submitted by Mr. ELKINS on the 29th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 15.

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the hearings, bills, and such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution 17, submitted by Mr. WARREN on the 1st instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 17.

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee and to have the same printed for its use; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Documents, submitted the following report (S. Rept. No. 1), which was read and agreed to:

The Joint Select Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House of Representatives, to which were referred the reports of the heads of departments, bureaus, etc., in respect to the accumulation therein of old and useless files of papers, which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business therein, respectively, and have no permanent value or historical interest, with accompanying statements of the condition and character of such papers, respectfully report to the Senate and House of Representatives, pursuant to an act entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," approved February 16, 1889, as follows:

Your committee have met and, by a subcommittee appointed by your committee, carefully and fully examined the said reports so referred to your committee and the statements of the condition and the character of such files and papers therein described, and we find and report that the files and papers described in the report of the Postmaster-General in House Document No. 3, Sixty-first Congress, first session, dated March 15, 1909, are not needed in the transaction of the current business of such departments and bureaus, and have no permanent value or historical interest.

Respectfully submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives.

F. M. SIMMONS,
J. H. GALLINGER,
Members on the part of the Senate.
ARTHUR L. BATES,
J. FRED. C. TALBOTT,
Members on the part of the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 1213) extending to the members of the Forsyth Scouts the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907 (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. Graham (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICK:

A bill (S. 1215) to furnish bronze medals of honor to surviving soldiers who responded to President Lincoln's first call for troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1216) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1217) granting an increase of pension to Penton Belville; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 1218) granting a pension to Henry Fleming; and

A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to William W. Maltman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A bill (S. 1220) for the relief of Jacob G. Barkley; to the Committee on Claims; and

A bill (S. 1221) granting a pension to Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALIAFERRO:

A bill (S. 1222) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, misbranded, or falsely graded naval stores, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1223) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Col. James Jackson to the rank of brigadier-general on the retired list;

A bill (S. 1224) to correct the military record of William R. Owen;

A bill (S. 1225) to correct the military record of David R. B. Winniford; and

A bill (S. 1226) granting an honorable discharge to Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1227) granting a pension to I. C. Taylor;

A bill (S. 1228) granting an increase of pension to Allen Rhodes;

A bill (S. 1229) granting a pension to John S. Montgomery;

A bill (S. 1230) granting an increase of pension to William Allen King; and

A bill (S. 1231) granting an increase of pension to David D. Garrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McENERY:

A bill (S. 1232) for the relief of James L. Bradford; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1233) to amend the patent laws of the United States; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 1234) for the relief of the estate or the heirs of Mrs. Martha L. Wells, deceased (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1235) for the relief of the legal representatives of G. A. Le More & Co.;

A bill (S. 1236) for the relief of the estate of Marcus Walker, deceased;

A bill (S. 1237) for the relief of the estate of Amy L. Mahoudeau, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1238) for the relief of T. Alonzo Walker and Augusta C. Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to John F. Corbett;

A bill (S. 1240) granting a pension to John Clay;

A bill (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Journal;

A bill (S. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kerr;

A bill (S. 1243) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1244) granting an increase of pension to William A. McGinety;

A bill (S. 1245) granting an increase of pension to W. L. Southgate;

A bill (S. 1246) granting an increase of pension to James S. Searcy;

A bill (S. 1247) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Thompson;

A bill (S. 1248) granting an increase of pension to John French; and

A bill (S. 1249) to amend "An act to amend section 4766 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;" to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1250) for the relief of Eliza V. C. Farris, for services rendered the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1251) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 1252) granting an increase of pension to Gates Saxton;
A bill (S. 1253) granting an increase of pension to Tilman P. Edgerton; and
A bill (S. 1254) granting an increase of pension to John J. Swett; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. ROOT:
A bill (S. 1255) authorizing the settlement of certain outstanding liabilities of the Government by the issue of new drafts upon the return of drafts heretofore issued representing said liabilities; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 1256) granting a pension to Melville A. Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1257) for the relief of Dr. Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:
A bill (S. 1258) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Schnell, alias Edward J. Snell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NELSON:
A bill (S. 1259) for the incorporation and regulation of corporations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:
A bill (S. 1260) to establish a subtreasury at Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.
A bill (S. 1261) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Glenwood Springs, in the State of Colorado;
A bill (S. 1262) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Montrose, in the State of Colorado; and
A bill (S. 1263) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Durango, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to Emerson E. Paden (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1265) granting a pension to John G. Schempp;
A bill (S. 1266) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Simons;
A bill (S. 1267) granting a pension to Hannah Mohr;
A bill (S. 1268) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Fernsworth;
A bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Faught;
A bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Starr;
A bill (S. 1271) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Raymond;
A bill (S. 1272) granting an increase of pension to David W. Aldrich;
A bill (S. 1273) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Selby;
A bill (S. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Livingston;
A bill (S. 1275) granting an increase of pension to Cora G. Davison;
A bill (S. 1276) granting an increase of pension to John Burns;
A bill (S. 1277) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parks;
A bill (S. 1278) granting an increase of pension to Spencer M. Hillibert;
A bill (S. 1279) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Vinyard;
A bill (S. 1280) granting an increase of pension to Wilbert B. Teters;
A bill (S. 1281) granting an increase of pension to Charles Roden;
A bill (S. 1282) granting an increase of pension to Marshall K. Ames;
A bill (S. 1283) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stannah;
A bill (S. 1284) granting an increase of pension to John G. Geiling;
A bill (S. 1285) granting an increase of pension to Adelia Dittman;
A bill (S. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Theodore A. Mather;
A bill (S. 1287) granting an increase of pension to John S. Sanderson;
A bill (S. 1288) granting an increase of pension to Hubert Steimel;
A bill (S. 1289) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hamilton;
A bill (S. 1290) granting an increase of pension to Annie George;
A bill (S. 1291) granting an increase of pension to John Mather;
A bill (S. 1292) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Hollister;
A bill (S. 1293) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McMahan;
A bill (S. 1294) granting an increase of pension to Henry Butler;
A bill (S. 1295) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hinman;
A bill (S. 1296) granting an increase of pension to Willis E. Hall (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1297) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Rawlings (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1298) granting an increase of pension to John H. Mattocks (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Surby (with accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Corliss (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. STONE:
A bill (S. 1301) granting an increase of pension to Annie C. Potter;
A bill (S. 1302) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Shaw;
A bill (S. 1303) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hewson;
A bill (S. 1304) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Wylie;
A bill (S. 1305) granting a pension to Sarah J. Ridgeway;
A bill (S. 1306) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Lee;
A bill (S. 1307) granting an increase of pension to Alfred N. Webb;
A bill (S. 1308) granting an increase of pension to Elias Baker;
A bill (S. 1309) granting an increase of pension to O. A. Stine;
A bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Tracy;
A bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to David Farquhar;
A bill (S. 1312) granting an increase of pension to Lucien W. Dunnington;
A bill (S. 1313) granting an increase of pension to David F. Ragsdale;
A bill (S. 1314) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Porch;
A bill (S. 1315) granting an increase of pension to Catherine R. Rice;
A bill (S. 1316) granting a pension to Alexander J. Souden; and
A bill (S. 1317) granting a pension to America V. Vincent; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1318) for the relief of Arthur H. Barnes;
A bill (S. 1319) for the relief of the heirs of Frances E. Bannister;
A bill (S. 1320) for the relief of the heirs of Ann L. Robb; and
A bill (S. 1321) for the relief of Joseph L. A. Daugherty; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1322) for the relief of John N. Neal; and
A bill (S. 1323) to correct the military record of John P. Griffith; to the Committee on Military Affairs; and
A bill (S. 1324) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjust the accounts of William R. Little, or his heirs, with the Sac and Fox Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:
A bill (S. 1325) granting an increase of pension to Louis N. Frank;
A bill (S. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Donna M. Blatter;
A bill (S. 1327) granting an increase of pension to Naomi V. Culley;
A bill (S. 1328) granting a pension to Emil Kuhblank;
A bill (S. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Ball;
A bill (S. 1330) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Wannall;
A bill (S. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Campbell;

A bill (S. 1332) to equalize the pension of Edward D. Bates from March, 1883, up to the time of the special act granting him $24 per month;

A bill (S. 1333) granting an increase of pension to Eli Strimel; and

A bill (S. 1334) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Ardeeser; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1335) for the relief of the widow of Joseph Culley;

A bill (S. 1336) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland;

A bill (S. 1337) for the relief of the mayor and city council of Baltimore, Md.;

A bill (S. 1338) for the relief of the estate of George Lloyd Raley;

A bill (S. 1339) for the relief of the estate of R. W. Isaac;

A bill (S. 1340) for the relief of the estate of Zachariah Claggett; and

A bill (S. 1341) for the relief of Elizabeth Shutt; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1342) placing M. H. Plunkett, assistant engineer, United States Navy, on the retired list with an advanced rank; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1343) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Craig (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1344) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hays (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRYE:

A bill (S. 1345) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1346) to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1347) to construct a vessel for the customs service for use in the vicinity of Portland, Me.; and

A bill (S. 1348) to construct a tender for the use of the engineer of the first and second light-house districts; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1349) granting a pension to Aaron O. Houghton;

A bill (S. 1350) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stone;

A bill (S. 1351) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1352) granting a pension to Alfonso Penley;

A bill (S. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Rose E. Staples;

A bill (S. 1354) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dearborn;

A bill (S. 1355) granting a pension to Emma K. Frank;

A bill (S. 1356) granting an increase of pension to William D. McKenney;

A bill (S. 1357) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Storah;

A bill (S. 1358) granting a pension to Alice Rugan;

A bill (S. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Eudora McLaflin;

A bill (S. 1360) granting an increase of pension to James H. Little;

A bill (S. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Gammon;

A bill (S. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Esther A. Field;

A bill (S. 1363) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Dinsmore;

A bill (S. 1364) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Ingalls (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1365) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1366) granting an increase of pension to John M. Johnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1367) granting an increase of pension to John Chatham (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PILES:

A bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to Woodbury Blocksom, alias Ralph D. Wood (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM (by request):

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution in relation to the term of service of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. R. 16) authorizing the printing of reports upon preliminary examinations and surveys, etc.; to the Committee on Printing.

TAXATION OF DISPLAY SIGNS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill which I ask to have read at length and to be laid upon the table.

The bill (S. 1369) providing for a license tax on display signs, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be levied, collected, and paid into the Treasury of the United States an annual license fee of 2 cents per superficial square foot or fraction thereof upon each and every posted display advertisement or sign of any article of commerce, trade, or commodity entering or advertised to enter into interstate commerce, whether such advertisement or sign be painted, printed or marked upon buildings, wood, paper, cloth, or other material displayed for the purpose of advertising any article or thing mentioned or described upon said sign.

Second. That said license fee shall be paid annually on or before the 1st day of May in each and every year as in the case of other licenses collected by the United States.

Third. That in ascertaining the superficial contents of such notices or advertisements the entire surface of the thing upon which such advertisement appears shall be measured and such contents shall be the basis upon which the said license shall be collected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the request of the Senator from Idaho, the bill will lie on the table.

TAXATION OF EXCESS LAND HOLDINGS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill, and I ask that it be read at length and laid on the table.

The bill (S. 1370) to provide for taxation of land holdings in certain cases was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all corporations, persons, or associations of persons owning or holding in their names lands in excess of 1,000 acres in any State or Territory of the United States shall pay an annual tax into the Treasury of the United States of 10 cents per acre upon such excess of holding over and above 1,000 acres for each corporation or persons or association of persons.

Second. That said tax shall be collected on or before the 1st day of March in each and every year as in the case of other taxes levied by the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will lie on the table, at the request of the Senator from Idaho.

TAXATION OF LANDS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill and ask that it be read at length and laid on the table.

The bill (S. 1371) to provide for taxation of land holdings in connection with interstate commerce was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every corporation, person, or association of persons owning, holding, or claiming to own or hold lands in any State or Territory of the United States, granted, purchased, or held in connection with the conduct of any interstate commerce business, or from which lands any article of commerce or trade entering into interstate commerce is taken or produced, shall pay an annual tax of 10 cents per acre upon said land on or before the 1st day of May in each and every year.

SEC. 2. That said tax shall be collected as in the case of other taxes levied by the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE CENSUS BILL.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN PRODUCTS IN DOMESTIC MARKETS.

Mr. DANIEL. I submit a resolution of inquiry and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) was read, as follows:

Senate resolution 20.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is directed to inform the Senate, as far as he may, what foreign products are sold in the United States lower than in foreign countries, and what information has been derived under the resolution of the Senate directing the Secretary of State "to procure, through our consular and other representatives abroad, all available information relating to the practice of foreign governments selling manufactured goods in this country at a price lower than the domestic price, the information to be communicated to the Senate at the earliest possible day."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HALE. Let it be read again.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is all right.

Mr. HALE. I withdraw the request.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

DOMESTIC PRODUCTS IN FOREIGN MARKETS.

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Senate resolution 21.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate what has been accomplished with reference to the statement requested by resolution sent to that department, and to give the Senate such information as he can with respect to manufactured products which are sold in foreign markets at lower rates than in America.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. JONES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 23.

Resolved, That the Committee on Industrial Expositions be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,440 per annum.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 22.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census or any subcommittee thereof, be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the hearings, bills, and such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE CENSUS BILL.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to state for the information of Senators that it is the expectation of the committee that the census bill can be reported out by Thursday morning. If so, I shall then ask the Senate to give it consideration on Friday and from day to day thereafter until it is disposed of.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON CANADIAN RELATIONS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 24.

Resolved, That the Committee on Canadian Relations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at a salary of $1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution repealing joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications, approved March 2, 1909, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Printing.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eighteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 8, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. George W. Goode, First Cavalry, to be major from April 3, 1909, vice Stevens, Fifth Cavalry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Douglas McCaskey, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from April 3, 1909, vice Goode, First Cavalry, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. Wait C. Johnson, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be captain from March 9, 1909, vice Hathaway, unassigned, retired from active service.

First Lieut. J. Millard Little, Thirtieth Infantry, to be captain from March 10, 1909, vice Ronayne, Twenty-eighth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. John L. Bond, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 23, 1909, vice Swaine, First Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Josephus S. Cecil, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 23, 1909, vice Gordon, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward R. Stone, Thirtieth Infantry, to be captain from March 25, 1909, vice Lasseigne, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Horatio K. Bradford, Seventeenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 9, 1909, vice Johnson, Twenty-sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Mason, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 10, 1909, vice Little, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Nicholas W. Campanole, First Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 15, 1909, subject to examination required by law, vice Ware, Twenty-first Infantry, detailed in the Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. John G. Macomb, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 23, 1909, vice Bond, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. L. Worthington Moseley, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 23, 1909, vice Cecil, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

James F. Dever to be postmaster at Rockmart, Ga., in place of James F. Dever. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1909.

KANSAS.

J. M. Gibbs to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, Kans., in place of Frank H. Roberts, resigned.

E. T. Metcalf to be postmaster at Colony, Kans. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

LOUISIANA.

Edson E. Burnham to be postmaster at Amite, La., in place of Edson E. Burnham. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1909.

MINNESOTA.

James A. Gillespie to be postmaster at Carlton, Minn., in place of William Gallagher, resigned.

NEW JERSEY.

Frank Hill to be postmaster at Dumont, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1909.

NEW YORK.

James A. Johnston to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. Y., in place of James A. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1908.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Albert Richardson Kirk to be postmaster at Albemarle, N. C., in place of Ella M. Sanders. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1907.

OREGON.

Lee Rowell to be postmaster at Sheridan, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1908.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Martin B. Allen to be postmaster at Honesdale, Pa., in place of Martin B. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired April 19, 1908.

Sallie P. Gillingham to be postmaster at Langhorne, Pa., in place of Sallie P. Gillingham. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1909.

John P. Thomas to be postmaster at Taylor, Pa., in place of John W. Reese. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1908.

TEXAS.

William L. Yanger to be postmaster at Iowa Park, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1909.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1909.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

James T. Du Bois to be consul-general at Singapore, Straits Settlements.

MINISTER.

George H. Moses to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Greece and Montenegro.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Charles Dyer Norton to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Oscar Lawler, to be Assistant Attorney-General of the United States.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

John W. Miller to be register of the land office at Wausau, Wis.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Harry L. Rogers, deputy paymaster-general, to be assistant paymaster-general with the rank of colonel.

Maj. George F. Downey, paymaster, to be deputy paymaster-general with rank of lieutenant-colonel.

TO PLACE ON RETIRED LIST.

Each of the retired officers herein named to be placed on the retired list of the army, with the rank of one grade above that actually held by him at the time of retirement:

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Ferdinand E. De Courcy,
Maj. Henry F. Brewerton,
Maj. Lafayette E. Campbell,
Maj. William M. Waterbury,
Maj. John R. Brincklé,
Maj. Edward G. Mathey,
Maj. James N. Morgan,
Maj. Edmund K. Russell,
Maj. Henry M. Kendall,
Maj. Thomas Sharp,
Maj. Washington I. Sanborn,
Maj. Henry P. Ritzius,
Maj. James M. Burns, and
Maj. William H. Kell.

With the rank of major.

Capt. John A. Payne,
Capt. George K. Spencer,
Capt. William W. Tyler,
Capt. Dillard H. Clark,
Capt. William O. Cory,
Capt. Christopher W. Harrold,
Capt. Lewis Merriam,
Capt. William M. Williams,
Capt. John H. Gifford, and
Capt. Edward I. Grumley.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Clarence Deems to be colonel.
Maj. Charles H. Hunter to be lieutenant-colonel.
Maj. Stephen M. Foote to be lieutenant-colonel.
Capt. George Blakely to be major.
Capt. Frank W. Coe to be major.
First Lieut. Francis W. Clark to be captain.
First Lieut. George A. Wieczorek to be captain.
First Lieut. Edward Canfield, jr., to be captain.
Second Lieut. Edward N. Woodbury to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Ray L. Avery, to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Edward A. Stockton, jr., to be first lieutenant.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Levi P. Hunt to be colonel.
Maj. Edwin P. Andrus to be lieutenant-colonel.
Capt. Daniel L. Tate to be major.
First Lieut. William H. Winters to be captain.
Second Lieut. George E. Price to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Isaac S. Martin to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Raymond S. Bamberger to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. George A. Somerville to be first lieutenant.

INFANTRY ARM.

Capt. Walter H. Gordon to be major.
First Lieut. George I. Feeter to be captain.
Second Lieut. John McE. Pruyn to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Henry W. Fleet to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Francis H. Burr to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. John C. Ashburn to be first lieutenant.
Second Lieut. Robert T. Phinney to be first lieutenant
Second Lieut. Hugh M. Kelly to be first lieutenant.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

John Anson Burket,
Charles Carroll Demmer,
Owen Chester Fisk,
George Burgess Foster, jr.,
James Shelton Fox,
James Charles Haley,
Howard Hume,
Thomas Holland Johnson,
Glenn Irving Jones,
Charles Tomlinson King,
Condon Carlton McCornack, and
Edward Leroy Napier.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Bradford Barnette to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Bradford Barnette to be a lieutenant.

Assistant Paymaster Edward R. Wilson to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Second Lieut. Clayton B. Vogel to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Boatswain Edwin Murphy to be a chief boatswain.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Willard C. Magner, at Morris, Ill.

KANSAS.

Charles Friskel, at Frontenac, Kans.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Benjamin W. Brown, at Northbridge, Mass.

MICHIGAN.

Thomas A. Dailey, at Adrian, Mich.
Cash B. Herman, at Carleton, Mich.
Robert E. Newville, at Boyne, Mich.
M. Byron Pierce, at Farmington, Mich.

MINNESOTA.

Lewis O. Norheim, at Montevideo, Minn.
Harry E. Woodis, at Amboy, Minn.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Frank I. Morrill, at Contoocook, N. H.

NEW JERSEY.

Palmer H. Charlock, at Elizabeth, N. J.

OHIO.

Charles H. Ellis, at Yellow Springs, Ohio.
Emley B. Gatch, at Milford, Ohio.
Seymour S. Tibbals, at Franklin, Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas F. Bourke, at Rossiter, Pa.
James Edward Butler, at Ellwood City, Pa.
David I. Stadden, at Glen Campbell, Pa.
James R. Underwood, at Roscoe, Pa.

VIRGINIA.

Robert Irby, at Appomattox, Va.

WISCONSIN.

Thomas H. Wylie, at Owen, Wis.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 5, 1909.

William G. Wheeler to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, his resignation having been tendered.

INJUNCTION OF SECRECY REMOVED.

The injunction of secrecy was removed by the Senate on April 5, 1909, from an extradition treaty between the United States and the French Republic, signed at Paris on January 6, 1909.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 5, 1909.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 3, 1909, was read and approved.

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 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, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 38.

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications," approved March 2, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to twenty minutes and the gentleman from New York to twenty minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress a joint resolution was passed providing that the documents which were appropriated for or ordered by the last Congress be distributed by Members of the last Congress, thereby shutting out the new Members of this Congress from the distribution of any public documents except those which may be ordered by this Congress until the 1st of next December. The excuse given for that was that it was ordinarily the habit for Congress not to meet until December, and therefore the Members of the Sixtieth Congress ought to have the distribution of documents until the 1st of December. There are, I believe, between 70 and 80 new Members of this House. They have been sworn in; they are here in Washington serving their districts as Members of the House.

When they are asked by their constituents for public documents which are being issued, they are compelled to say that although they are Members of Congress the documents belong to their predecessors who are ex-Members of Congress; and while the resolution was passed in the last House during the time the old Members of Congress were here, it seems to me very appropriate that this House with its new membership shall have the right to vote upon the question as to who shall have the distribution of the documents intended for the various Congressional districts during the time that the new Members are the Members of Congress and the old Members are ex-Members of Congress.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I desire simply to ask whether the gentleman has before him the resolution that it is proposed to repeal by this resolution, and if he has I would be glad to have it read so that we may understand just what we are repealing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which was passed to repeal reads as follows:

House joint resolution 263.

Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixtieth Congress of documents, reports, and other publications.

Resolved, etc., That all documents and books ordered to be published by the Sixtieth Congress which are actually printed prior to the first Monday in December next, to which Members of that Congress not Members of the Sixty-first Congress would have been entitled if published prior to the 4th day of March, shall be allotted such Members, and the term allowed to distribute the same shall be extended to the first Monday of December next.

Approved, March 2, 1909.

Now, by construction of the folding room, it is held that this means not only documents which were ordered printed by the Sixtieth Congress, but documents for which the Sixtieth Congress made the appropriations. Perhaps the easiest document to refer to would be the Agricultural Yearbook, to which each district becomes entitled to in the neighborhood of 1,000 copies. Under the joint resolution, which is now the law, these Yearbooks, which come out in June or July usually, would all go to the credit of the ex-Members of Congress in place of to the credit of the new Members of Congress, and the new Members of Congress being asked in their districts for the Yearbook will be compelled to say that although they are the Members of Congress the distribution of those documents—part of the duty of Members of Congress—is made by a man no longer a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present very briefly the question that is now before the House. I ask the attention of the House that the decision may be made which seems to be fair and just with reference to our own membership. I have no possible personal interest in this question, nor has the Committee on Printing, but in the Sixtieth Congress the question was presented in reference to the distribution of certain documents. The law is that an outgoing Member has the distribution of documents until the convening of the first session of the following Congress.

Under this, as we all know, the new session meets in the December a year following a new Member's election. The result is that the outgoing Member has the distribution of the documents that are published until the meeting of the next session in December following his election. The present Congress meets, instead of December, in the middle of March, and under the wording of the general law, instead of the outgoing Member having the distribution until December, his distribution is cut off in the middle of March. To meet that, so that outgoing Members of the Sixtieth Congress might have exactly the same treatment that has been allotted to the Members of other outgoing Congresses where there is no extra session—that they might have exactly the same treatment that will be accorded to any Member of the Sixty-first Congress who is not reelected—it was provided that in reference to documents ordered by the Sixtieth Congress and not yet published, those should be distributed to the outgoing Members down to December. An extra session has been called. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that documents ordered by this Congress go to the new Members, documents in relation to the tariff, tariff reports, and so forth—every one of those go to the new Members.

They are here in attendance now, and everything authorized by this Congress, everything that pertains to the tariff and the work we are doing, is given to us for distribution; but in reference to those documents which were ordered by the Sixtieth Congress and which might not have been printed by reason of the inability of the printing department to keep up with the requirements as fast as ordered, and are not yet ready for distribution, those go to the old Members. Now, gentlemen, as I say, I have no interest in this thing; but it did seem to the Committee on Printing, it seemed to the Members of the Sixtieth Congress, that we should deal with the outgoing Members of the Sixtieth Congress as Members of all other Congresses have been dealt with. What is the law? A man is elected in November. His office begins in March. He does not get the distribution of documents until December following the beginning of his term, and then he has the distribution for two years; if he is not reelected and goes out in March he has the distribution until the following December. The only exception to that would be the Members of the Sixtieth Congress whose distribution began in December, 1907. Unless we allow the law to remain as we passed it in the last Congress their distribution stops absolutely on the 15th day of March, 1909.

A Member of the Sixtieth Congress not reelected has the distribution of documents for fifteen months and no more. A Member of the Sixty-first Congress begins his distribution in March and he has it for the two years for which he is elected. If he is not reelected he still has it until the following December, because there will not be another extra session to pass another tariff bill two years from now; so a Member of the Sixtieth Congress not reelected has the distribution for fifteen months and a Member of the Sixty-first Congress not reelected will have the distribution for thirty-three months. Do gentlemen think it is fair for a Member of the Sixtieth Congress not reelected to have a distribution for fifteen months and that a Member of the Sixty-first Congress not reelected should have a distribution for thirty-three months?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, surely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the gentleman think the exceptional circumstances of this year—as this is an extra session and the present Members of the Sixty-first Congress will be in Washington during the whole of this spring—that this excep-

tional condition calls for an exception in favor of the Members of this Congress?

Mr. PERKINS. No; because the Members of the Sixty-first Congress have everything that belongs to them. We have everything that is printed as a result of the extra session.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Surely.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. These documents are primarily for the benefit of the people of the different districts. Will not an active Member be more active in making a general distribution than a man that is entirely out and engrossed in his private business?

Mr. PERKINS. I will say, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, that I should be very glad if Congress at some past time had seen fit to change the general law so that every man's distribution should begin the day he came in, session or no session, and should close the day he went out, session or no session. That would have been a better law, but it has not been the law for years untold. Instead of that being the law the distribution has ceased——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Surely.

Mr. SHERLEY. How are we going to make this a better law unless we do it sometime?

Mr. PERKINS. I think it perfectly proper that the Members of the Sixty-first Congress make their requisitions and begin their distribution of the works of this Congress now. I think it would be perfectly proper to have a law providing that at the end of the Sixty-first Congress distribution should be made——

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not the gentleman begging the question if he admits that the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa is right?

Mr. PERKINS. No; not at all; because the Members of the Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, Fifty-eighth, and Fifty-ninth Congresses have all had two years' distribution.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, but the gentleman keeps assuming that the distribution is a perquisite of the Congressman, whereas it is supposed to be for the benefit of his district. Now, if the position of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is right, the sooner we put it in the hands of that person most likely to make the distribution in the district the better.

Mr. PERKINS. If it had been regarded that way by Congress, it would not have been on the statute books for untold years that the distribution should not begin until the beginning of the following session.

Mr. SHERLEY. There can not be such a thing as a vested wrong; and if it is wrong, the sooner we change it the better.

Mr. PERKINS. If it is a vested wrong, certainly not. But it does not seem to be a vested right that a man of the Sixtieth Congress should be turned out with only a fifteen months' distribution—with only a fifteen months' control over books. The gentleman from Kentucky knows perfectly well that when it comes to such a document as the Yearbook, they were promised long in advance; he knows perfectly well that every Member of this House has upon the books in which he keeps his records a list of applications which exhaust every publication which he has as soon as it is placed to his credit.

Mr. SHERLEY. The "gentleman from Kentucky" certainly does not know it, but it may be true as to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] yield to his colleague [Mr. SULZER]?

Mr. PERKINS. I do.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman from New York explain to the House as briefly as he can just the difference between himself and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] regarding the distribution of public documents.

Mr. PERKINS. The difference is exactly this: The law has been, or the operation of the law has been, because Congress does not meet until December, though the term begins in March, that a Member coming into Congress has had books placed to his credit in December and distributes them from the December that he came in until the December following the closing of his term. On account of the special session meeting in March, we thought it was just that there should be the same distribution ordered in reference to Members of the Sixtieth Congress that had been followed for years in reference to Members of prior Congresses, and therefore we provided that the holding of the special session should not change that law, but that the Members of the Sixtieth Congress not reelected should have a distribution of documents ordered by the Sixtieth Congress, as they would have had if this extra session had not been called, the Members of the new Congress having, of course, the publications ordered as the result of the extra session. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to repeal that provision, and the result would be that the outgoing Members of the Sixtieth Congress will lose the distribution of publications which they ordered, but which are not yet printed.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. PERKINS. Surely.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not true that Congress originally provided that this distribution should commence from the "opening of Congress," for the reason that when a Member is elected the demand becomes greater upon the Member-elect, especially when Congress is in session, than upon the outgoing Member?

Mr. PERKINS. I hardly think that. The gentleman knows that the minute he is elected people regard him as having begun his office, and in his district they know he is coming here as a Member of Congress.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not a fact that anything that is desired to be brought to the attention of the Member of Congress by a constituent is directed to the person elected to Congress after Congress assembles, and not to the retired Member?

Mr. PERKINS. The constituent generally knows who has been elected in his own district in the previous November, and sends his request to him.

Mr. JAMES. Now, supposing a letter is addressed to the "Member of Congress from the First District of Kentucky," with a request contained in it from some one in his district; that letter is given to you and you are required to fill it with such books as requested; does the gentleman not think that we are expected, as we are here, to secure them, and it is not expected of the man who is not here? [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. I will say that I do not believe there is anybody in the gentleman's district would address a letter to him as the Member from the First District, but would address it to him as "Ollie M. James."

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I would like the gentleman to point out the line of demarcation in reference to this proposition: My predecessor has returned to his home and profession in private life. I am here and I am being deluged with requests that I ought to be able to fill, and he can not.

Mr. PERKINS. I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I occupied?

The SPEAKER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. I reserve my time.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I only want a moment on this resolution. I simply want to state the position that confronts the new Members. I live in a very remote district. My predecessor has returned to his home and his profession. I am here in Washington and Congress is in session. As the fact is known to my constituents, I am daily being deluged with a number of requests for seeds and maps and documents and the various kinds of government publications. I want to ask the gentleman who is opposing this resolution how these requests are to be satisfied? I want to say to him that it is decidedly embarrassing for me to have to write to those people and inform them that those publications have been allotted to a man who is no longer in office, and that I, who am here, for that reason am unable to supply those requests. Now, I want to say to you, gentlemen, that I believe that I can speak for all new Members, that we do not want these publications for the purpose of gratuitously flooding our districts with them, but that we do want them for the purpose of complying with the demands and the requests that we are daily receiving from our constituents, to whom these publications belong, and not to our predecessors in office. [Applause.] Therefore, gentlemen, I trust that you will see the predicament in which 70 or 80 new Members have been placed; that you will consider that these publications are the property and perquisites of our constituents, and not of ourselves or our predecessors, and that you will pass the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Colorado has hardly stated the case for the new Members as strongly as it deserves. The new Members here are intensely interested in this resolution. The requests they are receiving for papers and documents are so many that their position is very embarrassing under the present conditions, so much so that they would not be justified in voting against this resolution. The President of the United States loses all of his prerogatives the moment he steps down from his office. The moment a judge steps out of his office he loses control over

the business of his court; and everywhere as soon as a man leaves an office he ceases to perform the functions of that office. Now, why should a gentleman who has been a Member of Congress continue after his term expires to exercise the privileges of that office, unless it be to inflict humiliation upon the man who comes to take his place? I believe the present condition does us new Members great injustice, and I hope the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member on the floor of this House, and have been forced to the necessity of actually buying public documents in order to supply the needs of my constituents. Now, I either want this resolution passed or my pay increased in order to meet this extraordinary expense. [Laughter.] The salaries of the retiring Members of the Sixtieth Congress ceased on the 4th of March, their allowance for clerk hire ceased on the 4th of March, their distribution of garden seed ceased on the 4th of March, and there is no good, sound reason why their supply of public documents should not cease on the 4th of March.

Now, I know of one case where a retiring Member of Congress, who for some reason did not feel friendly to his successor, actually gave the documents away to some other Member of Congress not representing his district. The documents are the property of the people of the various districts, and not the property of the retiring Members. In my own case, my predecessor was kind enough simply to leave the walls of the office in which I transact my official duties. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from New York will use part of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALBY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] has six minutes remaining.

Mr. PERKINS. How much time has the gentleman from Illinois still left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten minutes time.

Mr. PERKINS. I will ask the gentleman if he is going to yield to any other speakers?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman is only going to make one more speech, I will take a minute or two myself to conclude, without yielding any more time.

Mr. PERKINS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I only wish to say a word or two. In this matter I represent those who are not here. Let us in this matter be fair. Three-quarters of us have no personal interest in it, but a rule is being applied to others which all of us have been subjected to. When I was first elected, as was the case with every Member of this House, the people in my district knew perfectly well who was the Member of Congress, and I received a certain number of applications, as you now receive a certain number of applications which perhaps you are unable to fill.

When I was elected, as was the case with everyone here, our terms began in March, but not until December did our distribution of documents begin. We have all gone through with that experience. I found no great difficulty with it. My constituents were perfectly reasonable. I either got documents from my predecessor, if he was willing to turn them over, or if he had turned them over to some one else I wrote back to my constituents and said, "Write me after December, when the distribution begins," and in that way I had no great difficulty. As a reward for that, when I go out of Congress I shall have the distribution under the general rule until the December after my term expires. I have no interest in this matter, but it does seem to me unfair that the Members of the Sixtieth Congress shall be the only Congressmen in years past or years to come who, instead of having their full two years' distribution, shall have it only for fifteen months.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, just one word. I came into Congress twelve years ago at the extra session which passed the Dingley tariff law, and I desire by the resolution that I now ask the House to vote upon to apply the same rule to new Members now which was applied when the last tariff law was passed at a special session. The new Members then received the public documents, and the old Members of the Fifty-fourth Congress did not have the gall to ask that they be allowed to rob the new Members. [Applause.] The gentleman from New York [Mr. PERKINS] says we should be fair. I believe in fairness. When the joint resolution was passed by the last Congress it was not an exhibition of fairness or justice, it was merely an exhibition of power. Now we have the opportunity to do away with the mere exhibition of power, and to deal fairness and justice to the new Members of Congress and to their districts. [Applause.] The people of their districts are entitled to receive their public documents from the men whom they have elected as their Members of Congress, and not from mere private citizens. [Applause.] I ask for a vote.

Mr. HOBSON. Before the gentleman takes his seat will he yield for a question as to the effect of this provision?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HOBSON. Reference has been made to the possible advantages of a change of procedure in this matter. I merely wish to ask the gentleman if the adoption of this resolution would accomplish that effect, and whether, after the 4th of March, 1911, when this Congress expires, the issuance of publications would cease for those who are now Members of Congress?

Mr. MANN. The resolution now under consideration and the resolution sought to be repealed only apply to the year 1909. They have no application after that. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the suspension of the rules and the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS), there were—ayes 190, noes 18.

Accordingly (two-thirds voting in affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution passed.

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 House bill 1438, the tariff bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry, and if the Chair can not answer it, it may be that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee can. I want to ask if it is not advisable to quit this general debate and at once take up the bill under the five-minute rule, discuss it from the first section to the last section for amendment, and report it back and pass it? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALBY). The gentleman from Missouri does not state a parliamentary inquiry, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I want to make one remark, and that is, we are ready for that performance right now. [Laughter.] [Cries of "The regular order!" on the Republican side.]

You can yell "Regular order" as much as you please, but you can not take that out of the RECORD except by a record vote. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The motion of Mr. PAYNE was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detain the House or to lengthen out this debate, which has dragged its length along for these last two weeks. I had intended on last Monday to say something to the House on the position I occupy on this bill, but I was prevented from doing so by very serious illness. Nor can I expect, nor do I now intend, to occupy, even if I were physically able, the time that it would take me to discuss the propositions in this bill as I had intended.

I merely rise, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of briefly discussing some of the features of this bill, and will amplify my views in the RECORD. I am one of those Representatives, Mr. Chairman, coming from that section of the country, the South, whose development in recent years has amazed and startled our own country and the world. Our increase in wealth, manufactures, in the products of the farm, the mine, and the factory, and everything that makes a people great and prosperous, is amazing, not because of any favorable or special privileges that the Government of the United States have given us at the expense of other citizens of the United States, but in spite of all vicious legislation at the hands of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not here to demand for my people, in this bill or any other bill, a change of the tariff law, or any special privileges for any product or manufacture of my section. We are ready to bear the burdens of taxation, and we do not want to reap any benefit that may result from the Government extending unequal taxation to any citizen of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We are for a tariff for revenue when the Government is economically administered, but not a dollar for protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The great cotton industry of the South, which pours into the laps of the people of the United States a golden stream of wealth, which during the prosperity from 1898 to 1907 made the balance in our favor of exports over imports, is the great-

est wealth-producing crop of the United States and of the world. The producers of this wealth-bearing crop, which brought in nearly $450,000,000 per annum of foreign gold to our people for the past eight years, do not ask, do not demand, protection of their raw product or the finished manufactures—do not demand any protection or special privileges at the hands of the Government for that great staple. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nor do we believe it is the duty of the Government to lay the hard and partial hand of taxation on the necessities of the people in order to give us an advantage over others upon the products we produce and the things we manufacture. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, it can not be expected that anyone in any reasonable time can discuss the party principles and party differences involved in the question of the tariff, with the various theories that are held relative thereto and the schedules which this bill contains. From the beginning of our Government it has been the policy followed by all political parties to raise a part of the revenue for the Government by the levy of duties upon imports. This must be done in order to obtain revenue for the Government, or other plans of taxation must be resorted to and other sources of revenue sought.

So long as our Federal Constitution limits the method and manner of taxation by the General Government, resort should be had for revenue to a tariff on imports. Otherwise, we must resort to direct taxation and apportion it amongst the States, according to population. I do not believe that the American people, and especially those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits and who own the land and real estate, will ever agree to such a change in our fiscal policy. Therefore nearly all are agreed that we must have a tariff law. It is as to the application of the principle of taxing imports by tariff duties to the various articles imported that the differences exist.

THE POWER OF TAXATION.

Nothing is more important than the question of taxation, and in this age and generation very few people can be found, even amongst the extreme protectionists, who will now deny that the tariff is a tax and that it must be paid by the American consumer. This power to tax is the strongest and most pervading of all the powers of government, reaching, as it does, directly or indirectly, all classes of people. As was stated by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of McCullough *v.* Maryland:

> The power to tax is the power to destroy.

No better illustration can be given of the truth of this proposition than the existing 10 per cent tax imposed on the circulation of all other banks than the national banks, because it drove out of existence every state bank of circulation within a year after its passage. This power to tax, and therefore this power to destroy, can be as easily employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to another, if there is no limitation on the use of the power which may be exercised.

To quote the language of Judge Miller, in the case of the Loan Association *v.* Topeka (20 Wallace, 657):

> To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortunes is none the less robbery because it is done under the form of law and is called "taxation." This is not legislation, but it is a decree under legislative forms.

The word "taxes" has been defined as the rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of the citizen by government for the use of the Nation or State, or as burdens or charges imposed by the legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.

To quote Judge Miller further:

> If it be said that a local benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactories, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. The merchant, the mechanic, the innkeeper, the banker, the builder, the steamboat owner are equally promoters of the public good and equally deserving of the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to the importunities of two-thirds of the business men of the city or town.

In this opinion Justice Miller quotes with approval certain cases from the State of Maine, to be found in the Fifty-eighth Maine Reports, page 590, and amongst other things as follows:

> Taxes are the enforced proportional contribution of each citizen out of his estate, levied by authority of the state for the support of the government and for all public needs. They are the property of the citizen, taken from the citizen by the government, and they are to be disposed of by it.
>
> There is nothing of a public nature any more entitling the manufacturer to public gifts than the sailor, the farmer, or the lumberman. Our Government is based upon equality of rights. All honest employments are honorable. The state can not rightfully discriminate among occupations, for discrimination in favor of one branch or one industry is discrimination adverse to all other branches. The state is equally to protect all, giving no undue advantage or special and exclusive preference to any.
>
> No public exigency can require private spoliation for the private benefit of favored individuals. If the citizen is protected in his property by the Constitution against the public, much more is he against private rapacity.

Instances might be multiplied by quoting like declarations by the courts dealing with the question of the right to tax the people for the benefit of any special interest. The right of commerce and trade we do not get from the Constitution, nor did our ancestors get it from kings; it is an inherent right of the Anglo-Saxon and of the American citizen. All restrictions upon it and all burdens placed upon the right to trade and commerce, other than to raise revenue for the Government, are contrary to the theory of a free republic. One of the chief grievances of the American colonies against George the Third, set forth in the Declaration of Independence, was "for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world."

NEW ENGLAND'S FIRST VIEWS ON THE TARIFF.

At that time, and up to 1846, England was and had been for centuries the most earnest, vigorous, and determined champion of protection the world ever saw, and enforced the extremest doctrines by all the powers of war and all the arts of diplomacy. To use the language of a distinguished Republican Senator from Maine in 1882:

> She destroyed the growing commerce of Ireland by one blow of her navigation laws; repressed her cattle raising, her woolgrowing, her manufactories, and made her the waste of to-day. She attempted the same rôle in America; forbid the exportation of her products to any other country than her own; forced all the carrying trade into English bottoms; repressed all manufactories of fabrics, and provided by law that none of the American colonies should manufacture iron of any kind; that no smith should make a bolt, spike, or nail of bar or wrought iron; that no mill or other engine for rolling iron or furnace for making steel should be permitted; and finally drove us to the Revolution and lost the brightest jewel from her diadem. * * *

The resistance to this oppression by taxation and restriction of trade showed itself in Massachusetts Bay, when the citizens of Boston, painted as savages, boarded the tariff-ridden ships and dumped the tea of tyranny into the waters of the harbor. The crack of the rifles of the patriots at Bunker Hill and Lexington in defense of the right to resist this oppression was heard around the world.

It may be well to recall something that Massachusetts has said and done in opposition to the protective policy, since Massachusetts and the East are to be benefited, probably, more by this bill than any other section of the country, and have grown rich and powerful by the maintenance and continuance of the protective system. The merchants of Boston in 1820 met at a town meeting and appointed a general committee, consisting of 29 men, amongst them some of the most honored of the State and most distinguished of the country. Mr. Daniel Webster was appointed chairman of a committee of seven to consider the scheme of a protective tariff. They issued an address, in which they invited the manufacturers, merchants, and farmers of the State to confer with them, and these delegates from all parts of the State formulated their views into a series of resolutions.

Certain things are stated in the resolutions and in the report made by Mr. Webster which may sound strange now, but it may be well to recall them. Amongst other things they alleged:

> That the avowed object of protection was to direct and control the occupations of men by granting special privileges to those engaged in particular pursuits.

They said further:

> This can be done (waiving any question whether it can be done at all without violating the spirit of the Constitution) only at the expense of the community, for it is a fact that legislation does not create wealth, but simply transfers it from hand to hand, and can enrich one class only by impoverishing others. It would surely be surprising that a system of restriction so unequal and so repugnant to all sound theories should be adopted by a free and enlightened people at a time when the greatest nations of Europe, after a long trial of it, have openly acknowledged its incorrectness, and whole nations suffering and lamenting the consequences of its adoption, and when our own unexampled success, under a more liberal policy, has given the sanction of experience to the deduction of reason.

This is but a part of the report, but he quoted the resolutions as follows:

> *Resolved.* That no objection ought ever to be made to any amount of taxes equally apportioned and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue necessary for the support of government, but that taxes imposed upon the people for the sole benefit of any one class of men are equally inconsistent with the principles of our Constitution and with sound policy.
>
> *Resolved,* That high bounties on such domestic manufactures as are principally benefited by that tariff (meaning the tariff then proposed)

favor great capitalists rather than personal industry or the owners of small capitals, and therefore that we do not perceive its tendency to promote national industry.

Resolved, That we are equally incapable of discovering its beneficial effects on agriculture, since the obvious consequences of its adoption would be that the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys and receive less for all he sells.

The entire memorial was presented by Mr. Webster in the first session of the Eighteenth Congress. (See Annals of Congress, vol. 2, pp. 3079, 3091.)

Thus it is true that years before the Democratic party placed in its platform opposition to this policy of tariff taxation of the many for the benefit of the few, the able men of New England pronounced this policy of protection inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States and with our theory of government.

THE DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

The substance of the Democratic theory can be found in the declarations of its platforms enunciated in 1832, 1836, and 1840, and since then, in this proposition:

That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of any other, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of the common country. We hold that the citizen of every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon equality of rights and privileges.

HENRY CLAY'S VIEW.

The Republican doctrine of to-day, which claims to be founded upon the theory of the American system advocated by Mr. CLAY, who was the chief exponent of the system in the early days of the Republic, has gone far beyond anything ever conceived or intended by Mr. Clay, and to-day the Republican doctrine stands for protection, not to the infant industries, but protection to certain favored manufacturing industries at the sacrifice of the rights and interests of all the other thousands and millions of people in the United States. The American policy advocated by Mr. Clay never looked to the closing of our markets against foreign products; all that he ever claimed was such an adjustment of duties for revenue as would afford incidental protection to home industries. In 1815, in a debate on the tariff, he proposed to raise money to pay off the war debt, and only urged a duty on imports of 25 per cent, instead of 20 per cent. He said:

In three years we can judge of the ability of our establishments to furnish these articles as cheaply as they were obtained from abroad, and can then legislate with the lights of experience.

He believed that three years would be sufficient time to place our industries on this desirable footing. Yet nearly one hundred years have passed since Mr. Clay announced this doctrine, and it is claimed now that we should not only levy tariff taxes to raise revenue but to encourage industries that were infants at that time. A century of protection has hardly been able to satisfy these infant industries, and we have now a tariff tax of 45 per cent ad valorem; and when the Treasury has been full and a surplus accumulated, that surplus has been dissipated by extravagant and wasteful expenditures, and there has not been any effort made to reduce taxes to something like a revenue standard, and every effort to do so is denounced by protectionists as ruinous to American industry. Mr. Clay can not be charged with having any such ideas as are now entertained by the Republican majority.

In 1842, in the Senate, while discussing the tariff act of 1832, in which all the duties were pared to the uniform rate of 20 per cent, Mr. Clay said:

If the compromise act had not been adopted, the whole system of protection would have been swept by the boards by the preponderating influence of the illustrious man at the head of the Government (President Jackson) at the very next session after its enactment.

And that so far as he could go he would; and that was not to lay duties for protection alone, but in laying duties for revenue to supply the Government with means, to so lay them as to afford incidental protection. He would, therefore, say to the friends of protection, "Lay aside all attempts beyond this standard and look to what is attainable and practicable."

Surely, if the spirit of Henry Clay could revisit these Halls, he would be shocked and horrified to be told that he was the father or founder of any such system which would produce such a bill for the country as the one under consideration.

DANIEL WEBSTER'S VIEW.

Daniel Webster, in his debate in the House in 1824, in reply to Mr. Clay, who advocated what he called "the American policy of protection," said:

Sir, that is the true American policy which shall most fully employ American capital and labor and best sustain the whole population. With me it is a fundamental axiom; it is interwoven with my opinions; the greatest interests of the country are united and inseparable; agriculture, commerce and manufacturing will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF OF 1846.

Various tariff battles were waged and laws enacted until 1846, when what is known as the "Walker tariff act" was passed.

This was a Democratic tariff, which imposed the highest duties upon luxuries and the lowest upon necessaries. No duty, even upon luxuries, was higher than 40 per cent ad valorem, except in the case of brandy and whisky distilled from corn, and other spirituous liquors or beverages of a similar character, which were taxed 100 per cent. No better illustration of the assertion that this Walker tariff act was the best tariff law we have ever had could be found than in the statement of Senator Allison, a Republican, of Iowa, in 1870, then a prominent Member of the House, and later, and until he died, one of the most distinguished Senators of the United States, as follows:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any we have ever had. If any interest was depressed under the tariff of 1846, it was the iron interest. I do not believe that this interest, as compared with other interests, had sufficient advantage under that tariff; yet when we compare the growth of the country from 1840 to 1850 with the growth of the country from 1850 to 1860—the latter decade being entirely under the tariff of 1846, or the amended and greatly reduced tariff of 1857—we find that the increase in our wealth between 1850 and 1860 was equivalent to 126 per cent, while it was only 64 per cent between 1840 and 1850, four years of which decade were under the tariff of 1842, known as a "high protective tariff," but the average rate of which was about 70 per cent below the existing rate, or 27 per cent under the tariff of 1842 as against 44 per cent upon all importations under the present tariff. Our industries were generally prosperous in 1860, with the exception, possibly, of the iron interest. This was the statement of Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, on this floor during the discussion of the tariff of 1864. With regard to the condition of the steel industry in 1860, the steel manufacturers in 1866, memorializing Congress for increase of duties on steel, stated that—

"It was reserved for Pittsburg to bring about the first substantial and enduring success in the year of 1860; and encouraged by our example numerous establishments have sprung into existence, as already indicated in this paper. This shows that under the revenue tariff of 1857, which imposed only an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent on steel, a substantial success was achieved in the steel manufacture in 1860." I have read the language of the memorial.

To show what the view of Mr. Walker was on this subject of raising revenue, I quote from his report, as follows:

This revenue of $244,000,000 a year as a maximum, I would derive from three sources alone:

1. By a tariff for revenue.
2. By an excise on wines, malt and spirituous liquors, and tobacco, abolishing all other internal taxation.
3. By a tax on our national banks, based upon just and fair equivalents.

In later years, he wrote of the effect of such a tariff:

A tariff for revenue, as experience has shown, instead of depressing improves all industrial pursuits, including manufactures, and vastly augments the wealth of the country. Under the tariff of 1846, as shown by the census, our wealth increase from 1850 to 1860, 126.54 per cent; whereas from 1840 to 1850 the increase was only 64 per cent; from 1830 to 1840, 42 per cent; and from 1820 to 1830, 41 per cent. So, also, from 1850 to 1860 our agricultural products increased 95 per cent, and our manufactures 87 per cent, being in both cases nearly double any preceding ratio of increase. So also our imports, exports, and revenue nearly tripled in the same period of time, and our domestic trade rose nearly in the same ratio. This augmented ratio is not the result of increase of population, which, from 1850 to 1860, was less than 36 per cent. The Irish famine was supposed by my opponents to account for the increase the first year, although the decreased price paid abroad that year for our cotton nearly equaled the additional sum paid by England for our breadstuffs and provisions. But the next year and the next, before any gold had reached here from California, our exports and revenue went on augmenting in a corresponding ratio, rising in eight years from $22,000,000, under that tariff of 1842, to $64,000,000, under the tariff of 1846.

There is another insuperable objection to the specific system, namely, that it unnecessarily and invariably taxes labor vastly more than capital, and the poor in a much greater proportion than the rich, upon the goods consumed. Under the system of specific duties of so much per pound, or yard, or gallon, etc., the specific duty is the same. The rich, who purchase the costly articles bearing only the same specific duty, pay, in proportion to value, less than one-half of what is paid by the poor, who purchase a cheaper and less costly article. If we take all the costly articles purchased by the rich bearing under the present tariff the same specific duty as the inferior article bought by the poor, we will find the difference against them exceeds $20,000,000 a year. Such is the immense additional tax exacted from labor under the system of specific duties.

This act of 1846 remained in force until 1857, when the duties on imports were reduced, and this remained true until 1861, at the beginning of the civil war, when a tariff act was passed providing for the raising of revenue for the Government at that time, and this was from time to time amended, increasing the rates and imposing an internal-revenue tax and a direct tax; and the captions of these bills show that they were intended to temporarily increase the duties on imports. These laws continued in force until 1870, when a tariff bill was framed reduc-

ing the internal-revenue taxes, but not reducing the tariff taxes. In 1872 a pretense was made to reduce duties, but the high protective duties still continued. Again in 1883 the internal-revenue tax was decreased, but the tariff taxes were kept up. An effort was made in 1888 by a Democratic House to reduce tariff taxation in what was known as the "Mills bill." While this bill passed the House, it failed in the Senate, the Senate being Republican. This brings us to the McKinley bill of 1890, the title of which act was to reduce revenue, which had accumulated under the tariff act of 1883, and under this act the protective duties were higher than during the war. Then came the Wilson bill of 1894, to provide revenue for the Government, but which failed of its purpose by reason of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States declaring the income tax unconstitutional. Then we had the Dingley bill of 1897, which had for its purpose to provide revenue and encourage the industries of the United States; and now we have the Payne bill, which has for its alleged purposes, to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage industries.

The American people, chafing under the injustice and wrong of these schedules which have existed since 1897, have made demands upon the party in power that they should be reduced. The pledge of the Republican party, as construed by the Chief Executive while a candidate for the Presidency, is that we shall have tariff revision downward. Yet, in this bill the same special interests are taken care of, duties are not equalized, and the same discrimination and injustice is practiced against the American people. The same power to tax is exercised and used and the burdens of the people are not at all diminished, and the property of the citizen is again to be confiscated by the Government for the benefit of the few. If it were left to me, I would eliminate every trace of what I conceive to be the plunder of the public for the benefit of the few from this system of taxation; I would prevent a few men from making their living in the sweat of other men's brows. It is not, in my judgment, a proper exercise of the taxing power; when the Government thus taxes the property of the citizen it amounts, in many instances, to confiscation, even though the proceeds be devoted to governmental purposes. By the exercise of the power conferred by this bill, under the guise of protection to the industries of the country, the Government places in the hands of individuals and corporations the power to confiscate the property of their neighbors for private gain. Taxation for governmental purposes is a burden, but to confer upon individuals the power to confiscate property is robbery.

This system of protection has grown so strong and has been fostered to such an extent that those who live upon it think it is sacred, as a statute contained in the Ark of the Covenant, and that it should be preserved unchangeable, like the laws of the Medes and Persians. They assume that it is right and proper at any time to put burdens upon the people, but that the people who bear these burdens have no right, whether in times of prosperity or in the time of adversity, to have them mitigated; that no Democrat shall dare touch it, and that it can only be handled by its friends. They flatly declare that we should bear the burdens of the system, sell our products wherever we can, but that we must buy what we need where they please for us to buy.

I now propose to discuss some of the features of this bill, which will be known as the "Payne bill."

THE DINGLEY BILL.

The effect of the administration of the policies promulgated by the Dingley bill have been such that the people, without regard to party, have clamored for and demanded a revision of the tariff schedules provided in that act. Under the Dingley Act, as under all protective-tariff acts, trusts and combinations have been formed, and the formation and combination of these trusts are but the natural results of the protective-tariff system. The protective tariff has been justly said to be the genesis of the trusts, and the trusts produce oppression and monopoly. So oppressive have been the exactions of the trusts under the Dingley law that a distinguished Republican, now a Senator from Iowa, said of it:

All the robberies and thefts committed by the insurance officials since the life insurance business was originated do not amount to the extortions paid under the Dingley law in one year.

Under it the prices of all articles, and especially the necessaries of life, have been advanced to the American consumer, while the foreigner has been favored by these same manufacturers and trusts and buy the same articles in the foreign markets at a much cheaper price. The demand of the people for a revision was so loud and insistent that the Republican party, which had produced these conditions by its protective-tariff law of 1897, was forced to heed it in its platform of 1908, when it promised revision of the tariff. The Republicans have stood pat for many years, until they realized that their standing pat would no longer bluff the people into submission, and they have finally thrown down their pat hand and in this bill presented a tariff measure which, in its effect, will be worse and more disastrous to the people than has been the Dingley law. The party in power has presented a bill which will ultimately raise the ad valorem rate 1.56 per cent, and they have buttressed so many of its provisions with jokers and countervailing duties upon many of the necessaries of life that, under the pretense of having articles admitted free or the duties thereon lessened, the actual tariff will be increased over the present rates.

I do not hesitate to say that this measure will be hailed by the manufacturers and combinations and trusts with much more joy than they welcomed the Dingley law. There is not a single provision in it that looks to in any way lessening the power and control of the monopolies in the United States, and the old game of extorting from the people will go on in the same way under this as under former high-protective tariff bills of the Republican party. The trusts will still flourish and will still bleed and plunder the people. The hope of the American people that this Congress would bring a blessing in the shape of a reduction of the tariff schedules is to be blasted if this bill becomes a law.

The present conditions are very much akin to those which existed in England in the seventeenth century during the reigns of Elizabeth and Charles the First. Monopolies in the necessaries of life flourished by grants from the Crown. Charles the First lost his head and the reign of Elizabeth was in danger of a shameful and disgraceful end by reason thereof. Our English ancestors began the fight against monopolies, and their descendants will continue the battle until the victory is won. It may not be amiss to recall the condition of affairs in England during that time. They are thus described by the historian Macaulay:

It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition, which had during forty years been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The ground was well chosen. The English sovereigns had always been intrusted with the supreme direction of commercial policies. It was their undoubted prerogative to regulate coins, weights, and measures, and to appoint fairs, markets, and ports. The line which bounded their authority over trade had, as usual, been but loosely drawn. They therefore, as usual, encroached on the province which rightfully belonged to the legislature.

The encroachment was, as usual, patiently borne till it became serious. But at length the Queen took upon herself to grant patents and monopolies by scores. There was scarcely a family in the realm that did not feel itself aggrieved by the oppression and extortion which the abuse naturally caused. Iron, oil, vinegar, coal, lead, starch, yarn, leather, glass, could be bought only at exorbitant prices. The House of Commons met in angry and determined mood. It was in vain that a courtly minority blamed the speaker for suffering the acts of the Queen's highness to be called in question. The language of the discontented party was high and menacing, and was echoed by the voice of the whole nation. The coach of the chief minister of the Crown was surrounded by an indignant populace, who cursed monopolies and exclaimed that the prerogative should not be allowed to touch the old liberties of England.

The Queen's reign was in danger of a shameful and disgraceful end, but that she, with admirable judgment, declined the contest and redressed the grievance, and in touching language thanked the Commons for their care of the common weal.

At the meeting of the Long Parliament, Sir John Culpepper thus spoke of these monopolies which oppressed the people:

They are a nest of wasps—a swarm of vermin which have overcrept the land. Like the frogs of Egypt, they have gotten possession of our dwellings, and we have scarce a room free from them. They sup in our cup; they dip in our dish; they sit by our fire. We find them in the dye fat, washbowl, and powdering tub. They share with the butler in his box. They will not bait us a pin. We may not buy our clothes without their brokerage. These are the leeches that have sucked the commonwealth so hard that it is almost hectical. Mr. Speaker, I have echoed to you the cries of the kingdom. I will tell you their hopes. They look to heaven for a blessing on this Parliament.

As an illustration of the present conditions and how this protective tariff builds up the manufacturer and extorts from the consumer, I call attention to the following statement made by Mr. H. E. Miles, a member of the National Manufacturers' Association, the chairman of its tariff committee, a manufacturer of agricultural implements, and at the head of that trust. The statement is taken from the American Industries, and was published on November 15, 1907, as follows:

I have made money every year out of the tariff graft. Not much, but still a little.

The tariff barons raised their price $50,000 to me. I made a charge against the jobber of $60,000, and I know that he charged more than $70,000 for the $60,000 he paid me. Before reaching the consumer the $50,000 charge became about $100,000, to be paid by the agricultural consumer.

The manufacturer who would prosper must make a double profit, one by the shrewd management of his business and another by still shrewder manipulation in Washington.

We have no great difficulty in shopping abroad, for we could get as high prices as at home. We are so held up, however, by our supply people that to most of us there is very scant profit in foreign business.

When Congress gave us 45 per cent, we needing only 20 per cent, they gave us a congressional permit, if not an invitation, to consolidate, form one great trust and advance our prices 25 per cent, being the difference between the 20 per cent needed and the 45 per cent given.

Mr. Miles shows how the tariff raises prices to those who, in manufacturing, have to buy other manufactured products. This expense is transferred to the next purchaser. The jobber charges a profit on the tariff, as well as on the cost of the article, and each person who handles the product collects a profit, so that, according to Mr. Miles, the first charge of $50,000 becomes $100,000 by the time it reaches the consumer. Mr. Miles in another article estimates the total loss to the people at $500,000,000 annually. The statement of Mr. Miles also shows that the tariff law is an invitation to consolidate, and that having been given the tariff on the theory that it is needed, the manufacturers naturally assume that it is intended that they shall take advantage of it, even if they have to combine to do so.

So to-day, in America, three hundred years after this fight against monopoly was inaugurated and carried on by the English people, we have a repetition of that condition. The American people have looked to this Congress, called in special session by the President, to remedy the evils that exist, and instead of receiving a blessing at the hands of Congress they have received this bill, which but further fastens the chains of monopoly upon the people. I believe that the same spirit of resistance to oppression and the exactions at the hands of the trusts and monopolies still lives in the American heart as found expression in our English ancestors three hundred years ago and that they will hold to a severe reckoning this Republican majority, which, in this bill, have so betrayed the trust of the people.

Let us examine some of the provisions of the bill briefly and see what has been done toward lessening the burdens of the people. You set out to raise revenue for a depleted Treasury, which your Dingley law has failed to keep replenished and which your extravagance has emptied. Your Dingley law has not only increased the amount the people must pay for the necessaries of life, but it has produced a panic. You not only propose to increase taxation by still further burdening the consumers of the land with an increased cost of living, but you propose to issue bonds and certificates of indebtedness in a time of profound peace. Your McKinley bill produced a panic in 1893 and forced you to prepare to issue bonds, after you had wasted a surplus left you by a Democratic President, and the same result has followed the Dingley bill—extravagance in public expenditures, a deficit in the public revenues, and bond issues in time of peace.

THE PAYNE BILL.

The Government must have revenue, and you propose to raise it by this bill—not by taxing the incomes of the rich and laying burdens upon the luxuries of life, but by taxing the inheritances of the poor, and by laying burdens upon the necessaries of life, which the common people and the poor must have. You propose to make the American breakfast table bear an increased burden of eleven and a half million dollars. Tea and coffee must be taxed to make up the deficit caused by your inefficient Dingley bill and by your extravagance. Under your proposed scheme of tariff revision, throughout this entire bill, the burdens of the poor are increased and no increased burden is put upon the rich. The cheaper grades of clothing, both of wool and cotton, must bear an additional burden. The cheaper the article and the greater its consumption, the more it is taxed under the provisions of this bill. It is proposed to raise nearly $7,000,000 from tea and $1,000,000 from the increased duty on hosiery, and that of the cheaper kinds, which already pays a tax of about $3,500,000; ladies' gloves are required to pay $1,500,000 of increased duty, making the toll on the women who wear gloves nearly $5,000,000.

THE PROVISION IN REFERENCE TO COFFEE.

The countervailing duty on coffee will amount to a tax of $2.90 per 100 pounds on all the coffee purchased from Brazil, which is the chief coffee-producing country of South America, and which supplies to this country 750,000,000 pounds of the 900,000,000 pounds consumed by our people. I base this statement upon information which I get from the Daily Consular Report of March 27, 1909, issued by the Bureau of Manufactures, and which is as follows:

EXPORT DUTIES ON COFFEE.

THEIR RELATION TO PROPOSED IMPORT DUTY IN UNITED STATES.

The tariff bill under consideration in the House of Representatives provides "that if any country, dependency, province, or colony shall impose an export duty or other export tax or charge of any kind whatsoever, directly or indirectly, upon coffee exported to the United States, a duty equal to such export duty, tax, or charge shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon."

The following statement shows the countries which impose export duties or taxes on coffee, the units for taxation, and rate. A column is added showing the equivalent of such tax in United States currency on 100 pounds of coffee.

Country.	Unit.	Rate of duty.	
		Foreign currency.	United States equivalent, 100 pounds.
Belgian Congo	100 kilos [a]	3 francs [b]	$0.263
Brazil:			
Rio de Janeiro	Kilo	29.75 reis	.411
Minas Geraes	Ad valorem	8½ per cent	
São Paulo	Kilo	41.4 reis	.57
Ceylon	Cwt	0.10 rupee	.029
Dominican Republic	46 kilos	$0.15	.1485
Ecuador	Kilo	0.005 sucre	.11
French Congo	Ad valorem	5 per cent	
French Somali coast protectorate	100 kilos	1 franc	.0088
Guatemala	101 pounds	$1	.99
Haiti:			
Coffee	do	$3	2.97
Coffee, broken, and residues of	do	$2.50	2.475
Nicaragua	100 pounds	$0.40	.40
Portuguese possessions:			
Cape Verde Islands	Kilo	4 reis	.20
Congo	100 kilos	1$080	.825
San Thome and Principe—			
To Portuguese ports	Kilo	16 reis	.78
To foreign ports in foreign vessels.	do	45 reis	2.21
To foreign ports in Portuguese vessels.	do	30 reis	1.47
Timor	Picul	2$520	1.99
Salvador:			
From the ports of Libertad and Acatjutia.	46 kilos	$0.40	.40
Surtax	do	0.265 pesos [c]	.10
From the port of La Union	do	$0.40	.40
Surtax	do	0.51 pesos [c]	.194

[a] Equals 220 pounds. [b] One franc equals 19.3 cents. [c] Silver.

In addition to the tax imposed by the Brazilian States as given in the above statement, coffee exported from these States is subject to a further tax of 5 francs per bag of 60 kilos (73.1 cents per 100 pounds). According to the decree of September 12, 1908, an additional tax of 20 per cent ad valorem is to be levied on all coffee exported from the State of São Paulo in excess of 9,000,000 bags during the crop year commencing July 1, 1908; in excess of 9,500,000 bags during the crop year beginning July 1, 1909; and in excess of 10,000,000 bags during the succeeding crop years.

No one believes that Brazil or any other South American country that produces coffee can or will abolish the export duty which its Government imposes on coffee. Therefore, if this countervailing duty prevails, it must be an additional tax of about 2.9 cents per pound on coffee imported into this country. Here, again, you sought to tax the poor man's breakfast table.

TEA.

The tax of from 8 to 9 cents per pound on tea is not justified. It was a much less tax than this on the same article that led our forefathers to rebel against the unjust taxation of England. Surely the Ways and Means Committee, who put this tax upon tea, have never read what Sydney Smith said about tea, when he used these words:

Thank God for tea! What would the world do without tea? I am glad I was not born before tea.

LUMBER.

The people looked to this Congress to give them free lumber, and you have refused to do so. Not only that, but you have added to the lumber schedule in the bill a provision that will virtually continue the same rates that now exist in the Dingley Act.

For twenty-five years before the Dingley Act no tax had been placed on lumber. It was not regarded as a fit subject of taxation, at least during times of peace. It does not bring in any considerable amount of revenue; it is but a bonus or bounty to the lumber manufacturers, which they in turn collect from the consumers.

You not only tax lumber, but you tax every common article of consumption and all the necessaries of life. For twelve years the lumber manufacturers have enjoyed a period of plenty and profit. Their product has doubled and almost trebled in value during that time, and lumber kings and millionaires have increased largely in numbers. It is about time that the American consumer of lumber should have his inning, and that they should again have free lumber. I quote on this subject from the late James G. Blaine, one of the greatest Republicans of the age, who was himself in favor of a protective tariff and who, in 1868,

while discussing the proposed tax on breadstuffs, salt, and lumber, said:

In the first place, let me say that during the war, when we were seeking everything on the earth out of which taxation could be wrung, it never entered into the conception of Congress to tax breadstuffs—never during the most pressing exigencies of the terrible contest in which we were engaged. Neither breadstuffs or lumber ever became the subject of one penny of taxation. It was not because of the influence of the rich grain dealers of Chicago or Toledo or Milwaukee. It was because if anything is universal, breadstuffs are universal, for they constitute literally the staff of life.

If you impose upon them a tax ever so small in amount, it will be made a pretext by the very speculators of whom gentlemen talk for adding an appreciable amount to the cost of a barrel of flour. Now, as to the article of lumber, I again remind this House that there never has been a tax on this article. The gentleman from Ohio may talk of this question as he pleases; but I say that whenever the western frontiersman undertakes to make for himself a home, to till the soil, to carry on the business of life, he needs lumber for his cabin, he needs lumber for his fences, he needs lumber for his wagon or carts, he needs lumber for his plow, he needs lumber for almost every purpose in his daily life.

I stand with Mr. Blaine on this question, and I stand with the Democratic platform of 1908, which demanded free lumber for the people. The man who builds his home should be encouraged and not burdened with a tax upon the absolutely necessary article out of which he must build his home.

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

Raw cotton is left free in the bill, as it should be, unless the bill is to be framed purely as a revenue measure, when there might be raised some revenue by taxing the 71,000,000 pounds of cotton that is imported annually into the United States. But I do not believe that cotton is a proper subject of revenue. I am not one of those who demand or expect a tariff duty upon the small amount of cotton that is imported into the United States. I come from a State that produces the largest number of bales of cotton of any State in the Union save one. In 1908 Georgia produced over 2,000,000 bales. True, some of it is what is called "sea-island cotton" or "long-staple cotton;" but I am not here to demand or suggest—on the contrary, I would oppose—the laying of a duty upon the Egyptian cotton that is imported into the United States. It would produce, it is true, a small revenue, but there is no necessity for the levying of a protective or prohibitive tariff on cotton imported into this country. No other country in the world can compete with the South in the production of cotton, and never will. Of the 13,450,000 bales produced in 1908, 8,364,000 bales, or over 63 per cent of the entire production, was exported; and a duty on cotton would not enhance the price one penny, because the price is fixed, not in America, but in Liverpool.

To put a tariff on cotton, in my opinion, would simply result in a retaliation in England and other countries that purchase our cotton and that send to us cotton raised in other countries. Besides, Egyptian cotton, which is the bulk of the cotton imported into this country, being about 58,000,000 pounds, does not compete with the sea-island or long-staple cotton in America, nor does it tend to reduce its price. On the contrary, the Egyptian cotton is mixed with the long-staple cotton raised in the United States, and is used to produce a grade of cloth that can not be made except by the combination of the two. So that to levy a tariff upon cotton of any sort, and especially on sea-island or long staple, would not be for a revenue purpose but purely for protection against a cotton that is not produced in the United States. This Egyptian cotton is of a brown-colored fiber; it is a long staple, and is best adapted for mercerizing and other processes that give a high finish to the cloth and cause it to resemble silk. Its brown color permits it to be used without dyeing in the manufacture, such as is seen in balbriggan underwear and lace curtains. Except in cases where the brown-colored fiber is especially desired, there is little reason for preferring the Egyptian cotton to the sea-island cotton. The higher grades of sea-island cotton have not only a finer fiber than any other cotton, but make finer and stronger yarns and threads. For this the grades of Egyptian cotton can not be substituted and are not substituted. Besides, there is no danger from the Egyptian cotton, because its production has not increased, but has decreased in the last year from 307,800 bales to 215,000 bales. Besides, nearly 38 per cent of the sea-island crop is exported; in 1907 there were 86,000 bales of sea-island cotton raised, or the equivalent of 34,000,000 pounds, and of this 12,000,000 pounds were exported, leaving only 20,000,000 pounds for consumption in the United States. Surely, when the demand of the United States for long-staple cotton is for three times as much as can be produced in the United States, it would not be fair nor just nor right to the consumers or the manufacturers of the goods made from long-staple cotton to exclude by a prohibitive tariff the importation of Egyptian cotton, which does not and can not compete with the sea-island cotton.

No man would be bold enough to suggest that an import duty on cotton would in anywise help or aid the cotton farmer of the South. The cotton crop of the South, two-thirds of which is exported, has brought into this country billions of dollars in gold, and has done as much or more than any one thing to produce prosperity of the kind we enjoyed two years ago. For five years, from 1900 to 1905, the cotton crop of the South brought $2,974,000,000, while the entire gold and silver output of the world amounted to $2,578,000,000, and for the three years following 1905 the value of the crop was over $20,000,000 more. It brought into this country nearly $450,000,000 last year, and while we had an excess of exports over imports of $456,000,000, the cotton crop produced the greater part of the excess. Unlike other farm products raised in this country, such as corn and wheat, cotton is not consumed at home, but is exported and brings back into the coffers of the country streams of gold to make it prosperous and rich. Of corn produced in this country in 1907, only 2.95 per cent was exported, and of wheat only 19.95 per cent was exported, while nearly two-thirds of the cotton crop was exported.

Yet the producers of this great wealth in the United States, which does so much to place the balance of trade with the world on our side, are taxed for everything they use in making this great crop. They have to pay tribute to the steel trust, to the agricultural-implement trust, to the bagging trust, and to the cotton-tie trust. They must buy all that they require in the highly protected market of the United States and sell their product in competition with the world.

I call attention to the following letter, in reference to the bagging trust, to show what extortions are practiced upon the cotton farmers:

NEW ORLEANS, *April 1, 1909.*

Hon. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been delegated last November by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange to present before the Ways and Means Committee its plea for free bagging and ties for the cotton farmer, I now beg to address you, with the hope of enlisting your assistance toward removing the present tax upon the above necessities to every man who raises a bale of cotton. If I can assist you in any possible way with information in connection with these articles, please command me, as there may be some points you would like to know which neither Messrs. GRIGGS, UNDERWOOD, nor POU touched upon when I was before their committee.

I observed that Chairman PAYNE laid considerable stress upon the fact that, according to the Treasury figures, there was imported during 1907 some 20,000,000 square yards—say, 16,250,000 running yards 44 to 45 inches wide—but the gentleman possibly did not know that during that year, and also the present year, the American Manfuacturing Company, known as the "bagging trust," were the ones who imported the greater part of that bagging into this country; and you may state, without fear of contradiction, that out of the five Calcutta mills engaged in making this bagging the American Manufacturing Company are this year importing the output of three mills, namely, Hastings, Briggs, and Kinnison, two of which are the largest in Calcutta; and I may also state that some years the American Manufacturing Company buy, through Ralli Brothers, in Calcutta, all of the cotton bagging made there.

I was struck with the absence before Ways and Means Committee of all of the American makers of bagging, for no man connected with the bagging trust appeared before the committee; but the American Manufacturing Company, the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, and the Peru Bagging Company combined and sent a Brooklyn lawyer there to present their claims asking for an increased duty. Perhaps none of the trust magnates would have enjoyed answering questions that might have been put to them.

In their written address to the committee the combine emphasized the fact that on account of foreign competition fewer mills in this country were now engaged in the business than some years ago. Let me here state that the big new mill situated in Brooklyn could make bagging enough for half of the present crop, while the Ludlow, Mass., mill has increased its capacity until it now can make about 25,000,000 yards each year.

You know that the cotton crop since 1892 has doubled in size—say, 6,700,365 bales raised in 1892; 13,408,841 bales raised in 1908—and during that time, under the protection the bagging trust has enjoyed it has grown rich and powerful. Did it not buy out and completely demolish the bagging mills of both Louisville and New Orleans? And did not the trust buy out the independent mill in Galveston, and has kept it idle ever since the storm? I know all the above to be facts.

The cotton farmer has not only paid the tax under the Dingley tariff, but please consider his losses incurred on account of the very inferior cloth the trust forces upon him. Read, if you please, the inclosed clipping from the New Orleans Times-Democrat, which will give you a fair idea of how the first bale grown in Mississippi last year looked upon its arrival by express at the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. Let Congress place bagging upon the free list, and you will then put within the farmer's reach a quality of bagging which will properly protect his cotton and thereby save millions of losses every year caused by damage and loss of cotton badly covered. Read, if you are interested, some of the letters we have received praising Calcutta bagging—which is the farmers' friend—and then you may realize the additional benefit free bagging will be to the farmer.

Let me here state that if you find you can not get bagging upon the free list, the same as the western farmer has had his binder twine since 1894, I hope you will then try for a reduction of the duty to one-fourth cent per running yard, for this is but another case of the "half loaf."

Under the Payne bill the reduction upon ties will be 9 cents per bundle. The Dingley duty of five-tenths equals 22½ cents per bundle. The Payne duty of three-fourths cent equals 13½ cents per bundle, say, 2.7 cents per bale of cotton, which, added to the present duty of 73½ cents per 100 yards of bagging, amounts to 7½ cents per bale of cotton.

No cotton ties have been imported for several years, and I think none will come in if the Payne tariff of 13½ cents per bundle stands, so no revenue will be derived there. Nearly 90,000,000 yards of bagging were required to cover the cotton raised in 1908, which, as above stated, the farmer was taxed upon at a rate of 73½ cents per 100 running yards. If you can aid in removing this burden, every cotton farmer in the South will owe you a debt of gratitude.

I trust you will excuse the length of this letter; but I thought it was possible that I might give you a new idea upon a subject I have been engaged with for twenty-five years.

With best wishes, I beg to remain,

Faithfully, yours, C. LEE MCMILLAN.

DISCRIMINATIONS IN THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

This bill is so sectional in its provisions that, while it gives free twine to the farmers of the West, it makes the cotton farmer pay a large toll to the combinations and trusts that control the market for bagging and ties. It is to such inequalities and such iniquities in all protective-tariff measures that we most strongly object. The South does not want a protective tariff on anything it makes. It is true that there are some manufacturers and some lumbermen in the South who are demanding an increase of the duties on lumber and other manufactures; but the South has grown great and prosperous, not by reason of the tariff but in spite of it, and those in the South who clamor for protection upon their manufactured products at the same time demand that the tariff be taken off the articles they purchase in other portions of the country. Their idea of statesmanship that the southern Representative should follow is thus expressed in a letter which I have from one who desires to have the duty retained on lumber:

It seems to us that our Representatives ought to vote for everything that is in our favor and to reduce the tariff on those things that we buy from the North, like machinery and other articles.

This is but an evidence of that same spirit of selfishness and greed upon which is bottomed the principle of a high protective tariff; and whether you find it in the North, South, East, or West, it is the same desire to have the Government protect and foster one class of men at the expense of another class; protect by tariff legislation what I make, but do not protect the things I buy. And that principle is embodied in this bill, for it puts the tariff high on articles produced in the East and reduces it or removes it entirely from articles manufactured in the South. This is particularly true of the schedule of cotton manufactures. Under the Dingley law the tariff tax on cotton manufactures averages about 47 per cent, and this bill increases it to over 50 per cent. Strange to say, the increases are all made on the finer grades of goods manufactured in the North, and the reductions are made on the coarser grades of goods manufactured in the South. I do not complain at some reduction in the tariff on cotton manufactures; a tariff ought to be laid on them for revenue purposes. In 1907 we manufactured about $450,000,000 worth of cotton goods, and we exported about $32,000,000 worth and imported cotton goods to the value of $73,000,000, producing something over $13,000,000 in revenue.

The South has made rapid progress in the manufacture of cotton, and we now consume in our mills more cotton than do the eastern mills. While we do not manufacture the finer grades of goods, we have almost a monopoly of the market for the coarser grades. No discrimination in this tariff bill can stop our progress, and the change in the present duties, or any considerable reduction, would not stop our progress. We have prospered in spite of discrimination and in spite of the tariff, and will continue to do so; but the injustice and outrage perpetrated in this bill is that on these goods that are made in the South the tariff is reduced, while on those manufactured in northern mills the duty is increased. What the southern manufacturer needs and wants is a market for his goods and not protection by tariff. The same schedules in the Dingley Act are high enough; in fact, they were too high, and should not be increased. There was no demand for their increase; certainly not from the cotton producers and manufacturers of the South.

The evidence before the committee shows that when the cotton manufacturers first appeared before the committee, one of their chief spokesmen, Mr. Lippitt, stated, in answer to a question by the chairman:

We are going to ask you to leave the duty as it is.

Mr. DALZELL asked:

All along the line?

And the answer was:

On the cloth schedules, with the exception of some few minor points. I am making my argument why it should not be changed.

And again he said:

I am not appearing here to ask for an increase in the duties on the cloth clause of the cotton schedule. The importations are not so large that we feel justified in asking that the duties be increased, but we would not like to see them decreased.

There was no reason for the increase of these duties. From a statement I have seen, it appears that the average dividends of the principal Fall River mills in 1907 were 25½ per cent; in New Bedford, 25 per cent. The Dartmouth Manufacturing Company paid last year 66 per cent, and on the 24th of February declared an extra dividend of 100 per cent.

I quote the following letter I have received, calling my attention to the injustice of this schedule of cotton manufactures:

NEW YORK, *March 27, 1909.*

Hon. CHARLES L. BARTLETT,
Washington, D. C.

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

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

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

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

The average dividends of the principal Fall River mills affected were, in 1907, a panic year, 25½ per cent; in New Bedford, 25.2 per cent. A prominent illustration is the Dartmouth Manufacturing Company, which paid 66 per cent last year, and on February 24 last, an extra dividend of 100 per cent. This mill makes precisely the class of goods which these paragraphs are designed to prohibit. All of these dividends are in addition to enormous salaries paid to officers.

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted.

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

As illustrating the cotton-goods schedule, I quote the following:

COTTON GOODS.

MERCHANTS GET TOGETHER TO OPPOSE HIDDEN DUTIES IN COTTON-GOODS SCHEDULE.

[Daily Trade Record, March 26, 1909.]

Aroused by a sense of injustice at what they term the "jokers" in paragraphs 318 and 321 of the cotton-goods schedule, about 40 well-known and representative dry-goods houses met in the rooms of the Merchants' Association and took steps in a movement the object of which is to arouse public sentiment against these parts of the bill becoming law, and to gain a full knowledge of the significance of what these apparently innocent provisions really mean.

When the synopsis of the bill which was first sent out, and which, by the way, contained no reference to the cotton-goods schedule, came to the attention of cotton-goods merchants, the first impression was that the new bill contained no material change in this regard. However, with more careful study of the completed bill, which came out later, additions to the old schedule have been noted and carefully analyzed which change the whole complexion of the law in so far as it affects foreign-made cotton goods of a certain character. Mercerized goods, in particular are attacked, and in such a way, it is stated, that goods which cost the consumer 19 cents, 25 cents, and 35 cents will increase in price 100 per cent. This, it is considered, will put importers out of business and will only benefit one or two large local firms.

The previous intimations that Henry F. Lippitt and James R. MacColl, representing the Arkwright Club of Boston, were responsible for the offending additions grow stronger and more frequent, and it is claimed that the loss of business which will result if the schedule, as it stands, becomes law will be irreparable, and that the added cost will be borne by the consuming public.

R. K. MacLea was chairman of the meeting referred to, at which the following resolutions were adopted:

"*Resolved,* (1) That we emphasize our protests against the method of changing the cotton-goods schedule as embodied in the Payne tariff bill, and use every effort to fully expose the attempted underhand advances as proposed by the wording of same following the suggestion as given to the Ways and Means Committee by Henry F. Lippitt and James R. MacColl, for the Arkwright Club of Boston, as shown and published in tariff hearings of March 1, 1909. (Appendix, p. 1772.) We further voice our protests against such methods and demand that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate Finance Committee of the United States Senate give due consideration to our joint protest.

"(2) That two committees be appointed, one to give publicity of the facts, another to act on behalf of wholesale dry-goods merchants interested to show the proper authorities at Washington the serious error as embodied in the Payne bill now before the House of Representatives on the cotton schedule."

A publicity committee, consisting of Frederic B. Shipley, of Shipley & Blauvelt, 49 Leonard street, and A. L. Reid, of A. L. Reid & Co., of 66 White street, and a representative committee, consisting of R. B. MacLea, of R. B. MacLea & Co., 79 Worth street; John Darling, of

John Darling & Co., 41 Union square; and F. D. Sherman, of Sherman & Sons Co., 62 Leonard street, were appointed.

The bill having been reported, the only hope for success, it is believed, lies in interesting the public and the press. This the committee hopes to do, and will at once get in touch with all of the wholesale and retail houses throughout the country.

Frederic B. Shipley, of Shipley & Blauvelt, when seen by a representative of this paper yesterday, gave out the following statement on the matter:

"While the cotton-goods schedules in the proposed law apparently provide for the same duties as the Dingley law, these provisions are largely nullified and the duty increased by paragraph 318, which alters the usual means of determining the duty.

"In the present law the duty has been fixed largely by the number of threads per square inch. Paragraph 318 provides not only that each thread shall be counted, but that 'each ply of two or more ply threads shall be counted as a thread.' As most cotton goods imported contain threads which are of two or more ply, the effect of this will be to remove most cloths from the low-duty schedules and place them in the high-duty schedules. Thus goods now paying 2½ cents per square yard will frequently pay 4½ cents per square yard. The operation of this will be that many goods imported, such as English reps and jacquards will pay about 52 per cent of their value, instead of 31 per cent as at present.

"In addition to this, paragraph 321 provides that all cotton cloth mercerized or 'subjected to any similar process,' shall be subject to an extra duty of 1 cent per square yard. On the cloths before mentioned, this will operate to bring the total duty up to about 66 per cent of their value.

"The phrase 'mercerized or subject to any similar process' will doubtless be construed to mean any sort of luster, and as almost all cotton goods imported have some luster, this means that practically all cotton cloths will not only have to pay the advances before mentioned, but will be subject to an additional tax of 1 cent per square yard.

"In fully 75 per cent of the cotton goods imported, this tariff will therefore be prohibitive and will not operate to increase the revenue.

"These provisions have been artfully designed, not by statesmen who are trying to protect American industry, but by cotton-goods experts who are adroitly trying to prevent any importations of cotton goods.

"If the bill is allowed to become a law, it will not only close up the majority of the importing houses, but it will work untold hardship on all classes of dry-goods merchants by removing from the popular price classes many cloths that are now retailed for 19, 25, and 35 cents. It will work special hardship on cotton-goods converters, leaving them at the mercy of a few cotton-goods mills who will be enabled to repeat their action of two years ago, when they arbitrarily raised the prices to an unlimited and unwarranted extent.

"The extra duty on mercerization is totally unjustifiable, since foreign cloths are already taxed the ad valorem rate on the cost of mercerization. In view of the fact that every mercerizer in America to-day is totally unable to take care of the business which he has in hand, there is no reason to charge an extra duty on mercerization.

"Another 'joker' in the proposed law is the provision that determines the number of threads to the square inch in that 'each filament of cotton' shall be counted as a thread. A 'filament' is an elusive term and may easily be construed to mean a section of a fiber, which would make even the cheapest cloth count more than the finest cloths made, and therefore impose the highest duty even on the lowest cloths.

"The pretended justification of the bill on the ground of protecting American labor is absurd, for the reason that the average duty is twice as great as the total percentage of wages, much less any difference between foreign and American cost of labor. On most American cloths for which American manufacturers are equipped, they are amply able to compete with foreign manufacturers in neutral markets.

"The object of this law is, therefore, to create the same conditions in the cotton-goods industry as exist in the steel and other industries, which enable American manufacturers to sell goods in America at a higher price than the same goods may be obtained for abroad."

But why should not Mr. Lippitt and his associates be protected, since they are from New England, where large (?) fortunes are not made? This gentleman, when asked what he considered a large fortune, said to the committee that he would not regard anything short of three-quarters of a billion dollars as a very large fortune. So that Mr. Lippitt, whom I have quoted, is reported to have afterwards urged the committee to make some changes in the cotton schedule which discriminate against other manufacturers and operate to the advantage of the mills in which he is interested. In this respect, as in others, the committee seems to have followed the idea of protecting those who are rich already at the expense of those who are poor, and who under this bill will still be compelled to pay tribute to the multimillionaires of New England, who do not regard themselves as rich until they have acquired three-quarters of a billion dollars.

THE PROGRESS OF THE SOUTH.

I desire to say a few words just here in regard to the great progress of the South, accomplished in spite of discriminatory tariff laws:

Since 1880 the population of the South has increased 63 per cent; the value of her property has increased 167 per cent; investments in manufactures have increased 716 per cent; cotton mills have increased 1,169 per cent; active spindles in cotton mills, 1,464 per cent; active looms in cotton mills, 1,453 per cent; the use of cotton in mills, 875 per cent; capital invested in cotton-oil mills, 2,268 per cent; pig-iron production, 767 per cent; coke production, 2,394 per cent; in lumber production, 830 per cent; in the products of the farm, 237 per cent; in bales of cotton raised, 85 per cent; in the value of the cotton crop, not including seed, 96 per cent; in the production of corn, wheat, and grain, 41 per cent; in mineral products, 1,976 per cent; in coal mined, 1,470 per cent; in iron ore, 649 per cent; in railroads constructed, 221 per cent; in exports from ports, 145 per cent; in capital in national banks, 248 per cent; in deposits in national banks, 721 per cent; in deposits in state banks, 649 per cent; and in expenditures for public schools, 285 per cent. (See Appendix B.)

This progress has proceeded steadily, until to-day the South is one of the most promising and wealthy sections of the country. We have made this progress by industry and under the most adverse conditions that ever beset a people. And this prosperity and progress is not due to any favors from the Government of the United States or to any privileges that have been granted it. This great South, prospering and advancing as it has done and will continue to do, in material development and wealth, is not to be allured from its devotion to the political principles and policies to which it has adhered through all these years by the proffer of privileges and benefits to it or its people, by placing burdens on other portions of the country. All they ask is a fair chance and an equitable and just distribution of the burdens and benefits of government. They are not to be shaken in their faith in the proper principles of government or party policies, or by the offer of plunder under the guise of taxation or protection to be extorted from other citizens of the United States. Nor are they to be swerved from their devotion to those principles by the offer of offices by those in power and who distribute offices. Nor are they yet ready to join the Republican party of the Nation in placing burdens and taxes upon the American people in order that they may receive a small portion of the benefits to be derived from such an unjust and unfair exercise of the taxing power of government. So far as the people I represent are concerned, they do not ask to participate in the plunder of the American people by unjust and onerous taxation. Let not the Republicans lay unction to their souls that the people of the South will change their political convictions. I can do no better here than to quote from a letter recently written by Bishop Warren A. Candler upon this very subject, and which letter I shall quote in full as an appendix to my speech. Said the bishop:

It should also be said that our long-established view of the tariff is not to be surrendered. With possibly one exception, the professors of political economy in every respectable college and university in America (the experts on this subject) unite with us in our unwavering opposition to protection. I am not sure that there is one exception, but I understand that in the University of Pennsylvania the heresy of protection is intrenched. The location of such instruction discloses its inspiration. Why should we renounce what is demonstrably correct? Certain protectionists are fond of calling themselves the "standpatters;" very well, if they can stand pat for an erroneous economic dogma we may well stand pat for a sound economic principle.

The truth is, the system of protection is not founded in reason nor based on righteousness; it is maintained by trading and mutual concessions among the Representatives in Congress of clamant and domineering interests. To employ the taxing power of the Government to enrich certain interests at the expense of all the people comes dangerously near robbery under the guise of legislation. It is utterly puerile to say such a system is necessary in order to maintain the wages of the laboring man. Who shall make the protected manufacturer, who has not scrupled to rob all the people, divide his spoils with his employees? Wages are not thus determined. And even if it were true that protection raises wages, it is also true that it raises the expenses of the laborer more, and thereby it reduces the amount of his net income.

It is true that in the South, as elsewhere, there are a few who are ready for proffered privilege to surrender their convictions, if they ever had any, or who are ready to fill offices when tendered. But the seasons will come and go, and the years will roll away into many decades before the rank and file of the Democrats of the South, who believe in the teachings and doctrines of the party, and who are Democrats from principle, will desert the tenets of that party in which they have long had faith and whose fortunes they have always followed. The mere fact that the people of Georgia may have given the President a hearty welcome and entertainment does not justify the statement that they have surrendered their political faith. The fact is that Mr. Taft received fewer votes in Georgia in November last than any Republican candidate for President ever received, except President Roosevelt in 1904, and no recruits will be made for the Republican party in Georgia or in the South by legislation of this character, which violates all the rules of equity and fair dealing and undertakes to lay the burden of taxation not only with inequality among the people, but with discrimination in favor of sections.

This bill proceeds upon the idea of retaliation upon the other nations of the world, so far as our foreign commerce is concerned. It comes out upon the highways of the world and proclaims commercial war, and pays no heed to the words of that great Republican, who himself did so much in the interest

of protection, when, in his last speech at Buffalo, he left this message to the American people:

The period of exclusiveness has passed. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend our markets abroad? * * *

We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing.

Instead of cultivating friendly relations with our South American neighbors, about which we have heard so much in recent years, especially from President Roosevelt and his Secretary of State [Mr. ROOT], this bill undertakes to regulate and control the fiscal systems of those countries and inaugurate a system of retaliation on them, and that, too, in reference to an article of food furnished us by those countries which is chiefly consumed by the poorer classes of our citizens.

AN INCOME TAX.

I favor an income tax as a just, fair, and proper tax.

The Supreme Court of the United States, as it was constituted in 1895, by a vote of 5 to 4, rendered a decision declaring the income-tax provision of the Wilson Act to be unconstitutional.

I desire now to call attention to a portion of the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Brown in that case, as follows:

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of these cases. I certainly can not overstate the regret I feel at the disposition made of them by the court. It is never a light thing to set aside the deliberate will of the Legislature, and, in my opinion, it should never be done, except upon the clearest proof of its conflict with the fundamental law.

Respect for the Constitution will not be inspired by a narrow and technical construction which shall limit or impair the necessary powers of Congress. Did the reversal of these cases involve merely the striking down of the inequitable features of this law, or even the whole law, for its want of conformity, the consequences would be less serious; but as it implies a declaration that every income tax must be laid according to the rule of apportionment, the decision involved nothing less than a surrender of the taxing power to the money class.

By resuscitating an argument that was exploded in the Hylton case, and has lain practically dormant for a hundred years, it is made to do duty in nullifying not this law alone, but every similar law that is not based uopn an impossible theory of apportionment. Even the specter of socialism is conjured up to frighten Congress from laying taxes upon the people in proportion to their ability to pay them. It is certainly a strange commentary upon the Constitution of the United States and upon the Democratic Government that Congress has no power to lay a tax, which is one of the main sources of revenue of nearly every civilized State. It is a confession of feebleness in which I find myself wholly unable to join.

While I have no doubt that Congress will find some means of surmounting the present crisis, my theory is that in some moment of national peril, this decision will rise up to frustrate its will and paralyze its arm. I hope it may not prove the first step toward the submergence of the liberties of people in a sordid despotism of wealth.

As I can not escape the conviction that the decision of the court in this great case is fraught with immeasurable danger to the future of the country, and that it approaches the proportion of a national calamity, I feel it my duty to enter my protest against it. (Pages 1145-1146 United States Supreme Court report, volume 1, book 39.)

Since that time President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress on the subject, and in speeches, has recommended the imposition of an income tax. I quote from his message, as follows:

The National Government has long derived its chief revenue from a tariff on imports and from an internal or excise tax. In addition to these there is every reason why, when next our system of taxation is revised, the National Government should impose a graduated inheritance tax, and, if possible, a graduated income tax. The man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the State, because he derives special advantages from the mere existence of government. Not only should he recognize this obligation in the way he leads his daily life and in the way he earns and spends his money, but it should also be recognized by the way in which he pays for the protection the State gives him.

President Taft, while discussing the same subject in a speech delivered in Ohio, used the following language, which he has repeated on a number of occasions since:

I believe a federal graduated inheritance tax to be a useful means of raising government funds. It is easily and certainly collected. The incidence of taxation is heaviest on those best able to stand it, and indirectly, while not placing undue restriction on individual effort, it would moderate the enthusiasm for the amassing of immense fortunes.

In times of great national need an income tax would be of great assistance in furnishing means to carry on the Government, and it is not free from doubt how the Supreme Court, with changed membership, would view a new income-tax law under such conditions. The court was nearly evenly divided in the last case, and during the civil war great sums were collected by an income tax without judicial interference, and it was then supposed within the federal power.

Surely this is a question worthy of consideration by the present Congress when it undertakes to make up a deficit in the revenues of the country, and the Government should again be given the opportunity to at least endeavor to collect from the wealth of the country a portion of the revenues with which to defray its necessary expenses, and the policy of laying the chief burdens of taxation upon the consumers and upon the backs of the toiling masses of our country, as is done by this bill, should be no longer continued.

INHERITANCE TAX.

I have already stated that I am opposed to the inheritance-tax feature of this bill, because it undertakes to levy a tax upon the small inheritances of the poor, and does not reach the large inheritances, upon which such a tax should be mainly imposed. Besides, 36 of the States now impose an inheritance tax, and from this source derive an annual revenue of from ten to fifteen million dollars, and the remaining States that have not already adopted this plan of raising revenue are considering the proposition. Under the act of 1898, known as the "war-revenue act," there was collected in the year 1902 something like $5,000,000 from this source.

I can not give my support to this bill, because I do not believe in the doctrine of protecting by the agency of the Government any business or any class by the imposition of tax that must be borne chiefly by the consumers of the country. I am not opposed to the levying of tariff upon imports sufficient to raise revenues for the Government, to carry it on and pay the expenses when economically administered, but in imposing the duty it should be fairly and justly imposed, and not, as is contained in this bill, discriminating in favor of classes and sections.

I have no desire to learn any new lessons as to the Democratic doctrine on the subject of the tariff. I am content to still follow the doctrine as laid down and upheld by the founders of the party, and by that great apostle of Democracy, Andrew Jackson. In his first message to Congress he said:

With regard to a proper selection of the subjects of impost with a view to revenue, it would seem to me that the spirit of equity, caution, and compromise in which the Constitution was formed requires that the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures should be equally favored, and that perhaps the only exception to this rule should consist in the peculiar encouragement of any products of either of them that may be found essential to our national independence.

In conclusion, I can do no better service to my party and my people than to recall and repeat the words of this most illustrious Democrat and advocate of the rights of the plain people of our country, to be found in his message to the Senate, protesting against their vote of censure for removing the deposits from the United States Bank:

It is not in a splendid government supported by monopolies and armies that they will find happiness or their liberties protected, but in a plain system, void of pomp, protecting all and granting favors to none, dispensing its favors like the dews of heaven, unseen, unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce. It is such a government that the genius of the people require; such a one only under which our States may remain for ages to come united, prosperous, and free.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Think not to delude us by proposing a tariff on cotton—the long staple, the sea-island kind, or any other kind. The price of our cotton, for long and short staple, is fixed in Liverpool, in the markets of the world. We export 65 per cent of the short staple and nearly 38 per cent of the long staple, or sea-island cotton; and to lay a tax on cotton, either long or short staple, is to put upon it merely a bonus for the cotton manufacturer, which will be taken from the pockets of the people and redound to the injury of the grower. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Hug not the delusion to your souls, gentlemen on the Republican side, that this great empire of the South, which has arisen from its ashes and which is developing simply the privileges and advantages that God has given them by the exercise of their own independence and their intelligence—hug not the delusive idea to your souls that that great empire wants any protection under this bill, but is true to the principles that their forefathers fought for. Hug not the delusion to your souls that that country is ready to sell its devotions and principles of party for a mess of tariff protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nor yet are they ready to forget the doctrines of their fathers for mere favor of more protection.

Mr. Chairman, I must desist. The House will grow weary, and I am myself hardly able to continue. I desire to say that I am ready to vote with my party and its party declarations in a removal of a tariff on lumber, every cent and every dollar of it. [Applause.] Up to the war no tariff on lumber was ever levied by any Congress. From 1868 to 1897 no unhallowed hand of any trust ever dared to lay a tax on lumber or salt. To use the language of a great Republican, probably the greatest Republican we ever had in modern times, a man that stood up for the principles of the Republican party, Mr. James G. Blaine, in a speech of 1868, declared that even during the stress of the civil war when you swept the sea of expediency, swept the ocean and land, went into the houses and dwellings of citizens and put an internal-revenue tax on every business, levied tariff taxes until they piled mountain high, never in war even did the Republican or Democratic party ever think of levying a tax on lumber, salt, or bread. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In

this bill you do all. Lumber to build the homes of the poor man and shelter his family is taxed for the benefit of the lumber trust. Salt must pay a tax, not for revenue, not to fill the empty coffers of the Government, made empty by the extravagance of the Republican party for the last fourteen years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not to run the Government economically, but that the lumber trust, the salt trust, the beef trust, the Standard Oil trust, the steel trust, the cotton bagging and tie trust, and all the other trusts may prosper, and that the people may continue to bear the burdens, not of taxation, but of robbery and injustice. [Loud applause.]

APPENDIX A.

DISSOLVING THE "SOLID SOUTH."

[By Bishop Warren A. Candler.]

Objection is being urged to the solidity of the "solid South," and intimations have been given out that an effort is being made to disintegrate it. Concerning the political phases of the subject, in the light of which men determine their party affiliations, I have nothing to say; but about the general subject I have some reflections to offer.

And, first of all, I would like to inquire why so much objection is urged to a "solid South" while nothing is said of a "solid New England?" The solidity of the latter is as obdurate and persistent as the solidity of the former, and for much the same reasons, doubtless. There is no solid West (i. e., North and Central West), because the West has been settled by a great variety of people and its population is too heterogeneous to be solid. But from the days of the colonies until now there have been distinct types of people in both New England and the South, and for the most natural reasons, therefore, they have been solid.

For one I believe that it is best they should be "solid." By their solidity they work out for themselves the best results, and at the same time they thereby make the best contribution to the well-being of the entire country. In a land which is filling up with multitudes of miscellaneous people from every part of the globe it is vastly important that in one or two sections at least there should be some stable forms of life and civilization.

The South especially possesses certain characteristics which should be perpetuated at all cost. They are of the utmost value to the Republic, and they must not be minimized or modified.

In the South is found the purest type of what may be called "original Americanism." Among its people are more men and women who trace their descent directly to colonial sires than in any other section of the Union. Its social forms and domestic life, as well as its architecture, tend naturally to the colonial type, and they should not be exchanged for any other.

Its religious life is orthodox in creed and evangelical in spirit. The variegated and eccentric ecclesiastical bodies which abound in New England have but a small and negligible following in the South. Southern Christianity has not been weakened by sending forth from its roots all sorts of isms, which, like suckers, weaken the main stem without producing any good fruit themselves. We have had few heresy trials, for we have had few heretics. Our people have accepted the Bible as the word of God, and have relied for salvation upon the atonement of Jesus Christ the Lord. By consequence the southern churches have more nearly succeeded in winning the whole population of the South to Christian living than have the churches of the other sections of the country succeeded with the people to whom they make their appeals. There are more church members in the South in proportion to population than can be found in any other part of the United States.

In the South we have also the best observance of the Sabbath, and in so far as we have anywise fallen from grace in this important matter our fall may be traced to influences which have come in upon us from without. If we had remained more "solid" with respect to the observance of the Sabbath, we would have done far better than we have by following, even for a little way, modish vice and foreign airs.

The South is the soberest part of the United States. There are fewer barrooms among us and fewer people who want barrooms than are found in New England or the West. Prohibition counts for more in the South than it does in any other section of the Union.

There are also fewer grafters and less graft in the South than any other section. Pennsylvania, the land of William Penn and great solidity, has shown more corruption in the building of her capitol and the government of the one city of Pittsburg than has been known in all the South during a half century. The southern people have not been without their faults, but they have been remarkably free from the cowardly, sneakish vice of stealing. Public officials in the South have not been given to pilfering public funds.

Many other characteristic excellencies of the southern people might be enumerated, but let these suffice for the present. Is it supposed that we shall change our principles with respect to these or any other matters? If so, why? Have our principles been demonstrated to be unsound? If so, in what particular? If we are to renounce our principles, what set of principles shall we put in their place? Has New England anything better to teach us? Is the land of the Pilgrim Fathers to maintain an unyielding solidity, while the South is to break up into classes of convenient size for instruction by New England? Let New England show more Christianity, more children, a better observance of Sunday, less drunkenness, and less graft before we sit humbly at her feet for instruction. We might have learned much from the New England of the Pilgrim Fathers, but we can learn little of value from the New England of their backslidden children.

But it may be said that we must change our view of the relative powers of the state and federal governments. This is not the time for that. It is true our picturesque President has assured the country that "we need through executive action, through legislative action, and through judicial interpretation and construction of law to increase the power of the Federal Government;" but at the risk of initiation into the "Ananias Club" or classification with the "undesirable citizens," we are bound to tell him such talk is perfidy to his official oath. He swore to support the Constitution, not to stretch it, and secession against the Constitution is worse than secession against the Union, for the Union draws its life from the Constitution. The Union without the Constitution is not the Federal Union, but the organized tyranny of an unscrupulous majority, doing as they list with the rights of the minority. If the Federal Government requires more power to fulfill its mission under the conditions of the present day, there are easy and constitutional ways of giving to it such power, but it does not belong to the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Government to filch power from the States or from the people, even though they purloin it in order to lay it in the lap of the Federal Government.

But does the Federal Government need so much more power? It is said that there is going on in our country a perilous concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. Suppose we centralize the Government at the same time this process of concentrating wealth goes on, and that eventually the concentrated wealth seizes the centralized Government. What then would become of the rights of the people? What would be done would simply be a question of what might be desired by the men wielding this immense combination of financial and political power. If they failed to find precedents for their usurpations they could plead the illustrious example of our present President, and call for the enlargement of the powers of the Federal Government by "executive action," "legislative action," and "judicial interpretation and construction of law." Doubtless, however, they would not stop for even that much formality of law. Under the lead of the President's rough-riding example the limit of their power would be only the limit of their desires.

Moreover, expansion of territory demands more and more the shifting of weight from the Federal Government to the local governments of the States. Otherwise the strain on the center will become too great and the whole structure will crumble. The security of the Union is in the sovereignty of the States.

This is certainly no time for the South to cease contending for the strict observance of the constitutional limitations imposed upon the Federal Government. A surreptitious revolution is proposed, and it must be resisted as vigorously as if it were an armed force attempting to subvert the Government. Let us stand solidly against it, and if any other section wishes to stand with us we shall not object. But if any other sections of the country invite us to abjure our devotion to the fundamental principles of the Government in order to obtain political spoils in the form of office and appropriations, let us give them to understand that neither we nor our fathers have been accustomed to accept bribes.

It should also be said that our long-established view of the tariff is not to be surrendered. With possibly one exception the professors of political economy in every respectable college and university in America (the experts on this subject) unite with us in our unwavering opposition to protection. I am not sure that there is one exception, but I understand that in the University of Pennsylvania the heresy of protection is intrenched. The location of such instruction discloses its inspiration. Why should we renounce what is demonstrably correct? Certain protectionists are fond of calling themselves the "standpatters;" very well, if they can stand pat for an erroneous economic dogma we may well stand pat for a sound economic principle. The truth is, the system of protection is not founded in reason nor based on righteousness; it is maintained by trading and mutual concessions among the Representatives in Congress of clamant and domineering interests. To employ the taxing power of the Government to enrich certain interests at the expense of all the people comes dangerously near robbery under the guise of legislation. It is utterly puerile to say such a system is necessary in order to maintain the wages of the laboring man. Who shall make the protected manufacturer, who has not scrupled to rob all the people, divide his spoils with his employees? Wages are not thus determined. And even if it were true that protection raises wages, it is also true that it raises the expenses of the laborer more, and thereby it reduces the amount of his net income.

We have nothing to take back as to the tariff. If other sections wish to unite with us in embodying in law the sound and honest views which we have held on this subject, we will welcome their association and assistance. But if they unite with us in our contentions, what then will become of their own solidarity, concerning the dissolving of which we hear nothing?

Other subjects might be brought forward, but I forbear for the present. Let me inquire with reference to the matters herein presented and other issues which naturally suggest themselves, what principle, or set of principles, which have operated as cohesive forces to make the South solid in her place, as New England is solid in her place, is it now proposed that we shall renounce? If we all go together into some new movement, will we not be as solid as ever? If we divide, will we be happier and more harmonious among ourselves and more influential with other sections by reason of the strife which division will engender? Were any people ever made more powerful or prosperous by discord? Wily enemies have been known to pursue the policy of dividing a people in order to conquer them, but those who have most faithfully resisted the foes of peoples thus threatened have always insisted that their security was their unity.

I take it no Trojan horse will be admitted within our gates. Our people may gaze on such devices with a certain sort of interest, but they will not be so simple as not to see that the contents of the animal are something more warlike than grass.

I beg to commend to careful consideration of all concerned the following paragraph, which I have extracted from one of the most ably conducted papers in the South:

"That the South is dissimilar from other parts of the Republic in important social, political, and religious matters is a proposition too plain to be disputed for a moment. That these differences are radical, historic, and persistent it would be easy to show. That they are to the advantage of our section is a belief that we hold without asking leave or license of any. The South is the social, political, and religious residuary legatee of American civilization. Its day is coming; indeed, is now. It has no need to fret or to be impatient of fortune, for it holds the illuminating lamp of the future of our national life. Only we must preserve our vantage and push our way toward a complete realization of our historic ideals. Nor must we be in haste to give up either our solidarity or our isolation. This may seem a reactionary or nonprogressive sentiment, but it is neither. Both the solidarity and the isolation of peculiar peoples have been employed of history and Providence in hastening the world's better destinies. This isolation and solidarity is no barrier to intercourse and cooperation in all common enterprises, but it is that eclecticism of people which puts their exceptional ideals above the thought of compromise or accommodation. The South can agree to no coalescences, ecclesiastical or otherwise, that will for a moment jeopardize its ideals."

That is what might be called "interestin' readin'." It is also quite suggestive. Southern courtesy and hospitality must not be mistaken for the renunciation of southern convictions.

It may be added that the task of breaking up the "Solid South" will not be found an easy one. The unifying processes of more than a century are not arrested and turned backward in a day. Blood and tradition, ancestry and history, the compacting power of war and the solidifying struggles of peace, common interests and common dangers, common memories and common hopes, count for something; and all these things must be reckoned with when men undertake to break up the "Solid South." Where will they find a solvent powerful enough to disintegrate in a moment what has been forming for more than a century? Can the seductive wooings of an artful partisanism put asunder

those whom Providence hath so manifestly joined together? Can the crafty pleadings of a thrifty expediency compass such an end? Can the saccharine sentiments which are wont to flow around banqueting boards dissolve the affiliations of generations? Hardly.

The "New South" is just the "Old South" going on its way—and "happy on the way." If any civil person is traveling the same road the South has no objection to his company, but it is not bowed down beneath an insupportable sense of desolation and lonesomeness. Its happiness is not dependent upon the presence of any traveling companion. With its cotton fields and factories, its fruit and flowers, and above all with its lofty and uncompromisable principles, the South asks no favor and begs no one for fellowship.

The people of the South are not wanting in independence of thought. They are not terrified into being "solid." They do not divide, simply because they are honestly agreed. It has not been for a sham solidarity, forced upon them by intolerance, that they have contended in peace and war. Such a view of them is shallow and misleading. The South is solid first and most of all in the sacred things which lie deeper down in the soul than passing policies and transient expedients of party politics. The southern people are one in heart, and I mistake them very much if they do not so remain for years to come.

APPENDIX B.

THE SOUTH—RESULTS—RESOURCES.

Summary of southern progress since 1880.

[From the Manufacturers' Record.]

	1880.	1900.	1908.
Population	16,369,960	23,548,401	26,834,705
Density	20.3	29.1	33.2
Manufactures:			
Capital	$257,244,564	$1,153,002,368	$2,100,000,000
Products	$457,454,777	$1,463,643,177	$2,600,000,000
Cotton mills:			
Capital	$21,000,000	$112,837,000	$266,500,000
Spindles, active	667,754	4,453,729	10,443,761
Looms, active	14,323	112,806	222,539
Cotton used ... pounds	108,694,989	747,744,066	1,059,519,893
Cotton-oil mills:			
Number	45	369	800
Capital	$3,800,000	$34,450,000	$90,000,000
Pig iron made ... tons	397,301	2,604,671	[a] 3,445,221
Coke made ... do	372,436	5,799,384	[a] 9,289,471
Lumber products, value	$39,000,000	$188,114,000	$365,000,000
Lumber cut ... feet	3,410,294,000	13,699,107,000	[a] 19,303,983,000
Farm products, value	$660,000,000	$1,271,654,000	$2,225,000,000
Cotton crop:			
Bales	5,723,934	9,003,296	10,582,966
Value without seed	$312,303,000	$339,958,000	$614,034,000
Grain products:			
Corn ... bushels	466,825,484	476,655,803	[a] 715,780,000
Wheat ... do	55,301,686	93,358,836	[a] 59,485,000
Oats ... do	55,201,270	83,998,256	[a] 43,053,000
Mineral products, value	[b] $13,817,930	$114,945,099	[a] $286,818,347
Coal mined ... tons	6,037,003	49,048,059	[a] 94,829,835
Iron ore mined ... do	842,454	4,707,449	[a] 6,316,027
Petroleum ... barrels	179,000	17,098,973	[c] 27,239,057
Phosphate mined ... tons	190,763	1,489,907	[a] 2,253,198
Railroad mileage	20,612	52,594	67,181
Exports, value	$264,905,753	$484,644,177	$648,098,715
National banks:			
Resources	$171,464,172	$516,798,036	$1,100,117,838
Capital	$46,688,930	$86,371,980	$162,558,230
Individual deposits	$64,733,249	$264,968,284	$531,277,537
Other banks, deposits	$83,444,576	$254,439,168	$624,752,437
Common schools, expenditures	$9,796,040	$26,535,848	[c] $37,687,615
Property, true value	$7,505,000,000	$13,863,073,149	$20,073,686,216

[a] Figures of 1907. [b] Figures of 1882. [c] Figures of 1905-1906.

INVENTORY OF THE SOUTH.

[From the Manufacturers' Record.]

An inventory of accomplished facts of southern progress since 1880, when it was enabled to resume its normal career, and of its material resources still to be thoroughly developed.

Population, from 16,369,960 to 26,834,705, or by 10,464,745, equal to 63.9 per cent.

True value of property, from $7,505,000,000 to $20,073,686,216, or by $12,568,686,216, equal to 167 per cent.

Capital in manufactures, from $257,244,564 to $2,100,000,000, or by $1,842,755,436, equal to 716.6 per cent.

Products of manufactures, from $457,454,777 to $2,600,000,000, or by $2,142,545,223, equal to 468.9 per cent.

Capital in cotton mills, from $21,000,000 to $266,500,000, or by $245,500,000, equal to 1,169 per cent.

Active spindles in cotton mills, from 667,754 to 10,443,761, or by 9,776,007, equal to 1,464 per cent.

Active looms in cotton mills, from 14,323 to 222,539, or by 208,216, equal to 1,453 per cent.

Cotton used, from 108,694,889 pounds to 1,059,519,893 pounds, or by 950,825,004 pounds, equal to 875 per cent.

Capital in cotton-oil mills, from $3,800,000 to $90,000,000, or by $86,200,000, equal to 2,268 per cent.

Pig iron produced, from 397,301 tons to 3,445,221 tons, or by 3,047,920 tons, equal to 767 per cent.

Coke made, from 372,436 tons to 9,289,471 tons, or by 8,917,035, equal to 2,394 per cent.

Value of lumber products, from $39,000,000 to $365,000,000, or by $326,000,000, equal to 836 per cent.

Lumber cut, from 3,410,294,000 feet to 19,303,983,000 feet, or by 15,893,689,000 feet, equal to 466 per cent.

Value of farm products, from $660,000,000 to $2,225,000,000, or by $1,565,000,000, equal to 237 per cent.

Bales of cotton raised, from 5,723,934 to 10,582,966, or by 4,859,032 bales, equal to 85 per cent.

Value of the cotton crop, not including seed, from $312,303,000 to $614,034,000, or by $301,731,000, equal to 96 per cent.

Corn, wheat, and oats raised, from 577,328,440 bushels to 818,318,000 bushels, or by 240,789,560 bushels, equal to 41 per cent.

Value of mineral products, from $13,817,930 to $286,818,347, or by $273,000,417, equal to 1,976 per cent.

Coal mined, from 6,037,003 tons to 94,829,835 tons, or by 88,792,832 tons, equal to 1,470 per cent.

Iron ore mined, from 842,454 tons to 6,316,027 tons, or by 5,473,573 tons, equal to 649 per cent.

Petroleum produced, from 179,000 barrels to 27,239,057 barrels, or by 27,060,057 barrels, equal to 15,118 per cent.

Phosphate mined, from 190,763 tons to 2,253,198 tons, or by 2,062,435 tons, equal to 1,081 per cent.

Railroad length, from 20,612 miles to 67,181 miles, or by 46,569 miles, equal to 221 per cent.

Exports from southern ports, from $264,905,753 to $648,098,715, or by $383,192,962, equal to 145 per cent.

Aggregate resources of national banks, from $171,464,172 to $1,100,117,838, or by $928,653,666, equal to 541 per cent.

Capital of national banks, from $46,688,930 to $162,558,230, or by $115,869,300, equal to 248 per cent.

Individual deposits in national banks, from $64,733,249 to $531,277,537, or by $466,544,288, equal to 721 per cent.

Deposits in state banks, savings banks, private banks, and loan and trust companies, from $83,444,576 to $624,752,437, or by $541,307,861, equal to 649 per cent.

Expenditures for common schools, from $9,796,040 to $37,687,615, or by $27,891,575, equal to 285 per cent.

This record of achievement is as nothing compared to what the South is yet to do in realizing fully its vast potentialities. To begin with, its area of 806,947 square miles is for the most part scantily populated, when one considers the more than 100 persons to the square mile supported in New England or the 93 persons to the square mile in such a State as Illinois. When the density of population in the whole South shall be equal to that of Illinois, there will be 75,046,071 inhabitants of the South, nearly the population of the whole country in 1900. That there is room for such a population and a support for it is obvious in the fact that of the 516,446,080 acres of land in the South but 337,981,784 acres, or 65 per cent of the whole, are in farm land, and of the farm land but 116,779,896 acres, or 34 per cent, are improved.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that anything I say will add to the value of this discussion. We have had fifteen days of it now, I believe, and the debate has not added much light either to the value of discussion of the protective-tariff system, as a system, or to the criticisms that are imposed upon it.

The eloquent gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], who has just taken his seat, in his opening remarks accused the provisions of the proposed legislation to be a grant of special privileges to somebody, and in his concluding remarks he charged that the proposed tariff was not levied for the purpose of producing revenue for the Government economically administered, but for the purpose of making rich somebody at the expense of others.

For fifteen days we have listened to the general charge that the tariff was levied for the purpose of being a burden on the consumer. There has not been an intimation that the tariff at any time is for the benefit of the producer.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], opening the discussion on that side of the House, cited the names of the authorities in the Nation who included the substance of all that could be said upon it. He named Alexander Hamilton's report and a number of others, and concluded with the report of Mr. Gallatin. Nothing that has been said upon the subject since Hamilton's report has added much to the knowledge of the people, or to the purpose for which the protective tariff is levied. Here is a great Nation, now, of 90,000,000 people, occupying land stretching from sea to sea, a great agricultural land, to which the inhabitants might easily turn for their own sustenance, and Hamilton's report was for the purpose of advising the country of the necessity of diversifying the industries of the United States, that it might find employment for all its people and be independent of the producers of other nations.

At this hour, Mr. Chairman, the question is the same that it was in his day. Ten millions of people are engaged as laborers upon farms; six and a half millions of people, speaking in round numbers, are engaged in labor in the manufactories; 1,800,000 people are employed upon the railways. All the vast army of men who are not employed in agriculture are employed in producing some form of manufactured goods or in the transportation of them. The charge is generally made that the whole tariff is levied for the protection of the manufacturer. The general answer to it is that the man who has received the most protection from the tariff has been the farmer upon his farm, and the wage-earner at his work and in his wages. Testimony to that effect is set forth in the language of Mr. Tompkins, from North Carolina, before our committee, in which he testified that fifteen years ago a cotton crop of 10,000,000 bales was worth 5 cents a pound, before the establishment of manufactories, and brought $300,000,000; and now, since the establishment of manufactories, that same crop of 10,000,000 bales brings to the South $600,000,000; and in addition to that, the discovery of the method of producing cotton-seed oil brings the South another $100,000,000.

Men have been drawn from the farms to labor in their own factories, and the men who competed upon the farm merely

for the production of cotton and the sale of it are competing upon the farm for the production and sale of the food which supports the factories, as well as supplies them with its cotton. The value of the farm products there is another hundred millions.

Mr. Chairman, but a few minutes more will suffice for all that I intend to say at this time. Last year we produced upon the farms of America nearly eight thousand millions of dollars worth. We sold abroad to other countries about one thousand millions of dollars' worth. Who bought the rest of it? Who had the money to buy it, and how did they get it? Last year the manufactured products of America were sixteen thousand and eight hundred millions of dollars, and we exported about nine hundred million dollars of that. Who bought the rest of it and who had the money to buy it? Twenty-three thousand million dollars' worth of commerce between the States and less than two thousand million dollars' worth of commerce between the United States and all the balance of the world!

The commerce between the States of our country is greater than all the commerce of Europe, Asia, and Africa with all the world. Who buys our commerce, and who has the money to buy it? We have lived for ten years under a tariff legislation that is denounced as partisan, as class legislation, as legislation for privileged wealth. Where did the money come from that bought sixteen thousand millions of dollars worth of manufactured products and seven thousand millions of dollars worth from the farms? Who paid for it? It is not worth while now to enter into a discussion of the schedules which this committee has been preparing for the next tariff. It is hardly worth while to attempt to answer charges that have been made against the Chicago platform. It is enough for us that for months the committee has been listening to the testimony of men engaged in every line of business. More statistics and more data have been collected for the preparation of this bill than for all of the other bills within the last forty years. In a few hours, I think, the bill will be laid before you for discussion, section by section.

As you read it it will be evident to you that it has not been made for the purpose of enriching one man at the expense of another, and it will be no reply to say that it is a tax levied upon the poor or upon the consumer. There is no consumer unless he is also a producer, and the man in America who is not a producer can not be a consumer of any value either to the Nation or to its productions from the farm or from the factory. The tariff legislation that is proposed now does not differ from the tariff legislation proposed by Hamilton, from that proposed and carried into effect by McKinley, nor from that proposed and carried into effect and operation by Dingley. You can not turn a page of the national life during the operation of the Dingley bill that does not show that the Nation was richer by a thousand millions of dollars at the end of every year. There were years when the Nation was richer at every sundown by a million of dollars. There were years when the Nation was richer by a thousand millions of dollars every thirty days.

Some complaint is made that the tariff is levied for the benefit of New England. Can you remember that at the same time the most of our manufactories are in New England and that there is neither coal, nor iron, nor wood, nor leather, nor any other natural production there within her borders sufficient to keep one-fourth of her mills running for thirty days? The great supply comes from the rest of the Nation. Look at the map of the country and at the roll of the deposits in the banks. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] sitting at my right represents a little district. His whole State is only half as large as my own congressional district, and yet in his State there are $400,000,000 on deposit in the savings banks, not counting deposits of the manufacturers who are protected by this protective tariff. Let me modify that expression. The men who are protected by the protective tariff are the wage-earners of his State.

Rocky and mountainous, rough with swamps, without coal mines or iron mines or any other raw material; without grazing for herds of cattle or sheep; without a 40-acre field, even in one spot, for corn or grain, he has in his State twice as much wealth accumulated as wages of labor as there is in my State, which has 80,000 square miles in it. Surely the wealth of New England——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Speaking of the great wealth of the wage-earner in Connecticut, I desire to ask the gentleman if the statistics do not show that a smaller per cent of the wage-earners own their homes in Connecticut now than they did twenty years ago?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I think the gentleman is mistaken. He has had plenty of time to inform himself upon that subject. I have not investigated the subject for the purpose of——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I say that the statistics show that.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I say that I have not investigated the subject for the purpose of answering questions of that kind; but it sounds very much like a question that might have been under discussion in a hotel lobby and ought to have been answered there. It was just as easy for gentlemen upon the other side, who have been propounding questions of the same character for the last fifteen days to themselves in the lobbies of the hotels in the evening, to have ascertained the facts and brought them here and presented them during the fifteen days they have had the opportunity to present them.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I sought to be entirely courteous to the gentleman——

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I do not wish to be discourteous to my friend——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri (continuing). And I say my statement is not predicated upon hotel-lobby discussions; it is based upon the statistics issued by the party in power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Then I say again in the fifteen days of debate that has been going on here there has been ample opportunity to have offered the authentic statistics before the House; and there will be time yet before the bill passes, and while the gentleman is my friend, I hope that he will lay them before the House.

Mr. SULZER. I would suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman from Missouri has laid the statistics before the House.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. But he was asking a question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But I followed it up by the declaration that the statistics show what I stated.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Lay the volume before the House in due course of time, and I will undertake to answer it then if I have overlooked it now. What I ask you to remember is this fact, that north of the Potomac and east of the Ohio River is more than two-thirds of the wealth of the entire Nation.

Let me repeat again, that north of the Potomac and east of the Ohio River are two-thirds of the wealth of the country, and there are the manufacturers, there are the producers who take seven-eighths of all that come from your farm and mine and manufacture it into material for commerce, and there the things are made, the $16,000,000,000 worth, $15,000,000,000 worth that is sold to us in our country. There is the market for our flocks and our herds, our wheat and our corn.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. You stated that north of the Potomac and east of the Ohio River is two-thirds of the wealth of the country.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not that of itself show that some unfair advantage in our economic system has been given to that section of the United States?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Not in the world. From the time of Alexander Hamilton to this time they have been building factory after factory. Just as I stated a little while ago, the little State of Connecticut, or take all New England, without coal, without iron, without sheep ranges and cattle ranges, and cotton fields, without the great producing soil that is found in your country, have been accumulating more manufactures, paid more wages, and put more money in the bank than all the balance of us put together.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow me just a repetition of what I said. Does not the very fact that that portion of the country which has the natural resources is poorer than that portion of the country which is by nature the poorest show that the Government is favoring the New England section to the detriment of the other sections?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Nowhere in the world. The only thing now that bothers New England is the fact that cotton mills have doubled in the field where the cotton is produced. And other factories are growing up in other parts of the country.

The shoe factories are in St. Louis, in Kansas City, in St. Joseph, and Omaha, nearer to the field which produces the leather for them and nearer to the consumer who uses them. Just as I stated a little while ago, if the gentleman will read

the statements made by Mr. Tompkins, of North Carolina, before our committee, he will see that cotton, which fifteen years ago only brought $300,000,000, last year brought $600,000,000, and he charges it to the fact that the cotton mills have gone nearer to the cotton fields. The same protective-tariff law that stretched over New England stretched over the great South and the great West and invited labor in all its operation.

Mr. HARDY. Have not those cotton mills of the South been compelled in their infancy and their poverty to compete with the great, wealthy factories of New England without any protection?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. No, sir. The same protection extended to them that extended all over the country. It was one law for one land.

Mr. HARDY. Is there any protection against New England for the young industries of the South and of the new West? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. The same protection. It is one law for one land, from sea to sea. The same protection which stands over the shoe factories of New England stands over the shoe factories of St. Louis, and there is in St. Louis the largest shoe factory in the world, turning out a million pairs of shoes every thirty days. There are in New England the cotton mills which were built nearly a hundred years ago, still in operation, turned by the same water power, while there is spread all over Georgia the new cotton mills that have been built within the last fifteen years.

Mr. HARDY. The point I am trying to present to the gentleman is: Are not we in the South building up infant industries, and, under the Constitution, are not we forbidden to have any protection against the old established and wealthy industries which may drive us out of the market?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Does the gentleman mean that there should be a tariff between States? Is that the doctrine he intends to advocate, that there must be a tariff between States, to enable Georgia, which was planted when Massachusetts was planted, to catch up with Massachusetts now?

Mr. HARDY. If protection is a righteous proposition, ought it not to prevail in every locality and in favor of every State?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. It does, without question. We make no law and have made none in forty-eight years that we have been responsible for legislation that is not for the whole people. We have never made a law which you have revised or repealed except a tariff law. The only tariff law that we have ever made that you have repealed was the McKinley law. We made it and put it in operation. You repealed it and put in operation the Wilson bill, and the country repudiated and repealed you at the first opportunity.

Mr. REEDER. I would like to make a suggestion, if you please. I would like to say to the gentleman that nature has built up a great protection in favor of the southern cotton industry, and that, in addition to the protection that we give, it seems to me, will produce a great deal of cotton manufacture.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia rose.

Mr. HARDY. Allow me just one suggestion by way of response to what the gentleman said a moment ago.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I prefer to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] now, and I will yield to the other question later.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I want to ask the gentleman if this very bill—the Payne bill—does not discriminate against the kind of cotton yarns made in the South in favor of the kind made in the East by reducing—and I have no complaint to make of that—the tariff upon the coarser classes of yarn up to 40, and made now almost altogether in the South, and by increasing the duty upon the finer yarns, made almost altogether in the East and in the North?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I did not enter into a discussion of the schedules. I did not intend, and neither did the committee, that there should be a discrimination against the mills of Georgia and in favor of the mills of New England. I want to say just one word further.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, and then I will not interrupt him again, because I am not able physically to do it. The gentleman, then, admits that my proposition about this particular bill is correct?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I am not quite sure that I have admitted that. I have said that I did not intend——

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman aided in preparing the bill. Is it not a fact, not only with reference to the finer and coarser yarns, but you put a provision in here which taxes thread which was double twisted, and put a higher tariff on that, and that was the kind of thread made in the East? Is it not a fact—and I do not want the gentleman to give away any secrets, if it is not proper—is it not a fact that within the last few days, with reference to the last proposition of twisted thread, the committee, realizing the injustice of this, have proposed to modify that by an amendment?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. The gentleman is perhaps correct about that, for I want to say that the committee did not intend to do injustice to any portion of the land or show partiality to any portion. We are preparing legislation to establish justice and equity in the whole Nation.

From now until the end of the debate on the bill, I think if it is shown that there are partialities to one section or discriminations against another, the committee will be just as willing to correct it as the gentleman from Georgia. I may add a little further that I was one of the Members who was in favor of a tariff on the long staple or sea-island cotton, for I am aware of the vast extent of territory over which its cultivation could be extended. I regret that the committee was unable to agree with me in that. If the gentleman is in favor of a tariff which will protect sea-island cotton and will perfect an amendment to that effect, I will stand by him.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I am not, because I do not think it needs it.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. He could have the benefit of it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would not be for it if it needed it.

Mr. HARDY. I wish to say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REEDER], who has stated that nature has given protection to the South, which it has denied to other countries, in her product of cotton, that whenever we sell that product cheaper abroad than at home something ought to be done to bring down our home price.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I have not yielded for a discussion with the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Just one word more. If the manufacturer of New England sells his product cheaper abroad than at home, they need no protection.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have heard that fallacy uttered more than once. If the gentleman will read the testimony presented to the committee, to which the gentleman has had access for the last fifteen days, it would have given him better information than that.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman deny that manufactured products are sold cheaper abroad than at home?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I have just made my reply to you, but if the goods sent abroad were emptied into the ocean, the wages of the men who made them would be paid just the same.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by what the gentleman has said—that it was the desire of the Committee on Ways and Means to do exact justice to all sections of the country. I want to say to the gentleman that my section of the country—Kentucky, with the exception of the claim on the part of those representing eastern Kentucky for an increase of the duty on lumber—has asked no favor at the hands of the committee for protection to any industry. Everything we produce in my section is sold in the open markets of the world, and 90 per cent of our greatest staple goes direct to Liverpool and other foreign markets. We have asked that the iniquitous tax of 6 cents a pound upon all tobacco be removed. The Ways and Means Committee have three times passed a bill, and it passed the House without an opposing vote, taking that tax from the backs of these people. I want to ask the gentleman now if he is not in favor or if he would oppose an amendment to this bill repealing the 6 cents tax on this product—tobacco—a tax that no man on this floor will defend for a second and that would not affect the bill or any of its schedules in its symmetry or autonomy in any way?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am not undertaking an investigation of the internal-revenue law for the purpose of replying to any suggestion that the gentleman has just made. I know it is a fact that the great market for our tobacco is in America. The merchants in Hamburg, who buy tobacco from all the islands of the sea, hold it to sell for manufacture in every nation on the face of this earth, and are trying to get into this great market of ours. Every nation on earth is trying to compel this Nation to reduce its tariff. The Democratic party is organized and somehow or other seems to be lined up upon the side of foreign nations and against the American laborer. [Applause on the Republican side.] How comes it that all of you should be insisting that we should levy the taxes in our law for the support of our Government upon terms which will be satisfactory to Hamburg, satisfactory to Liver-

pool, and satisfactory to every foreign country that desires to sell to this country?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will be as brief with a question as I can, and I know the gentleman——

Mr. CALDERHEAD. What is the question?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas misapprehends the purpose of my question and misapprehends the purpose of the amendment to which I referred.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. No, Mr. Chairman; I think not.

Mr. STANLEY. This 6 cents tax does not affect the internal revenue directly or indirectly. It is not collected on the imports; it does not deal with any portion of the foreign trade; it is an excise tax, levied here at home.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I am perfectly willing to yield for a question, but I am not going to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am calling the gentleman's attention to the misapprehension of my question and the purpose of this tax. I do not care to put a tax of a dollar a pound on imported tobacco or to take it off; what I am talking about is whether he is willing to take off the excise tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I said a moment ago that I did not intend to enter into a discussion of the internal-revenue tax. It has been a good many years since that tax was levied. There has been ample opportunity for a discussion of it and ample opportunity for revision of it, and if at the present time it is deemed necessary or advisable, it may yet be done.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not true that your party platform of 1888 declared in favor of taking this tax off of tobacco because your party declared that it was a hindrance, a burden, and an annoyance to agriculture? [Applause.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. That may be true.

Mr. JAMES It is true.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I think it is, or the gentleman would not state it. For the purposes of what I have to say at this time, I do not care much whether it is true or not, since Kentucky does not care for a tariff for any of her interests. Situated in the heart of the nation, with the richest soil and the most genial climate, with a most heroic people and a heroic history, I advise the gentleman to turn to the statistics of his State and inquire whether her sons have done their duty to their land or not when they compare it with the little New England States and see what they have done with their rocky coasts. And there are others. There is all that vast land of the South, richer by nature than any other land the sun shines on; with heroic traditions, with great men, with rich land, with easy, docile labor, what have you done with your rich inheritance?

These men in the frost-bitten States of New England, not by the favor of a sun that shines summer and winter like yours, not by the favor of a soil that is measureless in its richness, not by the favor of a gentle climate or great opportunity, not by the favor of rivers that can carry their produce to the sea, but by toil and labor the men in these little frost-bitten States have accumulated two-thirds of the wealth of the Nation, while you, with waterfalls enough to run all the machinery necessary for all the cotton that could be made on all your wide acres, ship two-thirds of your crop to some other country and sell it there. What have you done with your land?

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman tell this House what would become of the smoking factories and humming looms in New England if the South should manufacture all of her vast products?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Do not be uneasy for a moment about New England. She has taken care of herself from the day the Pilgrim fathers landed at Plymouth Rock until now, and she will take care of herself until the end. [Applause.] Do not be uneasy about that.

Mr. GARRETT. This bill indicates that. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Make all you can, develop your own lands to the utmost, and see what we will do.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Has not the condition the gentleman speaks of been occasioned by reason of the fact that New England has had from 45 to 90 per cent protection upon all that she produced and the South has had absolutely nothing?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. That is a question which is traditional in the South, and has occupied most of the hearthstones and most of the hotel corners for the last eighty years. Why do you not get to work on your own account? [Laughter.] When you set up a government of your own—I do not intend to accuse you of doing what was unjust—you intended to export cotton to England, and you provided in your constitution that no import duty should ever be laid upon any manufactured goods coming into your country.

You stood by your traditions then, and you are still standing by them. You are living by them. A tradition is a healthy thing for a people, and no nation lives long that does not reverence its fathers and its mothers; but it is time for the children of a rich land to take their traditions in hand and go to the fields of toil and begin to produce and manufacture for themselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HOBSON. I will ask the gentleman if he has ever been through the South since the days of the civil war, and since the devastation and prostration produced by reconstruction, and if he has since then seen the astonishing progress that has been made not only in the development of agriculture, but in the way of manufacturing?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Now, if the gentleman will wait, and not interrupt with a question——

Mr. HOBSON. I should like to know if the gentleman has been through the South and seen the changes that have occurred since the days of the civil war?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. There is no need of repeating the question. I understand it. I do not want to be interrupted again with a colloquy, without meaning any discourtesy whatever to the gentleman from Alabama.

When I saw the South it was devastated by war; it was poor. I know how poor it was when it went home from Appomattox. I realize the heroism with which they finally returned to their labors on their homesteads, but I know that until the operation of the Dingley law spread its influences and its sustaining hand over you, you paid no attention to factories, and I know that since that time you have built more cotton mills than you built before in a hundred years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I know also that 2,600 independent sawmill owners sent their delegates to represent them before our committee. The water power which turns the wheels had been running there from the time before the first governor of Georgia occupied his seat. The power to turn all that great forest into lumber for us to use in a market 800 miles away was open, and yet not a sawmill turned a wheel, except for their own little home consumption, until the Dingley law furnished a protecting hand over them, and then they sold lumber to little New England.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to ask the gentleman, who has told us some things that he knows, and in passing I want to say that he knows some things that have not happened [laughter on the Democratic side]——

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to yield to hear things that I do not know and things that have not happened. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman know that at least one State in the South, the only one for which I claim the privilege of speaking, even in part, produces one crop worth more each year than any other crop of any nature whatever produced by any State in the Union, and on top of that the people of Texas contribute a million of dollars to help pay the pensioners in Kansas? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Upon that subject I want to say one word. We frequently have heard it charged that the poor South is taxed to pay the pensions to my comrades. I want to remind them that the only tax they pay for that purpose is the internal-revenue tax levied upon whisky, beer, and tobacco, and the payment of that is purely a voluntary matter with each man. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. They pay it, do they not? They do not do like the people of Kansas, drink without paying the tax. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Pay it? Of course, they pay it. Unfortunately, it may be for them, they have paid more attention to the consumption which results in paying the tax than they have to turning the steel shafts that hold the spindles in the cotton mills. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to ask any question in relation to sentiment at all. I want to ask the gentleman one

question. He has discussed the cotton-cloth tax, although I did not hear him, as I was not in the Hall at the time. I want to ask this question about the cotton-cloth tax: Is there any difference in the Payne bill as to the tax on cotton cloth and that in the Dingley bill; and if so, what is the difference?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I stated, I think, although the gentleman did not hear me, that I did not intend to enter into a discussion of the schedules of this bill at this time for the reason that there will be ample opportunity to do that when the bill is presented in the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman was discussing the tax upon cotton mills, etc. I want the gentleman to give me a direct answer, as whether paragraph 321 of the Payne bill does not change the entire tax put upon cotton cloths in the Dingley bill, and the average increase reaches 50 per cent—prohibitive in a great many of the articles of cotton cloth imported.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the meaning of that question to be that therefore the South must stop making cotton and quit work? Of course I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am asking for information; I am not talking about sentiment, about the poverty of the South, or anything of the kind. I want the gentleman to answer that direct question about the difference in the rate in the Dingley bill on cotton cloths and in this bill.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I said before that I did not care to enter into a discussion about the schedules of the tariff at this time for the reason that we will have ample opportunity to do that as the schedules come before us.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman allow me right there to make a suggestion—not a speech at all?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Very well.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, this tax does not touch the southern cotton mill at all. The southern cotton mills make coarse cloths, and they have no competitor in the world on that character of cotton cloth.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I think that is true.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It relates only to the New England mills. If sections 318 and 321 are carefully examined it will be ascertained that by classification the theory of the Dingley tax is annulled, and which increases the rate 50 per cent on certain cotton cloths.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to remind the gentleman of this fact, that he has had that bill since the day it was reported to the House, and has had ample opportunity to study it. Some changes have been made in the bill recently for the purpose of correcting what appeared to be an injustice to his people. I think, perhaps, he will find as the bill comes before the House that it has been amended for the express purpose that he desires.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman think that a cotton mill at Fall River which makes 25 per cent in the panic year of 1907 ought to have additional protection? I am not complaining as to southern mills. They are not affected at all. The change made decreases revenues and increases the cost to the people of necessary cotton cloth by giving the New England mills a monopoly.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, there are questions of that kind which can be discussed, and doubtless have been discussed during the last fifteen or twenty days. They have been in every campaign. Wherever I have had the pleasure and honor of hearing those gentlemen talk about politics from the stump in the last ten years, I have heard these same kind of questions put to the audience as an evidence that the Republican party was unjust to the gentleman and his people and unfair in partiality to New England. I am not from New England. I have seen very little of it. The only portion that I have ever seen has been the heart of Connecticut. I live west of the Missouri River. For twenty-eight years I never was east of it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Not now. Mr. Chairman, I have watched the vast increase of that great empire, against the policy and against the legislation, so far as they were able to accomplish it, of our friends on the other side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman asked me——

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman asked me for some facts, and I want to give them to him.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can take the floor after I am through for the purpose of making a speech. I have watched the development of my country from the other side of the Missouri River. For twenty-eight years I was not east of it. A year after the time I went there they drove the golden spikes that united the Central Pacific with the Union Pacific Railway, and made one line of railroad from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean. When I went there, freight was $600 a ton in gold from the Missouri River to Salt Lake. The next year after that great railway was built it was $39 a ton for the same distance. The day before yesterday the sixth intercontinental line was completed. No golden spike was driven at Seattle when the Chicago, Milwaukee and Seattle Railway was completed.

All the notice that it excited was a paragraph in the newspaper. Fifteen great States have been built since that time. Mines and minerals have been developed, flocks and herds are scattered over their vast domains, affording the raw material that will keep the unemployed workingmen of America at work the year round. You are standing here to say that every tax we put upon it is in some way or other a burden upon the consumer. The consumer? Who is he but the man who produces?

Just a word more, Mr. Chairman, and then I am through. I wish to remind my Republican friends that it is not a question whether hides come in free or subject to a duty, of whether lumber comes in free or subject to a duty. Personally I know that they ought both to be protected, for the tariff is for protection to the laborer in the lumber mills, and there has been no evidence found in four years that there is a lumber trust which combines the lumber mill and the manufacturer. [Applause.]

I believe there ought to be a tariff on hides, for it is an industry which the farmer and the herd owner from the Missouri to the Rocky Mountains furnish to the market. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not believe that the shoe factories of New England or anywhere else need that 15 per cent. It is not a question of whether either of those things comes the way we want it; but it is a question of whether the legislation in which we believe, the legislation which is consistent with the life of the laborer of the Nation, the legislation which stands like a wall around the laborers of America to protect them from the competition of the poorly paid laborers of other nations [applause on the Republican side] shall be maintained and passed as a law or shall be defeated because some little petty item does not suit you and me. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And for it all there are many years to come. No nation has ever yet been born and started on its career with a purpose to die. A hundred million people in our brief life; in another century 300,000,000; in another five centuries who shall number the multitudes that stand upon our land, all of them rejoicing in that nobler spirit of life, in nobler action of life, in the higher standard of faith and hope, and that if all around them some kind of clouds come to disturb the air, and threats upon one side and answers upon the other side make the foundations of the Nation tremble, then I know that in that far-off day, just as in the day of the fragment of the generation to which I belong, when duty calls, liberty's sons will come answering from every hill and valley, singing the same song that we sung:

Oh, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light.
* * * * *
Oh, say, does that Star-Spangled Banner still wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

[Applause on the Republican side.]

And it will still be there. [Loud applause.] A thousand years, my own Columbia, it will still be there.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Could I answer the question he asked me a moment ago? Does the gentleman yield for a moment; it will not take but a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in this bill now before the House the clock of protectionism strikes twelve. The philosophy of the doctrine and the facts now existing in this country demonstrate the truth of that assertion. From Alexander Hamilton to President McKinley all of the great men who have written and spoken on this subject have contended that the philosophy of the doctrine was that a protective tariff invited the investment of capital in manufacturing enterprises in this country, which increased the employment of labor and consequently augmented the capacity to buy and strengthened the home market for all producers. To put it concisely, until quite recently all the advocates of the doctrine of protectionism based their support of it upon the theory that it was a great developing instrumentality, augmenting the wealth of the country in every way.

I need not weary the House by quotations from Alexander Hamilton's report or from any of the historical documents and speeches touching this subject, for no well-informed man will gainsay what I have stated.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that every character of development policy carries inherently the seeds of death; that any policy of development presupposes fruition, just as the great natural law of growth presupposes ultimate fruition and decay. Just as the fruits ripen and fall to the ground, just as the trees of the forest reach maturity and finally decay, just as every form of life finally goes into dissolution, so, in the very nature of things, a development theory when put in operation looks to its final death, to the cessation of its application, by reason of the consummation of those things sought by its adoption. More than that, a development policy the result of human invention should be based upon and be in accord with the great natural laws pertaining to the subject-matter to which the policy itself relates.

You ask a great physician what the real philosophy of medicine is, and he will tell you that it is a mere aid to nature's natural efforts to work out the laws of health, and that medicine really is the science of how not to give it. That, in the nature of things, any remedy which he adopts must be in accord with these natural laws, and temporary in its use, ceasing with the evolution of these natural laws, which he merely tries to aid. You ask the Huntingtons and the Hills the philosophy of railroad building, and they will tell you that donations by the citizens toward the building of the railroad is purely a temporary matter, an inducement, an aid, and that in the last analysis those who invest their capital in the building of railroads must look to the great natural forces that exist, or will be developed, for dividends upon such investments. The very origin of protectionism was grounded upon the theory of stimulating manufacture, the contention being briefly stated thus: That by restricting foreign competition in the home market, a more profitable field therein was created for the investment of capital; that such investments not only added to the taxable values but increased the employment of labor, furnished more mouths to eat and bodies to wear, with better wages to buy all those things needed for man's necessities and comforts; and that this condition produced a universal benefit, in that it tended to increase prices on everything within the home market for the simple reason that it made the demand greater, operating upon the same supply, and hence increased prices on all things, since value at last is the creature of relation.

In the beginning there was much force in this philosophy, for the reason that the facts then existing made the application of the doctrine capable of producing to a large extent these results, since in our early history we purchased nearly all manufactured articles abroad, and we were almost wholly an agricultural people, raising corn, tobacco, wheat, cotton, cattle, and so forth.

I do not care at this time to pause to discuss the question of whether the policy was a wise one to inaugurate or not. That has been for a hundred years a question upon which has been poured out the intellect of the world, but for the purposes of the argument I am now making that is immaterial. I have said, and I repeat with all emphasis possible, that we have reached a period at which the doctrine of protectionism is doomed to death by the changed conditions, which make its continued application more and more unjust and injurious. I have said, and I repeat that this bill makes the clock of protectionism strike twelve; that this policy has reached its fruition, and that the process of dissolution as certainly awaits it as ultimately it must await every other development policy.

In the language of my German friends I wish to say to the House that the philosophy of the doctrine of protectionism is "ausgespieled." This German word beautifully and truthfully expresses the situation as it exists to-day, and obviously to the thoughtful mind as manufacture was increased under this policy more and more its benefits grew less and its burdens increased. As the immortal Grover Cleveland once remarked: "It is not a theory but a condition which confronts us." What are the facts? In almost all lines of manufacture the American manufacturer is making as much and more than the American market consumes, and foreign export of American manufactured articles is growing by leaps and bounds. An examination of the reports of the department of the Government touching the subject discloses this fact, as well as the most casual investigation through the usual sources of information among us. And now I wish you to follow me. Is it true that we have reached the point in this development policy called "protectionism" where the manufacturer of the article upon which he has been protected by the tariff is making more than the people of the United States consume?

If that be true, and you know, each of you, that it is true, I submit that I have demonstrated that we have reached the fruition of your policy, and that the present and coming great task of the American statesman is how to abandon the policy as no longer productive of good, but really of injury if continued, with the least commercial and industrial disturbances on account of such abandonment. In other words, we have reached the point with this doctrine where statesmanship is the art of how to cease giving this medicine any longer without destroying the health of the patients who have been overstimulated by it. The fact is, we have gotten drunk, as a nation, on the wine of protectionism, and the serious problem now is how to sober up. Obviously, when the manufacturer, stimulated under this development policy, reached the point where he was furnishing an adequate supply for the home market demand, from his selfish standpoint, he recognized that he was confronted by a condition under which, if he wished to extend his business—increase his profits—he must do one of two things as a business proposition: He must compete with similar factories in the home market by reducing prices without respect to the shelter afforded by protection, or he must combine with these others engaged in the same business, so as to reap the benefit of the full prices afforded under protectionism, and expand such combined businesses by competition in foreign markets wherever possible. Is it strange that these combinations have rapidly sprung up in the country? Is it strange that the mother of protectionism finally gave birth in the fullness of time to this miserable brood of children that, like vampires, are now sucking the blood of the masses? The strange thing about it is that the American people will be so busy with their private pursuits as not to exercise their intelligence and call a halt in this process of what is now legalized robbery.

Will any man on this floor contend that this policy now and still invites the investment of capital in competing factories in the home market; that under this policy now there is increasing employment to labor and a universal diffusion of capacity to buy, by reason of its beneficent operation? No honest man can or will make any such contention, in the face of the facts as they are known to exist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the worst of the condition that confronts us. Not only has all the good philosophy which originally supported the doctrine passed out of it, by reason of the consummation of the purposes of its operation, but, under present conditions, the application and continuance of the policy not only ceases to be beneficent, but actually becomes malevolent. How? These manufacturers, having covered the American market with their supplies, and having organized, either by actual holding companies covering the various factories or by agreements which operate with the same practical results, to maintain the largest measure of profits possible under protectionism, are now going further, and by these processes they are seeking to depress the prices of the things they buy, to lessen labor by eliminating it wherever possible, and crushing and preventing any local competitor from springing up anywhere by the enormous capital and power they possess when thus massed under the shelter of protection.

I wish to say to my Republican colleagues on that side of the Chamber, and to Republicans everywhere, that you are being driven, inch by inch, by the great, natural economic laws of this country toward the abandonment of protectionism. You may war against these great forces for a while, but the time is coming speedily when they must finally overthrow you. You may ridicule the "Iowa idea." You may laugh and spit at LA FOLLETTE, CUMMINS, and others, but these men are types of the toiling masses within the Republic, and their views are a tribute, eternal as the hills, to the tenets of that party of the people from Jefferson to Bryan. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

These men who stand for genuine revision of the tariff are not going to grow less in numbers. They are continually going to increase more and more by reason of comprehension of the conditions which exist, and a great Democratic tide is rising in this country which will work out practical results, in spite of the "stand-pat" arguments of this House, in spite of the hand of the "Iron Duke" and his lieutenants, in spite of partisan politics, in spite of the contributions of wealth and power, in spite of a subsidized press, and in spite of time-serving politicians, and we shall sweep the "standpatters" from power in the Republican party and force it to accept finally on this character of legislation, as it already has done in other things, the true Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, or the Republican party will be disorganized and overthrown and the Democracy will reign supreme, and the manufacturer will cease to be

the only creature taken care of by the legislation of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I told you that the clock of protectionism strikes twelve. We can not go on always, as McKinley said at Buffalo, looking alone to the home market. The real need now—and it will be an ever-increasing one to the American people—is foreign markets. It is inevitable that the pockets and the patriotism, that the principles and the policies of the American people will finally jump together on this question. The manufacturer has too long been the pet of national legislation, and the great producers and consumers of this country must "have their day in court." The "bulls" of protectionism have played the stocks and bonds of the manufacturer, of trusts, of combinations to the limit, and the "bears" must now have their innings, and the corn raisers of the great Middle West, the wheat raisers of the great Northwest, can no longer be held in line for this policy by the waving of the "bloody shirt," by the adroit appeals to sectionalism, by the false sophistry of benefit to them, and they are gradually drifting in line with the cotton raisers and the cattle raisers on this doctrine.

The great cry for reduction of the tariff, a cheapening to them of the things they buy, in justice to them, because of the fact that they are selling their products in the world's market under the universal laws of competition, and blessing other nations and enriching their own, is swelling more and more in this country, and will finally become speedily a mighty voice which can not be hushed by all the hands of all the "Iron Dukes" of all the parties in this country. The irony, the bitter sarcasm, of this bill lies in the fact that the organized leaders of the Republican party, preaching the "stand-pat" doctrine and practicing it, too, as long as they dared, and now, when in the open, they no longer dare to thwart this voice in their own party, they are resorting to miserable subterfuge in order to still this voice. They knew well this cry was so strong, that for fear of national defeat in the last election, they suddenly became so anxious to revise and ostensibly reduce the tariff, that they pledged the people, prior to the last election, that if successful they would call, immediately after the short session of the Sixtieth Congress, a special session to revise the tariff, and while you evaded all you could any specific promise to reduce it, such was the party contention everywhere where this voice of reduction was making itself heard. All over the Middle West your orators were promising the people that the tariff would not only be revised, but that it would be reduced in the interest of the people. You knew the people were crying for bread; you knew that insurrection threatened your party organization; you met it by promises, and this bill is your performance, contemptible to every man who knows enough about it to look into it. This bill does not reduce the tariff. This bill is not in the interest of the toiling and consuming masses. This bill is still a "stand-pat" high-protection tariff measure, and you can not delude the people any longer. The people cried for bread, and you have given them a stone, and a grindstone at that. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, what are the people going to do about it? Are they going to continue to support a policy that, played to the limit, all the good has passed out of and that is growing worse every day? How long will the taxpaying consumers of this country stand for a policy that, played to the limit, is now resulting in combinations which control the home market and continually milk the American people of the highest possible profit, while they are selling abroad, under competitive conditions with other countries, cheaper than they sell at home? I bear glad witness to the fact that the great toiling masses are rapidly becoming better informed. You find to-day in the humblest home newspapers and magazines, and I am proud to say that they are not all subsidized, and more and more they are pouring out to these earnest, patriotic brains the facts as they exist, and more and more the wheat raiser, the cattle raiser, the corn raiser, the cotton raiser, and the toiler everywhere, is coming to realize that protectionism has played out; that his burdens are growing greater; that his wages are buying less; that it is harder and harder for him to hold his job; and that something awful, somewhere, is the matter. And as certain as the sun shines this great educational process going on among the masses will not stop, and these men are putting away from them sectionalism feeling, partisanship, and are drifting with irresistible force from different standpoints to the same conclusion—that the protection must be overthrown. Does this mean free trade? No. The Democratic party never in its history declared for free trade, and never could have logically done so, for the simple reason that it is a party always revering the Constitution of our country, and that Constitution proposes as a method of raising taxation to support the Government a duty on imports, a tariff, a tax, if you will, to be paid by the consumer of the articles taxed, and we could not therefore in this country ever go beyond a tariff for revenue.

We could not go to free trade, nor ought we to go too fast. I sometimes fear that the desperation of the "standpatter" and the delay of remedial relief may provoke such a storm against its own house as that the danger will be too sweeping and sudden a reduction of the tariff when it comes, as come it must, and that the problem confronting the conservative Democrat will be to prevent not a reduction, but too much reduction too suddenly. The Democracy's position on the tariff is the golden thread which runs through its whole history, in preachment and in practice, since its first national platform in 1840, and it declared then for the doctrine of a tariff for revenue, limited to the needs of an honest government economically administered. From that doctrine it has never wavered. As the great Thurman used to wake the echoes in the Middle West by saying "The tariff of the American people is a tax, and should be levied according to taxation principles," so the party, in all its history, has been true to this doctrine, and it has ever stood for the doctrine of a tariff for revenue. And what does that mean? Revenue is an income to the Government from taxation. A tariff for revenue is a tariff tax paid by the consumers of the articles taxed. I pause to call attention to the fact that while Republicans at home and elsewhere talk glibly about state taxation, you never hear one of them, here or elsewhere, talk about national taxation. They seem to have a horror of this word "tax," and some of them used to say, when we hurled it in their teeth, that the foreigner paid it, and logically got themselves in a ridiculous position of contending that their great system actually developed this country at the expense of the foreigner. Of course, few people ever believed such a ridiculous doctrine.

The overshadowing issue in this country to-day, like Banquo's ghost, which was an honest one which will not down, is the issue of low taxation and economic expenditure, of equality of the burden and benefits of taxation, and the wise economy of expenditure. That is the point, now, upon which all the thought of the country needs to be concentrated. Look at the Republican party as an organization now. Its main circus is the tent of protectionism, and everything else is a side show. Speaking to my brethren on this side, I implore you to get busy, get together, call our forces all over the country together, and let us cease fighting over side shows, as they are not important, but let us march in solid phalanx down upon the main circus, in through the main entrance, and grapple with the old "he" elephant himself. And, my brethren on this side of the Chamber, if we will get together in the coming campaigns upon the ancient and honorable doctrines of our party for low and equal taxation, honest and economic government, we can sweep this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What about the doctrine of free raw material? The very fact that the tariff is a tax forces the conclusion that it should be levied according to taxation principles. What are they? Equality, uniformity in the burdens and benefits of a tax without reference to classes, sections, individuals, or whatever else. The doctrine precludes the idea of fighting protection with a free list. It makes me sick to hear a Democrat, or a Republican, as to that, talk about free this or that or the other. Whenever you put articles of import upon the free list you increase the burden of the tax on everything else and increase the inherent evil of the incidental protection carried by it at the same time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As for myself, if I could write a tariff bill, I would have a free list that you could practically cover with a $10 bill. But you say, "Would you be for a tax on this, on that, or the other?" I would be for a tax of some sort on any old thing that is imported into this country, so that I could broaden the burden of the tax and decrease and lessen the incidental protection as far and as much as the system of taxation would permit under our trade conditions.

You ask me if I am for a tax on hides? Why, of course. The duty was over three millions of dollars last year on hides. For a tax on wool? Yes. For a tax on cattle? Yes. For a tax, in a word, on anything that we import. I would be for a very moderate tax on some things. Why? Because I believe in the old Democratic doctrine that if we could we would raise enough revenue to run an honest, economic Government by taxing the luxuries alone, but we can not. Therefore, we have to tax comforts as well, and we can not raise enough on both. Therefore, we have to have a tax on necessaries. I would minimize the free list. I would levy as low a tariff on the necessaries of life as the demands of an economic, honest Government would permit, and still higher on comforts, and still higher on luxuries, and enough on all classes of articles to meet the needs of an

honest, economic Government justly and fairly administered. That is the position that this country is as certain to come to as you live.

It would have been better by far for the country if this general debate had closed in four hours on a side, and the bill had been taken up section by section and this body permitted to assert its representative capacity on every schedule in this bill. [Loud applause.] But the "standpatters" are in the saddle. They own "the machine" of the House, and they are allowing the "Iron Duke" to dictate the great taxing power of this Government. You start in to stifle the voice of the people in this, the greatest representative body. You know it, and I know it, and the people are finding it out. Abraham Lincoln knocked the black out when he said:

You may fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you can not fool all of the people all of the time.

[Applause.]

The real question involved in this controversy among ourselves about the rules was not secondary issues, not a question of committee on committees; but really the question was of taking from the Speaker part of his power—taking the iron glove from the "Iron Duke"—and raise a Committee on Rules in this House that will be responsible to the Representatives here and to whom we could appeal for a rule that will give every Representative a fair show on every article that affects his district. The issue was "the machine," as run by the Speaker and his two appointees on the Committee on Rules.

Now we are beginning to reap the results. The "Iron Duke" and his two lieutenants are juggling and fixing up a rule by methods that no man would care to tell the truth about in the open day. They are endeavoring to satisfy this side and that side and get them to come together in a hodge-podge trade to force the stand-pat policy through in this House, and take the chance to have the thing helped out some at the other end of the Capitol by a like machine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I predict that the machine will go to pieces at the other end of the Capitol for the first time in forty years. They have no such rules over there. This bill, just like the railroad rate bill, I predict, will be better for the people when it comes from the other end of the Capitol than it is now and here. Perhaps the result of this is softened somewhat by the fact that this protracted debate has brought out a lot of concessions from the machine that we might not otherwise have gotten. If the blow is softened to that extent, I welcome the fact, but I apprehend the concessions will not amount to anything substantial. I predict that the iron and steel schedules will not be modified, nor will the woolen schedules. We are to be allowed to touch the lumber schedule in high places. I understand we are to have an amendment on hides, so that we may under hides "skin" the rest of the country. [Laughter and applause.] There may be an amendment on lumber offered, perhaps, and a few little things to satisfy some of the insurgents, but the body of the bill will stand in accord with the "standpatters" here and yonder.

Now, if I were as mean as some of the Populists were once in my district, when they had a mass meeting and spoke favorably of a measure that passed, and said it was a scoundrelly act, but helped their party—if I could find it in my heart, I would say in regard to the situation, "I welcome the situation, because I believe it means the destruction of the Republican machine in this country in the next congressional and presidential elections."

Just here I wish to call attention to the evidence of the growth of Democratic sentiment, which, in my judgment, is a matter on which the country and the party should be congratulated. Doubtless, upon past "paramount" issues, we either estranged entirely or caused the indifference of a very considerable number of voters who may be classified under the name of the "middle class"—the merchants, the bankers, and the professional men; but it is perfectly evident that upon this issue the merchant everywhere is becoming awake to the fact that protection played to the limit, which for a while he thought aided his business, and maybe made him sympathize with protectionism or be indifferent to the Democracy, is now affecting his business; that these combinations are fixing the price to him, decreasing his profits, dictating the course of his business, and interfering with the great laws of competition, and minimizes the value of his character and capacity in his business; that his real interests lie not with the great combinations and manufacturers, but with the great consuming masses, and he is beginning to protest everywhere and is rapidly drifting toward the ranks of the Democracy.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, as iniquitous and wicked in its conception and its execution as that glove and hosiery schedule is, out of the evil there is coming good; the merchants everywhere, and the women everywhere—God bless them all—are looking into this question, and they are protesting not only against this schedule, but more and more against the system which I assert is absolutely consistent when it writes into this bill this miserable glove and hosiery schedule. It is only what it has done times without number in the history of the organization. It is nothing new for the "standpatter" to build up a monopoly that is exactly what has been done all along, and this schedule, I trust, will form an object lesson that will rivet the minds and hearts of the American women and the American merchants upon this great problem, and that they will aid us in the destruction of any political organization which stands for a continuance of this policy.

Protests are coming in from them indicating that they are realizing that this protection played to the limit has evolved combinations that are destructive of competition, that narrow the middlemen's profits, and tend to destroy every just, economic law in its operation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You will not fool the country. The country will take the view of it that a lunatic did in a story which I intend to tell and then close.

Two lunatics were being conveyed to the Southwest Asylum, in my State. One said to the other:

Where are you going?

The other one said:

I am going down to the lunatic asylum.

What is the matter with you?

Why, I got to studying predestination and foreordination and God's election and man's free will, and all that, and I got mixed up.

I talked with the preachers and deacons, and it all got worse. I got so I couldn't sleep, saw all kinds of visions, and they just took me and said they were going to send me down to the asylum to straighten me out. Now, what is the matter with you?

Well—

Said the other—

I am going down to the asylum, too. They say I am crazy.

Well, what is the matter with you?

Why, I got to studying tariff revision, free trade, tariff for revenue, reciprocity, free raw materials, the maximum and minimum, and drawbacks, and all that, and I got all mixed up, and I thought the country was being ruined. One night I had a vision, and I heard a voice that told me the Republican party was coming into power the next election and that they were going to revise and reduce this tariff in the interest of the people and straighten all this out. I believed it, and I told my friends of my vision, and they took me and sent me down to the lunatic asylum.

Well—

The other man said—

you did not believe in a vision like that, did you?

He said:

Yes.

What! Did you believe that the Republican party as at present organized would reduce the tariff in the interest of the people?

Yes—

He said—

I did.

Well, you ain't crazy, you are just a natural-born fool.

[Laughter.]

[Mr. FOSTER of Vermont addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss a part of this tariff bill which is more than political. "For justice all places a temple, and all seasons summer;" and in the name of common justice I demand of the Ways and Means Committee either that they bring in an amendment taking the tax off of leaf tobacco in the hand of the farmer or that some man who refuses to do it have the courage, the manhood, the respect that is due the committee and the people to rise on this floor and defend his act and defend the justice of that tax. Mr. Chairman, this tax will, sooner or later, be the hardest thing you will have to defend. When the cry is abroad in the land that this bill is a cunningly devised plan to help the rich and oppress the poor, to aid the strong and to burden the weak, then this one little schedule will rise like Banquo's ghost, and it will not down. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, for many years there has been concealed a joker in your tariff bills. There is a provision to-day in the revenue laws providing that tobacco in the hand, just as the farmer raises it, without any process of manufacture at all, just as it comes from the stalk, is manufactured tobacco and subject to an internal-revenue tax of 6 cents a pound until you get enough of those leaves together, unmanufactured in any way, to amount to 2,000 pounds and to fill a hogshead, and then it is tobacco in the natural leaf and can be sold by whoever purchases or whoever wants it. Both in the hands of the vendee and in the hands of the vendor it is absolutely free from tax,

but the man who raises that tobacco can not sell it in small quantities unless he sells it to some manufacturer or broker. The result is that the tobacco that is raised must go through this so-called "process of manufacture." Now, for the purpose of smoking—pipe tobacco—the natural leaf is not improved by manufacture, and the manufacturers before the Finance Committee of the Senate all admit that to-day the greatest problem they have to confront them is how to make their tobacco as much like the natural leaf as possible. They admit that the cost of manufacturing is not half a cent a pound, and yet that tobacco, although manufactured at less than half a cent a pound, is sold at from 40 to 80 cents a pound to the very man that raises it.

If the 6 cents tax did not exist and there was no law preventing the farmer from selling his tobacco in the hand, one concern in Tennessee authorizes me to make the statement that it could handle 10,000 hogsheads of the farmer's tobacco for which they could find a sale at home, that they could ship it by the hundred pounds wrapped up in bales to the sawmills in Missouri, in Louisiana, and in Mississippi, and that they could sell it in small quantities in the same way all over the South.

As it is the only sale we have for our tobacco, the only purchasers of 95 per cent of it are the Regies and the American Tobacco Company. The only force, the one agency that demands as its inexorable ultimatum of the Republican party that this tax shall remain, is the tobacco trust, and I call upon you here to-day to let us have a vote and to let us see who are with the people and who are with the trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that the great majority of the men upon that side are not with this trust. The Committee on Ways and Means time and again has reported this bill. No man has spoken for the retention of this tax. No laborer, no farmer, none of the sons of toil, have asked for it. The insidious machinations of James B. Duke and those under his control, a few stool pigeons posing as independents—they are the only people who have asked for it.

I heard my friend from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] talk about the principle of the tax upon luxuries. The only reason you tax the luxury and tax it as high as you do, is that the men who indulge in the luxury pay for it. I do not object to a tax on manufactured tobacco—I do not care if you make it 40 cents a pound. I do not object to a dollar a gallon tax on whisky, and my people make it. If men choose to chew tobacco and to drink whisky, both bad habits, they can pay for it, but the man who raises a pound of tobacco is as much entitled to justice as the man who raises a bushel of wheat. You have no right to put a tax on the tobacco grower, that you may fill the coffers of the trust.

Now, I demand that this committee do one of two things: EITHER PERMIT MY AMENDMENT OR DEFEND YOUR REFUSAL ON THE FLOOR OF THIS HOUSE. Do not conceal a nameless outrage in the body of this bill; do not put a thing in there of which you are ashamed; do not put a thing in there which you know is wrong and will do a grave injustice to 500,000 men and then treat my appeals with silent contempt; do not refuse to do justice and then refuse to defend the act of injustice.

I interrupted my friend from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD]. He said they did not propose to allow imported tobacco to come into this country without a tax. He is a member of the committee, and I say it with all due deference, that he is utterly ignorant of the whole subject, or he misapprehended what I said, which I think is more probable. He says he objects to the free importation of foreign tobacco, and talks of this 6 cents tax as if it were an import. There is not a pound of tobacco in the Burley district or an ounce of tobacco in the Black Patch that ever comes back into this country when exported. There is not a pound of tobacco that is imported into this country that comes directly or indirectly in competition with it. Why, he was talking about the Hamburg market. I am surprised that a gentleman on the great Ways and Means Committee should know absolutely nothing about the tobacco market. He talks about the Hamburg tobacco competing with our own. Hamburg is not a tobacco market. Bremen is the only open tobacco market in Europe. If he reads the consular reports, he will see that Bremen is the great center which supplies Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and it actually breaks up the hogsheads we ship over there, and every dealer in the Bremen market has asked the privilege of having tobacco shipped to him in bales instead of in hogsheads.

If you allow this to go through, my friends, it will not in any way affect your revenue. If there is a man upon the Ways and Means Committee who will take five minutes or five hours and will convince me or will convince himself, or will at the end of the argument still claim in the presence of this House that this bill will affect our import duties by a mill, I will agree to make no further demands. Yea, more than that. Your Commissioner of Internal Revenue, one of the ablest commissioners you have had since the war, Mr. Yerkes, came before your committee and said that you could take this tax off the back of the farmer and that it would not affect the internal-revenue tax by a single cent.

My friends, you have read in the daily papers of the conditions that exist in western Kentucky and Tennessee. You have read the story of the Night Riders, a story of lawlessness and disorder in that country, and the accounts are very greatly exaggerated. No writer has yet taken the trouble to paint to you the misery, the want, the utter destitution that visited that country when the tobacco tenants for two long years got less than 20 cents a day because the American Tobacco Company arbitrarily in ninety days reduced the price of raw material from an average of over 7 cents a pound on over $60,000,000 worth of property.

You have never read how those farmers peacefully organized and stood together and held their crops unsold for three years, until they secured a fair price for them, and you have never read the story of the lives of these same farmers of Kentucky and Tennessee for generations before they became the hapless victims of a grinding and heartless monopoly. In the midst of labor broils, in the midst of war between employer and employee, in the midst of lockouts and of strikes, in a hundred years there had been no friction, there had been no strife, no jar between the landlord and his tenant in any of those 26 States. Three hundred thousand men for fifty years tilled the soil in peace; 300,000 men have for half a century lived as neighbors and friends with those for whom they toiled, and 300,000 men had as their sole ambition and highest desire to add to the column of home lovers and home seekers in this land.

On the fertile plains of Kentucky and Tennessee during all this era the little patches of tobacco on hill and dale furnished to the tumultuous scenes of conflicting toil one quiet haven. Hope and peace and plenty cast their mingled delights around them. Here in the midst of confusion and lockouts on every hand was labor's very Eden.

But it is an unequal contest. There is but one thing that will give them relief. There is no longer any competition in the sale of manufactured tobacco, and they want to sell it without manufacturing it. They want to sell their tobacco just as they grow it, just as the farmer has a right to sell his wheat and his hay and his corn; and you by a single amendment can give it to them. Five hundred thousand men will rise up and call you blessed if you do. One single solitary commercial bandit will grit his teeth in wrath and curse you if you amend this law. It is James B. Duke, whom your courts have indicted, whom your President has denounced, standing out, solitary and alone, against a host of toilers. For whom do you stand; the farmer or the trust? If you can not defend this iniquitious provision, for the sake of humanity and for the sake of justice and for the sake of common decency I appeal to you to repeal this pernicious provision in the organic law of the land. The Ways and Means Committee has three times reported a bill to this House repealing this obnoxious act, and three times when presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] it has passed this House without a dissenting vote. Three times it has died in the Senate; and I have produced here on this floor the very telegram that was sent in the name of an independent buyer to a certain member of the Finance Committee, whose name I am not permitted to call, stating that he wanted the bill killed.

I produced the man who sent that telegram. He said that he was not an independent buyer and Mr. Duke sent for him and took him to his office at 105 Fifth avenue, New York, and dictated that telegram, and that is the only voice that has ever been raised against the repeal of this infamous enactment. Can James B. Duke run a ground wire to the Capitol of the United States, and secretly steal the clothing from the back of a million men and women, and reduce them to a condition of almost abject servitude?

What are we asking? I am ashamed to say it. Only a little relief for the wretch who has toiled through heat and cold and rain and shine to bring to fruition a few leaves of tobacco. They have at last mastered the markets of the world, until to-day there is not a manufacturer of tobacco on earth save one to whom he can sell. There is not a foreign port which he may enter.

This poor man can not sell a leaf of his tobacco anywhere on the green earth, not in Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, Spain, Austria, Italy, or South Africa, unless it go to one purchaser; and we ask—what? We ask that he may take

in his own hand a few leaves of tobacco that he himself has grown, and start barefooted down the road to find a purchaser for them.

This brave tenant and his hard-pressed landlord are still sternly and stubbornly battling with the trust. They stand in the midst of poverty and disaster, still unwilling to surrender to their merciless master. Princely fortunes, old and established firms, almost omnipotent in the mercantile world, have been scattered and blown to the winds. The anathema of the law, state and national, this trust successfully defies. In the face of it all, these loyal, determined, patriotic farmers of Kentucky and Tennessee, in the face of pitiless penury, still stand by their homes.

There is one relief and only one—the producer of tobacco must find a market not controlled by the trust. That market you can open by the repeal of this tax. The only objection which has been or can be assigned is this pitiful loss of revenue. In the face of the facts and conditions that confront you, this is no objection at all.

There are 7,000,000 negroes in the South who prefer the natural leaf to tobacco in any other form. That tobacco is given to those negroes in the form of a ration by the owners of southern plantations. A Member of this House the other day told me that it was the custom to allow so many pounds of tobacco with every ration—so much meat and so much meal and so much tobacco. Now, the southern planter and the plantation darky alike would prefer the natural leaf. I know that in the sad hours for Kentucky and Tennessee we can look to the sons of the orange and evergreen for relief. They will not fail us in a response characteristic of that brave and generous land.

It is argued, Mr. Chairman, that if this tax should be taken from tobacco in this form that the sale would supersede the demand for tobacco in other forms, and in that way more materially decrease the revenues of the Government. I hope that this is true, and more than true. "'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished." Have you ever considered the full meaning of this argument? It is simply this: Men making a few cents for a day of thirteen hours' ceaseless toil in the cultivation of tobacco, will, after this long day is done, take a bundle of tobacco to the nearest country store and trade it for coffee or sugar or meat, and the merchant will sell it to the next customer instead of a plug made by James B. Duke & Co., and in that way the Government will lose the chance to take from this "o'erlabour'd wight" the sum of 6 cents.

Is there a man upon either side of this Chamber who will tell me in honesty and candor that he is the friend of the toiler, that he believes in protecting him against the oppression of the worst trust ever formed, and then have the temerity to claim that this Government should continue this old, cruel war tax, eating as it does the bread from the mouths of the overburdened and starving tenantry of the South?

Will you sit idly by, with your eyes open, and permit them to be ruthlessly plundered, see their last market destroyed, and refuse to this people, by a law you can not defend, the poor boon of making another market for themselves? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HOBSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes in order that I may reply to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] has reproached the South for being backward. It is not necessary to call attention to the progress that the South has made in recent years. This progress has been marvelous. As shown by statistics, it stands without a parallel in the history of America or of any other country. And yet the South is only on the threshold of its development, for in addition to its fertile soil and salubrious climate, it has boundless deposits of coal, iron, cement, salt, limestone, marble, and other minerals, along with great water-power possibilities and three-quarters of the cotton supply of the world, all constituting the basis for becoming the greatest manufacturing section of the world. But it is true that the South was a long time getting started. I believe the gentleman from Kansas little realizes the odds under which the southern people have been laboring. He can have but a slight idea of the terrible devastation wrought by the long civil war, nor can he realize the untold suffering of the reconstruction days, when ignorance was enthroned and the land turned over to be pillaged by adventurers, who squandered the meager resources of the public treasury. I am sure the gentleman has no realization of the staggering weight which the southern people are bearing as they try to uplift the colored race in the face of difficulties arising from misguided efforts of those at a distance who do not understand this great race problem. It is only within the last few weeks that the southern people have been able to draw a deep breath of relief in the assurance that no more will there come from the Government any suggestion of political domination or social equality. With these two questions set at rest we will, under God's guidance, grapple with this great problem and make more rapid progress in redeeming a part of a race that is otherwise going to extermination. And the reward for duty well done will be that the black man will become a growing asset for the South and for the Nation.

The gentleman from Kansas has reproached the South for clinging to its sentiments and to its traditions. I think that such a reproach is ill timed at this juncture, when we find special interests, far and near, forgetting their country, as they clamor for themselves. It is full time that some of the old devotion to country and to principle should again be manifested in public life. [Applause.] I believe, Mr. Chairman, that a man has not fully learned to live until he has found certain principles for which he is willing to die. [Applause.] I admit that the South is clinging to her traditions. Ninety-eight per cent of all the blood that flows in the veins of Southerners is American blood [applause], that has come down pure from the days when men were willing to sacrifice themselves, their fortunes, and their lives for country and for principle. [Applause.] It will be a happy day for the United States when the South, buttressed by industrial, commercial, and financial strength, goes forward and takes again the leadership in directing and molding the affairs of this great Nation. [Applause.]

The question has been raised of the South's share of the national taxes which go to pensions. This amounts to tens of millions every year, and is a heavy drain upon that section for which there is no return. But the South has never complained; the ex-confederate soldiers themselves have never complained, though the pensions have grown to mountain heights. The southern people have the kindliest feelings for the soldier that wore the blue, who showed so much courage and devotion, and the South is thankful to heaven that it is still a part of our great Union. [Applause.] The gentleman from Kansas no doubt loves his country. He doubtless feels a thrill when he looks at the stars in the flag, but I am bold to say that his feelings are not as deep as those of the man who realizes that there was a chance of his not being born under that flag. I have seen the flag when smoke and thunder were on the air, and then it was that my soul exulted and my thanks went up to Almighty God that I had been born under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

And I know that I am simply typical of the other southerners. My father was three times wounded, an officer in the confederate army; yet the earliest memory I have is his saying that he hoped that two of his sons would live, one to go into the army and one into the navy to fight under the old flag. [Applause.] I can tell you to-day, speaking for the whole South, that the fires of patriotism burn as brightly there as in any other part of the country—and no one has a right to doubt this fact since the evidence shown in the Spanish war. The stars in that glorious flag that answer to the names of the Southern States are glittering with a loyalty that is perfect, with a devotion to the Union that is absolute. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I would not join in any way in this discussion except for the fact I find myself differing from some of my colleagues and Members on this side as to what policy should be pursued in reference to some items in this tariff bill. I join in the main, but not all, with what has just been said in regard to the South by the gentleman from Alabama, who has just taken his seat. My father and mother were both born and raised in the district which that gentleman now represents. I have found out that in these tariff questions that special interests control and are the ones who are fighting for recognition here before the Ways and Means Committee. They are the dominant factors in framing a tariff bill. I want to refer, for instance, to the charge that the South is not doing what she ought in the way of material progress. You men of the North hear me. It is to-day as it was when Calhoun hurled the doctrine of nullification, the doctrine of secession, against the tariff barons of this Nation; it is true now, as it was then, that the South suffers most from the heavy taxation laid upon her toilers by your system of protective-tariff legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We are a cotton-raising people. That is our chief industry. The man who would sacrifice the interests of the cotton raiser of the South to those interested in lumber, in hides, in sugar, in rice, in a number of articles on this tariff list, in my opinion

does not represent the interests of the main body of people of the South who have suffered all these years from these unjust tariff burdens. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me tell you. Two-thirds of our cotton crop must find a market abroad. You can not help us by tariff legislation except by making our burdens as light as possible consistent with the needed revenue of an economical government, only by affording us an opportunity to buy what we need of manufactures at a lower price. We are interested in preserving the cotton-manufacturing industry of this Nation. It would be a foolish policy for us to advocate anything that would destroy the cotton-manufacturing industry of this country, or any other industry, for that, although we are dependent for two-thirds of our cotton products upon the cotton industries in foreign countries.

Let me put this to you. The gentleman from Ohio the other day plainly put before this House and the country how, by your protective tariff legislation, you are putting 11 cents a pound in the pockets of the woolgrowers of his State. You people a few years ago denied the proposition that you could create value by legislation. But here you are admitting that, by your high protective tariff policy, you are putting 11 cents a pound in the pockets of the woolgrowers of this country. Now, my friends, suppose you go to the cotton farmer with that proposition, a proposition that requires him to pay on an average nearly 100 per cent tax upon the woolen fabrics that he has got to buy. Are not you asking him a great deal when you require of him to support a policy by taxation that takes from his pockets his honestly earned money and puts it in the pockets of people in other parts of the country?

My friends, the southern white man has to support and educate his own family. Yea, more than that, he has to educate a family of negro children at the same time—tax himself to educate his own children, tax himself to educate almost an equal number of negro children; and then you come to him with this bill in your hand and lay further tax burdens upon his back by demanding 100 per cent on wool, 65 per cent or 70 per cent on cotton and on steel, and many other outrageously high rates in this bill.

Take the whole list, and, in heaven's name, can you hope to win the South under such a policy as that? You may get a few lumber barons, you may get a few wool barons, you may get a few of our people that receive direct benefit from your legislation, but, my friends, the great body of southern workers, those who are toiling in the fields, will control the South. You will never get them until you come, not with flattery upon your lips, not with a bribe in your hands by way of paying special interests, but with justice in your heart, with justice in your proposition, whatever it is. Then, and not until then, will you make any headway in the South, and that will be when the leopard changes his spots or the Ethiopian his skin.

My friends, I know that a Republican believes in special interests, and he may have some respect for southern men that join the Republican party in order to advance their particular special interests; but I do not believe that you have any respect for a man, not controlled by any of these special interests, that would come over and join your protective policy and thus practically betray the interests of the great body of his own people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You criticise the South. Let me tell you what you are doing. Look at the statistics of the census of 1900. Look at the boys and girls from 10 to 15 years of age in the South that are working in the fields. You men of chivalrous America, look at the girls of the South, of that tender age, that are in the fields. They are not all negroes. I ask you to look at the statistics with reference to the white boys between 10 and 15 years of age, and the white girls between 10 and 15 years of age, out in the fields; and yet you sneer at them because they have not made the advancement you think they should have made in education. What are you doing? You are by this bill taking schoolbooks out of their hands and putting them into the hands of your own children. You are tearing the roofs from over the heads of these people of the South and building more substantial and palatial residences for your own people. My friends, that is the condition. Mark my word; you will never win in the South until you leave flattery behind, until you leave political bribery behind, and come to us with a proposition involving the square deal, the fair thing, for the people of that section of the Union. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, they say, here is a bill that puts coal on the free list. A gentleman, a Republican, powerful in the councils of his party, turned and said: "Look here; you have turned traitor to the South. I am going to protect southern interests." Now, my friends, how does that proposition look? Coal is a necessary commodity in millions of homes to our people. Here is a proposition that puts coal on the free list, practically. We need it in Texas, we need it in every State in the Union, and here is a gentleman that says to the southern people, "Stand with me to put coal on the dutiable list. I want the southern people to join with me and enable me to recover my part of this special privilege, my tax on coal."

This powerful Republican says: "My colleagues in plunder are not fair. I have heretofore helped them collect a bonus on wool, iron, steel, cotton cloth, and they deny me my bonus on coal. I am outraged. You men of the South, help me to get my share. I do not propose to lift the burdens by a little finger's weight off the backs of our consuming masses, but I will continue their burdens. However, your lumber barons want their bonus, your meat and hide barons want theirs. Let us barons stand together and collect what we have heretofore collected, and let the consuming masses of the country bear the burden."

Mr. Chairman, I will not join in with this delightfully just and fair programme.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. While the gentleman is on that point, you have observed that a number of gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, some at any rate, are supporting the proposition to keep the tariff on lumber on the theory that heretofore there has been protection to the interests of the North, and now they intend the South to have its share. The gentleman has observed in the newspapers in the last few days a number of Republicans who are in favor of a tariff on lumber, and who now are threatening the organization that unless they keep this tariff on lumber they will join with the opponents and make an assault on the protective system as a whole. The gentleman, I am sure, sympathizes with those Republicans who want to make a general assault on the entire policy of protection. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLESPIE. Certainly. And it is the only way we can ever win. Take from them their bonus and they will join us for justice to all our people. Now, think of that proposition. Think of the thousands that live on the prairies of Texas and that have been systematically robbed by lumber trusts or lumber agreements in forcing up the price of lumber. Now, here is a proposition that looks to giving to my people cheaper lumber, and yet through some theory of taxation I am required to join the hosts who claim they have been deprived of a part of their booty by their own colleagues.

They come over and want my vote to continue the high price on lumber to the people of Texas. The same way about hides. Now, here is a proposition that is plain in my mind. There is a reasonable competition in this country among the boot and shoe manufacturers anyway. Practically, they have the field. They have excluded foreign competition. Now, in the face of home competition they are able to give our people their boots and shoes at a fair and reasonable price. If they can get their raw material cheaper under this competition, which is admitted to exist, it would inevitably tend to give the people of this country cheaper boots and cheaper shoes, cheaper harness and cheaper saddles. How can I deny such an open proposition as that? My people who have stood for and paid these unjust exactions for years—here is a proposition that offers them a prospect of cheaper shoes, cheaper leather products, and what shall I do? Shall I sacrifice the interests of the shoe wearers and the boot wearers of my district and State to the interests, whether they are cattle kings or packers, of the few that control the sale of hides?

My friends, on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number of my people as well as of the country at large, I am going to vote, if I can, to put hides on the free list, and I am going to vote to put leather and the products of leather of all kinds on the free list. [Applause.] If I can not get that, I am going to stand for hides on the free list anyhow. They have reduced the tariff on leather from 20 to 5 per cent anyway. I will do this believing the inevitable result will be to give my people and those of the whole country cheaper boots, cheaper shoes, cheaper harness, and cheaper leather manufactures of all kinds. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. Do I understand you are opposed to a tariff on wool and woolen products?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I would put wool to-day on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would reduce the tariff on woolen manufactures fully 50 per cent to-day. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think that the tariff on wool and woolens distinctly discriminates in favor of the South as against the North, where more woolens are consumed per capita in those colder climates?

Mr. GILLESPIE. You say it does discriminate?

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. Do you not think that the South pays less per capita to raise revenue on wool and woolens than the northern people would?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I suppose they would; I have not looked up the statistics. But what if it is so? The money stays with your people. Your tariff barons get a large share, and a much smaller share is forced from these barons by labor organizations.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. I would ask the gentleman to kindly tell us what your constituents consume in your district that you do not want taxed?

Mr. GILLESPIE. I have said I would reduce the tariff on woolen fabrics one-half, leaving 50 per cent. Is not the gentleman satisfied with a tax of 50 per cent? Why do you demand 100 per cent? [Applause.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. Do I understand that the people of the South do not want a tax on anything?

Mr. GILLESPIE. You do not understand any such thing, because the people of the South have never refused to bear their just burden of taxation at any time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio. On what do your constituents want to pay their share of the revenue necessary to run this Government?

Mr. GILLESPIE. We want to pay a tax on our incomes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We want to pay taxes on all luxuries that our people use. We have always been willing to pay a reasonable revenue tariff tax.

My friends, this is a serious matter with my people. Since I have been in Congress I have not appealed for one minute to sectional prejudice or any prejudices growing out of the war. I have told my people that if we can get our case before those of the American people who live north of Mason and Dixon's line, if we can convince them that we are not ourselves controlled by sectionalism, by prejudice, but that in the interest of this country we stand for justice and for nothing more, I believed that in time our people would be heard.

Lincoln said that this Government could not continue founded upon injustice. Your protective tariff policy is unjust. Injustice is embodied in it, and, as Lincoln said about slavery, I do not believe the American people will ever let this question rest. Every movement must tend toward the ultimate extinction of this unjust system of taxation now imposed by the Republican party. In 1890 you passed the Sherman antitrust law. You did this to keep the people quiet over their just resentment at tariff-sheltered trusts and monopolies, destroying home competition. But you have not enforced this law, and monopoly is now demanding its repeal or emasculation by amendment, so bold has monopoly become. The panic of 1907 exposed all your false pretenses that high taxation brings and continues prosperity. When, through short crops, the price of cotton advances, you tell the cotton farmer that high tariff did it. When the wheat crop of the world but ours fails, and the nations are paying famine prices for bread, and wheat goes up, you say high tariff did it. When labor organizations force wages up, you say high tariff did it. When the demands of the wars of the world, including ours, raise prices, you say the high tariff did it. When new gold supplies stimulate prices everywhere, you say high tariff did it. Your false pretenses are fully exposed. But the high cost of living and the trusts remain prominent. You told the people you would revise the tariff downward. This Payne bill exposes that false pretense. Mr. Taft promised a revision downward; but the tariff baron is greater than Mr. Taft. The Dingley bill promised reciprocity; but the tariff baron is greater than the Dingley bill. You promised the enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law; but the tariff baron is greater than the Sherman antitrust law. You stand fully exposed. You must receive the condemnation of the people. Every movement must look to the ultimate extinction of your unjust, unequal, and sectional tariff policy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. THISTLEWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of patience and not without some pleasure to this tariff discussion that has occupied the attention of this House and the people of the country generally for many days.

I should not trouble you at this time were it not a fact that this may be the only opportunity I may have of explaining my vote on this important measure.

I have been greatly amused by the arguments presented by some of my good Democratic friends on the other side of this Chamber. Some of them have pointed their long, bony fingers at this side and with wild gesticulations and in thunderous tones have declared that the tariff system under which this country has grown and its people prospered without a parallel in any country was robbery and graft, and that the framing of any tariff legislation was tinctured with dishonor.

I have great respect for opinions of some of my Democratic friends. I have great respect for those who disagree with me honestly, if they can suggest something better, but I have only contempt for denunciation without argument or for statements and opinions not founded on the truth.

Notwithstanding the defects of our revenue system, as pointed out by our good Democratic friends; notwithstanding all the ills of our tariff legislation that has been so vigorously denounced, and under which the business of the country has been carried on, we have made greater progress under the Dingley tariff law in the last twelve years than in any like period of our country's history. And yet you say everything is going wrong in the face of the undisputed fact that the laborers of this country have been better clothed, better paid, and better fed than in any other country on the face of the globe. In no country are the women and children treated with that consideration that are accorded to them here. We have more savings banks, with more depositors, and, what is more, some of our savings banks' depositors are helping to furnish the money to run the institutions of industry which have added so much to our country's greatness. We have more miles of railroad, and as an evidence of the general prosperity of the country I do not know of a single railroad in the hands of a receiver, showing our people are traveling and that they have the money to pay the freight.

But, while I am a protectionist, while I believe in protection as a principle, because I have seen the great good that has come to this country through the operation of our tariff laws, there are some features of this bill I do not indorse. I do not believe it is wise to remove the duty on hides; the land upon which most of our cattle are raised is no longer cheap. Some one has said the hide is raw material. The hide to the farmer, if he does the killing, is his finished product. If he sells his bullock at the rate of 5 cents per pound, gross, the hide when taken off will bring him 8 to 10 cents, or nearly as much per pound as the dressed carcass.

Land in Illinois upon which cattle are now being raised is selling from $50 to $150 per acre. To raise cattle on this high-priced land requires you shall have not only the best breed of cattle, but that you must endeavor to sell in your best home market. The hide of a good butcher steer will sell for $10 or more; and yet some one says the hide is a by-product.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose in this bill is the excessive duties, as I believe, sought to be collected from imported hosiery and gloves, and in response to a large petition from the business interests of my district I desire to enter my earnest protest against this schedule. I say to the framers of this bill that they have trouble on their hands.

Whenever you attempt to impose a seeming excessive charge on the things that are so dear to the hearts of the ladies of this country, as gloves, hosiery, and so forth, you have a fight. The trouble this will bring you compared to the attack by the gentleman from Alabama will be as the disturbing of a hornet's nest to that of the ordinary house fly. Do not do it, gentlemen. Do not increase the duty on this class of goods. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the committee that it is not my purpose to deliver a tariff speech. I think this House and the country have been surfeited with tariff speeches; but representing a district in that great section of the country about which so much has been recently said, my constituents entertaining some views not in entire accord with all that has been said, sitting here not in a Democratic caucus or in a Democratic convention, as some gentlemen seem to suppose, but under my oath as a Representative in the Congress of the United States, I propose, if I am enabled so to do, to represent faithfully the views of my constituency in any vote that I may cast in this House of Representatives. Gentlemen coming from that section of the country—I mean nothing personal in my remarks—some of them representing simply the interests of short cotton, shall not, I respectfully submit, prescribe my Democracy for me. I am not a free trader in any sense of that term; and as I declared upon this floor more than two years ago, whenever the Democratic party declares for free trade, I shall sever my connection with it the next day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does not the gentleman equally oppose the doctrine of protection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will answer the gentleman. The Democratic party has declared, as the gentleman from Texas well knows, for a tariff for revenue only. It has declared for a tariff for revenue with incidental protection, and I believe that is the most sensible declaration it ever made on the subject, because it is absolutely impossible to fix and collect a duty on any article coming into this country in competition with like articles produced here unless you do add a measure of protection to the people who own and sell such like articles so produced in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Democratic platform in this country has also declared, and I think the gentleman will find it in the platform of 1888, that the Democrats stood for a tariff for revenue that would take care of the industries of this country, at least to the extent of the difference in the cost of labor abroad and in this country, and I stand for that. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I realize full well that incidentally advantage occurs when you levy a duty on certain articles. I wish to know the position of the gentleman himself. He belongs to the same party that I do, and comes from the same Southland, and I ask him the simple question——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Whether I believe in protection?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Whether you are a protectionist or not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will answer the gentleman, and answer him plainly.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Can not the gentleman say "yes" or "no?"

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I say to the gentleman that all legislation is the result of compromise, and I do not expect to write the tariff bill for this majority. I say to him that if they put into this bill what my people want and what they sent me here to get, I shall not undertake to dictate to them what else they shall put into it, because I have no power to do it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does the gentleman stand for this doctrine, that if he gets his part of the swag he will vote to give protection in making this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, the gentleman ought not to use that language.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Well, I will not use that word, I will say when it is a question of dividing the advantage, if the gentleman gets his part, is he satisfied?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will tell you what I said to my people and what they said to me: As long as a protective-tariff system prevails in this country, as long as the articles we have to buy are taxed, as long as my people have to bear the burdens of it, they say that we ought at least to have a division of the benefits. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is where I stand. You may call it "swag" or what you please, but I represent as intelligent and patriotic a constituency as the gentleman from Texas does. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I can say to the gentleman that the incidental protection he speaks of is a necessary incident when you levy a tax; but does it make a difference with the gentleman (whether he stands for protection, or does not stand for it) whether the bill has a tax on long-staple cotton or on oranges and other products of that district? Would he be for protection with these items in the bill and against protection if they are not included?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not said that I was for protection per se.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is the gentleman for or against it? Yes or no.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am absolutely in line with the Democratic platform that I quoted, and I am not in line with the Populistic element that has controlled it recently. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question right there?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If gentlemen will just wait a minute, I want to complete a statement I was about to make, and I hope the gentlemen will wait a moment. I want to say this, because aspersions have been cast, perhaps not intentionally—I would not charge gentlemen with that—upon some of us who represent constituencies whose interests are distinct from some of the others. I want to state to this House and to the country what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] stated a few days ago. The very Democratic caucus under which these gentlemen claim to be acting, to which they swear all sorts of allegiance, and condemn every man who does not, has a rule—and if it did not have that rule I would not have stayed in it—to the effect that every Representative is left free, where a constitutional question is involved and he has an opinion on the subject, to vote as he pleases. He is also left free, when instructed by his people in a certain regard, to vote the instructions of his constituents. On two several occasions a Democratic legislature in the State of Florida, solidly Democratic at one time and almost solidly Democratic at the other, has memorialized Congress to put a duty on Egyptian and other long-staple cotton coming into this country in competition with the sea-island cotton.

Our legislature has also memorialized Congress to put a duty on citrus fruits, pineapples, and other products of my State, and I am instructed in that regard, and no caucus and no opinionated Democrats can make me violate the solemn obligation I owe to my people. [Applause.] Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest that the applause on the Republican side is suppressive of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman has not stated a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can not hurt me by such things as that. The people of my district know me.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, indeed, that the gentleman from Florida has seen fit, when I asked him a respectful question to find out whether he was a protectionist or not, to say that he claimed that he does not belong to the Populistic element that has come into the Democratic party. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think that was an answer to my question, or did he mean to reflect the idea that there is anything Populistic about my record or about the people that I represent?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I meant to tell the gentleman where I stood. I tried to do it. I told him I stood on the platform as I have quoted it to him.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. And in that connection the gentleman made the answer that he did not stand with the Populistic element.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And I have told the gentleman that I was not for protection per se.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Not for protection per se?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then the gentleman is not for protection for itself, but for himself. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is that the idea?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knows that I am not for myself, but for my constituency.

Mr. DIES rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, let me get through with this gentleman first.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. May I ask the gentleman this question: Did he intend the House or the country to understand that the Democracy of Texas is in any way impregnated or poisoned with Populism?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman exactly what I meant the country to understand, that we do not intend, so far as I am concerned, and I believe the people I represent, to follow your Nebraskan Populistic leader any more. [Applause and cheers.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he stand with the New Jersey Democrat who said here that Mr. Bryan knew too much of the decalogue to be President of the United States? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state this: I think the southern Democracy never made a greater mistake in its life than when it turned its back on its Democratic friends in the East, whom it has driven from the party, and tied up with Populism out in Nebraska. [Applause and cheers.] Now, let me go on. I can not yield any more.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. But I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a two-hours' speech on Saturday——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The Nebraskan needs no defense at my hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to ask the gentleman from Florida: Is he a Cleveland Democrat on the tariff? Does he stand for the doctrine of free raw material?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am just a plain, old-fashioned Democrat, and when you all get back there

you will be better off. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to say this: In 1896 I happened to be the United States district attorney in my State under Mr. Cleveland's appointment. Notwithstanding the fact that federal officials were being removed everywhere because of political activity, I went over that State and upheld the banner of the regular Democracy as represented by Mr. Bryan at the risk of having my head cut off every night, any night, any morning. It was not done, and I have followed him three times, and I am awfully tired. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; for a question.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. That is all. I want to know whether the gentleman regards as Populistic doctrine the principles announced by the Democratic platform in 1892, under which we elected the last Democratic President that we have elected, which platform declares:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud and robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, read all of that, please.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia (reading)—

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

Is that Populistic or Democratic doctrine?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is very Democratic, because there was a good Democrat on the ticket that time. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say this——

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Is not that good Democratic doctrine to-day?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to express publicly my opinion that the Democratic party will never win a national election on the tariff question as long as these divisions and differences of opinion exist, some being for revenue only, some for revenue, with incidental protection, some free traders, and, perhaps, some protectionists; but if you will join with me and a few other humble members of the party and let us have a tariff commission, with a maximum and minimum rate, and thus take the tariff out of politics and go before the country on the time-honored principles of the party, we may rehabilitate it in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman does not mean to say that is not Democratic doctrine.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; I would not say that anything was not Democratic doctrine from some standpoint. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I deny nothing; but I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, and these gentlemen can not charge me——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Let me ask the gentleman one more question. The gentleman from Florida wants a tax on sea-island cotton. I want to know if he is willing, in order to get a tariff on sea-island cotton, to join the Republicans in putting an increase on hosiery and knit goods and tea and coffee and the other things that they have in their bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I stated a while ago that all legislation was the result of compromise.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will answer. I will give a categorical answer, but I will do it in my own way. I have said there are diverse interests all over this country. I do not expect to write this bill. It would be presumption to go to these gentlemen and ask the privilege of doing so. I do not know whether they are going to put sea-island cotton in the bill or not. I do not know anything about it at this late hour, I can assure the gentleman; but I said this in the beginning of my remarks, that if they put into that bill what my constituents sent me here instructed for, I shall not undertake to dictate what else they shall put in it after getting what my people want——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. You will take theirs?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will vote for the bill; yes. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, one thing further——

Mr. WEISSE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I desire to go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say now, Mr. Chairman, that these gentlemen who assume to themselves the entire right to speak for the South are not entitled to that right. I can speak for a part of it, and I have as much right to speak for that great section as any man on this floor, I do not care who he is. My father has slept in the grave of a confederate soldier, wrapped in the uniform of that great army, for forty-odd years. I was raised in that section and have lived there all my life, imbued with every sentiment that has nerved and actuated the great people from out of whose loins I came. I believe I am rendering those people a better service, reverencing the memory of their deeds, loving their history and all that; I believe I am rendering them a greater service when I stand for the material upbuilding of my section in everything that makes a people great, rich, powerful, and prosperous. [Applause.] I am sick and tired of hearing my southern colleagues upon this floor pleading for the poor man in the South. For God's sake do something to take him out of that class, and you will not have to make that plea. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The factories in the East are going to the South every day where the raw material is, in that balmy climate where living is cheap, where a man can work three hundred and sixty-five days in the year in the open air, where fuel is cheap, and everything else that goes to support a family is cheap. We can in our cotton factories, in our canning establishments, and in other industries of similar kind soon defy the world in the cheapness of manufacture. I want to say to the gentleman who is still standing, although Spartanburg is not in his district——

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Wait a minute, let me finish and then I will yield. So many cotton factories have been established in Spartanburg, S. C., in recent years that they do not raise enough cotton in the country to supply them, and they have to bring it in from other parts.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say to the gentleman, in answer to his statement——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not yield for that.

Mr. FINLEY. Hold on. There are about as many cotton mills in my district as there are anywhere.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Go ahead.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman says he will vote for this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not say that.

Mr. FINLEY. I beg pardon, but I understood the gentleman to say that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I said if they took care of my people in the bill I would vote for it.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman know what is in the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know what the Ways and Means Committee may put in it by way of amendment.

Mr. FINLEY. Have they taken care of you or not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know whether they have or not.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman vote for the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If it does not take care of what my people sent me here for, I will not vote for it. That is plain and frank and honest.

Mr. FINLEY. If they put in what you want in the bill and you vote for it, what is the difference between the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who will also vote for the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, there is a vast difference between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the "gentleman from Florida."

Mr. FINLEY. For the purposes of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In the first place, they have served a great many years here, and they are very able gentlemen. The "gentleman from Florida" is only an ordinary Florida cracker. [Laughter.]

Mr. FINLEY. But for the purposes of this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, the gentleman can draw all the fine distinctions he wants to. First and last, I say this to you, that I am here instructed by my people. If this Republican party, to which I do not belong, but which controls the House—and they have got a right to control it—put in the bill what my people instructed me to get if I could, I will vote for the bill regardless of the party framing it.

Mr. FINLEY. When the gentleman says that he will vote for the bill, does he mean that he will then be voting with the Democratic party or with the Republican party?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will be voting with those Democrats nearest my views.

Mr. BYRD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; just for a question.

Mr. BYRD. If I understood you, you said that if what you wanted was in the bill you would vote for it. Would you do

that notwithstanding everything else in the bill meant robbery to the American people? Answer that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have just stated that I would vote for it if they put in what my constituents wanted, no matter what else they put in.

Mr. FINLEY. Is that the price?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to know what the gentleman means by that?

Mr. FINLEY. I did not mean anything offensive, but if you had any political convictions.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not the convictions of a man who represents a district that has got nothing in it in the world but a bale of short cotton, a "nigger," and a mule. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I must decline.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. As most of the gentlemen know, I have been sick for some time, and I am standing here exerting myself too much now.

But I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion. I do not care anything about the scoffs and jeers of these people. I came to my own conclusion, and my people have come to theirs. You folks do not elect me to Congress. You do not send a Representative from the Second District of Florida here to represent that district. I am here to represent the 225,000 or 230,000 people in that great district which sweeps the entire eastern coast of Florida. There is not a State in the Union that is not represented in that district by some citizen from that State.

They are wholly American in every respect. They have come from all over this Union there; they have married and intermarried with our people, and it is as thoroughly an American community as there is in the broad expanse of this Republic; and I am tired of living back in the years before I was born. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Democracy ought to be progressive if it is anything; it ought to keep pace with the times; it ought to meet the conditions as we find them; and I do not concede for a moment that you gentlemen represent the Democracy; you do not represent it any more than I do. I will meet you, if I live, at the next national convention, and we will see who is in control and who represents the Democratic sentiment of this great Republic of ours. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

On the 1st day of December last I had the honor to appear before the honorable Ways and Means Committee of this House in advocacy of an import duty on Egyptian and other long-staple cotton imported into this country. In the statement which I then made to the committee was incorporated the memorials of the legislature of my State, to which I have referred; an article from the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, No. 2908, dated June 29, 1907; resolutions of the sea-island cotton growers of Georgia and Florida, and other documents, as well as abundant and indisputable facts showing the absolute justice of the contention which I was then and am still making. That address or statement to the committee was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CLARK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA, ASKING FOR A DUTY ON LONG-STAPLE COTTON.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1908.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee: I am here as the representative of the people of the Second Congressional District of Florida in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, together with certain of my constituents, who are growers of sea-island cotton in Florida, and who are duly accredited representatives of the sea-island cotton growers of that State, for the purpose of asking your honorable body to incorporate in the bill revising the present tariff schedules, which you will soon frame, a provision placing a duty on all Egyptian, West Indian, and other "long-staple" cotton imported into the United States from any foreign country whatsoever.

Lest my position and that of our people should be misunderstood, I beg the kind indulgence of the committee while I briefly state what my understanding of the views entertained by the people of Florida, irrespective of political parties, are. I desire to assure the committee at the outset that I believe I fully appreciate the proprieties of the occasion, and therefore shall not attempt to afflict the committee with a speech on the tariff, but shall content myself with a statement of our position and follow that with facts and figures which I trust and believe will amply justify the asking which we shall make of this committee.

First, I submit, Mr. Chairman, without in anywise discussing or even impinging on the relative virtues of a "protective tariff" and a "tariff for revenue," that the recent election and other elections preceding it have, in my opinion, forever established as a part of our system of government the indirect scheme of taxation, viz, the levy and collection of customs duties on articles imported into this country from foreign lands. This being true, I am firmly of the opinion that this matter ought to be removed from the domain of partisan politics and hereafter treated as a business proposition and a commission or other proper tribunal created to deal with it.

Second, I construe the verdict of the American electorate in the recent national contest to mean that the majority desired the dominant political party to "revise the tariff," and I recognize that the responsibility for results is with the majority.

Third, believing that as long as the policy of levying and collecting customs duties on imports is to be maintained by the United States, the people who are forced to bear the burdens of this system of taxation should be allowed to reap some of the benefits which flow from it, myself and my associates are here to ask and to urge that this committee in its work of revision will place a reasonably fair and proper duty on all Egyptian, West Indian, and other such long-staple cotton as is imported into this country from Egypt, the West Indies, and other foreign lands, and which are competitors in the markets of the United States with the sea-island cotton grown in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

As evidencing that I am truly voicing the sentiments and desires of the people of Florida on this subject, I desire to read certified copies of two memorials to the Congress of the United States passed by two different legislatures of the State of Florida, in the years, respectively, A. D. 1899 and A. D. 1905. I may add that both of these legislatures were practically solid Democratic bodies.

The memorials are as follows:

MEMORIAL 1.

Memorial to our Senators and Representatives in Congress in reference to a duty on Egyptian or long-staple cotton, or the importation thereof.

Whereas the present price of long-staple or sea-island cotton is now far below the cost of production, causing a large area of our State to languish and a once profitable industry to wane and die; and

Whereas the low price referred to is not due to overproduction, as is demonstrated by the fact that for a crop of 104,557 bales in 1896 and in 1897 the average price for the grade of "fine" was 11 cents, while the last crop, 75,000 bales only, or 25 per cent less than the year previous, and the average price for the grade of "fine" was 2 cents less, or 9 cents per pound; and

Whereas the indisputable cause for our low prices, financial depression, and agricultural discontent is found in the annually increasing importation of Egyptian cotton, the product of pauper labor; and

Whereas the Democratic party and people have not deemed it derogatory to their principles and interests to have a duty placed on wool, pineapples, citrus fruits, and tobacco; and

Whereas the placing of said duty on the above-mentioned article has proven a direct benefit to our people and with which protection they would not part without a struggle; and

Whereas there are but two ways whereby the money necessary to maintain the National Government can be raised, and since the funds derived from internal revenue are insufficient even when made onerous and burdensome, as they now are; and

Whereas we are forced from the nature of things to depend on a tax laid upon goods and products imported into this country from foreign countries to raise funds to assist in the support of the Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that a tariff should be laid for revenue only and arranged so that if it shall prove a burthen all may equally bear it; if a benefit, it may be equally shared.

Resolved further, That we are unalterably opposed to the free importation of Egyptian or other long-staple cotton.

Resolved, That we favor an import duty of 50 per cent ad valorem and 5 cents per pound on all long-staple cotton imported into the United States, and that a copy of these resolutions be furnished each of our Senators and Representatives at Washington.

MEMORIAL 2.

Memorial to the Congress of the United States, asking that a duty of at least 10 cents per pound be levied on all importations of Egyptian and other long-staple cotton brought into the United States as raw material.

Whereas the present price of long-staple or sea-island cotton is below the standard of profitable production and has so been for some years past, causing a large area of our State to be uncultivated and our farming interests to languish; and

Whereas the policy of protection to American interests, if to be continued, should embrace within its fostering care the tillers of the soil, who are now and must ever be the mainstay of our republican form of government; and

Whereas the long-staple or sea-island cotton grown in this country is used exclusively in the manufacture of the finer fabrics, such as laces, etc., and a duty upon the Egyptian cotton and other foreign long-staple cottons would therefore be no burden upon the poor, but would only affect those well able to bear it, and at the same time would greatly encourage a large portion of our farming population; and

Whereas we believe that the levy of such a duty would materially aid in building up our factories engaged in the manufacture of the finer cotton fabrics, while at the same time protecting our farmers from the pauper labor of Egypt: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this legislature that a duty of 10 cents per pound on all Egyptian and other long-staple cottons imported into the United States should be levied by Congress.

Resolved further, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby earnestly requested to use all honorable means to accomplish this end.

Be it further resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby requested to furnish each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress with a certified copy of this memorial.

STATE OF FLORIDA, *Office of the Secretary of State, ss:*

I, H. Clay Crawford, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that the foregoing are true and correct copies of memorials to the Congress of the United States as passed by the legislature of Florida, sessions 1899 and 1905, respectively, as shown by the original enrolled resolutions as filed in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida, at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 11th day of November, A. D. 1908.

[SEAL.] H. CLAY CRAWFORD,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CLARK (continuing). On the 25th day of November, 1908, in response to a call therefor, a convention of delegates representing the sea-island cotton growers of Georgia and Florida met in the city of Lake City, in the State of Florida, to consider this matter. I am told that fully 200 sea-island cotton growers from the two States were present, and the result was the appointment of a committee to appear here to present their cause to this committee. These gentlemen so appointed are now here.

In addition to sending representatives here, the convention adopted certain resolutions, which are as follows:

"In convention of the sea-island cotton growers of Georgia and Florida, held at Lake City, Fla., this the 25th day of November, 1908, the growers of cotton finding, after years of experience, that Egyptian cotton without a tariff on it, on account of the cheap labor of 8 or 10 cents per day required to produce said Egyptian cotton, is injuring the interest of the sea-island cotton growers by placing the value or selling price of his cotton below the cost of production, which at present is from 22½ to 24 cents per pound, and thereby jeopardizing the industry and output of the yield of sea-island cotton necessary for the world's consumption and needs: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That a committee of four from Georgia and four from Florida be elected to meet the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, December 1, and ask that a tariff of 10 cents per pound be placed on Egyptian cottons.

"*Resolved further*, That it is the sense of this convention that we want our American industries protected and that we want the producer to share equally in such protection with the manufacturer.

"*Resolved further*, That Hon. Harvie Jordan, president of the Sea Island Cotton Association, and Hon. C. S. Barrett and Hon. R. F. Duckworth, of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, be requested to cooperate with any committee selected by this meeting."

Mr. CLARK (continuing). With the permission of the committee I will now read an article appearing in the Florida Times-Union on November 25, 1908, over the signature of Maj. Alex St. Clair Abrams, one of the ablest lawyers and one of the most brilliant men in all the South, and who has had a great deal of experience with relation to cotton. It is as follows:

THE COTTON QUESTION.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *November 23.*

EDITOR TIMES-UNION: In view of the early meeting of the cotton growers of Florida, at Lake City, I trust they will appoint a committee to proceed to Washington and appear before the committee charged with the work of preparing a revision of our tariff laws, and insist upon a tariff being levied on all cotton imported into the United States.

As is well known, I have always been a Democrat of the school of the late Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania. I believe in protecting American products and industries, and while it may be true, and doubtless is, that some of the schedules in the Dingley bill are unreasonably high, nevertheless it seems clear to me that the principle of protection has enormously added to the development and prosperity of the country.

When the Dingley bill was before the Congress, I went to Washington for the purpose of aiding, however feebly, in the work of obtaining protection for Florida fruits, vegetables, and cotton. Unfortunately, the Democratic policy was hostile to protection, and but little could be accomplished. The tariff put upon vegetables, oranges, and pineapples was wretchedly inadequate, and still is, while the idea of putting a tariff on cotton was generally ridiculed. As a result, we have been importing, on the free list, every year from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of Egyptian long cotton, while more than half the time, by reason of this competition, the Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina growers have not been able to raise it profitably. While this cotton has been admitted free of duty, thread and fabrics made from long cotton have been heavily protected and the manufacturers have reaped large harvests, while the growers have either made bare livings or suffered loss.

Aside from any question of principle, it is clear that with a deficit of over $50,000,000 there can not be much reduction in the existing tariff, and now that the bill is being revised, our representatives in both Houses should insist on a tariff on cotton of at least 5 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem.

I know of my own knowledge that for years in Alachua, Baker, Columbia, Bradford, and other counties in which long cotton is raised the majority of the growers were always heavily in debt and their property mortgaged to merchants and factors.

I have given the matter much thought and feel sure that if when the Dingley bill was passed a tariff had been imposed on cotton, as suggested by me, that it would by this time have added 100,000 souls to the population of Florida and increased output at least $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 per annum, besides affording a reasonable profit to the growers.

From a remark made by the committee to Mr. Chase, representing the fruit growers, I see that the South is being met with the same rebuke I met with from Mr. Dingley, whom I saw personally in my effort to get a tariff on cotton. He asked me if the tariff was put on cotton would the Florida Representatives vote for his bill. I told him that I could not answer for that, but that probably they would not. He replied to me as follows: "Mr. Abrams, it would make no difference to me whether a Member of Congress was a Democrat or a Republican if he favored the protection of American industries and production, but when you gentlemen come to us and ask us to put a tariff on your productions, and at the same time send representatives to both Houses to oppose protection and to vote against protective measures, your people can not find fault if we take you at your word and decline to give you the protection which you secretly ask and publicly oppose." I have given his language as near as I can recall it after so many years, but I do not hesitate to say that there was much force in what he said.

The western and eastern sheep owners are amply protected from foreign wool by the tariff placed thereon. I can see no reason why the southern growers of cotton, who have to produce a staple at much greater cost and labor than the growing of wool on sheep's back, should not also be given protection; and rather than not have it, I think every representative in both Houses from Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida should vote for the revised tariff bill, no matter if some of the schedules are, in their opinion, unreasonably high, provided we obtain adequate protection for our industries and productions.

American producers, whether black or white, can not compete with Egyptian growers, who pay 6 or 8 cents per day for labor, and whose lands in the Valley of the Nile are annually fertilized by nature by the annual overflow of the valley by the river. So, likewise, we can not compete with the West India pineapple and citrus growers for the same reason.

I therefore trust that a vigorous and successful effort will be made to get the committee to impose a tariff on cotton. And just here I want to remind those interested in obtaining it that the tariff should be imposed on cotton in general, so as to avoid all technical questions that may arise as to what is or is not long cotton. The Egyptian cotton is not as long as our sea-island cotton, and unless the tariff is placed on cotton without designating it "long" or "short" there will be danger of contests by the manufacturers who are anxious to import the staple free of duty, while they are amply protected in the articles they manufacture, and as a result of such protection keep the price of their productions just as high as it had ever been.

If we can obtain this tariff, I feel confident that within ten years the increased production of cotton in Florida will add 150,000 souls to our population and increase the value of our lands in the counties producing the staple from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000.

The committee in Washington will take up the cotton question on the 1st of December, and it seems to me that the board of trade, as well as the Lake City convention, should take immediate measures so that Florida may be well and thoroughly represented before it.

ALEX. ST. CLAIR-ABRAMS.

Mr. CLARK (continuing). In addition, along this line, I beg permission to say, Mr. Chairman, that when I came here to Congress for the first time I came here through a long-drawn-out primary election contest, in which there were four other candidates, and in that contest from every stump I openly and publicly promised the people that, if chosen, I would use every legitimate and proper effort to secure the duty on cotton for which I am now before you contending. My election, then, by quite a large majority and my return twice since then without opposition clearly establishes, in my opinion, the wishes of my constituents on this subject.

During the present year, in a hotly contested primary election for United States Senator from Florida, the Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER was chosen by a large majority, and Mr. FLETCHER announced himself on this subject as favoring exactly what I stood for four years ago.

Having, I feel, established that the people of Florida desire the asking here made, I now invite your attention to existing conditions, upon which we base our insistence.

When I mention sea-island cotton, I refer to that cotton which is of very fine texture, of quite lengthy staple, and, so far as I am advised, is only grown in this country in portions of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. I am aware of the fact that in certain parts of Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas they grow a cotton of longer staple than the ordinary "short" cotton which is common to practically all of our southern territory, and that this cotton is ordinarily referred to as "long-staple" cotton, but it is not the sea-island cotton of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

The best quality of our sea-island cotton is grown on the islands near Charleston, S. C., and the staple of this cotton is from about 1½ to 2¼ inches in length.

I believe it is generally conceded that our Florida sea-island cotton ranks second in texture, and the staple runs from 1⅝ to 2 inches in length. The Georgia sea-island cotton comes third, there really being, however, as I am informed, no very great difference in texture or length of staple between sea-island cotton grown in the three States, under similar conditions, as to the selection of seed, planting, cultivation, and harvesting.

This sea-island cotton of the three States mentioned, and in the interest of which we are asking a duty on imported long-staple cottons, is used principally in the manufacture of laces, thread, mercerized silks, plushes, velvets, velveteens, curtains, table covers, and other goods of the finest character. Not 10 per cent of our sea-island cotton or imported Egyptian cotton is made into thread.

The total quantity of cotton such as we contend is a competitor of our sea-island cotton in the markets of the United States consumed in this country for the year ending August 31, 1908, was as follows: Ninety-two thousand eight hundred and fifteen bales of Egyptian cotton, 12,061 bales of Peruvian cotton, 6,405 bales from British West Indies.

I have ascertained from Census Bulletin 97, released for use on November 9 of the present year, that the net quantity of cotton imported into the United States during the year ending August 31, 1908, was 140,870 bales of 500 pounds each, and that of this amount 122,170 bales, or 85 per cent of the entire importation, was of Egyptian growth.

I am informed by Director of the Census North that the total importation of what is known under the generic term of "long-staple cotton" into the United States for the present year amounts to 71,072,855 pounds, of the value of $14,472,241. Of this amount there came into this country from Egypt 58,356,306 pounds of long-staple Egyptian cotton of the value of $12,287,460. This cotton came into the United States free from duty, and competed with the sea-island cotton of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida in the markets of the United States.

The quality of Egyptian cotton, known in this country as the "Joannovich" variety, is constantly improving in quality, owing to the improved methods of seed selection, as well as more modern methods of planting, cultivating, and harvesting. This variety of Egyptian cotton is the particular cotton which is the most dangerous competitor of our sea-island cotton which has yet come into the American market.

In this connection the committee should consider that within less than three years after the proposed tariff revision bill goes into operation the area for the growth of cotton in Egypt will be vastly extended. This will be due to the completion of the work of raising the Assouan dam in the Nile in Upper Egypt. It is proposed to raise this dam 23 feet, and will require an expenditure of $7,500,000.

Concerning this proposed improvement, which is to be made solely for the benefit of cotton culture in that country, I desire to call the attention of the committee to some statements appearing in the Egyptian Gazette, which item I have taken from the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of the Department of Commerce and Labor, No. 2908, dated June 29, 1907, as follows:

"The result of the work will have an important bearing on the cotton crop. The area under cotton in 1906 is given as 1,506,290 acres. Taking the present cotton crop at 6,750,000 kantars (a kantar equals 100 pounds), the average yield per acre works out to 4½ kantars. The area under cotton in Lower Egypt alone is 1,260,107 acres, this representing about 40 per cent of the total cultivated area in that division of the country. The whole of this area being perennial irrigation is cotton bearing. These figures indicate, therefore, that on an average cotton is grown on the same land two years out of five. The area under cotton in Upper Egypt is given as 246,183 acres. This represents only a small proportion of the cultivated area, less than half the latter being under perennial irrigation. Moreover, the climatic conditions south of Assiout are unfavorable for growing cotton. In order to ascertain to what extent the cotton-bearing area is susceptible of expansion, we assume that the whole of the basin lands in the northern half of Upper Egypt will be brought under perennial irrigation, and that the uncultivated portions in both Upper and Lower Egypt will ultimately be reclaimed. The cotton-bearing area will then extend over some 5,600,000 acres (being the total of 6,387,100 acres given above,

less about 800,000 acres south of Assiout). On the basis of 40 per cent acreage per annum and a yield of 4½ kantars per acre, this area might produce an annual cotton crop of about 10,000,000 kantars. It is to be observed that a considerable portion of the land at present under cultivation is being improved, which will, without doubt, contribute to raise the average yield per acre. On the other side must be set the consideration that last year's crop was so favored by a good Nile and satisfactory climatic conditions as to raise the average yield above the level of recent years. Of the total of 10,000,000 kantars, no more than 7,000,000 kantars would consist of the Mitafifi, Abassi, and Yoannovitch varieties, for which the delta is famous, the remaining 3,000,000 kantars representing the lower-grade cotton produced in Upper Egypt. Lord Cromer, in discussing these figures, remarks in his report for 1906:

"'It will, of course, be understood that this crop of 10,000,000 kantars can not be produced until both the supply of water has been largely increased, either by raising the Assouan dam or by some other means, and until reclamation works on a large scale have been executed in Lower Egypt.' Sir William Garstin, probably the highest authority on the subject says: 'I do not think that 10,000,000 kantars as an eventual yield for the Egyptian cotton crop is at all an impossible figure, but it will take many years to arrive at—probably ten or fifteen.'

"The Egyptian cotton crop might conceivably receive a still greater extension in course of time from two further sources, namely, the reclamation of the lakes in Lower Egypt and the development of the oases (reclamation of Lower Egypt is the Khedive's especial project). The former, if ever carried out, would add some 800,000 acres to the cultivated area and a further 1,500,000 kantars to the cotton crop. The latter is at present too problematical to permit of any estimate being made of the possible results."

It will be observed that it is the intention to complete the dam mentioned and bring this vast additional territory into cultivation for cotton about the year 1912. As it is hardly possible that another revision of the tariff will take place for ten, fifteen, or possibly twenty years, it will at once be seen what the completion of the dam will mean for the cotton growers of sea-island cotton in this country unless they are given the benefit of a duty upon their competitors from abroad. The fact is that no sea-island cotton can be raised in this country.

The South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida sea-island cotton growers can not begin to compete with the long-staple cotton growers of Egypt and other foreign countries. In the first place, the lands in Egypt produce, without fertilization, about 450 to 500 pounds of lint cotton per acre, whereas our sea-island cotton-growing lands in the State of Florida will not produce one-third so much without fertilization.

In the second place, it is utterly impossible to employ labor on a farm in the State of Florida for less than $25 to $30 per month for men and at least $15 per month for women. This is the lowest possible figure, and farm labor is exceedingly scarce at those prices. This condition exists because of the fact that the turpentine farms, phosphate plants, lumber camps, and other like places where labor is in demand in our State are anxious to secure hands at from $1.25 to $2.50 per day.

My information is that farm labor in Egypt in an abundant supply can be obtained anywhere from 10 cents to 20 cents per day for able-bodied men. The committee, on this statement of fact, will have no difficulty in determining at once how serious a condition threatens the sea-island cotton industry in the United States.

I have not taken the time to closely investigate, but I am under the impression that an investigation of the present tariff schedules will show that every article of cotton manufacture imported into this country is dutiable, thus benefiting the American manufacturer of cotton goods of whatever description and leaving the grower at the mercy of the pauper labor of Egypt. He sells in markets that are free and there meets with his product the competition of the world and buys in a protected market and thus pays a large tax on every article he produces, although such article may be manufactured out of his own product.

The grower of wool in the West is protected against the cheap labor engaged in the growing of wool in foreign lands by a duty on all importations, and his sheep graze on the public lands. He is thus twice favored by the Government.

The Republican party, which is now in control of every department of the Government, and which through its representatives will frame the intended revision of the tariff, declared in the twelfth resolution of its platform, in 1860, that that party was in favor of "that policy of national exchanges which secures for the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers a reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence." I invoke that declaration of more than forty-eight years ago now in the interest of "agriculture" in my section of the country. If, Mr. Chairman, your party has benefited, protected, and cared for the artisan and the manufacturer, you have not fostered, cared for, and protected the agricultural interests of the country in its different forms.

In view of the facts which we have been enabled to put before this committee, I shall insist that the committee owes it to those engaged, and who desire to further engage in the cultivation of sea-island cotton in this country, to place a duty upon Egyptian cotton, and all other cottons grown in foreign lands, of such texture and length of staple as to make them competitors in the American markets with our sea-island cotton, of at least 10 cents per pound on lint, and at least 4 cents per pound on all such cotton in the seed. This, in my judgment, would not be a prohibitive tariff, but in its operation would produce revenue for the Government, and at the same time would, in a measure at least, equalize the difference between the cost of production in such countries as Egypt and in this country, and would give to our people at least an even chance in their own markets. We are not asking any special favors, Mr. Chairman; we are not insisting upon any privileges being granted to us that are not granted to the remainder of the citizenship of this country, but we do believe that when we toil in the sun of a semitropical climate for twelve months in the year to produce a crop of cotton, and when everything we purchase for our own consumption, even if manufactured from the identical sea-island cotton which our sweat and toil has produced, we are forced to bear the burden of paying the price increased by the addition of a tariff, that we should at least be permitted to enter, with the article which we produce, the markets of our own country upon an equal footing with Egypt and the West Indies, conscious that we are asking nothing but that which our patriotic fellow-citizens of this committee, with full knowledge of the facts, will gladly accord us; I submit to this committee the case of my constituents.

I do not think I care to add anything else unless the committee desires to ask questions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Are you to be followed by some other, who raise this cotton?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I could not give you anything with reference to the practical raising of the cotton. We have some practical men who can give you all the information along that line that you desire.

Mr. BOUTELL. The total importations of this long-staple cotton you gave in round figures at 71,000,000 pounds?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. What is the present domestic production?

Mr. CLARK. About 80,000 bales, I should say. It will run about 300 pounds to the bale. Sea-island cotton runs 300 pounds to the bale; that is, the standard bale.

Mr. BOUTELL. How many pounds would that make of the domestic product as against the 71,000,000 pounds imported?

Mr. CLARK. Well, that is 80,000 bales, 300 pounds to the bale. I would have to figure it up. It would be about 24,000,000 pounds, I think.

Mr. BOUTELL. Twenty-four million pounds of the domestic product?

Mr. CLARK. As against 71,000,000 pounds imported?

Mr. BOUTELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GAINES. Practically one-third?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir; just about.

Mr. DALZELL. Do you not think that this tariff you are asking for is what Mr. Cockran would call a tariff on apprehension?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know what he would call it.

Mr. GAINES. It is the Assouan Dam that is troubling you, is it not?

Mr. CLARK. No; the Assouan Dam has troubled us to some extent, but the importation free of duty of 85 per cent of the long cotton consumed in this country is what is troubling us now.

Mr. HILL. You are not able, of course, to anywhere near supply the demand, even if all the land used for the growing of this cotton in the United States were in use?

Mr. CLARK. I don't know about that, Mr. Hill. When I first went to Florida they were growing long-staple cotton down on the peninsula below Tampa, and there is not a pound grown now in any but 17 of the 45 counties of Florida. My opinion is that if it were profitable to grow sea-island cotton in Florida we could, in connection with the sea-island growing belt of Georgia and the islands of South Carolina, supply the demand in America for this class of cotton.

Mr. HILL. Why not? Do you not get more for it now than you ever have before?

Mr. CLARK. I could not tell you that, but I know labor has increased.

Mr. HILL. You mean the demand has increased and your domestic supply has not increased?

Mr. CLARK. No; I say labor has increased.

Mr. HILL. Oh, labor?

Mr. CLARK. I say labor has increased so much and the cost of living has increased so much that it is impossible to raise it now.

Mr. HILL. What is the cost per acre of that land on which that cotton is grown on the sea islands, on an average?

Mr. CLARK. I should say $25 an acre.

Mr. HILL. Do you think you would require a duty to protect the product of land worth $25 an acre against products grown on land worth $200 or $300 or $400 or $500 an acre?

Mr. CLARK. I do not mean land that has been cleared and put in a thorough state of cultivation. I mean you can buy it for that now, but after you put it in a thorough state of cultivation it would probably be worth from $50 to $100 an acre.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Do you think there is sufficient area in the region spoken of, if cultivated, to supply the American demand for this cotton?

Mr. CLARK. I think we could supply it if we could raise it profitably.

Mr. NEEDHAM. You spoke of the area being limited to three States——

Mr. CLARK. You can raise this cotton, I think, in every inch of the State of Florida; certainly from the Suwanee south. That would be two-thirds of the State.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Then you think the area is practically unlimited there in which you could raise this cotton?

Mr. CLARK. No; I would not say it was unlimited. I say the area is quite large in Florida.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose the value of the domestic long-staple cotton has followed to a large extent the value of the imported cotton, has it not?

Mr. CLARK. I could not tell you about that, Mr. UNDERWOOD. These gentlemen who handle cotton and deal with it, and all that, can give you that practical information better than I can give it to you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I notice here in the Treasury reports that the value of the imported article in 1894 was a little over 10 cents; in 1895 it was 9 cents; in 1896 it was 12 cents; in 1897 it was 11 cents; in 1898 it was 9 cents; in 1899 it was about 10 cents; in 1900 it was 12 cents; the same figure in 1901; in the next year 12 cents; in the next year 14 cents; the next year 17 cents——

Mr. CLARK. What year was it 14 cents?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was in 1903.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In 1904 it was 17½ cents; in 1905 it was 15 cents; in 1906 it was 15 cents; in 1907 it was 19.9 cents. So that there has been a constant rise in the price of cotton, a constant rise in the price of the domestic product, notwithstanding the importations that have come in.

Mr. CLARK. No——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what these figures show.

Mr. CLARK. There was a rise in cotton last year, Mr. Underwood, because our people, the long-staple cotton growers—to be perfectly frank with this committee—became so absolutely tired of selling their cotton at a loss that they got together and decided they would hold their cotton until they could get a better price for it, and that is the reason it went up last year. Some of the local people decided to stand by them financially and enable them to hold it, which they did. But of course they can not do that always. That would be a losing fight in the long run.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But, outside of last year, there has been a continual increase in the imported cotton from 1894 from something like 10 cents to 15½ cents.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; the price now in the market is some 17 or 18 cents.

Mr. RANDELL. The increase in this cotton has not been nearly as much in per cent in the other grades of cotton?

Mr. CLARK. No, sir; it has not.

If you will permit me to say one word more, I would like to do so. I am here insisting upon this proposition. If the tariff schedule is to

be maintained and duties to be levied on every single solitary thing on the face of the earth which is manufactured from this long-staple cotton, and the manufacturer is to be protected, if it is a good thing for him, why is it not a good thing for the man who toils in the sun and grows it, and furnishes the long cotton to the manufacturers?

Our people, in other words, are tired of selling our stuff absolutely in competition with the pauper labor of Egypt; and every time our wives buy a little of this artificial silk that has been exhibited this morning we pay an enormous tax, and we are buying our own goods, made from the product of our own soil.

That is the whole question in a nutshell, as I see it; and that is why I am presenting this case in behalf of my constituents.

Mr. HILL. You ask a duty on cotton generally, without any particular reference to long-staple cotton?

Mr. CLARK. No; I do not.

Mr. HILL. I thought you had in the past.

Mr. CLARK. No, sir; I have not. That is a mistake. We have a monopoly as against the world in short cotton; we do not need any protection.

Mr. BOUTELL. Right in that connection, Mr. CLARK, you have gone thoroughly and intelligently into this question of the growth and supply of cotton in the different parts of the world. The question that Mr. HILL asked suggests whether you have in your investigation found out what progress is being made by the English, German, and French manufacturers, statesmen, and economists in attempting to solve the problem of growing their own staple in their own colonies or possessions.

Mr. CLARK. Well, I have not any information sufficient to give this committee. I only know in a general way that that is true.

Mr. BOUTELL. You know that they are making great efforts in that direction?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. And spending large sums of money?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BOUTELL. Now, you have given an illustration of what can be done by the growers of long-staple cotton in foreign countries with the cheap labor. Suppose that Great Britain and Germany and France should solve this problem of producing their own staple entirely, in India, Egypt, and the French possessions in Africa. Then we would be brought face to face—perhaps it will be the framers of the next tariff—with the problem, first, of protecting our growers of short cotton against this Hindoo and African labor; and, second, with the more important problem of using our own staple in our own American factories.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOUTELL. Well, if there should be at any time a falling off in the foreign demand for the raw cotton, in order to utilize it and continue the value of the raw cotton, we must manufacture it here at home, must we not?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; that is the way I view it, sir.

Mr. BOUTELL. And if that time should approach with a falling off of the foreign demand for our cotton, increasing domestic demand for our cotton, it will make a very largely increased spread of the manufacturing of cotton in the South, will it not?

Mr. CLARK. There is no doubt about it in the world, sir.

Mr. BOUTELL. If these foreign manufacturers of cotton should produce all of their own staple, we could by broadening our manufacture here still absorb our entire domestic crop?

Mr. CLARK. Surely, yes. Now, I will let these other gentlemen speak.

Mr. HILL. You acknowledge the ability of the South to compete with the rest of the world in short-staple cotton?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I think so.

Mr. HILL. But claim that they can not compete in the long-staple cotton?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. HILL. Are you not aware of the fact that labor in India and China, where short-staple cotton is produced, and more particularly India, is much lower than it is in Egypt?

Mr. CLARK. I understand that, but they have not been able yet to produce cotton that competes with us in what we call "short cotton."

Mr. HILL. Then it is a question of quality between India cotton and cotton in the Southern States, and not a question of price?

Mr. CLARK. Well, of course the quality controls prices very largely, I *think*, in everything. I think it is always a question of quality. It is so in the case of men, animals, and goods.

Mr. COCKRAN. As I understand it, your position is that if there were a general freedom of trade, cotton would be willing to take its chances with the rest, but when every other industry levies upon cotton, cotton wants a chance to levy back upon others?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Cockran, representing my constituency, I want to say this: We are American citizens. I think every State in the Union is represented in my district by some citizen who has transferred his residence down there. We are willing to take our chances with the American people in any plan or scheme of taxation adopted by them. If it is considered best to remove all the duties from cotton goods and leave cotton free, we will take our chances with the rest; but if these duties are to remain we want our interests taken care of, along with those of the other sections of the country. That is the way I think our people view it.

Mr. COCKRAN. That is precisely as I understood.

On December 14 last, with the consent of the Ways and Means Committee, I filed an additional statement, as follows:

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK CLARK, M. C., IN ADVOCACY OF PLACING A DUTY ON RAW COTTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1908.*

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As additional to what has been said and submitted in behalf of the levying and collection of a duty on all long-staple raw cotton imported into the United States, either in lint or in seed, from Egypt, Peru, the British West Indies, and other foreign lands, I shall submit, first, a letter from the Hon. Alex. St. Clair-Abrams, of Jacksonville, Fla. Major St. Clair-Abrams states the case so clearly and has such an intimate knowledge of conditions that I feel I can do no better than simply submit his letter for your consideration. The letter is as follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *December 8, 1908.*

Hon. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARK: I have received your letter, as well as the pamphlet, on the tariff hearings. There is one matter that I do not think has been sufficiently impressed on the committee, and it is this: That you can only raise long cotton, or sea-island cotton, on light sandy soil, while short-staple cotton can be raised on clay and other heavy soils. On the light sandy soil the average of lint on the long or sea-island cotton varies from 100 to 125 pounds per acre, while on the short cotton the average will be 200 to 500 pounds per acre. Therefore it is not only the difference in price of labor and cost of picking, but also the difference in the average production of cotton, which bears most heavily upon the grower. I think you could have safely stated to the committee, and can still safely state to them, that in Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida there is enough of this light sandy soil adapted to the cultivation of long or sea-island cotton to supply not only the United States, but the world.

As a result of the average low price and the uncertainty, caused by the competition from free Egyptian and other cotton, the children of the farmers who are raising the staple, instead of going into the same business, leave the farms and seek other and more profitable avocations, and the result is that instead of the staple increasing in volume every year it remains about stationary and is principally cultivated by the older men, who have no other occupation and are not familiar with any other business that could prove more profitable.

When I came to Florida, in 1874, there was a great deal of long cotton raised in Putnam, Marion, Orange, Volusia, Brevard, Polk, Hillsboro, and Manatee counties. To-day not a bale of cotton is raised in those counties, although there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land in them admirably adapted to the culture of the staple. The decline in the price has been the sole cause of the people abandoning the staple as a farm product. It is perfectly clear to my mind that unless a protective duty is imposed on this cotton that within twenty years there will not be a bale of sea-island cotton raised in the South.

It is not a question of apprehension as to the future, but a question of the actual condition which exists at the present time. Under ordinary circumstances our production of long cotton should have increased fourfold, instead of which it has either remained stationary or is actually declining. In the meantime thousands of our young men, both white and black, who were born on these long-cotton farms, are annually leaving them because they see no hope of making even a fair living out of its culture. To stop this exodus and abandonment of these farms, to keep these young men on them and afford them a reasonable opportunity of earning a fair profit, is certainly worthy of the attention of Congress.

As you have properly stated, for years I have given this matter a great deal of attention and study. Not a few of my clients have been utterly ruined by the low prices of long cotton and have seen their farms sold from under them as a result, and they driven, in their mature years, from the homes where they were born to live a life of struggling poverty elsewhere.

Because of my knowledge of the situation and my advocacy of a protective tariff, I refused in 1888 to accept a nomination for Congress tendered to me at Orlando by a committee as a result of the long-drawn-out struggle between General Bullock and Hon. John E. Hartridge, on the sole condition that I would pledge myself to abide the action of the Democratic caucus on the subject of the tariff. I mention this fact only to show how many years I have had this matter in my mind.

I regret exceedingly that I could not have been in Washington to have aided you in this matter, and wish you the most complete success.

If you think this letter will help you any you are at liberty to file it with the committee.

Repeating my sincere hope that you will be successful in obtaining this much-needed and much-merited relief to the long-cotton growers of this State, I am, my dear Clark,

Very truly, yours, ABE ST. CLAIR-ABRAMS.

I have made every possible effort to secure exact figures as to cost of production of cotton in Egypt. I have been enabled to secure what I regard as authentic information touching the labor cost in Egypt. I made the statement in my former address to the committee on this subject that labor in the cotton fields of Egypt only commanded a wage of from 10 to 20 cents per day. It seems I was in error, because from the evidence which I shall now furnish the committee it appears that laborers in the upper Nile section receive a wage of from only 9 to 11 cents per day.

I herewith submit a letter from the Hon. Charles P. Neill, Commissioner of Labor of the Department of Commerce and Labor, under date of December 9, 1908, which speaks for itself:

WASHINGTON, *December 9, 1908.*

Hon. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your request to the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor, for information regarding the cost of field labor in the cotton fields of Egypt has been referred to this office for attention.

In reply I would say that exact and recent data on this subject are not available. The best information which I can supply you is the following extract from the United States Monthly Consular Reports for 1904, page 1107:

"*Wages in Egypt.*—The Deutsche Kolonial Zeitung of April 7, 1904, says that of the population of Egypt, which is about 8,000,000, only a few are engaged in commerce and industry; the greater part are devoted to agriculture. The labor supply is large and wages are low. In Upper Egypt wages are from 9 to 11 cents per diem; in Lower Egypt, 13 to 18 cents. Board is never furnished. In addition to wages by the day or the month (the latter for overseers), payments may be made according to the work. For example, to plow 1¼ acres, 94 cents; to irrigate it, 70 cents. The fellaheen prefer to receive their wages in natural products, particularly shares of the crop—as, for sowing and reaping, 5 per cent of the grain; for thrashing, 1 per cent of the grain and 1 per cent of the straw. In growing cotton on bad ground they receive one-third to one-half of the crop; on good ground, about one-fifth of the crop and the refuse parts of the cotton plant, to be used as firewood. In the case of corn, the laborer gets one-half the crop; in rice, which requires irrigation, three-fifths. The fellaheen do not like to work where it is necessary to use the sakieh or shadoof (mechanisms to draw water by animals or by hand, respectively). On the whole, the position of the laborer in Egypt is not good."

Hoping that this information is sufficient for your purpose,

I am, very truly, yours,

CHAS. P. NEILL, *Commissioner.*

I desire to state to the committee, in conclusion, that since the hearing on this subject, December 1 last, I have been to Florida, and my further investigation of the subject convinces me of the truth of the following:

First. There exists in the sea-island cotton belt of the United States sea-island cotton-producing land sufficient to supply any demand for this product in the United States.

Second. No one now engages in the production of sea-island cotton as a money-making proposition. The sea-island cotton now grown in Florida is chiefly grown by the very small farmer, who makes a support for his family otherwise and simply plants enough of this cotton (which is generally worked and gathered by his children) to make a bale or two of lint, thus guaranteeing to him some ready money at Christmas time.

Third. Eighty to 100 pounds of lint, under present methods and without the use of fertilizers, per acre is a fair average crop of sea-island cotton for Florida.

Four hundred and fifty pounds of lint per acre, with the present crude methods of cultivation and without the use of fertilizers, is considered a fair average crop in Egypt.

Fourth. Labor in the Upper Nile region in Egypt is from 9 to 11 cents per day, and in the Lower Nile region it is from 13 to 18 cents per day.

Counting twenty-six working days to the month, and multiplying the said twenty-six days by the average wage, which would be 13½ cents per day, we would have $3.51 as the average monthly wage paid laborers in the cotton fields of Egypt, as against from $25 to $30 per month paid to farm laborers in the sea-island cotton region of Florida.

Fifth. Conditions surrounding the production of sea-island cotton in the United States have grown worse year after year, and unless something is done to save the industry the time is close at hand when not a pound of sea-island cotton will be grown in the United States.

In conclusion, I desire to print with these remarks a clipping from the Evening Metropolis, a newspaper published in Jacksonville, Fla. The item is a telegraphic dispatch from the town of Alachua, a town of about 1,000 inhabitants located in the heart of the sea-island cotton belt, and has been always one of our principal markets for sea-island cotton.

The news clipping speaks for itself, and I herewith present it:

"BACKSET FOR COTTON—GROWERS NEAR ALACHUA HAULED STAPLE BACK HOME.

"ALACHUA, *December 14.*

"Something that has scarcely ever happened in the county, and never at Alachua, is the fact that cotton offered for sale has had no buyers.

"This place has not only always paid more for cotton than any other place in the county, but has generally been the leader of the State, and the fact that cotton has been offered for sale by the growers there for the past several days without buyers certainly shows that the market is in bad shape.

"It has always been said that cotton is one thing that the farmer could depend on to get cash out of; but the present crop will doubtless make many of the larger growers look to other products another season and see if cotton can not be again brought up to where it will pay the farmer to grow it."

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK CLARK.

In addition to my own statements, which I have just quoted at length, a number of gentlemen, some of them growers of sea-island cotton in Georgia and Florida, appeared and made arguments in favor of the levy of a duty on imports of Egyptian and other long-staple cottons. I desire to call particular attention to a communication from Hon. Harvie Jordan, of Georgia, president of the Sea Island Cotton Association, and also president of the National Cotton Association, which can be found at page 4502 of the Tariff Hearings. Mr. Jordan says:

HARVIE JORDAN, OF ATLANTA, REPRESENTING ASSOCIATION OF COTTON PRODUCERS, ASKS FOR DUTY ON COTTON.

ATLANTA, GA., *December 7, 1908.*

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As president of the Sea Island Cotton Association and the National Cotton Association, which two organizations embrace a very large element of cotton growers engaged in the production of sea-island and long-staple cotton in the Southern States, I respectfully beg to file an appeal with your committee for the speedy enactment of an amendment to our present tariff laws by which an import duty of not less than 40 per cent shall hereafter be imposed on the market valuation of all foreign raw cotton imported to America which can be used as a substitute or competitor by American mills against similar grades raised in this country. The southern cotton growers of sea-island and long-staple varieties earnestly desire the levy of this import duty by the Federal Government, in view of the fact that the heavy and constantly increasing annual importations of Egyptian raw cotton into this country by American manufacturers is becoming a serious menace to the production of such grades of cotton in this country. In 1907 the importations of Egyptian long-staple cotton was 90,000 bales, which was 10,000 bales in excess of the total production of sea-island cotton in the States of Georgia and Florida for the same period. These importations are constantly on the increase and seriously affect the price of not only the sea-island productions of Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina, but between 300,000 and 500,000 bales of long-staple cottons annually produced in the Mississippi Delta and territories adjacent thereto.

It is altogether unfair to give high protection to American manufacturers against the shipment of manufactured cotton goods from abroad into this country and at the same time allow the importations of raw cotton into this country duty free. American mills under this process are protected against competition from foreign mills, while they are given the power to regulate the price of sea-island and long-staple cotton raised in this country by the importation of Egyptian varieties of raw cotton duty free. Under this system the highly civilized and progressive American farmer is made to compete with the practically enslaved peasantry of Egypt. We do not believe that these conditions represent the true policy of the American Government. Either the protective duties favoring American manufactured cotton goods should be wiped out entirely and the American mill owners placed on a parity of competition with American cotton growers, or a duty of at least 40 per cent of the market value of all grades of Egyptian and other foreign-grown cotton should be levied against the importations of such cottons into this country. There are many mills in America to-day which are using only Egyptian cotton, which they receive at their mills duty free, while the finished product of their mills is protected by a duty of from 40 to 60 per cent against the competition of similar products manufactured abroad.

The southern cotton growers of these varieties are asking for a fixed duty of 10 cents per pound on all grades of Egyptian cotton shipped into this country. Such a duty would at once mean an increased demand for long-staple varieties in this country by American mills, and would stimulate production of these varieties, especially in the Delta of the Mississippi, where competition with Egyptian cotton under existing conditions is not profitable.

This is a plain presentation of the case, and the fixing of a duty as requested would mean the increase of many millions of dollars annually to the producers of sea-island and long-staple cotton without injury or detriment to American manufacturers. We hope to secure your favorable indorsement of the proposition herewith submitted.

Yours, respectfully,

HARVIE JORDAN,
President Sea Island Cotton Association;
President National Cotton Association.

Having now, Mr. Chairman, presented the case of my constituents from the standpoint of the necessity for the placing of Egyptian cotton on the dutiable list at a fair and reasonable rate, let me very briefly call attention to the unjust, yea, even harsh treatment accorded the Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina grower of sea-island cotton by and under the terms of this bill. In almost every line of it he is discriminated against. I am quite sure there is not a single article in the wide, wide world of which sea-island cotton constitutes a component part which, under the terms of this bill, is not placed on the dutiable list, and at a highly protective rate. He is forced to sell his product in an open market, free to all the world, and in direct competition with the product of the "pauper labor" of Egypt; and when he goes into a store to buy a little piece of lace, mercerized cloth, or other article for his wife, his children, or himself, although the article is manufactured from sea-island cotton—the product of his own industry and toil—he finds himself buying in a protected market, where he is forced to pay heavy tribute to the manufacturer.

Not only this. Almost everything which the Florida sea-island cotton grower buys, and which he must buy to enable him to produce this cotton on his farm, is on the dutiable list. I have selected a few items from the bill, and I call the attention of the committee to them. They are as follows:

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

ANIMALS, LIVE.

222. 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.
223. Swine, $1.50 per head.
224. Horses and mules, valued at $150 or less per head, $30 per head; if valued at one $150, 25 per cent ad valorem.
225. Sheep, 1 year old or over, $1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head.
226. All other live animals, not specially provided for in sections 1 or 2 of this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.
227. Barley, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds.
228. Barley malt, 25 cents per bushel of 34 pounds.
229. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, 2 cents per pound.
230. Buckwheat, 15 cents per bushel of 48 pounds; buckwheat flour, 25 per cent ad valorem.
231. Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds.
232. Corn meal, 40 cents per 100 pounds.
234. Oats, 15 cents per bushel.
235. Oatmeal and rolled oats, 1 cent per pound; oat hulls, 10 cents per 100 pounds.
237. Rye, 10 cents per bushel; rye flour, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
238. Wheat, 25 cents per bushel.
239. Wheat flour and Seminola, 25 per cent ad valorem.
240. Biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Thus it is seen that if a Florida cotton grower buys a mule or a horse from Kentucky, Tennessee, or Missouri, and the value of that mule or horse is $200, the Florida man must pay to the Kentucky, Tennessee, or Missouri dealer his tariff protection of 25 per cent ad valorem. And just here let me say, in passing, that I have yet to hear of any effort being made by my extremely virtuous Democratic colleagues from the States named to put either mules or horses on the free list. It is not much of a mule or horse that is not worth $150 these days, and yet, under this paragraph, if the animal is only worth fifteen or twenty dollars, there is a duty of $30 per head, and still my virtuous friends from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, who are the only real, genuine Democrats left on the earth, do not, in the interest of the "common people," complain.

Corn is protected to the extent of 15 cents per bushel, and corn meal—the poor man's bread—is taken care of at the rate of 40 cents per hundred pounds. Why is it that some of these "holier-than-thou" Democrats from Missouri, Illinois, Nebraska, Iowa, and other corn-raising States, do not rise on this floor and denounce this iniquity of taxing corn and corn meal? Here, my friends, is where you could render a real service to the "common people," for whom you express such great love in general-debate speeches.

Oats are taxed 15 cents per bushel, rye taxed 10 cents per bushel, wheat taxed 25 cents per bushel, wheat flour taxed 25 per cent ad valorem, and wool protected at a high rate.

My position is that the tariff schedules ought to be equalized, so that the burdens of the system may be equally borne and the benefits equally shared by every section of our common country and by all our people, whether they be common or uncommon. No logician beneath the skies can give one single sensible reason why corn, oats, barley, rye, potatoes, wheat, or wool should be on the dutiable list in any American tariff bill, while long-staple cotton is kept on the free list. I challenge any and every Representative upon this floor to furnish such reason, if he can. It has not been furnished thus far, Mr. Chairman, either at the tariff hearings or in this debate.

Amplifying very briefly my statements in colloquy with some of my colleagues in the beginning of my remarks, I will say that I am of the opinion that in acting upon matters of legislation the primary duty of a Representative in the American Congress is to his immediate constituency; he should represent and reflect their wishes and views faithfully; and if the time should come during his service when he can not conscientiously pursue this course, his duty, to my mind, is perfectly plain.

He should surrender to his people the commission they have intrusted to him, and thus allow them to fill their seat in this House with a Representative who can and will truly and faithfully voice their sentiments in this body. I think no other course would be honorable. The secondary duty of a Representative here, in my opinion, is to the great body of the country at large, and I yield to no man on this floor, on either side of this Chamber, in patriotic love of country from ocean to ocean and from the mountains to the sea. I love every star that glitters in the flag; I love the institutions of the Republic, and my people are as ready to uphold, protect, and defend them as are the people from any portion of the broad domain over which flies that proud emblem of liberty, the Stars and Stripes. Borrowing from another, let me say that my people, standing for this Republic, indorse the sentiment—

To our country, may she ever be right; but right or wrong, our country still.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago, the other side of the House seemed to applaud the statement of the gentleman from Florida, that it was time for them to do something for the poor man of the South, and thereby take him out of that category. I agree with this sentiment. The time has come for something more than honeyed words to our section. If your applause indicates a spirit of sincere willingness to aid us, then the way is open, and action on one item of this bill will afford this aid. Nor will you be asked to take a step inconsistent with the working theory on which your bill has been constructed.

I recognize that it is built on protective lines, but it is not necessary that a protection measure should be inherently unjust in the application of the protective principle, to the extent of surrendering revenue that is badly needed. A deficit of $100,000,000 clamorously proclaims the need of the Treasury for more revenue, and in the search for that revenue you have indicated a willingness to tax luxuries in order to secure it. Now, I am going to afford the majority party of this House a chance to do justice; to take advantage of an opportunity neglected by the Ways and Means Committee; to square itself with its professed principle of protection; and at the same time afford incidental aid to a large body of farmers in the South who are engaged in a heartbreaking struggle with foreign cheap labor, and the American tobacco trust. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

This opportunity will be made clear when your scrutiny is directed to certain features of the tobacco schedule.

The majority report of the Committee on Ways and Means contains two statements to which I wish to call the attention of the House. On page 5 of the report will be found the following statement, in connection with the advance of duties, and the avowed purpose for which the duties have been increased. Here are the words of the report:

We have increased the duties on certain articles for the *sole purpose* of *increasing the revenue*, and *most* of the *articles on which the duties have been increased, are luxuries*. (Italics mine.)

Now, I wish to remind the majority side of the House that if it is their purpose to raise revenue, there is one article in the tobacco schedule from which a handsome revenue can be raised, an article which we are all agreed, is a luxury. This article is imported Turkish tobacco.

The bill under consideration is a protective-tariff bill, and some of the schedules are phenomenally high. This is conspicuously true in the case of Sumatra leaf, which carries an import tax of $1.85 per pound. The effect of this duty has been to build up in this country an absolutely artificial system of cultivation; an industry of a restricted character, that could not exist for a moment under natural conditions, if the duty was removed. The Payne bill continues this duty, because there is a limited production of shade-grown tobacco in the States of Connecticut and Florida, a production that is largely in the hands of corporations that have been strong enough to secure from the lawmaking body in the past, a duty of $1.85 a pound. This duty has enabled them to do business, and make money.

One of the witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee stated that the tremendous possibilities for profit in this industry, as a result of this duty, have stimulated production abnormally. But, while the committee has continued this duty, it has been blind to the interests, and deaf to the demands, of a large body of tobacco growers in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina who raise tobacco under absolutely natural conditions. If the committee desired to raise more revenue, and this is given as one of the objects of the bill, an opportunity is presented to compass this result, by imposing a higher duty on an imported article which comes into this country from Turkey, Asia Minor, and Egypt. Incidentally, while raising revenue from a luxury, they would aid the tobacco farmers of three States. Now, what are the facts in regard to smoking tobacco, used both for cigarettes, and pipe smoking? A large proportion, if not the entire amount, of the bright tobacco raised in this country for cigarettes, and for pipes, is raised in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

The duty on the imported tobacco that competes with this home-grown product, is very low, as compared with the duty on Sumatra leaf.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. The gentleman from Virginia is discussing a matter of vital importance, outside of the politics in it, to every Member in this House, and I think the House ought to be in order.

Mr. SAUNDERS. There are no politics in this proposition. It is a question of justice which rises above politics [loud applause], and as such I am presenting it to the majority side of this House, and simply asking them to be consistent. They have framed this bill, and have announced to the country that it was framed on protective lines.

In the majority report from the Ways and Means Committee, it is stated that they have increased duties on luxuries to raise more revenue. To be consistent, the duty on this luxury, this imported Turkish leaf, which is the fad of the day for smoking, ought to be increased, and the additional revenue that this increase will afford, ought to be collected. The Treasury needs the revenue, and here is one subject at hand from which it can be secured.

I suppose that the duties have been increased on luxuries, because it was considered the proper thing to do, because they were considered appropriate subjects to carry a greater burden. Now, Turkish tobacco is a luxury, and if adequately taxed, will be a great revenue producer. Why not increase the duty on this subject-matter? The committee has been satisfied to retain the tax of $1.85 per pound on Sumatra tobacco, and a tax of 35 cents a pound on this class of tobacco, although the latter duty is really only equal to 17½ cents a pound. Why do I make that statement? Because the evidence taken by the Ways and Means Committee shows that the tobacco which comes into competition with the bright tobacco of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, is equal per pound, for the purposes for which it is intended, to 2 pounds of the home-grown product. That fact makes the duty on this Turkish tobacco only 17½ cents a pound, so far as the interests of our home growers are concerned.

And yet Sumatra tobacco coming into this country in competition with the hothouse growths of shade-produced tobacco in Connecticut, and Florida, carries a duty of $1.85 per pound. If you gentlemen want to be consistent, if you are in quest of some subject-matter from which consistently, and appropriately, you can raise a larger revenue, then I direct your attention to a foreign-grown product which will carry a higher duty. Increase this duty, and you will increase our revenues anywhere from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year, according to the duty imposed, and at the same time do something for those struggling farmers of the South, in whom your applause of a few moments ago seemed to indicate that you were so much interested. Did it mean that, gentlemen, or did your applause simply indicate that you were delighted to see that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] was out of touch, and harmony, with the rest of the Democrats on this side of the House? What did your applause mean? If it meant that you are interested in our struggling farmers, then let me give you a few facts. You will find that in this matter, my statements are amply borne out by the record. The importation of Turkish tobacco has been increasing for the last ten years.

This tobacco comes into competition with Virginia, and North and South Carolina bright tobacco. Its importation has in-

creased from 400,000 pounds in 1897, to something over 7,000,000 pounds in 1907, the last period for which we have the figures of importation available. This tobacco carries a tax of 35 cents a pound, and it is easy enough to see what it would yield in the way of revenue if this tax were increased to $1.25 a pound. You may ask me in that connection, Would not the increase exclude the Turkish tobacco leaf? It would diminish it to some extent, just exactly as the tax on Sumatra leaf has to some extent diminished the importation of Sumatra tobacco, but the amount that would come in under the increased duty, just as the Sumatra leaf has come in under a larger duty, would be sufficient to make a considerable increase in the revenue from this source. I suppose there is hardly a Member on this floor who knows what Sumatra tobacco leaf yields in the way of revenue to this Government. Let me give you the figures. There is annually imported into this country about 6,500,000 pounds of Sumatra tobacco leaf, at $1.85 per pound, yielding something like $12,000,000 of revenue.

I ask the gentlemen on that side of the House, Would they not prefer to get the revenue that they need, and that we know the country needs, from this source—a tax on imported tobacco—rather than from coffee and tea, both of which are taxed in the Payne bill? It can be done without any trouble. You can secure from this source all of the revenue that you would derive from the tax on both tea, and coffee. If, incidentally, there comes any benefit to the producers, it will come to a class of people who need that benefit, as much as any class of workers in these United States.

We hear a great deal, Mr. Chairman, about the principles of protection, and the interests of American labor, but when the Republican party comes to apply those principles, they seem to think that the application ought to be confined to industrial labor entirely. They build up protected interests, which give employment in industrial centers, and then they talk with pride of the people working in those protected industries, who receive from $4, to $5, to $10, or $15, a day.

Yet when it comes to applying the same principles to agricultural labor, they seem to be indifferent to its interests. Agricultural labor ought to be as dear to the hearts of the American lawmaker, as labor in the factories, or in the shops. [Applause.] What do the people who work in the tobacco fields of Virginia get in the way of protection? Your attention is called to the fact that domestic shade-grown tobacco is doubtless protected by a high duty, because its production is controlled in large measure, by corporations able apparently to impress their demands upon the Republican party, and to have what they want, written into the tobacco schedules. But the bright tobacco of Virginia, and of North and South Carolina, is raised by individual growers, who are never seen about the halls of Congress clamoring for protection, or for a duty. Most of them are not able to raise the money with which to furnish a lobby in their interests.

Yet their rights are as great, and as equitable, as the rights of the people who have come here, and secured the duties on Sumatra tobacco. What does the Virginia tobacco grower get for his bright tobacco? An average, say, of 10 cents per pound. What does that price mean in the way of a daily wage, for the people who work in the tobacco fields? Does that price mean to the tobacco grower, a daily wage in anywise equivalent to the wages received by the men who work in the protected industries, in the tin plants, or in the steel plants, or to the wages paid to the men who work for the companies that raise shade-grown tobacco? Not at all. According to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, ordinary darky laborers working for the people who grow tobacco under shade, receive from $22, to $24 a month.

What of the man who cultivates, and owns the fields, and raises his own tobacco? What does he often get as a daily wage, from the sales of bright tobacco? He gets, Mr. Chairman, in many cases, not more than $10, or $15 a month, if his returns are calculated as wages. In bad years he gets less than this. It is not an infrequent thing for a tobacco raiser, to find that the proceeds of his crop barely pays his fertilizer bill.

This Turkish leaf is a subject that can stand an increased duty. Do you ask me how, as a Democrat, I am asking you to increase this duty? If I could write this bill, I would secure relief for my people in some other way, by some other form of fiscal legislation.

But you are writing this bill, and we have the right to come to you gentlemen, who have announced the principles that control your action, and ask you to be consistent, to be just, to be fair, and to make your actions square with your professions. You profess to be in favor of protection; you announce that you have advanced duties to secure revenue. In the same breath you assert your willingness to tax luxuries. Now, I bring to your attention a subject-matter that is a luxury, and one that will yield a large revenue, if adequately taxed.

In addition, by the imposition of an adequate duty on Turkish tobacco, you will incidentally aid a large number of American farmers, who, in the truest sense, are laboring men. I say that I have a right to ask the Republican party, which has announced the working theory upon which the Payne bill has been constructed, to be consistent in their treatment of kindred interests, and to furnish us a bill purged of sectionalism, and in all respects just, and equitable in its application of the principle for which it stands. I ask nothing more, and should receive nothing less. [Loud applause.]

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Virginia yield me time, if he has it, to make a statement?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman from Texas started out with the proposition as a foundation for his excellent speech that the South necessarily ships two-thirds of its raw cotton across the ocean for a market. This is far from the truth. Instead of having men in Congress representing their fair land who base their fine logic and flowing wit on false premises, careful thought would lead one to the conclusion that the people of the South should send men here who would look after their interests and see that those interests are protected rather than promulgate such ideas. The gentleman from Virginia has argued until the very close in favor of protecting his people, and then he seemed to remember some Democratic time-honored dogma and set the whole thing aside by saying they would devise some other method of taking care of the southern laborer.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, no; I addressed you gentlemen as Representatives on the majority side of the House, simply asking you to be consistent and just.

Mr. REEDER. I am with you as to that proposition, but it seems to me that both the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Virginia have indicated that the South is derelict in not sending Members here to represent them who will work to have their industries protected.

I believe that your industries should be protected, and I believe that they should be protected to such an extent that your people would be more prosperous than they are to-day, and that the whole Nation would benefit by your increased prosperity. It is not necessary to ship two-thirds of the raw cotton raised in the South across the ocean for a market. If your people would reach out for the protection of the cotton manufacturer with the same energy that the western and northern people use in seeing that the interests of their constituents are looked after, the South would be much more prosperous, and every part of the Nation benefited vastly by the better market you would thus furnish for other manufactures and for food products. One section can not be a laggard without injury to all.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. REEDER. Oh, just let me get through with this statement.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, that we are on the cotton schedule——

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, to what gentleman from Texas does the gentleman from Kansas refer?

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. BURLESON. Surely you did not understand from his remarks that he was asking for protection upon any product of our State.

Mr. REEDER. He started off with this proposition, that you produce cotton and that you must send two-thirds of your cotton across the ocean as raw material. This was the foundation for his speech and is all wrong, because you have no business to send two-thirds of your cotton across the ocean as raw material. You should send men to Congress who are in favor of protecting the cotton industry, and manufacture the greater part of that cotton in the South.

Mr. BURLESON. With the permission of my friend from Virginia, I will state to the gentleman from Kansas that the South has not yet abandoned, but still adheres to her traditional policy as to the tariff. She has her faults, but a desire to pilfer her neighbors' pockets, even though it could be accomplished through the instrumentality of law, is not one of them. For her I beg to decline the suggestion of the gentleman. Furthermore, it would be silly to put a duty on raw cotton. Cotton does not need protection.

Mr. REEDER. I do not refer to raw cotton. I mean the manufactures of cotton.

Mr. BURLESON. Cotton goods are protected now; the duty, especially on the finer grades made in New England, is as high as a cat's back.

Mr. SABATH. They are protected now to 50 or 60 per cent.

Mr. REEDER. No one is suggesting a duty on raw cotton; but I do insist that manufactures of cotton ought to be protected sufficiently to cause the work of manufacturing to be done in this country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You could not protect them more. It is prohibitive now.

Mr. GLASS. Does the gentleman believe in protecting American industries because they are American industries or because they send Republicans here to Congress? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REEDER. I believe that the Democrats have made a failure in this. Their constituents need protection, but the tenets of your party are such that you have got to make some excuse when you ask for protection. You worship party tenets so much you dare not go forward. You will not admit you have foresight. You only use a hindsight, and your people continue to suffer stagnation for that reason. The South ought to send men here who want protection and who do not fear to say so and work to get it.

My friend CLARK, the witty leader of the minority, says the tariff is now prohibitive on cotton. The fact is, this statement is so far from the facts that nearly $95,000,000 worth of the products of your cotton, which you have shipped abroad in the raw state, came back in 1906 manufactured, and paid nearly $40,000,000 tariff to get back to our markets. There is some difference between prohibitive tariff and ninety-five million imports; but what is ninety-five millions when a traditional Democratic policy is to be upheld?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, the West wants protection, and you are willing to vote for protection, too.

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman never saw a State more in favor of protection of American labor than Kansas, and we have little direct protection.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If I will say what we want in the South, will you give it to us?

Mr. REEDER. No; I would not like to say that. [Laughter.] I do not know you well enough.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Suppose the South sends Republicans here; would that change the gentleman's view?

Mr. REEDER. It would not. I would not give Republicans all they want, because some of them want a tariff on lumber, and I am not in favor of that. That protects stumpage, not labor. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question.

Mr. REEDER. I am afraid that the gentleman will spoil what I intended to say at this point.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Kansas to say that we ought to manufacture all the cotton in this country.

Mr. REEDER. Yes; you ought to manufacture all the cotton needed in this country and much to sell abroad in the way of cotton goods.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Does the gentleman want to help the South to build more cotton mills?

Mr. REEDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Then, vote to reduce the enormous duty on cotton-mill machinery. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REEDER. I do not believe that is the way to do it. It does not profit to kill one industry and thus throw American laborers out of employment to build up some one else. That is Democratic doctrine. I want Americans to make that machinery, and I wish you people to be so protected that you can afford to pay for the machinery and sell all of the cotton manufactures used in the United States and much elsewhere, and not have your Congressmen get up here and make speeches, with the foundation for such speeches the statement "that you, of necessity, have to ship your raw cotton across the ocean to find a market," though I concede this is Democratic doctrine and usage.

Mr. SAUNDERS. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas a question? Does he think that I made out a pretty good case for the people in whose interests I have spoken?

Mr. REEDER. Yes; until you get about through. Then you seemed to think you must preserve some Democratic precedents, or time-honored tenets, and backed up considerably.

Mr. SAUNDERS. My friend is mistaken in thinking I have "backed up" at all. I have merely asked the gentlemen on that side to be consistent. Is that asking too much of a Republican? Now, I want to show the gentleman how much stronger I can make my case. This Turkish tobacco, on which I ask that the duty be increased, as a matter of consistency on your part, as well as of advantage to my people and to the public revenues, is manufactured chiefly into cigarettes and smoking tobacco, at a profit of 100 per cent or more to the manufacturers. I want to say further, and this may explain why it is that we have not been able to get an increase in the duty on this tobacco, that 90 per cent of the Turkish tobacco importations into this country, are used by the American Tobacco Company, the "tobacco trust." At the same time Turkey does not allow us to import into that country a pound either of raw tobacco, or of the manufactured product from America.

Sumatra leaf is a wrapper tobacco. Turkish leaf is a filler tobacco. On account of its distinctive qualities Sumatra tobacco can, and does, carry a very large duty. Its importations, in the face of a duty of $1.85 a pound, are millions of pounds a year.

Turkish tobacco has its distinctive qualities—a peculiar flavor, due to the salts in the soil where it is grown. This flavor has caused the smoking of Turkish tobacco, chiefly in the form of cigarettes, to become quite a fad, a national fad. Hence this tobacco, as a luxury and fancy tobacco, will carry a large increase of duty, and under this duty, yield a large increase of revenue, anywhere from three to five millions of dollars a year, according to the duty imposed.

The importations of Sumatra tobacco are about 6,500,000 pounds a year, yielding about $12,000,000 a year.

The importations of Turkish tobacco have grown from about 400,000 pounds a year to about 8,000,000 pounds a year, the figures for the year 1908 not being available.

A large increase in the duty on this tobacco would diminish to some extent the importation of the lower grades of this product, a very desirable thing, by the way, to do, but large quantities would continue to be imported, as no American filler leaf has the peculiar flavor of this tobacco.

Hence this tobacco will carry a large increase of duty, and the importations under a larger duty will yield a large amount of additional revenue. European and Asiatic Turkey, and Egypt, send us practically all of this Turkish tobacco.

Turkey does not allow the importation of tobacco from this country, however manufactured.

The duty on Turkish tobacco is at present 35 cents on the pound, which is really only about 17½ cents per pound, as compared with American filler tobacco, for the reason that, owing to the small stems in the Turkish tobacco, a pound of it will go as far as 2 pounds of American tobacco.

Sumatra tobacco and Turkish tobacco do not compete, as one is a wrapper and the other a filler tobacco.

There is an estimated profit of 100 per cent, or more, in the manufacture of this Turkish tobacco into cigarettes.

I think the facts given strengthen my case.

Mr. REEDER. It requires a good deal of gall on the part of the Republican party to force protection upon the South for their interests, with their Representatives fighting constantly against such a protection; but as the gentleman seems to have a proper case for protection and frankly asks such protection, I heartily favor his having such protection for the tobacco he indicates.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, well, they have got the gall.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; they have gall enough to do it.

Mr. STANLEY. I want to ask the gentleman just one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REEDER] a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. I want to state to the gentleman from Kansas that so far as his observations go there is a non sequitur in their application to anything that has been said by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS]. The claim of the gentleman from Virginia for an increase of this duty is absolutely Democratic, for the reason that it is in the first place a revenue tax, and in the next place it is a duty upon a luxury, and in the third place it is a duty that in its operation affects a trust and does not in any way affect the people.

There is nothing in the Democratic platform or in the Democratic policy that prevents the laying of a large revenue upon a luxury because incidentally somebody in this country may produce a small quantity of that same article.

Mr. REEDER. The extended statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, misnamed a question, bars cotton manufactures from protection. But in the interest of the South we have used of our gall and given your workers in cotton quite a protection on what to us are necessaries. I wish that the gentleman after this, if he has a correction to make in a speech of the gentleman from Virginia, will call him to one side and correct it before the gentleman from Virginia starts in to make the speech

and not take my time for such a good and necessary labor. I will, for a moment, if I have the time——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will give the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman from Kentucky says you are arguing the case as a tariff for revenue; the fact is, you are arguing it for the protection of your people.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; I merely made a quotation from the Payne report. Are you familiar with that report?

Mr. REEDER. Somewhat.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Here is what it says: That it has increased duties on certain articles for the sole purpose of raising revenue, and that most of "the articles on which duties have been increased, are luxuries."

Now, I call the attention of the gentleman to the following facts—that Turkish tobacco is a luxury, and as such is a proper subject upon which you can raise revenue for the country. I said that to be consistent in carrying out the announcements on your side, you ought to take this subject-matter, and put an increased duty on it, as being at once a luxury, and a revenue producer.

Mr. REEDER. The gentleman insisted he wanted this tariff for the protection of his people. I wish to emphasize two points; first, the gentleman from Texas started out with the proposition we must ship two-thirds of our raw product abroad. That is not true. The South should send men here in favor of protecting southern industries and then you would manufacture your own raw material and save millions of dollars to the South. The gentleman from Virginia certainly insisted that he wanted this raise of the tariff to protect his people, and it would be a dangerous stretch of imagination to imagine his interest in this item and not consider the thought of his people's interest.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; I did not.

Mr. REEDER. You certainly did.

Mr. SAUNDERS. What I said was that if you were consistent, you would get your revenue from a tax on a luxury, and incidentally we would get some benefit.

Mr. REEDER. Your argument was it would benefit your people.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. One of the inconsistencies of your position is that it is predicated on the hope of consistency on the other side.

Mr. SAUNDERS. The point is well taken.

Mr. REEDER. You should educate the southern manufacturers on this proposition. If you favor protection for your industries, send men here to work along that line and get your industries protected and the South will then prosper beyond measure, because they have unlimited resources.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I ask the gentleman——

Mr. SAUNDERS. This is an illustration of your attitude. You prefer to be inconsistent rather than help southern industries.

Mr. REEDER. No; the southern people are the inconsistent people. We have helped your people with a good duty on manufactures of cotton and I will do all I can to protect your tobacco raisers with a higher duty on tobacco.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. We made last year 13,486,000 bales of cotton. Of that, a little over 4,500,000 was manufactured both in the East and the South. Now, how many factories do you suppose you would have to build in the East or South to manufacture all the 13,500,000 bales of cotton?

Mr. REEDER. If the South were represented here by such men as are sent from New England, we would manufacture 9,000,000 bales of it. That is what they would do and what you ought to do.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Is it not a fact that Kansas has sent men here who do not know any more about the cotton industry than——

Mr. REEDER. I do not think I know as much about cotton as the gentleman from Georgia, but I do know this, that there is a great deal of cotton manufactured abroad that ought to be manufactured by the people of the South.

There is plenty of money in this country to manufacture much of this cotton, and all that stands in the way is the Democratic idea that you must not protect your home industries.

Mr. BURLESON. In the name of common sense, tell us how the duty on raw cotton would encourage the manufacture of it.

Mr. REEDER. I do not want a duty on raw cotton; I want a duty on manufactured cotton.

Mr. BURLESON. You have that now, to an unconscionable degree, in the present law, and on hosiery and goods to be used by your people and mine this bill materially increases the duties.

Mr. REEDER. I want just enough, so that the American workmen will do the work and get the pay for manufacturing our cotton goods.

Mr. BURLESON. But New England has been demanding and receiving a prohibitory tariff on cotton goods for years. And, Mr. Chairman, I pray that enlightenment may some day come to the farming constituents of the gentleman from Kansas, when they can at last realize that they can not be made rich by increasing the tax burden resting upon themselves. I hope that some day they will come to know that just such bills as this one makes them pay a higher price for everything they eat and wear, everything they use, with absolutely no recompense.

The duties on farm products in this bill, with the possible exception of barley, are a delusion and a snare. In truth, they afford the farmer no benefit and only serve as a means of deceiving them, in certain States, into a continuation of support of the Republican party. Such farmers seem unable to realize that the real effect of such bills as this and the present Dingley law is to enable the crafty beneficiaries under its provisions to plunder for their own enrichment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I tremble when I think that the God above is still exacting of men an observance of that law handed down on the tablet of stone which says, "Thou shalt not steal." If he is doing so, as an inevitable consequence a very hot fire must be kept kindled for those intelligent Republicans who are instrumental in keeping such fruitful means of thievery as these modern tariff laws in existence, for under them the toiling millions are plundered in order that a few trust magnates and manufacturing monopolists may roll in wealth.

Mr. REEDER. The facts are, the way to have goods cheap, money plenty, and farm products high is to so protect manufactures as to have our goods made by our own people. See tin; first stage, tin made in Wales and high; second stage, a tariff on tin; tin now made at home and cheap. Abraham Lincoln once said—he knew this much about a tariff—when you buy goods made abroad you have the goods, but some one else has the money. When you buy goods at home we have the goods and the money. Even a Democrat ought to see the latter is the better condition.

Mr. WEISSE. Does the gentleman believe that this bill protects American labor?

Mr. REEDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman kindly explain to this House how the Republicans are protecting labor when, through the drawback system of this bill, the foreign laborer can buy the products made by American labor cheaper than he can himself? How are you protecting American labor by denying him the right to buy the work of his own hands as cheaply as the same can be bought by a foreigner?

Mr. REEDER. You overlook the fact that he must have money to buy at any price, and the only source of money is his labor. If certain raw material is sent into this country and we pay a tariff on it, and we can not pay that tariff and have the labor done here and send the goods manufactured therefrom abroad and sell them, we had a good deal better rebate that tariff than not have the work of manufacturing done by our people.

Mr. WEISSE. Then the gentleman is in favor of a tariff on hides? He can not get the hides into this country on account of the 15 per cent duty. They go to Europe to be tanned, and they deny our tanners the manufacture of that leather and the exportation of their leather goods. This same system gives to the foreign manufacturer cheaper leather than our own manufacturers, all in the interest of the beef trust.

Mr. REEDER. Put a higher tariff on manufactured leather and then they can manufacture it in this country, and we will have to apply our rebate system on leather sold abroad, as we can not control that market, but we can give our laborers the pay for tanning and also for manufacturing the leather.

Mr. WEISSE. It will absolutely kill our export trade in leather if you do that. Give us free hides and we can beat the world in any market. We are willing to let the heavy leather come in free if you will put all material used in tanning and cattle on the free list, which you will not do. The tanning business is such that there are 70 per cent less of tanners to-day than there were ten years ago.

Mr. REEDER. That is exactly the difficulty with your southern prosperity. You let foreigners do your manufacturing. This rebate system gives you free hides where you compete for a foreign market. The southern people should manufacture their cotton, and I would like to see the South send men here who are in favor of the southern people manufacturing at least their own raw material.

Mr. WEISSE. You can not get the hides of South America tanned here as long as you let England buy them 15 per cent cheaper than we do by reason of the tariff.

Mr. REEDER. By means of the rebate system we answer your statement absolutely and give the labor to Americans at good wages. Then you can have them manufactured here if you put a tariff on leather.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, in response to what he said a while ago about the prosperity of the South, if it is not a fact that the South, during the present panic, sent money to New York and the other money centers of the country to do the business of the country upon? The South is to-day one of the most prosperous sections of this country, and I want to say that it will continue so if you do not rob it of its just dues with your high protective tariff. Let her alone and she will take care of herself.

Mr. REEDER. The South has had very fair prosperity under the Dingley tariff. They could have greater prosperity if they would send men here imbued with the idea that they must protect southern industry rather than work in the interest of the foreign manufacturer.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman wants the South to send men here who would deliberately sacrifice her time-honored principles of justice in order that they may take from the pocket of one man in order to put gain into the pocket of another. If that is what he wants, I hope the time will never come that that class of Representatives will be sent here to disgrace that fair land upon this floor in that way.

Mr. REEDER. There is a good deal more prosperity, in my judgment, in Texas and Florida than in most parts of the South. It is on account of their not paying so much attention to those "time-honored Democratic principles." They are working along the line of the advanced thought of the times. I commend other portions of the South to their example.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield the floor?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He did not have the floor.

Mr. REEDER. I did not understand that I had the floor, but I am not through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman did not have the floor.

Mr. REEDER. I think I am going to do the southern people some good, and I would like to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. All gentlemen will be seated.

Mr. REEDER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like a little time on my own hook, if I could have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman did not have any time.

Mr. REEDER. I did not have, but I would like to have some.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 96, noes 139.

So the committee refused to rise.

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend making a speech on the tariff question, but I am thoroughly in favor of a protective tariff; I am in favor of a protective tariff, and I am also a Member from a purely agricultural region. We do not expect to get any great amount of protection for our products direct, and we never have had such protection. All we expect is that with a great number of people working all over this Nation and receiving good wages, we will be furnished a good market for our products. [Applause.]

I am sure the South would be in a very much better financial condition if they would send Members to Congress who would work to secure a protective tariff for such products as they in the South could produce and which they ought to manufacture. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Southern Members were complaining this morning about New England having a preference over the South in the tariff. The fact is the tariff is the same for both sections. But the South has a vast advantage over New England, because they have the products that support their laborers right at their door.

They have water powers handy; they have raw material in close proximity to their factories; nature has built up around you what New England does not have and what could not be given you by law. With these many advantages the southern people should wake up to the fact that they should not ship cotton abroad in the raw state, but should manufacture it at home into all the articles which are made out of cotton. The South should see to it they have Members on this floor who will favor the passage of laws that will protect them to such an extent as to insure that your cotton will not pay the expense of middlemen and transportation across the ocean twice and a tariff to get back, and then sell in a market which you are clearly entitled to. So I believe it is in regard to every other industry. I do not believe that the protective tariff should be so high as to keep all manufactures out; but I believe it should be very near that point. I would keep it below, because I do not wish the people to pay any more for manufactured goods than is necessary to permit us to continue to pay our citizens such wages as will permit them to clothe, feed, and educate their children in a manner likely to produce a high grade of citizens in spite of the pauper wages the Democrats would have them meet in unprotected competition. Our laboring people differ from other people, because of the better wages we pay, and because of their living better and educating their children more generally; our laboring people have many of the luxuries of life, and the tendency of our giving our laboring people so good an opportunity not only makes our laborers' standard higher, but has a tendency to better the condition of the laborers of every nation of the world.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will ask the gentleman if it is a fact that the foreign manufacturer is able to pay the cost of transportation on raw cotton to Europe, manufacture the raw cotton into the finished product and then pay the cost of transportation back to the United States, and still compete successfully in our markets with finished product in cotton here?

Mr. REEDER. It is. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE] made a speech this morning he started out with this as a foundation for his speech, "We must ship two-thirds or three-fourths of our raw cotton across the ocean." This is a false proposition. The speech was a good one, but he located it on a sandy foundation which will simply slip from under it, and thus destroy his whole logic. On page 418 of document 1503, Notes on the revision of the tariff, I see that of the raw cotton sent out from the South to foreign lands $93,850,689.93 worth of manufactured goods came back to be sold to our people. And that not only was the freight paid across the ocean and back and a profit to numerous middlemen, but a tariff of $38,999,267.96 was paid for its return to our markets, and this for the one year ending July 1, 1906.

Here is some fifty millions each year that belongs to your people of the Southland. If fifty million per annum is not enough of a bonus on one item to awaken the South, your people should send men here who would work with New England to pass a tariff for protection on cotton manufactures so high that they could afford to have this work done by Americans and then use your natural advantages over New England with such energy as to get your full share, and thus be of vast benefit to the Southland and of some considerable benefit to the sections of the country which furnish you food for your laborers. And while we in Kansas would probably pay a little more for our cotton goods, we would have a better market for all of our products. It seems very clear to me we should have a tariff for protection to southern labor, and, incidentally, it should be a tariff for revenue. We should no doubt raise some revenue by the tariff, but it is much more important, especially to the South, who are losing the very life blood of their prosperity by having their raw materials sent abroad for manufacture, that this bill should be for protection to American labor. Every laborer in this country who can be protected and given a better wage thereby becomes a better citizen, and his children will grow to be better men and women; and not only that, but they will be better customers than you can find in any other portion of the world. Our market is worth a great deal more than all the other markets of the world to the American producer, and if the southern people would proceed along the line of protection, they could make this market still better than it is now.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REEDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman is talking about cotton. Now, I live in a cotton-manufacturing district, and I would like to say to the gentleman that it costs probably a million dollars to build a mill in South Carolina which could be duplicated in England for $600,000. That is because of the enormous duty that is placed on cotton-mill machinery, rubber

belting, structural steel, and the material that we must buy to equip that plant. Now, does not the gentleman think that the building of a mill that will give employment to a thousand people for all time to come is such an industry that the New England manufacturers could afford to release their grasp on the machinery that goes into that mill?

Mr. REEDER. The idea embodied in the gentleman's question is the primal mistake of the Democratic party. The gentleman virtually asks me this: If we have men working now in the manufacture of machinery to put into cotton mills, and those men get $2 a day, would it not be better to make them take $1.20 a day instead of $2?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Now, another question.

Mr. REEDER. I hope the gentleman will wait until I have an opportunity to answer the first one. That is the mistake the Democratic party is making and always seems to be determined to make; that is, that we should lower the wages of our laboring men from $2 to $1.20 a day. Now, that would be a fatal mistake. I would rather see you pay for the mill a price which will protect the laborers who are engaged in the manufacture of the machinery that goes into the mill and then raise the price on cotton products, so that where your laborers now get four or five dollars per month they will get ten or twelve dollars a month or more.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. What is your drawback clause for—to let in free material to give labor something to do?

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer that question also. The drawback clause means that, although we can not control the foreign market, we can do this: If a man is manufacturing goods in this country and has to pay a duty on raw material, if he can not meet the competition in the foreign markets and pay that duty, when he manufactures goods for the foreign market we return to him 99 per cent of the duty that he pays on the imported materials going into the manufactured product which he exports. That permits him to meet the competition and thus give employment to American workmen. That is Republican doctrine, and that is just what we ought to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden the House in a prolonged argument of the various schedules embodied in this measure, but would rather devote the inadequate time allotted me in a discussion of the effect the adoption of the bill will have upon that class of our American citizenship, the bone and sinew, I might say, of our body politic—the American laborer.

I desire to talk upon this subject because it is one in whose every particular I am well versed by experience, which, after all, is the only fruitful source from which can emanate information which can be depended upon.

About the laboring man and concerning the field of duty in which he is engaged, I possess that peculiar information which is enjoyed only by one whose early requirements rendered it imperative that employment must be had or the necessities of life would not be forthcoming.

It happened to be my good fortune to be born poor. My parents being in necessitious circumstances, and the opportunities in the neighborhood in which I lived for securing employment by one whose financial conditions made it impossible for him to secure the necessary education to obtain higher employment were extremely meager, and so my life from early childhood until young manhood was spent in the dangerous, hazardous, and laborous work of stone quarrying, in which business I acquired information and experience which ultimately made it possible for me to accept the presidency of the company from which I earned my first dollar.

These years of preparation, which finally shaped my career, gave me a splendid opportunity to study the desires, the necessities, and the inclinations of the laboring man, with whom I had had years of experience. I suffered what they suffered; I enjoyed what they enjoyed. Their grievances received my sincere sympathy and their troubles I made my own. When they were happy I was happy, and when they were sad I was remorseful. Our hearts beat in unison, and I have never learned to disregard their reasonable appeals for assistance; and I hope that I may never so far forget my own early experience as to fail when opportunity offers to render them whatever assistance I can and to espouse their cause whenever it seems to me to be in their interests so to do.

I am in favor of the adoption of the bill now pending before the House for a twofold reason.

First, I am in favor of its adoption because I believe that it will bring back those banner days of commercial supremacy which the United States enjoyed following the passage of the Dingley tariff bill, which brought great blessings and remained in full force and with undiminished powers until the recent unavoidable panic, the blighting ravages of which were so speedily and effectually checked by the wise, sane, businesslike, and apparently providential action of a Republican President, backed by a Republican Senate and House of Representatives.

Secondly, I want to hear the hum of the wheels of American industry. I want again to smell the smoke of commercial activity. I want to hear the rumbling of the wheels of factory and mill. I want to know that away down in the bowels of the earth, amid the grime and smoke and dirt and dust, there will be found the same light-hearted, well-paid, contented American wage-earner that is to be found in more favorable employment, and with less arduous duties to perform. I want them all to be equally happy.

I want the American laboring man to be the best-paid, the best-housed, the best-clad, and the most-contented person on earth; and the American laborer is the best paid, the best housed, the best clad, and the most contented of his class that can be found anywhere upon the face of the earth. He receives from two to five times as much in exchange for his hire as is received by any like person in this broad universe, and he has been receiving said wage since the adoption of the Dingley tariff bill, a Republican measure passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President.

The laboring man who remembers the doleful years from 1893 to 1897 needs no argument to convince him that the Republican policy of protection is, when compared with the system which made those days a curse to American manhood and American womanhood, the most blessed and the most beneficent system ever adopted by man for the benefit of his kind.

The enemies of this measure are filling the air with bitter, vindictive, and partisan rant because of the provision contained therein to tax the breakfast table by putting a duty on coffee and tea. I am not in favor of that tax, but I want to call attention to the indisputable fact that there was not a laboring man in this country from 1893 to 1897 who would not have been willing to pay five times the price he now pays for a cup of good coffee or tea in exchange for the privilege of receiving employment at half the wage he now receives. It was not a matter of the cost of coffee or tea in those days, Mr. Chairman, but a matter of bread, and the wherewithal to purchase the same.

I am a protectionist because I believe that protection affords greater opportunities to all classes of our citizenship than a free-trade or tariff-for-revenue system can possibly give.

There has never been a time in this country, from its very foundation to the present time, when a tariff-for-revenue policy was in existence that the country did not suffer commercial paralysis; and there never was a time following the adoption of a Republican protective-tariff system that the country did not, under its stimulating and invigorating effect, take on new and increased activity.

There are other good reasons why I am a protectionist, Mr. Chairman, and why I favor the adoption of the bill we are now preparing for final enactment into law, but I am particularly wedded to the system because of the protection it affords the wage-earner.

I do not want to live to see the day when the American workingman will be forced by legislation to accept the low wage scale of foreign free-trade nations. If there be those here who think that there is no substantial difference between the wages received by our laborers and the wages received by foreign laborers, I would respectfully invite their careful inspection of the following comparison of wages in this country and the wages paid in free-trade Europe:

	United States.		Great Britain.		Germany.		France.		Belgium.	
	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.
Bricklayers	$0.55	$4.40	$0.21	$1.68	$0.13	$1.04	$0.13	$1.04	$0.08	$0.64
Stonecutters	.42	3.36	.20	1.60	.12	.96	.14	1.12	.07	.56
Stonemasons	.46	3.68	.21	1.68	.13	1.04	.14	1.12	.08	.64
Hodcarriers	.29	2.32	.13	1.04	.08	.64	.10	.80	No data.	
Carpenters	.36	2.88	.20	1.60	.13	1.04	.15	1.20	.07	.56
Painters	.35	2.80	.18	1.44	.12	.96	.13	1.04	.07	.56
Plumbers	.44	3.52	.20	1.60	.11	.88	.15	1.20	.08	.64
Machinists	.27	2.16	.17	1.36	.13	1.04	.13	1.04	No data.	
General laborers	.17	1.36	.10	.80	.08	.64	.10	.80	.05	.40

A comparison of the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain, and Belgium.

Articles.	United States.		Great Britain.		Belgium.	
	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.
One yard cashmere cloth of cotton and low botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	$0.064	$0.196	$0.013	$0.143	.....	.....
One yard cashmere cloth of cotton and botany worsted of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	.064	.135	.015	.163	.....	.....
1 yard all-wool sateen of botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	.058	.65	.014	.30	.....	.....
1,000 common red building brick	2.33	1.91	.....	.....	$0.66	$0.69
1 dozen ivory-handled table knives, practically same size, American make best English steel, English make ordinary steel	.94	7.18	.85	3.65	.....	.....
1 dozen knife blades used for above knives	.63	.55	.445	.40	.....	.....
1 gross green glass spirit bottles, equal capacity and weight	1.88	2.25	1.15	1.91	.....	.....
1 ton (2,240 pounds) Hematite pig iron	1.23	9.43	.79	11.25	.....	.....
1 dozen plain ironstone-china plates, equal size, American make half ounce heavier	.22	.24	.15	.21	.....	.....
1 dozen plain cups and saucers same size, style, and weight	.23	.25	.12	.36	.....	.....

A comparison of the wages of labor employed in woolen manufacture in the United States, England, France, and Italy.

	Italy.	France.	England.	United States.
Sorters	$4.60	$6.40	$7.30	$12.50
Washers or dyers	3.00	4.25	5.00	7.00
Carders	2.30	4.00	3.90	6.00
Gill boxes	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Comb minders	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Boss spinner	7.00	9.25	12.60	18.00
Mule spinner	5.80	6.20	7.30	9.50
Ring spinner	2.30	4.00	3.00	6.00
Weavers	3.00	4.60	4.00	9.00
Fullers and pressers	3.50	4.25	6.00	7.00

If the above tables are correct, and they are correct, and if the Republican protective tariff system is responsible for the great difference in wages received by our wage-earners and those received by wage-earners of Europe, and it certainly is so responsible, then it is beyond me to understand how it is possible for any man who is compelled to earn his bread by toil to so far forget his own interests as to want to change said system. I do not believe, however, that any appreciable number of them do want a change. The American laborer is better educated than his foreign brother. He has better opportunities for acquiring information concerning public affairs than is afforded abroad. He knows the value of the franchise and knows how to exercise it, and can be counted upon to do the right and the intelligent thing when it comes to protecting the protection which protects him.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of the pending measure when amended as I understand it will be when it shall be taken up under the five-minute rule. It contains some schedules I would change, and some I would strike out of the bill if I had my way about it. I would reduce the tariff on some articles in some of the schedules and increase the duty on others. It is not a perfect measure. No tariff bill ever was perfect. None ever will be. But we must have money to meet the expenses of our Government, and I believe the easiest and least burdensome way to raise that money is by the tariff method.

The tariff question has been discussed from the formation of our Government, in season and out of season, down to the present good hour, and I will wager that when time rolls his scroll into internity and Gabriel blows his horn the gentlemen on the other side of this aisle then representing, or misrepresenting, the Democratic party, even though it be then too late, will cry out "Protection! Protection! Protection!"

The way to keep America prosperous is to keep American workmen employed. To do this we must prevent Europe from taking the American market. You can not employ men in European factories to make goods for American consumption without throwing American workmen out of employment. What advantage is there in being able to buy foreign-made goods cheap if to do so we are first compelled to shut off the forge and the loom? What would it profit us to have Europe take our market while we are looking for theirs? The American market is the best in all the world. It amounts to $27,000,000,000 per annum, while the export trade of the world, including the United States, amounts to but twelve billions annually. Do we want to give up the home market and take a chance on the foreign market? I hope not. It does not appeal to me as a wise suggestion. I am opposed to it. My plan is to keep the American workmen employed, pay them good wages, keep them happy, make it possible for them to buy the goods made by their fellow-citizens—make the tariff sufficient to protect the American workman, but not so high as to cause an inflation of prices; to be exact, I should like to see the tariff just enough to make the difference in cost of production at home and abroad so that our workmen can find employment in making goods for home consumption, hold the home market, and thus maintain the present standard of wages and living.

I am a Republican and I believe in protection. I am one of those who believe in taking the responsibility placed upon us by our election. [Applause on the Republican side.] After having done so I shall be glad to submit my case to the good people of my district and abide the result of their verdict, whatever it may be. [Loud applause.]

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; 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.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following privileged report (H. Rept. No. 4) from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 53.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption hereof general debate on H. R. 1438, "A bill to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," shall be closed, and the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of said bill for amendment under the five-minute rule; but committee amendments to any part of the bill shall be in order at any time, and also preference shall be given to amendments to paragraphs 196, 197, 708 (lumber), 581, 447½ (hides), 227 (barley), and 228 (barley malt).

That an amendment shall be voted on to section 637, to wit: Strike out the proviso and insert as a new paragraph, No. 36½, the following: "Crude petroleum and its products, 25 per cent ad valorem."

That said specified amendments shall take precedence of committee amendments.

That consideration of said bill for amendment shall continue until not later than Friday, the 9th day of April, at 3 o'clock p. m., at which time the said bill, with all amendments that shall have been recommended by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, shall be reported to the House, and the previous question shall then be considered as ordered on said amendments and said bill to its engrossment, third reading, and final passage.

A separate vote may be had on the amendments relating to hides, lumber, oil, barley, barley malt, tea, coffee, or any of them, irrespective of their adoption or rejection in Committee of the Whole, and the vote upon all other amendments in gross.

That the daily hour of meeting hereafter shall be 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary that I should occupy the attention of the House for any length of time aside from the time necessary to explain the terms of this rule. The rule relates to the consideration of the tariff bill reported to the House some two weeks or more ago. The first thing it provides is that general debate, which has continued for two weeks, shall now be closed. The next thing it provides for is amendments, to be considered in Committee of the Whole, and those amendments are of two classes: First, amendments reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. These amendments are to be in order to any part of the bill at any time. Second, amendments relating to certain paragraphs in the bill covering subjects that have been considered of primary importance and of exceptional interest to the Members of the House, to wit, hides, barley, barley malt, lumber, and the two subjects which will be included in the amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means, tea and coffee.

Special provision is made for the consideration of an amendment to paragraph 637, the proviso to which paragraph reads as follows:

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

Mr. Speaker, the amendment to that paragraph, provided for in the rule, is to strike out the proviso and insert the following:

Crude petroleum and its products, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Of course the effect of that amendment is to allow our own people to fix what shall be the duty upon petroleum in any given instance, or indeed in all instances, rather than to allow the amount of that duty to be fixed, as it would be in the bill reported, by some other country.

The consideration of these amendments will engage the attention of the House up until Friday next at 3 o'clock, during which time the House will be engaged in their discussion. At that time, the bill, together with such amendments as may have been adopted by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, will be reported to the House, the previous question will be considered as ordered upon the amendments, on the engrossment and third reading of the bill, and on the bill to its final passage. There will, however, be permitted in the House a record vote upon the various subjects that are made amendable in the bill, without regard to whether or not those amendments have been voted up or voted down in the Committee of the Whole.

The hour of meeting has been changed from 10 o'clock in the morning until the ordinary hour of 12 o'clock noon.

I reserve the balance of my time and yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the status of this tariff bill before the House is this: We have discussed the bill for two weeks under general debate. I believe there is a concensus of opinion in favor of closing general debate. I know that there is no opposition on this side of the House to that portion of the resolution that seeks to close general debate, but it is not necessary to bring before this House a special rule to close general debate. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the chairman of the committee, had been willing this morning, he could have moved in the House to close general debate, and close it by unanimous consent of this House. So that the only proposition that comes before us to vote upon on which there is a difference of opinion is how we shall consider the bill. General debate is no consideration of the bill.

The rules of this House for a hundred years have recognized that when you come to consider a great appropriation bill or a great revenue bill the only way the House can express the sentiments of the country and the Members can express the sentiments of their constituencies, is to consider the items contained in the bill item by item. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is impossible to get a consensus of this House or an expression of the opinion of the country by voting en bloc for a tariff bill, as much so as if it was a general appropriation bill. Recognizing that, to some extent the Committee on Rules has very graciously said to the House that on some particular amendments, which we will point out to you, you may have an opportunity to cast your vote, and try to voice the expressions and the wishes of your constituencies. But, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of this House, under the law that the Republican party has fixed for the government of this House, the membership of the House have been guaranteed that great appropriation bill and great revenue bills shall be considered item by item.

There has been no effort made in this debate or the consideration of this bill, either in the committee or in the House, since the 11th day of last November to in any way delay or hamper its passage by the minority Members of the House. The Democracy represented on this committee has been willing to drive the bill to its final passage at the earliest hour it could be done, with a fair and reasonable consideration of the items in the bill. Last June, before this House adjourned, I called the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to the fact that we were ready to sit here all summer and prepare a tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, our Republican friends are to be congratulated that at last you have been able to frame a rule which satisfies the insurgents in your own ranks. You do not dare to bring in a rule, as has been stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], which will allow a vote upon all the sections of this bill. It may be presumed, therefore, that your proposed rule satisfies the demands of the heretofore clamorous and discordant elements in your own ranks. How you propose to put this bill through will be developed hereafter. The air is full of rumors. It is even claimed by those in charge of the bill that they are assured of Democratic support. Let it be understood here and now that this bill represents all of the viciousness and discrimination of the protective-tariff system, and no Democrat can consistently vote for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But it is rumored that you are expecting help from this side of the Chamber because your bill satisfies the demands of certain districts. Let us hope that there is no gentleman on this side of the Chamber who has been "satisfied" so far as the demands of his district are concerned to that point which will constrain him to support such a vicious measure as this. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This bill represents the fundamental difference between the two parties struggling for ascendency in this Nation, and gentlemen who support the bill belong on that side of the Chamber and not on this. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I can not understand that code of ethics which constrains any gentleman to say, "Because the bill has satisfied me and my district I will support the measure, no matter what its effect may be upon the interests of other districts and the American people generally." That is selfish greed run to seed.

I can conceive of no position more brutal in its disregard for the rights of others, or more corrupting as an example of legislative conduct. As well might the member of a caravan, banded together for mutual protection crossing a desert, attacked by a band of Arabs, say to the chief of the attacking band, "If you will give me part of the booty, I will surrender to you all of my companions." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would commend to gentlemen, if there be those who entertain any such intention, the spirit of that great man, Robert E. Lee, who, when the supreme hour came, put aside the allurements of place and power and cast his lot with the weaker side; not, indeed, because he was a southern man, but because the voice of duty called him there. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would use some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. I prefer the gentleman would use all his time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not fair.

Mr. DALZELL. I think it is fair enough.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you are going to have one speech, it is fair; but it seems to me if you are going to have more than one, you ought to use part of your time now.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN]. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I trust that every man in this House will understand that I realize full well the meaning of this resolution and the effect it is likely to have, if adopted, upon the mighty lumber and coal interests of my home district. But, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, above and beyond the local interests of my own district there rises the welfare of the entire ninety millions of people in this Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.] Therefore let me pass by for a moment my own personal interest and speak of the welfare of the Nation at large.

We are here to pass the Payne tariff bill. To-day this great Nation of ninety millions of people and all its mighty industries, aggregating in value untold thousands of millions of dollars, is standing idle, waiting, resting its industrial sinews and holding its commercial breath, waiting for the passage of this tariff bill that will lift from athwart its pathway a shadow. These industries are willing and anxious to move on, and all they ask is that before they start the pathway along which they are to go shall be lighted by law, and then they will, as best they can, adjust their business to the prescribed conditions.

Even a bad bill is better than no bill; even an imperfect bill passed soon is better than interminable delay and prolonged uncertainty.

The question now before this House is the adoption of this resolution, which will enable this House to pass the Payne tariff bill and send it over to the Senate. We must pass this or a similar resolution to enable us to pass this bill. Every man with two ideas above the intellectual level of a chimpanzee knows that if we do not pass this or a similar rule to limit time and expedite matters, we will still be talking and still considering while spring blossoms into summer and summer dwindles into winter. And in the meantime the vast industrial energy of this Nation will be waiting, waiting, waiting. And when everybody gets to waiting, that constitutes industrial paralysis.

I do not claim to be wiser or more patriotic than my political brethren on this floor, but I, for one, want to see this tariff bill passed, and passed soon, whether it exactly suits me

or not. It ill becomes any man to set up his own little interest against the great and overpowering welfare of this Nation at large. Speaking for myself alone, I thank God that my Republicanism is a little deeper than my selfishness. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I shall vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

Now, what is the present situation, so far as my especial and particular interest in this bill is concerned?

The Ways and Means Committee have reported into this House this great tariff bill, and it is conceded by most Republicans here that that committee have done the best they could considering the necessities of the United States Treasury on the one hand and the welfare of the consumer on the other. The committee felt that it was necessary to make some reductions in the tariff on some items, but they have endeavored to treat all industries with fairness.

In this bill as it now stands that committee have cut the tariff on lumber right square in two, in the middle, and they have cut off the 67 cents per ton tariff on coal and placed coal on the free list.

Considering that lumber and coal are two of the biggest industries in my region, do not you think that by these sacrifices I have already contributed about as much to the general welfare as ought to be asked of any man or any region?

But there are men on this floor—on the Republican side—whose industries have not been touched and are still afforded ample protection in this bill, and these men are now demanding that what little protection to lumber now remains in this bill shall be wiped off. They have threatened to hang the country up by the heels and let it dangle till the dog days come while they talk tariff unless lumber is hit another blow.

They are willing to accept this bill in its present form with all the protection it gives to their own interests, but they demand an opportunity to vote to place lumber on the free list, while at the same time their industries are sheltered behind the protection afforded by this bill. That is a pathetic exhibition of supreme selfishness.

I know that they have demanded the peculiar language of this resolution in order to aid them in smiting lumber, which is the big industry in my district. If I consent to this programme, I want you to know that I am not so stupid that I do not understand it, but it is because I put my patriotism and my regard for the welfare of my country above my selfishness. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago I lived in the then Territory of Wyoming. Those were the days of which Eugene Field sang—

When money flowed like likker, 'nd the folks wuz brave 'nd true.

The enterprising citizens of those days and that region had a way of expediting justice that was mighty swift; they frequently hung a man first, and made up the court record afterwards. [Laughter.]

There was a certain old settler in that region whose front name in his lifetime was "Bill," although I do not now recall that there is any name on his tombstone.

Bill was engaged in the business of raising cattle, and he prospered marvelously. The only cow brute he had on earth in the beginning was one old brindle steer. But he turned that old steer out on the range in the fall, and the next spring he branded a thousand head of calves as the natural increase. [Great laughter and applause.]

Yes; Bill was prospering, and all went merry as a marriage bell until one night—one dark night—a vigilance committee called on Bill without the formality of an engraved invitation.

They called old Bill out of the cabin and put a noose around his neck with a facility made perfect by long practice [laughter], and the leader then said to him:

Bill, we are going to hang you; what have you got to say about it?

Old Bill rolled his quid into the other cheek and said:

Well, gentlemen, I s'pose I've got more interest in this performance than ary other gent present, but I am the least enthusiastic over the programme.

[Great laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, that describes exactly my feelings in this present situation. [Renewed laughter.]

When I look around over this polite political vigilance committee gathered together in this Hall, I think I realize that you are about to confiscate my lumber industry and at the same time lead me to the political scaffold. Permit me, as my farewell message, to say to you, that—

I have more interest in this performance than ary other gent present, but I am the least enthusiastic over the programme.

[Great laughter.]

A great many men on this floor who come from prairie States hug to their breasts the delusion that they can get cheap lumber for their communities, and that the price of agricultural products will still remain high. Do not think it for a minute!

If you smite the lumber business of the United States, the recoil of that blow will stagger every interest that you think you are representing when you vote for free lumber.

Let me give you in about a dozen words a word picture of the size of the lumber industry—as I know it to be:

In my own State of Washington the lumber business is enormous. We have in that State 1,309 sawmills, employing 110,000 men. We pay out every year in wages to those men the enormous sum of $75,000,000. The total capital invested in sawmills and machinery in the State of Washington (not including standing timber or logging roads or lumber vessels) is the stupendous sum of $160,000,000.

In the entire United States, the figures showing the total of the lumber business are still more astounding. In the United States there is over $600,000,000 invested in the sawmill industry. There are employed in the United States in the lumber industry over 800,000 men, with an annual pay roll to labor of $200,000,000. There are 28,000 sawmills in the United States, scattered from ocean to ocean.

When you think you can strike down the lumber industry of this Nation without any serious consequence, I bid you think of those 800,000 laboring men scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land—and if they can not have work, they will not have bread. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time did I occupy, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has occupied ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I mean personally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has an hour.

Mr. DALZELL. I know; but how much time personally did I occupy?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used five minutes personally and yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN].

Mr. DALZELL. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the refusal of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to yield me part of the time that was to go to him compels me to seek time from the same source from which he takes his. Whatever differences I may have with my party associates in this House I shall settle at an appropriate time, and, I think, to my own satisfaction. At this time I desire to discuss this proposed rule.

I concede, Mr. Speaker, the obligation of the majority to prepare a tariff bill in accordance with their theory of a tariff measure and to enact it into law in that shape in which they believe it should be enacted. The pending bill is entitled:

An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

If this bill did any of the things which it purports to do, I should not find so much fault with the majority for attempting to prevent the House perfecting it as it should be perfected. But this bill does not do any of the things purported in its title. It does not raise the revenue required, because, for the first time in the history of the country, a tariff bill provides for the issuance of $290,000,000 of interest-bearing obligations of the Government to provide revenue sufficient to run the Government. In no other tariff bill ever enacted has this been done. Under the war revenue act of 1898 only $15,000,000 of 3 per cent certificates of indebtedness were issued, not for the purpose of raising revenue to defray the expenses of the Government, but to enable the administration to help out the speculative interests in the country during the panic last year. This bill contemplates the issuance, not of $100,000,000 of 3 per cent certificates as were provided in that act, but the issuance of $250,000,000 of 3 per cent certificates, and forty million Panama Canal bonds, and taken in consideration with the attitude of the administration in the curtailing of expenses, it must be apparent that the most extraordinary expenditures ever contemplated must be in the minds of some people.

The bill does not equalize duties, Mr. Speaker. When it was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means there was no stampede of the idle rich to this Capitol from the golf courses or from the balmy summer resorts in the South, where they spend the winter months. Confident that the tariff was to be revised by its friends, this Capitol has seen a complete absence of the great magnates representing combined corporate wealth in this country.

I speak, with my associates, on behalf of the great consuming public of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We ask you not to revise this iniquitous tariff law in the interest of those who have been the beneficiaries, but in the interest of

those who have been suffering under its inequalities for years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Speaker has recently said, and his statement has been repeated on the floor of this House, that every day this bill is delayed in this Congress the business interests of the country suffer at the rate of $10,000,000 a day. Mr. Speaker, I much prefer that the business interests of this country should continue to suffer at the rate of $10,000,000 a day for two or three months than that the great toiling masses of the country should be for ten or fifteen years more subjected to the same inequalities and burdens under which they have labored for twelve years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My position upon a tariff measure is easily stated. I believe it is in harmony with the historic Democratic doctrine. I should enact a law which would raise sufficient revenue to meet the expenditures of the Government economically conducted. I should place all raw materials upon the free list. In distributing the burdens, I would place them upon luxuries and not upon necessities. In adjusting the rates of duties upon those articles upon which duties were imposed, I would endeavor to equalize the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I rejoice that I was a party to a measure which will enable the Democratic party to place itself squarely on record as to its position on tariff legislation before the bill is enacted into law. My colleague from New York [Mr. HARRISON] has already in detail pointed out those things which he believes and I believe should be incorporated into the motion to recommit to be made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. And let me say that, with many millions of others of the people of this country, I await with expectation and hope the form in which that motion to recommit will be framed, confident that the Democratic party as now controlled and represented here will not fail to meet the expectations of the millions of suffering toilers throughout the country when the time comes to record the Democracy upon what should be in a tariff bill. Mr. Speaker, I can not believe that my party will fail to take advantage of this opportunity, and I rejoice that the country will have squarely before it the position of the two parties upon the tariff for the first time in twelve or fourteen years.

I have that confidence in the House of Representatives that if I had my way I would be willing to permit this bill to be considered section by section, item by item, so that the people's Representatives might have an opportunity properly to discharge their duties. I shall await with some curiosity to see how those who were recently professing themselves as anxious to relieve this House from a so-called "system of tyrannical rules" will vote at this time upon this rule. If they are as anxious as they professed to be less than three weeks ago, this rule can not be adopted, and this House will be placed in a position where it can carry out the mandates of the American people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL].

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill was prepared and written in secret, and the rule proposed here to-day is for the purpose of preventing its proper consideration. I oppose the adoption of this rule and defend the rights of the people. The Committee on Rules intend to prevent an exposure of the hidden frauds, commonly called the "jokers," in the bill, and to render impossible any improvement of the measure. The Constitution imposes upon you and me, as representatives of the people, the duty of making the tariff law. You know that it is impossible for the House of Representatives to pass on the items in this bill unless they consider it section by section. No opportunity is given under this rule to so consider it, but only to vote on and discuss committee amendments and a few other specific items, namely, lumber, hides, barley, and barley malt.

Also, it gives us the right to vote to retain the present duty on petroleum or to tax it 25 per cent. It means to cover up inequalities in the bill. It means that the Representatives here on this floor will not have the right to have written in the bill what they desire to contain. They must stand for extortion, and not to give simple, fair, honest provision for the good of the whole people. [Applause.] You can not cast an intelligent vote in the way required by the rule. If this bill is passed through the House in bulk the Senate will be compelled to make the bill instead of the House of Representatives. The Constitution gives us the right and imposes upon us the duty to make the revenue laws. Will you shirk that duty for party advantage? Will you nullify that right? Will you permit the special and favored interests to frame this law for their own advantage? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This rule will save a little time. It will help pass this bill sooner; but, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that for every hour you save by its adoption in preventing amendments under the five-minute rule you will cover up some nefarious scheme that even the majority on that side of the House would not favor if they understood it. The bill is full of fraud and deception. I challenge gentlemen on that side to meet us on that proposition. We will give to them an opportunity to answer whether that charge is true or false, if they will consider the paragraphs in their order. If you, gentlemen, stand here and vote for a gag rule and prevent consideration and amendments when the charge is made here openly by us on this side of the House by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, you will be called to answer to the people for your unfaithfulness.

If you follow the Republican machine in this House, and the Senate fails to protect the country, the new law will pour more money into the coffers of the trusts and cause more wrong and misery than even the present law you have faithfully promised to revise. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as much as I dislike the wording of this rule, I am going to vote for it. I want to say to the gentlemen on this side of the House who have been for several days demanding that certain provisions should be put into this rule before they would vote for it—I say to you, gentlemen, some of you from the States of Minnesota, and Iowa, and from Kansas, that you are not good Republicans. [Laughter.] You are not good protectionists. [Applause.] You are demanding protection for an industry directly in your representative district, and demanding free trade on the products of another State, your neighbor.

Ah, gentlemen, the man who will demand free trade on his raw material that is his neighbor's finished product, and ask protection on his own finished product, is a statesman in the great structure of American politics about the size of a 2 by 4, the smallest timber in the structure. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is your size, no matter who you are. You demand protection to barley. One gentleman from the State of Minnesota said he could not vote for a rule that did not give more duty on barley than 15 cents per bushel. There was produced in that great State last year but 172,000 bushels of barley, about $75,000 or $100,000 worth. He is demanding more protection to barley, but he wants free trade on that great and magnificent industry, the lumber industry, which amounts in volume to nearly $800,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Measure your patriotism, figure it out yourselves, whatever it may be, and you will find in the arena of American politics you are not larger than a fly speck on the map of the world. [Applause.] Gentlemen, the country is demanding prompt action on this tariff bill, so that the business world may go forward, and I am generous enough to say that I will submit my case to the Members of this House and to the people of the country and show my patriotism in my desire to enact this tariff bill into law at the earliest possible moment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, to offer a motion to recommit on a tariff bill with instructions is no new performance. On the McKinley bill Mr. Carlisle offered a motion to recommit with instructions. On the Wilson bill Mr. Converse offered a motion to recommit with instructions. On the Dingley bill Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, offered a motion to recommit with instructions. Following those illustrious examples, at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit with instructions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The situation about this matter is this: I am against this rule and every rule like it. My position is that the humblest man in this House, the veriest congressional tenderfoot here, has a right to offer an amendment to any item in this bill from A to Z. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He has as much right as the chairman of the committee has or as I have. It is the only way that a tariff bill can be thoroughly considered and presented to the country. Now, what does this rule do, in brief? It fixes certain amendments to be offered. Then it gives a majority of the Ways and Means Committee a right to offer an amendment here at any time about anything, but no other Member is to be permitted to offer any sort of amendment. That is unjust, unfair, un-American, and preposterous. If gentlemen want to tie their own hands, let them do it; I will not. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when you go back to your constituents do not be so cowardly as to undertake to load the whole of this indefensible transaction onto the man who occupies the Speaker's chair. [Applause.] You can not defend yourselves by that trick. Like Saul at the stoning of Stephen, you stand by, consenting, when you vote for this rule. You thereby make yourselves parties to

taking away from yourselves the right to freely offer amendments.

I said twice in my speech that the Democrats did not want to waste an hour and that we did not want general debate, but we wanted to amend the bill. Two weeks ago last Friday I took the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee out into the lobby before the debate began and offered to waive every minute of the general debate if they would let us at the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I told him that all we wanted was a chance to amend it, and that I would cooperate with him to prevent any waste of time. Thirteen days have rolled by. Many good speeches have been made. They might as well have been made on the top of Pikes Peak for all the effect they have had, except to drive the majority into bringing in a few amendments, such as putting tea and coffee on the free list. We did that much good, anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, these amendments are not sufficient; we have a right to have a vote upon the question whether that outrageous raise in hosiery shall stay in this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have a right to say whether steel rails shall go upon the free list. These amendments that are picked out by the men on this committee are no more important than a hundred that I could stand here and enumerate. For instance, that outrageous raise on gloves, made for the benefit of one lone glove maker in the city of Johnstown, N. Y. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why should we not have a crack at the prohibitive rates on woolen goods in this country, that are consumed everywhere? I could name 100 more, if I had time, but I have only five minutes.

I know you have 47 majority. I know you will get a little aid and comfort over on our side—but very little. You postponed this rule from last Thursday, when you had us here to vote on a rule, down to the present minute, because you did not have enough votes to pass it, and in order that you might trade and traffic, bulldoze and wheedle and coax enough men back onto the reservation, like the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], to get this rule through. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my brethren on this side of the House that we will be held responsible for this bill before the people of the country. That fact has weighed upon the members of your committee in the preparation of the bill, and every fact has been sought, every source of information has been tried in order that we might present a bill that would do simple justice to the people of the United States—to the consumer and the laborer—that we might so adjust the balance of duties in this bill that no man might be deprived for a moment of his right to labor, and no man or woman might be deprived of the right to buy a good article in the market, made by American workmen, at the lowest possible price. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Responsibility on the other side of the aisle is different. It is theirs to criticise and not to construct. They gave out after the close of the hearings that they were to consult, that they were to formulate a bill, that they were to astonish the country with the excellence of their tariff ideas. They did nothing during the months we were at work, and when we brought in our bill they said they had had no time to consider it. They had every moment of the day and of the night that we had for the months that we spent in our deliberations; and if they had used the same diligence, if they had used the same courage, if they had used the same patriotism, they would have presented to the country their ideas in a tariff bill.

The bill came before the House and before the country and was open to criticism. The gentleman says we have spent too much time in general debate. I do not believe he has even read the general debate. There has been much that is valuable said on the floor and some criticism that was just on the bill and some criticism that was grossly unjust. It has been met by counter argument; but the bill still remains, gentlemen, as it was presented to this House, and the fact remains that the great mass of the Republicans in this House at this moment are willing to vote for this bill with a few amendments that have been placed upon it by the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We can not satisfy every interest. The gentleman complains of hosiery; and I want to say to you gentlemen on this side, that there is not a single protected item in this bill that is better justified than the increase of duty on hosiery put into this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They complain of gloves. Yet it is precisely the case that we had in tin plate twenty years ago, when we followed the leadership of William McKinley and created that magnificent industry employing 25,000 of our people; and twelve years ago, under the leadership of Mr. Dingley, when we imposed the duties on men's gloves. We were making about 5 per cent, and to-day we are making 90 per cent of men's gloves. [Applause on the Republican side.] And they are much cheaper than they were when we put the duty on them. It is as fine a vindication of the idea of protection as was the duty on tin plate.

Now, men that make men's gloves can make women's gloves; and with the same measure of protection that we put on men's gloves we come before you to-day with a bill to put a duty on women's gloves; and when we shall employ 50,000 of our people in making women's gloves for American women to wear, they will be sold as cheaply and cheaper than they are to-day; and the American workmanship will make better gloves than the women are wearing to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen, the country is waiting to have this tariff question settled. They want it settled now. Telegrams and letters are coming to our committee: "Hurry up the passage of the tariff bill." Will you falter, will you delay, because you can not have your own way in everything? Is your judgment better than the judgment of the great mass of the Republicans? Gentlemen, there has never been a moment since I have had a seat in this House that I did not believe that the wisdom of a majority of the Republican party, after full consideration of a question, was better than my own, and I was willing to follow, no matter who led the great mass of Republicans and blazed the way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So, gentlemen, we should surrender our individual opinions, we should surrender for the good of our party, we should surrender for the good of the country. This is the way all great measures are passed in the House of Representatives, and with the Democratic party carping and criticising and ready to do mischief in any way they can. There are a few dissatisfied gentlemen on this side, but I want them to stop and think how many industries they might destroy for want of proper knowledge and information. How many industries might you destroy not only in the whole country, but even in your own congressional district?

Gentlemen are excited here about the duty on barley. The farmers of their districts, they say, want barley put back again to 30 cents. We put it at 15 cents, not on my motion; and yet I venture to say that I have received more resolutions from grangers, more petitions from farmers, asking me to see to it that the duty on barley did not exceed 10 cents a bushel, and under no consideration to go above 15 cents, than resolutions and petitions to the contrary have been received by any other gentleman; and still I cheerfully ask to have put into this rule this provision that you might vote upon barley to satisfy the people of your districts, the farmers who you state are in favor of a greater duty on barley. Gentlemen, look beyond your own districts, look to the future, look to the millions of our people, look to the workingmen, ready for work, and for the sake of the toiling masses hasten the passage of this bill! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the committee. I have only a single word to say in conclusion. The consideration of a tariff bill by a special rule is nothing new in the history of tariff legislation in this country. The McKinley bill was considered under a rule. The Wilson bill was considered under a rule. On the 5th of January, 1894, the Democratic party then being in control of this House, a rule was introduced which provided for the consideration of the tariff bill then pending, known as the "Wilson bill." That rule provided that on January 10, five days thereafter, general debate should close, and on January 25, fifteen days thereafter, the bill should be reported to the House, the previous question considered ordered upon the amendments upon the bill to its engrossment and third reading, and upon its final passage. As a matter of history, the bill was passed without any opportunity afforded to the Members of the House to consider each and every paragraph of the bill. Why, gentlemen on the other side of the House are agonizing to-day because they say that they will have no opportunity to consider this bill item by item.

Mr. Speaker, I recall an historic occasion in this House when a Democratic Speaker, occupying the chair you now occupy, and a Democratic majority being in control of the House, a rule was adopted which, with only fifteen minutes' debate on either side, compelled a vote upon and secured the passage of 637 Senate amendments to the Wilson bill, and that despite the protests of Republicans on this side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] And these are the gentlemen who are to-day agonizing because they shall not have an opportunity

to spend the dog days in Washington considering item by item the paragraphs of a tariff bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a tariff bill made by a Republican committee in response to the call of a Republican President, pursuant to the mandate and in redemption of the pledge of the Republican platform made in Chicago last summer. It is a well-considered bill, a well-matured bill. It appeals not, of course, to the satisfaction of every Republican—no tariff bill made by uninspired human wisdom could be made so perfect as to respond to the desires of all—but it should appeal to every true Republican, because it is a bill drawn along Republican lines in accordance with Republican principles for the protection of American industry and the maintenance of an American wage. And now the country at large stands waiting and asking us not to talk, but to act. I suggest that we act. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The SPEAKER proceeded to put the question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a motion to recommit this rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenues, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report back a substitute for said resolution that will provide for the immediate closing of general debate on said bill and for its immediate consideration under the five-minute rule, so that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to offer amendments to and pass on separately each and every paragraph in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the precedents for the last ten years have been uniform, holding such a motion not in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the Speaker one of his own decisions. [Cries of "Regular order" on the Republican side.] O, just possess your soul in patience over there.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I demanded the previous question. The gentleman has not the floor to make any motion of any kind.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. DALZELL. Even if his motion were in order.

The SPEAKER. Not until after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit if a motion to recommit is in order, the previous question would not take the gentleman off the floor to make that motion.

Mr. DALZELL. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is not entitled to the floor to make his motion; and, furthermore, his motion is not in order. I shall be very glad to see, and I think we all will on this side of the House, the gentleman's motion to recommit the bill when that time comes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You will see that, if you do not go blind before next Friday. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair, without objection, will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All I want to do is to read the rule and read the Speaker's decision:

RULE XVII.

PREVIOUS QUESTION.

There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions, allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

Now for the precedent—page 287, volume 5, Hinds' Precedents, section 5576:

The motion to refer under rule 17 may be made pending the demand for the previous question—

I commend that to the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

on the passage, whether a bill or resolution be under consideration.

Mr. DALZELL. But not applicable to this case.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (reading):

On January 4, 1904, Mr. JAMES HAY of Virginia presented a resolution relating to an investigation of certain alleged misconduct on the part of Members, and after debate thereon moved the previous question.

Pending this question Mr. SERENO E. PAYNE of New York, rising to a parliamentary inquiry, asked when it would be in order to make a motion to recommit the resolution.

The SPEAKER said—

The same Speaker in the chair now—

"The Chair is of the opinion that pending a demand for the previous question the motion which the gentleman indicates would not be in order."

The question was taken on the motion for the previous question, the yeas and nays being ordered. There appeared—yeas 78, nays 78, answering present 9—not a quorum.

Thereupon the House adjourned.

On January 5, when the resolution was again taken up, the Speaker said:

The Chair desires at this time to correct a ruling made by the Chair yesterday. After the previous question had been moved upon this resolution yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] proposed a motion to refer. The Chair had in mind clause 4 of Rule XVI, which is as follows:

"When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motion shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order."

Now, with that rule standing alone, the ruling of the Chair was strictly in accordance with the letter of the rule; but the Chair had overruled Rule XVII, which is as follows—

Just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania overlooked it just now—

There shall be a motion for the previous question, etc.

There is no use quoting it again, as I have already quoted it. Then the Speaker determined, after quoting the rule:

In the opinion of the Chair, if called upon to rule for the first time and harmonize Rule XVI with Rule XVII, the Chair would hold that Rule XVI applies to resolutions and that Rule XVII applies to joint resolutions and bills.

Evidently, under Rule XVII, it was the intention of the House, by the adoption of the same, to give the House an opportunity after a bill had been engrossed and read a third time, if there were accidents, or for any reason it was the sense of the House that the bill ought to be recommitted, to have that opportunity. In practice that motion is in constant use in the ordinary business in the House in cases where the previous question is ordered upon the bill to its passage after the bill has been engrossed and read a third time. But the Chair does not feel at liberty or believe that it would be a correct ruling, in view of the practice of the House heretofore, to so harmonize these two rules. It has been the practice of the House, certainly from the time of Speaker Crisp, to hold that Rule XVII applies to resolutions as well as to bills. That was followed by Speaker Reed and also by Speaker Henderson.

Gentlemen are familiar with that fact, for the reason that in cases of resolutions reported from election committees in the determination of election contests it has been the constant practice after the substitute was voted on to move to recommit with or without instructions. So the practice of the House having been to substantially nullify Rule XVI, and the Chair not feeling at liberty to depart from that practice, so far as the motion to commit is concerned, holds that under Rule XVII it is in order, pending a motion for the previous question upon a resolution, or after the previous question upon the resolution has been ordered, either, at the election of the House to commit the resolution.

The Chair thought proper to call the attention of the House promptly to the error that the Chair fell into yesterday.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt at all that in a proper case a motion to recommit may be made after the ordering of the previous question, but I call the attention of the Chair to paragraph 61 of Rule XI, which reads:

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of.

Now I call the attention of the Speaker to a ruling in the Fifty-second Congress, a Democratic Congress, and in the Fifty-third Congress, also a Democratic Congress, where Speaker Crisp ruled:

Pending a report from the Committee on Rules, one motion to adjourn is in order, and thereafter no other dilatory motion, even of the highest privilege, is in order.

And also in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third Congresses, Mr. Speaker Crisp said:

The former practice of entertaining the question of consideration against a report of the Committee on Rules was reversed.

But without regard to these cases, I call your attention to a ruling that is right in point, as follows:

Pending the motion for or after the previous question is ordered on a report from the Committee on Rules, the motion to recommit is not admitted under the more recent practice of the House, although the rulings conflict.

That was ruled by Speaker Crisp and by several Speakers since, and that is the identical question that is now before the Chair and is decisive of the question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair quite agrees with the ruling that the Chair made on the motion then pending. But the Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the fact that while the Chair ruled properly in that case, yet that ruling does not cover this motion. It is not a universal rule. This is a report from the Committee on Rules, and the same question was raised in the speakership of Mr. Speaker Crisp, as follows:

On March 28, 1894, the previous question had been ordered on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules fixing times for the consideration of the contested-election cases of O'Neill *v.* Joy, from Missouri, and English *v.* Hillborn, from California.

Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, moved to recommit the pending resolution to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to so modify the resolution that an additional vote might be had in the Joy case on the question of ordering a new election, if the House should determine that the facts required one, and with instructions to allow a suitable time for discussion.

Mr. Joseph H. Outhwaite, of Ohio, made the point of order that a motion to recommit a report of the Committee on Rules was not now in order.

The Speaker sustained the point of order, holding as follows:

"In the first place, ordinarily, under all parliamentary rules with which the Chair has any acquaintance, except the system under which we are now operating, a motion to recommit is not in order after the previous question is demanded or ordered. A motion to recommit is simply another method of permitting the House to amend, and under ordinary rules the right of amendment is cut off by the previous question. The House has, however, a provision in its rules that even pending the demand for the previous question or after it is ordered a motion to recommit may be in order.

"Rule XI provides that 'It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and pending the consideration thereof the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced, he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of.

"Now, the purpose of the rule, as disclosed by the language which has been read, was that on reports from the Committee on Rules the House should have the right, without delay and without motions tending to delay, to dispose of such report. The language is similar to that used in reference to motions to suspend the rules; and the Chair is aware that there may be some embarrassment at times because of the distinction between a report from the Committee on Rules and a motion to suspend the rules. But take the case now before the House. The Chair has no doubt that it is within the power of the House to amend a report from the Committee on Rules. The Chair has never entertained any doubt about that. If the House should vote down the demand for the previous question, then this report could be amended.

"The idea that the Chair has always had in enforcing this new rule was so to construe it as to permit the House to vote without delay upon the final proposition, either as reported by the committee or as agreed upon by the House if the House should choose to amend it.

"Now, the House has ordered the previous question. What does the previous question mean? It means that the House shall proceed to vote upon the proposition on which it is ordered. If a motion to recommit is in order, perhaps a motion to lay on the table might be in order; and the effect of both these motions, whatever the motive of the mover might be, would be to delay the House in reaching a final vote on the proposition before it, and on which the House has expressed a desire for a final vote by ordering the previous question. The Chair has always held, in construing the rule, that any motion which would tend to prevent the House from a speedy vote upon the final proposition is not in order.

"The Chair holds that on a report from the Committee on Rules, when the previous question has been ordered, it is not in order to move to recommit to the committee. The Chair thus holds the more willingly because the matter is entirely in the power of the House. If the House desires to amend or alter in any respect a report of this character, it need only vote down a demand for the previous question, and then the whole field of amendment is open; the report can be altered in any way to suit the wishes of the House.

"In other words, the Chair accepts the ordering of the previous question as an expression of the desire of the majority of the House to vote upon the resolution as it stood when the previous question was called upon it. Therefore, the Chair holds that the motion to commit is not in order."

This ruling of Mr. Speaker Crisp has been four times, the Chair is reminded, sustained by Mr. Speaker Henderson, and the present occupant of the chair has on two occasions followed the rulings of Mr. Speaker Crisp and Mr. Speaker Henderson; so that while the Chair now admits the correctness of the ruling that he made in the case read by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as applying to ordinary resolutions, he calls the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is not an ordinary resolution. The Chair now reads from the Manual, page 273, at the bottom, the rule that was adopted in the Congress presided over by Mr. Speaker Crisp, as follows:

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of.

And under that rule these decisions were made by Mr. Speaker Crisp, by Mr. Speaker Henderson, and the present occupant of the chair. It is an exception under the express rule to the ordinary practice arising under Rules XVI and XVII.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 180, answered "present" 1, not voting 11, as follows:

YEAS—196.

Alexander, N. Y.	Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Payne
Allen	Estopinal	Kennedy, Ohio	Pearre
Ames	Fairchild	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Perkins
Anthony	Fassett	Knapp	Plumley
Barchfeld	Fish	Knowland	Pratt
Barclay	Focht	Kronmiller	Pray
Barnard	Foelker	Küstermann	Prince
Bartholdt	Fordney	Lafean	Pujo
Bates	Foss	Langham	Reeder
Bennet, N. Y.	Foster, Vt.	Langley	Reynolds
Bennett, Ky.	Foulkrod	Law	Roberts
Bingham	Fowler	Lawrence	Rodenberg
Boutell	Fuller	Longworth	Scott
Bradley	Gaines	Lorimer	Sheffield
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Loud	Simmons
Brownlow	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Lovering	Smith, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garner, Pa.	Lowden	Smith, Iowa
Burleigh	Gillett	Lundin	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Goebel	McCall	Snapp
Calder	Graff	McCreary	Southwick
Calderhead	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Sperry
Campbell	Grant	McKinlay, Cal.	Stafford
Capron	Greene	McKinley, Ill.	Steenerson
Chapman	Griest	McKinney	Sterling
Cocks, N. Y.	Gronna	McLachlan, Cal.	Stevens, Minn.
Cole	Guernsey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sturgiss
Cook	Hamer	McMorran	Sulloway
Cooper, Pa.	Hamilton	Madden	Swasey
Cowles	Hanna	Madison	Tawney
Creager	Hawley	Malby	Taylor, Ohio
Crumpacker	Hayes	Mann	Tener
Currier	Heald	Martin, S. Dak.	Thistlewood
Cushman	Henry, Conn.	Miller, Kans.	Thomas, Ohio
Dalzell	Higgins	Miller, Minn.	Tilson
Davidson	Hill	Millington	Tirrell
Davis	Hollingsworth	Mondell	Townsend
Denby	Howell, N. J.	Moon, Pa.	Volstead
Diekema	Howell, Utah	Moore, Pa.	Vreeland
Dodds	Howland	Morehead	Wanger
Douglas	Hubbard, W. Va.	Morgan, Mo.	Washburn
Draper	Huff	Morgan, Okla.	Weeks
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Mudd	Wickliffe
Durey	Hull, Iowa	Needham	Wiley
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Nye	Wood, N. J.
Edwards, Ky.	Johnson, Ohio	Olcott	Woodyard
Ellis	Joyce	Olmsted	Young, Mich.
Elvins	Kahn	Palmer, H. W.	Young, N. Y.
Englebright	Keifer	Parker	The Speaker

NAYS—180.

Adair	Dies	James	Pickett
Adamson	Dixon, Ind.	Jamieson	Poindexter
Aiken	Edwards, Ga.	Johnson, Ky.	Pou
Alexander, Mo.	Ellerbe	Johnson, S. C.	Rainey
Anderson	Ferris	Jones	Randell, Tex.
Ansberry	Finley	Kellher	Ransdell, La.
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Kendall	Rauch
Austin	Flood, Va.	Kinkead, N. J.	Reid
Barnhart	Floyd, Ark.	Kitchin	Richardson
Bartlett, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Kopp	Robinson
Bartlett, Nev.	Gallagher	Korbly	Rothermel
Beall, Tex.	Garner, Tex.	Lamb	Rucker, Colo.
Bell, Ga.	Garrett	Lassiter	Rucker, Mo.
Booher	Gill, Md.	Latta	Sabath
Borland	Gillespie	Lee	Saunders
Bowers	Glass	Lenroot	Shackleford
Brantley	Godwin	Lever	Sharp
Burgess	Goldfogle	Lindbergh	Sheppard
Burleson	Good	Lindsay	Sherley
Burnett	Gordon	Livingston	Sherwood
Byrd	Goulden	Lloyd	Sims
Byrns	Graham, Ill.	McDermott	Sisson
Candler	Gregg	McHenry	Slayden
Cantrill	Griggs	Macon	Small
Carlin	Hamill	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, Tex.
Carter	Hamlin	Martin, Colo.	Sparkman
Cary	Hammond	Maynard	Spight
Clark, Fla.	Hardwick	Mays	Stanley
Clark, Mo.	Hardy	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Clayton	Harrison	Moore, Tex.	Sulzer
Cline	Haugen	Morrison	Talbott
Collier	Hay	Morse	Taylor, Ala.
Conry	Heflin	Moss	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Helm	Murdock	Thomas, Ky.
Covington	Henry, Tex.	Nelson	Thomas, N. C.
Cox, Ind.	Hinshaw	Nicholls	Tou Velle
Cox, Ohio	Hitchcock	Norris	Underwood
Craig	Hobson	O'Connell	Wallace
Cravens	Houston	Oldfield	Watkins
Cullop	Howard	Padgett	Webb
Dawson	Hubbard, Iowa	Page	Weisse
De Armond	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer, A. M.	Willett
Dent	Hughes, N. J.	Parsons	Wilson, Ill.
Denver	Hull, Tenn.	Patterson	Wilson, Pa.
Dickson, Miss.	Humphreys, Miss.	Peters	Woods, Iowa

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Andrus

NOT VOTING—11.

Boehne	Driscoll, D. A.	Murphy	Russell
Coudrey	Fornes	Rhinock	Wheeler
Crow	Gill, Mo.	Riordan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. RUSSELL.

Until further notice:

Mr. CROW with Mr. BOEHNE.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. FORNES.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. GILL of Missouri.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 178, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

YEAS—195.

Alexander, N. Y.	Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Payne
Allen	Estopinal	Kennedy, Ohio	Pearre
Ames	Fairchild	Knapp	Perkins
Anthony	Fassett	Knowland	Plumley
Barchfeld	Fish	Kopp	Pratt
Barclay	Focht	Kronmiller	Pray
Barnard	Foelker	Küstermann	Prince
Bartholdt	Fordney	Lafean	Pujo
Bates	Foss	Langham	Reeder
Bennet, N. Y.	Foster, Vt.	Langley	Reynolds
Bennett, Ky.	Foulkrod	Law	Roberts
Bingham	Fowler	Lawrence	Rodenberg
Boutell	Fuller	Longworth	Scott
Bradley	Gaines	Lorimer	Sheffield
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Loud	Simmons
Brownlow	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Lovering	Smith, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garner, Pa.	Lowden	Smith, Iowa
Burleigh	Gillett	Lundin	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Goebel	McCall	Snapp
Calder	Graff	McCreary	Southwick
Calderhead	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Sperry
Campbell	Grant	McKinlay, Cal.	Stafford
Capron	Greene	McKinley, Ill.	Steenerson
Chapman	Griest	McKinney	Sterling
Cocks, N. Y.	Gronna	McLachlan, Cal.	Stevens, Minn.
Cole	Guernsey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sturgiss
Cook	Hamer	McMorran	Sulloway
Cooper, Pa.	Hamilton	Madden	Swasey
Cowles	Hanna	Madison	Tawney
Creager	Hawley	Malby	Taylor, Ohio
Crumpacker	Hayes	Mann	Tener
Currier	Heald	Martin, S. Dak.	Thomas, Ohio
Cushman	Henry, Conn.	Miller, Kans.	Tilson
Dalzell	Higgins	Miller, Minn.	Tirrell
Davidson	Hill	Millington	Townsend
Davis	Hollingsworth	Mondell	Volstead
Denby	Howell, N. J.	Moon, Pa.	Vreeland
Diekema	Howell, Utah	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Dodds	Howland	Morehead	Washburn
Douglas	Hubbard, W. Va.	Morgan, Mo.	Weeks
Draper	Huff	Morgan, Okla.	Wickliffe
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Mudd	Wiley
Durey	Hull, Iowa	Needham	Wilson, Ill.
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Nye	Wood, N. J.
Edwards, Ky.	Johnson, Ohio	Olcott	Woodyard
Ellis	Joyce	Olmsted	Young, N. Y.
Elvins	Kahn	Palmer, H. W.	The Speaker
Englebright	Keifer	Parker	

NAYS—178.

Adair	Craig	Hardy	Lloyd
Adamson	Cravens	Harrison	McDermott
Aiken	Cullop	Haugen	McHenry
Alexander, Mo.	Dawson	Hay	Macon
Anderson	De Armond	Heflin	Maguire, Nebr.
Ansberry	Dent	Helm	Martin, Colo.
Ashbrook	Denver	Henry, Tex.	Maynard
Austin	Dickson, Miss.	Hinshaw	Mays
Barnhart	Dies	Hitchcock	Moon, Tenn.
Bartlett, Ga.	Dixon, Ind.	Hobson	Moore, Tex.
Bartlett, Nev.	Edwards, Ga.	Houston	Morrison
Beall, Tex.	Ellerbe	Howard	Morse
Bell, Ga.	Ferris	Hubbard, Iowa	Moss
Booher	Finley	Hughes, Ga.	Murdock
Bowers	Fitzgerald	Hughes, N. J.	Nelson
Brantley	Flood	Hull, Tenn.	Nicholls
Burgess	Floyd	Humphreys, Miss.	Norris
Burleson	Foster, Ill.	James	O'Connell
Burnett	Gallagher	Jamieson	Oldfield
Byrd	Garner, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett
Byrns	Garrett	Johnson, S. C.	Page
Candler	Gill, Md.	Jones	Palmer, A. M.
Cantrill	Gillespie	Kelliher	Parsons
Carlin	Glass	Kendall	Patterson
Carter	Godwin	Kinkead, N. J.	Peters
Cary	Goldfogle	Kitchin	Pickett
Clark, Fla.	Good	Korbly	Poindexter
Clark, Mo.	Gordon	Lamb	Pou
Clayton	Goulden	Lassiter	Rainey
Cline	Graham, Ill.	Latta	Randell, Tex.
Collier	Gregg	Lee	Ransdell, La.
Conry	Griggs	Lenroot	Rauch
Cooper, Wis.	Hamill	Lever	Reid
Covington	Hamlin	Lindbergh	Richardson
Cox, Ind.	Hammond	Lindsay	Robinson
Cox, Ohio	Hardwick	Livingston	Rothermel
Rucker, Colo.	Sims	Sulzer	Watkins
Rucker, Mo.	Sisson	Talbott	Webb
Sabath	Slayden	Taylor, Ala.	Weisse
Saunders	Small	Taylor, Colo.	Willett
Shackleford	Smith, Tex.	Thomas, Ky.	Wilson, Pa.
Sharp	Sparkman	Thomas, N. C.	Woods, Iowa
Sheppard	Spight	Tou Velle	Young, Mich.
Sherley	Stanley	Underwood	
Sherwood	Stephens, Tex.	Wallace	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Andrus.

NOT VOTING—14.

Boehne	Driscoll, D. A.	Murphy	Thistlewood
Borland	Fornes	Rhinock	Wheeler
Coudrey	Gill, Mo.	Riordan	
Crow	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Russell	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. THISTLEWOOD with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska, with Mr. BORLAND.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the order just adopted, the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In order to save time——

Mr. PAYNE. Pending that——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under the rule that motion is not in order.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, we can go into Committee of the Whole and then rise.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then let us go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DALZELL. It will take about two minutes to go through the form.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It may take more than two minutes, I will advise you right now.

Mr. DALZELL. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] will take the chair.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 197, on page 55, strike out all of lines 9 to 19, inclusive——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to inquire whether we are now considering these amendments under the five-minute rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I desire to know, under that rule, if debate is limited on each amendment to five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the debate upon amendments is governed by the ordinary rules of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is, five minutes in favor of a proposition and five minutes against it?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say, that in order to expedite——

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not completed the reading of the amendment. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Paragraph 197, on page 55, strike out all of lines 9 to 19 inclusive, the words to be stricken out being 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Michigan if this is offered as a committee amendment?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was on the floor addressing the Chair before the gentleman from New York was.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to rise always has precedence. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee do now rise.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. CLARK of Missouri) there were—ayes 208, noes 168.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed Mr. PAYNE and Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 192, noes 146.

So 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.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the printed bill is exhausted in the document room. I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of 1,200 copies of the bill as reported to the House in bill form.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not have it printed with these celebrated amendments printed in different type?

Mr. PAYNE. Because it is not practicable.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why is it not practicable?

Mr. PAYNE. Because the amendments are not ready, and we could not get the bills for use to-morrow morning.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would rather have it printed the other way, but I am not going to object.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DENBY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Lewis B. Moon, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I demand the yeas and nays. [Cries of "Oh, no!"] Oh, you have got to work every night until 5 o'clock. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. We will work until 5 o'clock to-night.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know it, and that is what I want.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 205, nays 150, answered "present" 3, not voting 29, as follows:

YEAS—205.

Alexander, N. Y.	Dwight	Hubbard, W. Va.	Mondell
Allen	Edwards, Ky.	Huff	Moon, Pa.
Anthony	Ellis	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore, Pa.
Austin	Elvins	Hull, Iowa	Morehead
Barchfeld	Englebright	Humphrey, Wash.	Morgan, Mo.
Barclay	Esch	Johnson, Ohio	Morgan, Okla.
Barnard	Estopinal	Joyce	Morse
Bartholdt	Fairchild	Kahn	Mudd
Bates	Fassett	Keifer	Murdock
Bennet, N. Y.	Fish	Kendall	Needham
Bennett, Ky.	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Norris
Bingham	Foelker	Kennedy, Ohio	Nye
Boutell	Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Olcott
Bradley	Foss	Knapp	Olmsted
Broussard	Foster, Vt.	Knowland	Palmer, H. W.
Brownlow	Foulkrod	Kopp	Parker
Burke, Pa.	Fuller	Kronmiller	Payne
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines	Küstermann	Pearre
Burleigh	Gardner, Mass.	Lafean	Perkins
Butler	Gardner, Mich.	Langham	Plumley
Calder	Gardner, N. J.	Langley	Poindexter
Calderhead	Garner, Pa.	Law	Pratt
Campbell	Gillett	Lawrence	Pray
Capron	Goebel	Lenroot	Prince
Cary	Good	Longworth	Pujo
Chapman	Graff	Lorimer	Reeder
Cocks, N. Y.	Graham, Pa.	Loud	Reynolds
Cole	Grant	Loudenslager	Roberts
Cook	Greene	Lovering	Rodenberg
Cooper, Pa.	Griest	Lowden	Scott
Cooper, Wis.	Gronna	Lundin	Sheffield
Cowles	Guernsey	McCreary	Simmons
Creager	Hamer	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Cal.
Crumpacker	Hamilton	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Iowa
Currier	Hanna	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Mich.
Cushman	Haugen	McKinney	Snapp
Dalzell	Hawley	McLachlan, Cal.	Southwick
Davidson	Heald	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sperry
Davis	Henry, Conn.	McMorran	Stafford
Dawson	Higgins	Madden	Steenerson
Denby	Hill	Madison	Sterling
Diekema	Hinshaw	Malby	Stevens, Minn.
Dodds	Hollingsworth	Mann	Sturgiss
Douglas	Howell, N. J.	Martin, S. Dak.	Sulloway
Draper	Howell, Utah	Miller, Kans.	Swasey
Driscoll, M. E.	Howland	Miller, Minn.	Tawney
Durey	Hubbard, Iowa	Millington	Taylor, Ohio
Tener	Volstead	Wickliffe	Young, Mich.
Thistlewood	Vreeland	Wiley	Young, N. Y.
Thomas, Ohio	Wanger	Wilson, Ill.	
Tilson	Washburn	Wood, N. J.	
Tirrell	Weeks	Woodyard	

NAYS—150.

Adair	Dickson, Miss.	Hughes, N. J.	Rauch
Adamson	Dies	Hull, Tenn.	Reid
Aiken	Dixon, Ind.	Humphreys, Miss.	Richardson
Alexander, Mo.	Edwards, Ga.	James	Robinson
Anderson	Ellerbe	Jamieson	Rothermel
Ansberry	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Rucker, Colo.
Ashbrook	Finley	Johnson, S. C.	Rucker, Mo.
Barnhart	Fitzgerald	Keliher	Sabath
Bartlett, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Kinkead, N. J.	Saunders
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Kitchin	Shackleford
Bell, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Korbly	Sharp
Booher	Gallagher	Lamb	Sheppard
Borland	Garner, Tex.	Lassiter	Sherley
Bowers	Garrett	Latta	Sherwood
Brantley	Gill, Md.	Lever	Sims
Burgess	Gillespie	Lloyd	Sisson
Burleson	Glass	McDermott	Slayden
Burnett	Godwin	McHenry	Small
Byrd	Goldfogle	Macon	Smith, Tex.
Byrns	Gordon	Maguire, Nebr.	Sparkman
Candler	Goulden	Martin, Colo.	Spight
Cantrill	Graham, Ill.	Mays	Stanley
Carlin	Gregg	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Griggs	Moore, Tex.	Sulzer
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	Morrison	Talbott
Clayton	Hamlin	Moss	Taylor, Ala.
Cline	Hardwick	Nicholls	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Hardy	O'Connell	Thomas, Ky.
Conry	Harrison	Oldfield	Thomas, N. C.
Covington	Hay	Padgett	Tou Velle
Cox, Ind.	Heflin	Page	Underwood
Cox, Ohio	Helm	Palmer, A. M.	Wallace
Craig	Henry, Tex.	Patterson	Watkins
Cravens	Hitchcock	Peters	Webb
Cullop	Hobson	Pou	Weisse
De Armond	Houston	Rainey	Wilson, Pa.
Dent	Howard	Randell, Tex.	
Denver	Hughes, Ga.	Ransdell, La.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Andrus	Fornes	Lindbergh

NOT VOTING—29.

Ames	Gill, Mo.	Maynard	Slemp
Bartlett, Nev.	Hammond	Murphy	Townsend
Boehne	Hayes	Nelson	Wheeler
Carter	Jones	Parsons	Willett
Coudrey	Lee	Pickett	Woods, Iowa
Crow	Lindsay	Rhinock	
Driscoll, D. A.	Livingston	Riordan	
Fowler	McCall	Russell	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. WOODS of Iowa with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. LEE.

Mr. PICKETT with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. PARSONS with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. NELSON with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. JONES.

Mr. HAYES with Mr. HAMMOND.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. AMES with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BATES, from the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, to which was referred the reports of the heads of departments, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 3), which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 6514) granting certain obsolete ordnance for ornamental purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 6515) for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 6516) to amend an act entitled "An act making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, under the Twelfth Census"—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6517) to create a tariff commission, and defining its powers and duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYE. Resolution (H. J. Res. 43) directing payment of

money to widow of Hon. James Hinds, deceased, according to terms of resolution passed in Fortieth Congress, third session—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 52) for relief of Elizabeth J. Farrell—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 54) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish certain information in reference to secret-service employees—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

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. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Holding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6519) granting an increase of pension to James Gannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. J. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 6521) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jackson Hockett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 6522) granting a pension to Martha E. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R 6523) granting an increase of pension to Allen Matley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNARD: A bill (H. R. 6524) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Sheaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Harlan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to Emmett Langston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting an increase of pension to Travis Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6530) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Cohn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Spears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6532) granting an increase of pension to David Monticue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting an increase of pension to James McCurdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Dill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to Erie Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Fultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting an increase of pension to Rorsey Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to James H. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) granting a pension to Mary De Prez—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) granting a pension to Margaret McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6541) granting a pension to Daniel W. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) to authorize the honorable discharge of Theodore F. Colgrove, late lieutenant-colonel of the One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 6543) for the relief of the heirs of William Russell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 6544) granting an increase of pension to Almon E. Abel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6545) for the relief of F. M. Yarbrough—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6546) granting an increase of pension to David Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Martin King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6548) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. D. Pinnick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6550) granting an increase of pension to James Hewitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 6551) granting an increase of pension to George A. Mills—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6552) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Junkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Dorsett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6555) granting an increase of pension to George W. Whitacre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6556) granting an increase of pension to David Studebaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) granting an increase of pension to James N. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 6558) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Ragsdale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Joint resolution of general assembly of Ohio, favoring repeal of all duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of employees of Biddle Manufacturing Company, of Knoxville, Tenn., asking passage of paragraphs 325, 326, and 327 of the Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of employees of Loudon Hosiery Mills, of Loudon, Tenn., and employees of Davis Hosiery Mills, of Chattanooga, Tenn., asking passage of paragraphs 325, 326, and 327 of Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employees of Holston Manufacturing Company, of Lenoir City, Tenn., asking for passage of paragraphs 325, 326, and 327 of Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of George Blair, of New York City, favoring a duty on moving-picture films—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many citizens of the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James T. Reno, of Edinboro, Pa., against removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Youngsville Manufacturing Company, against increase of duty on plate glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Ephraim Allen, of Eden, Me., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of New York, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of physicians of Brooklyn, N. Y., against a duty on Guinness stout—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of duty on paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Liberal Immigration League, favoring arrangements by which American missionaries can be accorded the same rights in Russia as Russian missionaries are accorded in America—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Congress of the Knights of Labor against all tariff legislation that does not grant adequate protection to American labor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. E. Jagger for a duty on patent leather—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rumford Local No. 9, Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against reduction of the duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of citizens of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Journeymen Bricklayers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Petition of citizens of the Third Congressional District of Indiana, opposing tax on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 371, A. S. of E., against reduction of tariff on barley, grain, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Dayton, Ohio, favoring a reserve for care of the American elk in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Comfort, Antrim County, Mich., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of New York Fruit Exchange, against tariff increase on lemons—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Adirondack Lumber Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, against tariff reduction on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Germania Brewing Company, of Buffalo, N. Y., against duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York City, for appropriation to widen the Hudson River to Troy—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Retail Grocers of Philadelphia, against tariff on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Producers' Association, against reduced tariff on petroleum and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, against reduction of tariff on wooden boxes, box shooks, and lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Luyties Brothers, of New York, favoring amendment to tariff bill to encourage sale and exportation of spirits of domestic manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chapin Post, No. 2, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring bill for erection of monument to the late Brig. Gen. Henry W. Lawton—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Fine Arts Federation, of New York, favoring the bill introduced by Senator NEWLANDS—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of the Thirty-fifth Congressional District of New York, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of willow growers of New York State and willow-basket makers of Liverpool, N. Y., for increase of duty on willow baskets—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUREY: Petition of various residents of the Twenty-fifth Congressional District of New York, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of machine printers of New York, favoring increase of duty on wall papers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of many soap manufacturers of the United States, for reduction of the duty on tallow—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging upon the Congress of the United States that provision be made in the new tariff now under preparation for such equitable arrangement as will insure for our exports the application by the Republic of France of the minimum rates of duty that other favored nations enjoy in their commerce with that country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Retail Grocers' Association of Philadelphia, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of the Twenty-ninth Congressional District of New York, favoring higher duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Business Men's Association of South Norwark, Conn., against reduction of tariff on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York City, against the ad valorem basis of duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of paper manufacturers of the United States, against a reduction of duty on paper products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of committee of wholesale grocers of New York, favoring reduction of duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Yellow Pine Manufacturers' Association, against reduction of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Shoe Wholesale Association of the United States, against the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of James W. Howard, to place crude asphalt and crude bitumen on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Knickerbocker Chocolate Company, of New York, asking that crude cocoa be restored to the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Smith & Henley, Joseph Beth, and Charles F. Holesark, all of New York City, asking removal of duty on raw and refined sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 400 machine wall-paper printers of New York City, asking increase of duty on wall paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David Stevenson Brewing Company, of New York, asking for removal of duty on Canadian barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Bay View Reading Circle, of Zion City, Ill., against passage of hosiery and glove schedule in Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. F. Bidinger, representing Sprague, Warner & Co., of Chicago, against tax on tea or coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of Hon. Charles D. Watson and 74 other citizens of St. Albans, Vt., asking for removal of the duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of National Coffee and Tea Association, of New York, against a duty on coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 28 citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District of Illinois, in favor of removing casein and lactarene from the free list and imposing a certain duty on the same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Coffee and Tea Association, of New York, against a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sprague, Warner & Co., of Chicago, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of James W. Van Cleave, favoring adjustment of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of lithographers of Greater New York, favoring tariff on lithographs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Adirondack Lumber Manufacturing Company, opposing change of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of New York State, favoring improvement of the Hudson River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Fine Arts Federation, of New York City, favoring the Mall for a Lincoln Memorial—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of New York Fruit Exchange, opposing reduction of duty on lemons—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American lithographers of New York, for a proper tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, favoring an increase of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jed, Frye & Co., New York, favoring reduction of tariff on canned and cured fish—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing casein and lactarene on the free list and urging removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, against reduction of duty on barley or other agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George W. Pitner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of residents of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of Utah Lithographing Company, against reduction of duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Utah, against a duty on tea and coffee—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 duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of farmers and elevator men of Paynesville, Minn., protesting against the proposed reduction in the tariff on barley—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George E. Brett, L. B. and D. Richards, and F. Kron, dry-goods merchants of Mankato, Minn., protesting against proposed increase in tariff on cotton hosiery and women's leather gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. McDERMOTT: Petition of Chicago Live Stock Exchange, against repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring removal of the duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MALBY: Petition of residents of St. Lawrence County, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of New York, against any duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Petition of Canon City Lodge, No. 610; Central City Lodge, No. 557; and Telluride Lodge, No. 692, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, all of Colorado, for an American elk reservation in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Colorado, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Colorado, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: Petition of various residents of the Twenty-seventh Congressional District of New York, for removal of duty on casein and lactarene—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of various residents of Utica, N. Y., against placing of duties on teas, coffees, cocoa, or spices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Sumner County Medical Association, for the creation of a bureau of health—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Sedgwick and Wichita counties, Kans., for a pension for the members of the United States Military Telegraph Corps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Eighth Congressional District of Kansas, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, for retention of the present duty on cattle and hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Harvey County, Kans., against passage of Senate bill 3940—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: Petition of 106 citizens of East Stroudsburg, Pa., favoring removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of H. G. Miller and Kalispell Lumber Company, of Kalispell, Mont., favoring a duty on lumber—to the Committee on Way and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Charles Conters and 128 other tin-plate workers, of Cumberland, Md., asking for an amendment of the drawback feature on tin plates in the Payne tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Lansing, Mich., for legislation to regulate commerce in intoxicants, and favoring also the antiopium bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of C. E. Jagger, favoring a duty of 30 per cent on manufactured patent leather for shoes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Wolfe Brothers Shoe Company, favoring placing shoes on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. J. Wittenberg, of New York City, against placing coal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frank Gehring, of Jersey City, N. J., for increase of duty on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. C. Lowry, secretary of wholesale grocers' committee, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of importers and jobbers of tea in the city of Boston, against a duty on tea—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 Dryden & Palmer, J. H. Barker & Co., and Wallace & Co., favoring placing crude cocoa on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sprague, Warner & Co., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging upon the Congress of the United States that provision be made in the new tariff, now under preparation, for such equitable arrangement as will insure for our exports the application by the Republic of France of the minimum rates of duty that other favored nations enjoy in their commerce with that country—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, against an increase of duty on linoleum—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Manhattan Shoe Company, for repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of assembly of the State of Ohio, favoring removal of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Siegman & Weil, for lower duty on artificial silk—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolutions of the Pennsylvania State Association of Architects, approving the report of the Fine Arts Council recommending that the proposed Lincoln Monument to be erected in the national capital shall be upon the site at the end of the Mall, as originally provided for; and in favor of the Newlands bill, creating a bureau of fine arts—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, protest of John B. Swartz and 15 other residents of Perkasie, Bucks County, Pa., against the imposition of any tax or duty on teas or coffees—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 6, 1909.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

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

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

THE TARIFF.

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

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 tariff bill, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I now call up the amendment which I offered last evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was reported yesterday, but without objection will be again reported.

The Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Paragraph 197, on page 55, strike out all of lines 9 to 19, inclusive, the words to be striken out being 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.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry is this, and it might as well be settled now as at any other time: If this motion of the gentleman from Michigan is voted up or is voted down, then, under the rule, can any other amendment be offered touching the subject of lumber?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Chair that that is the way I understand it, that an amendment can be offered provided for in the rule.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the very thing that I am asking about.

Mr. TAWNEY. This is not an amendment provided for in the rule.

Mr. MANN. Anybody can offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what I want to find out.