

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. George B. Davis, Judge-Advocate-General, to be Judge-Advocate-General with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning May 23, 1909, with rank from May 24, 1901. His present term of four years will expire May 23, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the navy from the 13th day of February, 1908, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Robert W. Cabaniss,
Raleigh E. Hughes, and
Claude B. Mayo.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the navy from the 13th day of September, 1908, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Carter L. Wright,
John W. Lewis,
Rufus W. Mathewson,
Willis W. Lawrence,
Irving H. Mayfield,
Philip H. Hammond,
Harvey W. McCormack, and
Ernest D. McWagter.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the navy from the 12th day of February, 1909, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Bruce R. Ware, jr.,
Claudius R. Hyatt,
William F. Cochran, jr.,
George C. Logan,
George H. Laird,
Henry G. Shonerd,
Harlow T. Kays,
Robert C. Giffen, and
Richard E. Cassidy.

Ensign Frank D. McMillan to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, upon the completion of three years' service in the present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank D. McMillan to be a lieutenant in the navy from the 2d day of February, 1909, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the navy from the 14th day of April, 1909, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date to correct the date from which they take rank as confirmed on April 28, 1909:

John G. Ziegler, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Glenmore F. Clark, a citizens of Kentucky;
William M. Kerr, a citizen of New York;
George A. Riker, a citizen of New York; and
Tharos Harlan, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

James W. Harper to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ark. Office became presidential April 1, 1909.

MICHIGAN.

Fred P. Baker to be postmaster at Flint, Mich., in place of James A. Button, deceased.

NEW YORK.

George A. Waterbury to be postmaster at Lyndonville, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

OREGON.

F. O. Minor to be postmaster at Bend, Oreg., in place of Charles W. Merrill, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1909.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward T. Marvel to be collector of customs for the district of Fall River, Mass.

SURGEONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Ezra K. Sprague to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Passed Asst. Surg. Rupert Blue to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Passed Asst. Surg. Charles H. Gardner to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Passed Asst. Surg. James H. Oakley to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

H. Percival Dodge to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Morocco.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

A. C. Doyle, at Cerro Gordo, Ill.

OHIO.

George T. Baughman, at Larue, Ohio.
Charles Doll, at Lorain, Ohio.
Adolphus D. Haney, at Morrow, Ohio.
Vernie E. Humphrey, at Fayette, Ohio.
John A. Kneisley, at Osborn, Ohio.
Thomas C. Lichty, at Antwerp, Ohio.
Ward B. Petty, at Sycamore, Ohio.
W. A. Ritter, at Napoleon, Ohio.
Charles E. Samuels, at New Paris, Ohio.
George H. Willis, at Bethel, Ohio.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 13, 1909.

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

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BRITISH IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Special Agent Charles M. Pepper on the British iron and steel industry and the Luxemburg iron and steel wages, together with a supplemental article on English chain manufactures, by Albert Halstead, American consul at Birmingham (S. Doc. No. 42), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Anna, Cobden, Belleville, Dongola, Springfield, Vergennes, Matthews, Edwardsville, Pinckneyville, Cutler, Carbondale, Cairo, Carterville, Duquoin, and Sparta, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DICK presented a petition of Bradford Grange, No. 877, Patrons of Husbandry, of Madison County, Ohio, praying for the repeal of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the retention of the proposed duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Georgetown, Cincinnati, Ripley, Shelby, Peebles, Portsmouth, Seaman, Belfast, Fairfax, Mount Orab, Sardinia, Buford, and Mowrystown, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the repeal of duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the International Chamber of Commerce, province of Albay, Philippine Islands, praying for the repeal of the duty on hemp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES. We have two paper mills in our State. I have here a telegram from the owner and manager of one of those paper mills giving his idea as to the effect taking the tariff off wood pulp may have on that mill. I ask that the telegram be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., May 12, 1909.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES,

Washington, D. C.:

If Payne tariff on news goes through, our mill at Camas, Wash., which employs several hundred people, can not exist. British Columbia will manufacture all the news paper which is used on the coast, and we will be forced to move our mills there. Told you this when I had the pleasure of seeing you in Washington.

L. SCHWARBACHER.

Mr. PAGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fairhaven, Conn., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress in regard to international peace. I ask that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress in regard to international peace.

Whereas the progress of industry and the happiness and prosperity of the people of all countries depends upon the maintenance of peace among the nations of the world; and

Whereas international wars have resulted usually from jealousies due in a large degree to mutual misunderstandings which could have been made clear by conferences and investigations; and

Whereas it would promote the progress of peace in international relations to have a parliamentary union at stated intervals, composed of delegates from all nations; and

Whereas the friendly relations existing between the United States and all nations make it peculiarly fitting that the proposal should come from this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to initiate proceedings to invite the nations of the world to send delegates to an interparliamentary union for the purpose of discussing and establishing a system of international arbitration and investigation of disputes between nations and to arrange for a permanent interparliamentary union at stated intervals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State.

L. H. RANCROFT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JOHN STRANGE,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. E. ANDREWS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Appleton, Oshkosh, Florence, Mazomanie, Milwaukee, Neenah, Menasha, Chippewa Falls, Birch City, Sheboygan, North Freedom, Augusta, Kaukauna, and Rhinelander, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of New Jersey, relative to inheritance taxes. Accompanying the concurrent resolution is a letter from the governor of the State of New Jersey, which I ask may be read, and, with the concurrent resolution, ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was read, and, with the accompanying concurrent resolution, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
April 5, 1909.

Hon. JOHN KEAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The inclosed is copy of a concurrent resolution adopted by the legislature of the State, it having been passed unanimously in each house, in relation to the proposed inheritance tax in the pending tariff bill in the Congress.

I want to add my personal indorsement of this resolution and earnest hope that the request of the legislature may in this regard be complied with by the Representatives of this State.

Yours, very truly,

[SEAL.]

JOHN FRANKLIN FORT.

Assembly concurrent resolution. State of New Jersey. Introduced March 16, 1909, by Mr. Lewis.

Whereas there is a proposition pending in the Congress of the United States to impose an inheritance tax upon the property of decedents, resident within the States, as well as those resident within the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States; and

Whereas it is the sense of the legislature of the State of New Jersey that inheritance taxes should be imposed by the State for State purposes only: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature of the State of New Jersey hereby request the Senators in Congress from this State, and the Members of the House of Representatives from this State, to oppose the enactment of any law imposing collateral inheritance taxes for the benefit of the National Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives of this State to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gardiner, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wenatchee, Seattle, and Leavenworth, all in the State of Washington, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry importers and publishers of post cards of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on post cards imported into the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry manufacturers, merchants, and producers of the State of California, remonstrating against the retention of the proposed duty on sulphur, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE presented the memorial of John T. Kelly and J. B. Underwood, of Willard, N. Mex., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation authorizing Torrance County, in that Territory, to incur bonded indebtedness in excess of the amount now fixed by law, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield, Salem, Darien, Silver Lake, and Vienna, all in the State of Missouri, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of St. Joseph, Willow Springs, Thayer, St. Louis, Lupus, Wooldridge, James-

town, Jefferson City, Lahman, Seymour, Blythedale, Hannibal, Albany, Kansas City, Quincy, Mexico, Brookfield, Louisiana, Hermann, Washington, Shelbyville, Poplar Bluff, Farmington, Bismarck, Sturgeon, Orrick, Kirksville, Moberly, Pomona, Mansfield, and Fordland, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Thomaston, Bridgeport, Terryville, Tewell, Reynolds Bridge, and Norwich, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of the National Association of Master Bakers of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit speculation, manipulation, and gambling in wheat, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the G. M. Hallstead Division, No. 434, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Elmira, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "Burkett boiler-inspection bill" and the "Borah-Dawson full-crew bill," which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Jewelers' Board of Trade, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the creation of a permanent tariff commission, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 6, Cigar-makers' International Union of America, of Syracuse, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on imported gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Fort Stanwix Canning Company, of Rome; of Local Grange No. 1002, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bullville; and of E. O. Rose, of Stony Point, all in the State of New York, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 167, International Typographical Union, of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on print paper and wood pulp, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Warwick Knife Company, of Warwick, N. Y., and a petition of sundry employees of the Robeson Cutlery Company, of Perry, N. Y., praying for the retention of the proposed duty on imported knives or erasers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred resolution No. 4, reported from the Committee on Indian Depredations by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], to report it favorably with an amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, as follows:

Senate resolution 4.

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Depredations be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of \$1,200 per annum, said employment to continue during the Sixty-first Congress.

The amendment was, in line 5, after the words "said employment," to insert "to commence March 15 and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 2338) granting an increase of pension to Ellwood Craig;

A bill (S. 2339) granting a pension to William J. Ricards (with the accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2340) granting a pension to Christiana Donahoe (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 2341) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2342) to establish a fish-culture station at or near Sykeston, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 2343) for the relief of John H. Howlett; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2344) to provide for the utilization of state and territorial lands in connection with projects under the reclamation act, and for other purposes (with the accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 2345) for the relief of registers and former registers of the United States land offices; and

A bill (S. 2346) to provide for refund to Adam Pfeifer of money erroneously paid by said Adam Pfeifer to the Government of the United States in making final homestead proof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Christina;

A bill (S. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Wallace W. Sears;

A bill (S. 2349) granting an increase of pension to Louis Freeman;

A bill (S. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Hogue;

A bill (S. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Edwin N. Josselyn;

A bill (S. 2352) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Kitchen (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2353) granting an increase of pension to William Crotzer (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2354) granting an increase of pension to George E. Hanson (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2355) granting an increase of pension to John S. Taylor (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2356) granting an increase of pension to Harrison J. Blodgett (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2357) granting an increase of pension to John Ward (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2358) granting an increase of pension to Henry Silker (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2359) granting an increase of pension to Albino R. Stone (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2360) granting an increase of pension to John Caven (with the accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2361) granting an increase of pension to John W. Miller (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. ROOT submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. DICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

STAMPS ON FOREIGN BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8098) making appropriations for expenses of the Thirteenth Decennial Census for the fiscal year 1910, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STATEMENT OF INCREASES IN DUTIES.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the other day I introduced a statement giving the estimates made by an expert of the Treasury Department of the duties which were lowered and raised and where they remain the same in the tariff bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] asked at the time if there was an itemized statement. I replied that there was not. Since then a statement has been prepared by this expert showing precisely the increases in the bill. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 41) and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimates of increases in duties of H. R. 1438.

Para- graph.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE A.				
1	Acid, oxalle	Free	1 cent per pound	(b)
35½	Nut oil, or oil of nuts, n. o. p. f.	do	8 cents per gallon	(b)
3	Grease, n. o. p. f.	20 per cent	25 per cent	25.00
22	Glue, valued above 10 cents and not above 35 cents per pound	25 per cent	2½ cents per pound and 15 per cent	103.12
	Glue size, patent and vegetable	20 per cent	25 per cent	25.00
32	Cotton-seed oil	4 cents per gallon	do	123.41
39	Opium, crude or unmanufactured, not adulterated, 9 per cent and over of morphine	\$1 per pound	\$1.50 per pound	50.00
	Morphia or morphine, sulphate of	\$1 per ounce	\$1.50 per ounce	50.00
	All alkaloids and salts of opium	do	do	50.00
65	(L) Perfumery, cosmetics, and toilet preparations: Alcoholic perfumery—cologne and other toilet waters and toilet preparations containing alcohol	60 cents per pound and 45 per cent	60 cents per pound and 50 per cent	6.42
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	60 cents per pound less 20 per cent	60 cents per pound less 20 per cent	2.72
	Preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, etc., and perfumery not containing alcohol, n. s. p. f.	50 per cent	60 per cent	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	40 per cent	48 per cent	20.00
67	(L) Soap, fancy, toilet or medicinal	15 cents per pound	20 cents per pound	33.33
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	12 cents per pound	16 cents per pound	33.33
SCHEDULE B.				
99	(L) Plate glass, fluted, rolled, ribbed, or rough, ground smooth and not obscured otherwise: Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches	8 cents per square foot	10 cents per square foot	25.00
	Above 16 by 24 and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches	10 cents per square foot	12½ cents per square foot	25.00
100	(L) Plate glass, cast, polished, finished, or unfinished, and silvered: Not exceeding 16 by 24 inches	8 cents per square foot	10 cents per square foot	25.00
	Above 16 by 24 and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches	10 cents per square foot	12½ cents per square foot	25.00
SCHEDULE C.				
129	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, etc., valued above 16 cents per pound	4⅞ cents per pound	7 cents per pound a	48.94
	Sheets and plates, n. s. p. f., valued above 16 cents per pound	do	20 per cent a	82.65
136	Steel ingots, blooms, and slabs, n. s. p. f.: Cold rolled, cold drawn, cold hammered, or polished in any way, valued above 16 cents per pound	4⅞ cents and ¼ cent per pound	6 cents and ⅓ cent per pound a	23.73
	Cold rolled, cold hammered, blued, etc., better than the grade of cold rolled, smoothed only, valued above 16 cents per pound	4⅞ cents and 1 cent per pound	6 cents and ⅔ cent per pound a	12.28
	Sheets and plates, n. s. p. f., better than grade of cold rolled, valued above 16 cents per pound	do	7 cents and ⅔ cent per pound a	29.82
136	Steel circular saw plates valued above 16 cents per pound	5⅞ cents per pound	20 per cent and ¼ cent per pound a	61.92
144	Card clothing: Manufactured from tempered steel wire	45 cents per square foot	55 cents per square foot a	22.22
	Other	20 cents per square foot	45 cents per square foot	125.00
146	Castings, cast-iron vessels, plates, stove plates, andirons, tailors' irons, etc., castings of iron n. s. p. f.	⅞ cent per pound	35 per cent	221.69

a Infinite.

Paragraph	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE C—continued.				
151	Cutlery, razors and razor blades, finished or unfinished: Valued less than \$1.50 per dozen..... Valued \$1.50 and less than \$3 per dozen..... Valued \$3 per dozen or more.....	50 cents per dozen and 15 per cent..... \$1 per dozen and 15 per cent..... \$1.75 per dozen and 20 per cent.....	6 cents each and 40 per cent <i>a</i> 10 cents each and 40 per cent <i>a</i> 12 cents each and 50 per cent <i>a</i>	76.59 60.11 41.61
153	Table, carving, cook's, kitchen, etc., knives, forks, and steels, with handles of mother-of-pearl, shell, ivory, etc.	16 cents apiece and 15 per cent.....	14 cents apiece and 15 per cent.....	(b)
154	Files, file blanks, rasps, and floats of all cuts and kinds, 7 inches in length and over.	\$1 per dozen.....	40 per cent.....	18.31
157	(L) Sheets, plates, wares, or articles of iron, or other metal, enameled or glazed with vitrous glasses.	40 per cent.....	45 per cent.....	12.
163	Needles for knitting or sewing machines, including latch needles.....	\$1 per M and 25 per cent.....	\$1.25 per M and 25 per cent.....	10.09
171	Antimony as regulus or metal.....	3 cent per pound.....	14 cents per pound.....	100.00
174	Copper, sheathing, or yellow metal, etc.....	2 cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	c 5.50
177	(L) Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, of gold, silver, or other metal.....	5 cents per pound.....	10 cents per pound.....	100.00
	Bullion and metal threads, made of tinsel wire, etc.....	5 cents per pound and 35 per cent.....	10 cents per pound and 30 per cent.....	1.48
	Laces, embroideries, braids, etc., made of metallic threads.....	60 per cent.....	1 cent per pound and 60 per cent.....	19.60
182	Ferrotungsten.....	\$4 per ton.....	20 per cent.....	4,900.00
	Ferrochrome.....	do.....	do.....	1,049.42
185	Penholder tips and penholders, or parts of.....	25 per cent.....	25 cents per gross and 25 per cent.....	100.00
189	Watch movements: Having not more than 7 jewels..... (L) Having more than 7 and not more than 11 jewels..... (L) Having more than 11 and not more than 15 jewels.....	35 cents each and 25 per cent..... 50 cents each and 25 per cent..... 75 cents each and 25 per cent.....	65 cents each..... \$1.35 each..... \$1.85 each.....	15.40 9.51 17.09
190	Zinc in ore.....	120 per cent.....	\$11.20 per ton.....	281.75
	Calamine (zinc ore).....	do.....	do.....	(d)
SCHEDULE D.				
208	Osier or willow: Prepared for basket makers' use..... Manufactures of..... Do. (reciprocity with Cuba).....	20 per cent..... 40 per cent..... 32 per cent.....	25 per cent..... 45 per cent..... 36 per cent.....	25.00 12.50 12.50
SCHEDULE G.				
226	Live animals: All other n. s. p. f. Do. (reciprocity with Cuba).....	20 per cent..... 16 per cent.....	25 per cent..... 20 per cent.....	25.00 25.00
230	Buckwheat flour.....	20 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	25.00
231	Corn or maize.....	15 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	33.33
234	Oats.....	do.....	do.....	33.33
236	Rice, cleaned (from Philippines).....	75 per cent or 2 cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	33.33
237	Rye.....	10 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	100.00
238	Wheat.....	25 cents per bushel.....	30 cents per bushel.....	20.00
244	Caseln.....	20 per cent.....	25 per cent.....	25.00
256	Hops.....	12 cents per pound.....	15 cents per pound.....	25.00
260	Pease, split.....	40 cents per bushel.....	45 cents per bushel.....	12.50
	Plants, trees, shrubs, and vines: Myrobalan plum, Mahalib or Mozzard cherry, 3 years old or less.....	50 cents per M and 15 per cent.....	\$1 per M.....	9.80
265	Yams.....	Free.....	25 per cent.....	(d)
266	Fish: Caviare.....	3 cent per pound.....	30 per cent.....	3,429.41
270	Fruits: (L) In brine— Citron..... All other..... (L) Jellies..... Do. (reciprocity, Cuba).....	Free..... do..... 35 per cent..... 28 per cent..... 2 cents per pound..... 1 cent per pound.....	2 cents per pound..... do..... 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent..... 3 cent per pound and 28 per cent..... 24 cents per pound..... 1 cent per pound.....	(d) (d) 28.57 28.57 25.00 100.00
271	(L) Figs.....	15 cents per gallon.....	20 cents per gallon.....	33.33
	(L) Dates.....	20 cents per cubic foot.....	25 cents per cubic foot.....	25.00
272	Olives, green or prepared, in other coverings.....	1 cent per pound.....	14 cents per pound.....	50.00
273	Grapes, in barrels or other packages.....	1 cent, 20 per cent per pound.....	14 cents, 20 per cent per pound.....	50.00
	Lemons.....	do.....	do.....	50.00
SCHEDULE H (ALL L).				
297	Brandy: Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)..... Do. (reciprocity with France)..... Do. (reciprocity with Germany)..... Do. (reciprocity with Italy)..... Do. (reciprocity with Portugal)..... Do. (reciprocity with Spain)..... Do. (reciprocity with Switzerland).....	\$2.25 per proof gallon..... \$1.80 per proof gallon..... \$1.75 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... do..... do.....	\$2.60 per proof gallon..... \$2.08 per proof gallon..... \$2.50 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... do..... do.....	15.55 15.55 48.57 48.57 48.57 48.57 48.57
	Alcohol: Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)..... Do. (reciprocity, France)..... Do. (reciprocity, Germany).....	\$2.25 per proof gallon..... \$1.80 per proof gallon..... \$1.75 per proof gallon..... do.....	do..... \$2.08 per proof gallon..... \$2.00 per proof gallon..... do.....	15.55 15.55 48.57 48.57
	Gin: Do. (reciprocity, France)..... Do. (reciprocity, Germany).....	\$2.25 per proof gallon..... \$1.75 per proof gallon..... do.....	do..... do..... do.....	15.55 48.57 48.57
	Other spirits, n. s. p. f., manufactured or distilled from grain: Whisky: Do. (reciprocity, France)..... Do. (reciprocity, Germany)..... All other..... Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)..... Do. (reciprocity, France)..... Do. (reciprocity, Germany)..... Do. (reciprocity, Italy)..... Do. (reciprocity, Spain)..... From other materials: Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)..... Do. (reciprocity, France)..... Do. (reciprocity, Germany).....	\$2.25 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... \$2.25 per proof gallon..... \$1.80 per proof gallon..... \$1.75 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... do..... \$2.25 per proof gallon..... \$1.80 per proof gallon..... \$1.75 per proof gallon..... do.....	\$2.60 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... do..... \$2.08 per proof gallon..... \$2.60 per proof gallon..... do..... do..... do..... do..... \$2.08 per proof gallon..... \$2.60 per proof gallon..... do.....	15.55 48.57 48.57 15.55 15.55 48.57 48.57 48.57 48.57 15.55 15.55 48.57 48.

d Infinite.

Estimates of increases in duties of H. R. 1438—Continued.

Para- graph.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE H—continued.				
300	Cordials, liqueurs, arrack, absinthe, kirschwasser, ratafia, and other spirituous beverages or bitters containing spirits, n. s. p. f.	\$2.25 per proof gallon	\$2.60 per proof gallon	15.55
	Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)	\$1.80 per proof gallon	\$2.08 per proof gallon	15.55
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	\$1.75 per proof gallon	\$2.60 per proof gallon	48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Switzerland)	do	do	48.57
	Vermuth and ginger wine or ginger cordial, in casks or packages other than bottles or jugs, containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol.	40 cents per gallon	do	30.00 (?)
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	35 cents per gallon	do	a 48.57 (?)
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	a 48.57 (?)
	Containing more than 18 per cent of alcohol	50 cents per gallon	do	b 4.00
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	35 cents per gallon	do	b 48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	b 48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	b 48.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Portugal)	do	do	b 48.57
	In bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 pint:			
	Do. (reciprocity with Italy)	62½ cents per dozen	do	a 24.30
	Containing each more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart.	\$1.60 per dozen	do	c 36.84
	Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)	\$1.28 per dozen	\$2.08 per gallon	d 21.87
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	\$1.25 per dozen	\$2.60 per gallon	d 24.81
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	d 24.81
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	d 24.81
	Do. (reciprocity, Portugal)	do	do	d 24.81
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	d 24.81
	Quantity in excess of 1 quart or 1 pint per bottle	5 cents per pint	\$2.60 per proof gallon	e 30.00
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	4 cents per pint	do	e 62.50
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	e 62.50
302	Bay rum or bay water, whether distilled or compounded	\$1.50 per proof gallon	\$1.75 per proof gallon	16.67
303	Wines, containing not more than 24 per cent of alcohol:			
	Champagne and all other sparkling, in bottles, containing ½ pint or less	\$2 per dozen	\$2.40 per dozen	20.00
	Containing more than ½ pint each and not more than 1 pint.	\$4 per dozen	\$4.80 per dozen	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	\$3.20 per dozen	\$3.84 per dozen	20.00
	Containing more than 1 pint each and not more than 1 quart	\$8 per dozen	\$9.60 per dozen	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	\$6.40 per dozen	\$7.68 per dozen	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Portugal)	\$6 per dozen	\$9.60 per dozen	60.00
	Quantity in bottles in excess of 1 quart per bottle.	\$2.50 per gallon	\$3 per dozen	20.00
304	Still wines and rice wine or saké and similar beverages:			
	In casks or packages other than bottles or jugs—			
	Containing 14 per cent or less of absolute alcohol	40 cents per gallon	45 cents per gallon	12.50
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	35 cents per gallon	do	28.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	28.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	28.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Portugal)	do	do	28.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	28.57
	Do. (reciprocity, Switzerland)	do	do	28.57
	Containing more than 14 per cent and not more than 24 per cent alcohol	50 cents per gallon	60 cents per gallon	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	35 cents per gallon	do	71.43
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	71.43
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	71.43
	Do. (reciprocity, Portugal)	do	do	71.43
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	71.43
	Do. (reciprocity, Switzerland)	do	do	71.43
	In bottles or jugs containing each not more than 1 pint.	80 cents per dozen	92½ cents per dozen	15.62
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	62½ cents per dozen	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	48.00
	Containing each more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart.	\$1.60 per dozen	\$1.85 per dozen	15.62
	Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)	\$1.28 per dozen	\$1.48 per dozen	15.62
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	\$1.25 per dozen	\$1.85 per dozen	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Spain)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Portugal)	do	do	48.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Switzerland)	do	do	48.00
	Quantity excess 1 quart or 1 pint per bottle.	5 cents per pint	6 cents per pint	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Germany)	4 cents per pint	do	50.00
	Do. (reciprocity, France)	do	do	50.00
	Do. (reciprocity, Italy)	do	do	50.00
305	Malt liquors, viz, ale, beer, and porter:			
	In bottles or jugs	40 cents per gallon	45 cents per gallon	12.50
	In other coverings	20 cents per gallon	23 cents per gallon	15.00
306	Malt extract:			
	Fluid—			
	In bottles or jugs	40 cents per gallon	45 cents per gallon	12.50
	In casks	20 cents per gallon	23 cents per gallon	15.00
	Solid or condensed	40 per cent.	45 per cent.	12.50
307	Cherry juice and other fruit juice n. s. p. f., not over 18 per cent alcohol.	60 cents per gallon	70 cents per gallon	16.67
	Containing more than 18 per cent alcohol (reciprocity, Germany)	60 cents per gallon and \$1.75 per proof gallon	70 cents per gallon and \$2.07 per proof gallon	17.50
	Prune juice or prune wine, not more than 18 per cent of alcohol	60 cents per gallon	70 cents per gallon	16.67
SCHEDULE I.				
310	Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps or warp yarn, etc.: Not colored, bleached, dyed, advanced, etc.—			
	Nos. up to and including No. 15	3 cents per pound	2½ cents per pound or 20 per cent	24.46
	No. 18	3½ cents per pound	3 cents per pound or 20 per cent	41.95
	No. 20	4 cents per pound	3½ cents per pound or 20 per cent	107.25
	No. 25	5 cents per pound	4½ cents per pound or 20 per cent	42.75
	No. 30	6 cents per pound	5 cents per pound or 20 per cent	11.42
	No. 34	8½ cents per pound	6½ cents per pound or 20 per cent	5.60
	No. 90	22½ cents per pound	18 cents per pound or 20 per cent	17.57

a 10 per cent alcohol.

b 10 per cent alcohol; should be over 14 per cent alcohol.

c On 14 per cent alcohol.

d 10 per cent alcohol; should be much more.

e 10 per cent alcohol; should be more.

Estimates of increases in duties of H. R. 1438—Continued.

Para- graph.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of Increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE I—continued.				
310	Cotton thread and carded yarn, warps or warp yarns, etc.—Cont'd. Colored, bleached, dyed, combed, or advanced, etc., numbers up to and including No. 20.	6 cents per pound.....	6 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	38.66
	No. 21.....	5½ cents per pound.....	do.....	98.73
	No. 22.....	5½ cents per pound.....	do.....	110.44
	No. 24.....	6 cents per pound.....	do.....	61.71
	No. 25.....	6½ cents per pound.....	6½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	59.34
	No. 26.....	6½ cents per pound.....	6½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	53.56
	No. 27.....	6½ cents per pound.....	6½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	17.10
	No. 28.....	7 cents per pound.....	7 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	42.45
	No. 29.....	7½ cents per pound.....	7½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	74.58
	No. 30.....	7½ cents per pound.....	7½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	36.99
	No. 32.....	8 cents per pound.....	8 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	22.43
	No. 33.....	8½ cents per pound.....	8½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	50.51
	No. 34.....	8½ cents per pound.....	8½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	62.02
	No. 35.....	8½ cents per pound.....	8½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	27.42
	No. 36.....	9 cents per pound.....	9 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	5.44
	No. 37.....	9½ cents per pound.....	9½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	44.68
	No. 38.....	9½ cents per pound.....	9½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	37.29
	No. 40.....	10 cents per pound.....	10 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	2.79
	No. 41.....	10½ cents per pound.....	10½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	12.21
	No. 42.....	10½ cents per pound.....	10½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	33.90
	No. 45.....	11½ cents per pound.....	11½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	12.31
	No. 47.....	11½ cents per pound.....	11½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	2.59
	No. 53.....	13½ cents per pound.....	13½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	34.70
	No. 67.....	16½ cents per pound.....	16½ cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	44.09
	No. 250.....	75 cents per pound.....	65 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	33.33
	No. 270.....	81 cents per pound.....	67 cents per pound or 25 per cent.....	54.42
313	Cloth: Not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, country warp and filling— Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed.....	1 cent per square yard.....	2½ cents per square yard.....	125.00
	Bleached.....	1½ cents per square yard.....	7 cents per square yard.....	460.00
	Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed.....	2 cents per square yard.....	3 cents per square yard.....	50.00
	(L) Not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, etc.— Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued over 7 cents per square yard.....	25 per cent.....	4½ cents per square yard.....	51.52
	Bleached, valued over 9 cents per square yard.....	do.....	5½ cents per square yard.....	44.60
	Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued over 12 cents.....	30 per cent.....	8 cents per square yard.....	47.60
314	Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, country warp and fillings— Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, ex- ceeding 6 and not exceeding 8 square yards to the pound.....	2½ cents per square yard.....	3 cents per square yard.....	20.00
	Valued over 9 cents per square yard.....	30 per cent.....	4½ cents per square yard.....	a 17.87
	(L) Bleached, valued over 11 cents per square yard.....	35 per cent.....	6½ cents per square yard.....	a 17.23
	(L) Dyed, etc., valued over 12½ cents per square yard.....	do.....	7 cents per square yard.....	a 13.09
315	Cloth, exceeding 150 threads and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, etc.— Not bleached, dyed, colored, etc., valued over 10 cents per square yard.....	do.....	5½ cents per square yard.....	a 20.88
	Bleached (L), valued over 12 cents per square yard.....	do.....	8 cents per square yard.....	b 32.83
	Dyed, colored, stained, etc. (L), valued over 12½ cents per square yard.....	40 per cent.....	do.....	b 11.20
316	Exceeding 200 and not exceeding 300 threads to the square inch, etc., not bleached, dyed, colored, printed, etc.— (L) valued over 12½ cents per square yard.....	do.....	6½ cents per square yard.....	b 1.60
	Bleached (L), valued over 15 cents per square yard.....	do.....	8 cents per square yard.....	b .02
	(L) Dyed, colored, stained, etc., valued over 17½ cents per square yard.....	do.....	11½ cents per square yard.....	b 29.42
317	Exceeding 300 threads to the square inch, etc.— Not bleached, dyed, colored, etc., not exceeding 2 square yards to the pound.....	4 cents per square yard.....	6½ cents per square yard.....	b 62.50
	Not valued over 14 cents per square yard.....	40 per cent.....	6½ cents to 12½ cents per square yard c.....	8 to 25
	Bleached, valued over 16 cents per square yard.....	do.....	11½ cents per square yard c.....	20.85
	Dyed, colored, stained, etc., valued over 20 cents per square yard.....	do.....	12½ cents per square yard c.....	16.77
321	Cotton cloth in which other than the ordinary warp and filling threads have been introduced in the process of weaving, etc.; exceeding 50 and not 100 threads to the square inch, etc.: Not bleached, dyed, colored, etc.— Not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	3½ cents per square yard.....	4½ cents per square yard.....	30.80
	Exceeding 9 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	3½ cents per square yard.....	do.....	13.33
	Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed— Not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	4½ cents per square yard.....	5½ cents per square yard.....	21.05
	Not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting warp and filling— Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, val- ued at over 7 cents per square yard.....	25 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	7½ cents per square yard.....	38.07
	Bleached, valued over 9 cents per square yard.....	do.....	do.....	31.88
	Dyed, colored, etc., valued at over 12 cents per square yard.....	30 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	10 cents per square yard.....	32.45
	Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, etc.; not bleached, dyed, colored, etc.— Not exceeding 4 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	3½ per square yard.....	do.....	185.71
	Exceeding 4 and not 6 square yards to the pound— Valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	4 cents per square yard.....	6½ cents per square yard.....	59.37
	Valued over 9 cents per square yard.....	30 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	8½ cents per square yard.....	32.12
	Bleached, exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, valued at over 11 cents per square yard.....	35 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	10 cents per square yard.....	10.40
	Dyed, colored, stained, etc., exceeding 8 square yards to the pound, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard.....	35 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	12 cents per square yard.....	25.89
	(L) Exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling— Not bleached, dyed, colored, etc., valued at over 10 cents per square yard.....	do.....	8½ cents per square yard.....	4.54
	Bleached, exceeding 4½ and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound— Valued at more than 7 cents per square yard.....	6 cents per square yard.....	7½ cents per square yard.....	20.83
	Valued at over 12 cents per square yard.....	35 per cent and 2 cents per square yard.....	12 cents per square yard.....	27.01

a And more.

b Some values increased more than here shown.

c Prohibitory.

Estimates of increases in duties of H. R. 1438—Continued.

Para-graph.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE I—continued.				
321	Cotton cloth in which other than the ordinary warp and filling threads have been introduced in the process of weaving, etc.; exceeding 50 and not 100 threads to the square inch, etc.—Continued. (L) Exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling—Continued. Dyed, colored, stained, etc., exceeding $4\frac{1}{2}$ and not exceeding 6 square yards per pound— Valued at more than 7 cents per square yard..... Valued at over $12\frac{1}{2}$ cents per square yard..... (L) Exceeding 200 and not exceeding 300 threads to the square inch, etc.— Bleached, valued at over 15 cents per square yard..... Dyed, colored, etc., valued at over $17\frac{1}{2}$ cents per square yard..... Cotton cloth, mercerized or subjected to any similar process.....	6½ cents per square yard..... 40 per cent and 2 cents per square yard..... do..... do..... 13½ cents per square yard..... 14½ cents per square yard..... 1 cent per square yard additional.....	8 cents per square yard..... 12 cents per square yard..... 13½ cents per square yard..... 14½ cents per square yard..... 1 cent per square yard additional.....	15.63 2.43 10.44 8.14 (a) 28.57
329	Duck.....	35 per cent.....	45 per cent.....	28.57
SCHEDULE J.				
353	Woven fabrics n. s. p. f. composed of flax, hemp, or ramie, etc., weighing $4\frac{1}{2}$ ounces or more per square yard.....	35 per cent.....	45 per cent.....	28.57
SCHEDULE L.				
393	Spun silk in skeins, cops, warps, or on beams: Valued not exceeding \$1 per pound..... Valued over \$1 and not exceeding \$1.50 per pound..... Valued over \$1.50 and not exceeding \$2 per pound..... Valued over \$2 and not exceeding \$2.50 per pound..... Valued over \$2.50 per pound..... All on which duty does not equal 35 per cent or 37½ per cent.....	20 cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 30 cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 40 cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 50 cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 60 cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 35 per cent..... 30 per cent.....	35 cents per pound..... 50 per cent..... do..... do..... do..... do..... 75 cents per pound (?).....	12.06 33.90 33.76 37.78 36.91 42.86 55.23
394	Thrown silk, not more advanced than singles, tram, etc. Sewing silks and silk threads or yarns of every description.....	do.....	\$1 per pound.....	94.37
395	Velvets, plushes, and other pile fabrics: Plushes..... Plushes on which ordinary duty does not amount to 50 per cent..... Velvets, velvet or plush ribbons, and chenilles..... Velvets on which duty does not amount to 50 per cent..... Other pile fabrics..... Fabrics woven in the piece: Weighing more than 4 ounces and less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ ounces per square yard— In the gum, or dyed in the thread or yarn..... Boiled off..... Dyed or printed in the piece.....	\$1 per pound and 15 per cent..... 50 per cent..... \$1.50 per pound and 15 per cent..... 50 per cent..... \$1.50 per pound and 15 per cent..... \$2.50 per pound..... \$3 per pound..... \$3.25 per pound.....	\$1.75 per pound..... \$1.85 per pound..... \$2.50 per pound..... \$2.80 per pound..... \$2.50 per pound..... \$2.72 per pound..... \$3.25 per pound..... \$3.50 per pound.....	40.07 1.86 25.23 11.32 30.80 8.80 8.33 7.69
395	Weighing more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ ounces and not more than 8 ounces per square yard— In the gum, containing not more than 20 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 20 per cent and not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 30 per cent and not more than 45 per cent in weight of silk..... Dyed in the piece..... Containing not more than 20 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 20 per cent and not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 30 per cent and not more than 45 per cent in weight of silk..... Dyed in the thread or yarn—black except selvages— Containing not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 30 per cent and not more than 45 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 45 per cent in weight of silk; exceeding original weight of silk..... Weight not increased beyond weight of raw silk..... Other: Containing not more than 30 per cent in weight of silk..... Containing more than 45 per cent in weight of silk; weighted to exceed original weight of the raw silk..... Other, on which specific duty does not amount to 50 per cent.....	50 cents per pound..... 65 cents per pound..... 90 cents per pound..... 60 cents per pound..... 80 cents per pound..... \$1.10 per pound..... 75 cents per pound..... \$1.10 per pound..... \$1.50 per pound..... \$3 per pound..... 90 cents per pound..... \$2.25 per pound..... 50 per cent..... \$3.25 per dozen and 10 per cent.....	63½ cents per pound..... 80 cents per pound..... \$1.05 per pound..... 85 cents per pound..... \$1 per pound..... \$1.25 per pound..... \$1.75 per pound..... do..... \$1.80 per pound..... \$3.50 per pound..... \$1.75 per pound..... \$3.50 per pound..... 75 per cent..... 60 per cent.....	27.50 23.08 16.67 25.00 20.00 13.64 133.33 59.09 20.00 16.67 93.33 55.56 50.00 12.04
396	Handkerchiefs or mufflers composed wholly or in part of silk, etc.; hemstitched, or imitation hemstitched, or reeved, etc.; weighing not more than 4 ounces per square yard, dyed or printed in the piece.	20 per cent.....	50 per cent.....	150.00
401	Horsehair, artificial [The duty on a large number of articles composed of artificial silk is increased by this number.] All silk—(L.).			
SCHEDULE M.				
408	(L) Lithographic prints from stone, zinc, aluminum, etc. n. e. s.: On paper or other material— Exceeding $\frac{1}{16}$ inch and not exceeding $\frac{1}{8}$ inch in thickness— Not exceeding 35 square inches..... (L) Lithographic cigar labels, flaps, and bands, etc.: Printed in less than 8 colors, but not including metal leaf printing..... Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)..... Printed in 8 or more colors but not including metal leaf printing..... Printed in whole or in part in metal leaf..... Do. (reciprocity, Cuba)..... Printed in bronze printing..... Booklets, decorated in whole or partly by hand or by spraying..... Decalcomanias, in ceramic colors..... Decalcomanias, if backed with metal leaf..... All other.....	5 cents per pound..... 20 cents per pound..... 16 cents per pound..... 30 cents per pound..... 50 cents per pound..... 40 cents per pound..... 15 cents per pound..... 8 cents per pound..... 20 cents per pound (?)..... 20 cents per pound..... do.....	7 cents per pound..... 27½ cents per pound..... 22 cents per pound..... 32½ cents per pound..... 52½ cents per pound..... 42 cents per pound..... 27½ cents per pound..... 15 cents per pound..... \$1 per pound..... 65 cents per pound..... 40 cents per pound.....	40.00 37.50 37.50 8.33 5.00 5.00 83.33 87.50 400.00 225.00 100.00
409	Writing, letter note, hand made, drawing, etc., paper: Not ruled, bordered, embossed, printed, or decorated..... Ruled, bordered, embossed, printed, or decorated.....	2 cents per pound and 10 per cent..... 2 cents per pound and 20 per cent.....	3½ cents per pound and 15 per cent..... 3½ cents per pound and 25 per cent.....	65.42 38.78
411	Wrapping paper.....	25 per cent.....	35 per cent.....	40.00

aAn increase on a large number of articles.

Estimates of increases in duties of H. R. 1438—Continued.

Para- graph.	Article.	Rates of duty.		Per cent of increase.
		Present law.	Senate bill.	
SCHEDULE N.				
422	Button forms: Lastings, mohair, cloth, silk or other manufactures of cloth, woven or made in patterns of such size, shape, or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit for buttons alone.	10 per cent.	40 per cent.	300.00
425	Cork, manufactured: All other manufactures.	25 per cent.	30 per cent.	20.00
429	Fireworks.	20 per cent.	75 per cent.	275.00
434	(L) Feathers and downs, n. s. p. f., including bird skins or parts of, with feathers on:			
	Crude or not dressed, colored or manufactured:			
	Feathers for beds.	15 per cent.	20 per cent.	33.33
	Ostrich feathers.	do.	do.	33.33
	All other.	do.	do.	33.33
	(Reciprocity with Cuba).	12 per cent.	16 per cent.	33.33
	Dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed and finished birds suitable for millinery ornaments:			
	Ostrich feathers.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.	20.00
	All other.	do.	do.	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba).	40 per cent.	48 per cent.	20.00
	Quilts and other manufactures of down.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.	20.00
	(L) Feathers, artificial or ornamental, fruits, grains, leaves, flowers, etc., of whatever material comprised, n. s. p. f.	do.	do.	20.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba).	40 per cent.	48 per cent.	20.00
	Boas, boutonnières, wreaths, and all articles n. s. p. f., etc.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.	20.00
435	Furs, articles of wearing apparel of every description, partly or wholly manufactured, composed of or of which fur is the component material of chief value, but not in part of wool.	35 per cent.	50 per cent.	42.86
445	(L) Coral, manufactures of, n. s. p. f.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.	20.00
448	Leather, cut into shoe uppers or vamps, or other forms, etc.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.	14.28
	Gaufrage leather.	20 per cent.	do.	100.00
	Manufactures of leather n. s. p. f.	35 per cent.	do.	14.28
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba).	28 per cent.	32 per cent.	14.28
449	Bags, baskets, belts, satchels, card cases, pocketbooks, jewel boxes, etc., and manufactures of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value, n. s. p. f.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.	14.28
455	Manufactures of:			
	Bone and horn n. s. p. f.	30 per cent.	35 per cent.	16.67
	Chip, n. s. p. f.	do.	do.	16.67
	Straw and grass n. s. p. f.	do.	do.	16.67
	India rubber.	do.	do.	16.67
	Palm leaf.	do.	do.	16.67
	Weeds.	do.	do.	16.67
	Whalebone.	do.	do.	16.67
465	Pencil leads not in wood or other material:			
	Black.	10 per cent.	1½ cents per ounce.	(?)
	Colored.	do.	2 cents per ounce.	(?)
	Copying.	do.	3 cents per ounce.	(?)
	(If rate of duty not changed, why change the form?)			
471a	(L) Foreign-built yachts, pleasure boats, or vessels not used or intended to be used for trade.	Free.	35 per cent.	(a)

∞ Infinite.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the calendar is in order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, after line 8, the Committee on Finance propose to insert as a new paragraph the following:

115½. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 25 cents per ton: *Provided*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich	Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Rayner
Bacon	Craze	Hale	Richardson
Bailey	Culberson	Hughes	Root
Beveridge	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Borah	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Depew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bristow	Dillingham	La Follette	Stephenson
Brown	Dolliver	Lodge	Sutherland
Bulkeley	du Pont	McCumber	Tallaferro
Burkett	Elkins	McLaurin	Taylor
Burnham	Fletcher	Money	Tillman
Burrows	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Burton	Foster	Oliver	Warren
Chamberlain	Frye	Page	
Clapp	Gallinger	Penrose	
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Perkins	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, in the course of the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] yesterday, I gathered the impression that the Senator is opposed to the pending amendment of the Committee on Finance restoring a duty on iron ore. It is my purpose at this time to make some observations upon the restoration of duty on iron ore as proposed by the Senate bill.

Under the existing law, the rate of duty on iron ore is 40 cents a ton. The House bill removes that duty and puts the product on the free list. The Senate committee, in its desire to conform to the general purpose of the committee to reduce duties wherever it can be done without injury to American industry and American labor, proposed the amendment reported, to wit, a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore.

A duty on iron ore has always been a fruitful source of revenue. From the foundation of the Government, under all parties, whether revenue or protective, a duty has been imposed upon iron ore. I propose to submit at this point a table, without reading, asking to have it inserted in the Record.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the table will be printed in the Record.

The table referred to is as follows:

Tariff on iron ore.	Per cent.
1789, unenumerated articles	5
1790, unenumerated articles	5
1792, unenumerated articles for two years	7½
1794 to 1797, unenumerated articles	10
1797 to 1800, unenumerated articles	12½
1804, unenumerated articles	15
1806, 1809, 1810, 1812, unenumerated articles	15
1812, July, unenumerated articles	30
1813, unenumerated articles	15
1816, February, unenumerated articles	30
1816, April, unenumerated articles	15
1824, unenumerated articles	12½
1832, unenumerated articles	15
1833, unenumerated articles	15
1841, unenumerated articles	20
1842, unenumerated articles	20

	Per cent.
1846, minerals and bituminous (mineral) substances, crude.....	20
1857, minerals and bituminous (mineral) substances, crude.....	15
1861, March, minerals and bituminous (mineral) substances, crude.....	20
1861, August, December, minerals and bituminous (mineral) substances, crude.....	20
1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866 (four acts), 1867 (five acts), 1868 (two acts), 1869 (two acts), 1870 (two acts), 1872 (two acts), classification and rate unchanged.....	20
1874, 1875 (two acts), 1879, 1880, 1882 (two acts), iron ore.....	20
1883, iron ore.....	\$0.75
1890, iron ore.....	\$0.75
1894, iron ore.....	\$0.40
1897, iron ore.....	\$0.40

Mr. BURROWS. This table shows that under the tariff of 1789 iron ore bore a duty of 5 per cent, and there has never been an hour from that time until the present when a duty was not levied on iron ore for the purpose of securing the needed revenue for the support of the Government. Even the Wilson law, which was intended to be a decided step toward free trade, imposed a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore.

It appears from this that a duty has been levied upon iron ore from the foundation of the Government. It is now proposed to take the rash step not to reduce the duty, but to remove it entirely, and expose this product of our mines and their workers to the unrestrained competition of foreign countries.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. RAYNER. Only for a question.

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. RAYNER. I did not hear the Senator. What revenue does the Senator say we would get at 25 cents a ton? What would be the revenue under the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. BURROWS. I have been speaking of the amount of revenue which would be lost by putting iron ore on the free list.

Mr. RAYNER. No; but I should like to know how much would be the revenue under the Senate committee amendment at 25 cents a ton.

Mr. BURROWS. By referring to the schedule on the Senator's desk, he will very readily discover the answer to his question.

THE EFFECT.

Mr. President, if the House provision should be adopted, the immediate result would be a loss of \$332,020 in revenue, and under the importations of 1890 there would be a loss of \$867,547 in revenue. With a deficiency in the Treasury of the United States to-day of over \$94,000,000, it is difficult to comprehend what could have prompted the House to cut off this source of revenue, and it is equally difficult to understand why anyone in the Senate should be willing to ratify such action. The fact that there is such a deficit, the fact that the duty upon iron ore would yield so much revenue, it seems to me is a sufficient reason why the duty should be retained, if not at the present rate of 40 cents then at the moderate tax of 25 cents a ton, as proposed in the Senate bill.

I submit in this connection a table taken from the official records, showing the imports of iron ore from 1894 until 1908, and the duty collected thereon.

The table referred to is as follows:

Imports.

IRON ORE, INCLUDING MANGANIFEROUS IRON ORE, AND THE DROSS OR RESIDUUM FROM BURN'T PYRITES.

[Under general tariff.]

Year.	Duty.	Tons.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Per cent.
1894..	75 cents per ton.....	171,377.12	297,510.00	128,532.85	1.74	43.20
1895..	do.....	30,576.21	46,112.00	22,932.16	1.51	49.71
1896..	40 cents per ton.....	276,579.05	372,860.98	110,631.64	1.35	29.67
1897..	do.....	776,271.06	1,217,314.00	310,508.45	1.57	25.51
1898..	do.....	541,404.82	778,116.97	216,561.94	1.44	27.83
1899..	do.....	352,532.00	466,254.00	141,013.19	1.32	30.24
1899..	do.....	269,110.10	408,298.00	107,644.05	1.50	26.69
1900..	do.....	946,632.97	1,497,713.00	378,653.18	1.58	25.28
1901..	do.....	772,799.66	1,131,765.00	309,119.88	1.46	27.31
1902..	do.....	1,189,983.25	2,333,123.00	475,998.30	1.96	20.40
1903..	do.....	1,044,728.71	2,334,789.00	417,891.46	2.24	17.00
1904..	do.....	583,786.54	1,243,268.00	213,514.64	2.33	17.17
1905..	do.....	254,845.84	503,674.00	101,988.33	1.98	20.24
1906..	do.....	369,571.15	766,222.00	147,828.46	2.07	19.30
1907..	do.....	511,125.07	1,212,607.00	204,450.03	2.37	16.85
1908..	do.....	306,249.00	653,046.00	122,499.00	2.13	18.76

FROM CUBA (RECIPROCITY TREATY, DECEMBER 27, 1903).

1904..	40 cents per ton less 20 per cent.....	151,302.00	346,439.00	48,416.64	2.29	13.98
1905..	do.....	502,970.00	1,162,975.00	160,950.40	2.31	13.84
1906..	do.....	614,636.00	1,952,501.00	196,683.52	3.17	10.07
1907..	do.....	584,670.00	2,137,784.00	187,094.40	3.66	8.75
1908..	do.....	651,036.00	2,288,336.00	208,331.00	3.51	9.10

Mr. BURROWS. But, Mr. President, independent of the question of revenue, which I grant you is exceedingly important at this juncture, there are other—

Mr. RAYNER. The schedule makes it only \$127,781.27, and I suppose we will have to deduct—

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator's answer conveys no information to me or to the Senate, as that fact appears in the schedules already presented to the Senate, and in no way detracts from my statement that by putting iron ore on the free list we would lose a revenue of \$332,020.

But in addition, Mr. President, to the loss of revenue there are other considerations of the highest importance. This duty imposed on foreign ores has resulted in the development of an important industry in the United States, which I am quite sure the Senate will not wholly disregard.

It appears from the official tables that this industry of iron-ore mining exists to-day in 29 States and Territories of the Union. There have been opened and developed 525 mines, producing in 1907, in round numbers, 52,000,000 tons of iron ore, valued at \$132,000,000. These industries exist, as appears from the table, in Minnesota, Michigan, Alabama, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Tennessee, Virginia, New Jersey, Georgia, Arkansas, Texas, Missouri, North Carolina, and other States, showing that these industries are established in 29 States and Territories, and that there was a yield of ore of 51,720,619 tons last year, valued at \$131,996,147. I insert here a table showing the extent and value of this industry.

The table referred to is as follows:

Rank.	State.	Production, 1907.	
		Quantity in long tons.	Percentage of total production.
1	Minnesota.....	28,969,658	56.11
2	Michigan.....	11,830,342	22.87
3	Alabama.....	4,039,458	7.81
4	New York.....	1,375,020	2.61
5	Wisconsin.....	838,744	1.62
6	Pennsylvania.....	837,287	1.62
7	Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.....	* 819,544	1.59
8	Tennessee.....	813,690	1.57
9	Virginia.....	786,856	1.52
10	New Jersey.....	549,760	1.06
11	Georgia.....	444,114	.86
12	Arkansas and Texas.....	118,667	.23
13	Missouri.....	* 111,768	.22
14	Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia.....	62,808	.12
15	North Carolina.....	50,439	.10
16	Connecticut and Massachusetts.....	37,166	.07
17	Ohio.....	23,589	.05
18	Colorado.....	11,714	.02
Total.....		51,720,619	100

* Includes California and Washington.

† Includes Iowa.

Rank.	State.	Value, 1907.	
		Amount.	Percent- age of total.
1	Minnesota.....	\$76,638,836	58.08
2	Michigan.....	36,441,330	27.61
3	Alabama.....	4,863,129	3.69
4	New York.....	2,820,135	2.14
5	Wisconsin.....	2,665,737	2.02
6	New Jersey.....	1,815,586	1.38
7	Virginia.....	1,538,920	1.17
8	Tennessee.....	1,325,134	1
9	Pennsylvania.....	1,298,717	.98
10	Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.....	967,190	.73
11	Georgia.....	837,102	.63
12	Missouri.....	226,286	.17
13	Connecticut and Massachusetts.....	136,440	.10
14	Arkansas and Texas.....	120,060	.09
15	North Carolina.....	113,488	.09
16	Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia.....	95,891	.07
17	Ohio.....	41,081	.03
18	Colorado.....	21,085	.02
Total.....		131,996,147	100

* Includes California and Washington.

* Includes Iowa.

Mr. BURROWS. It will appear from this table that Minnesota takes the lead in the production of iron ore, showing an output of 28,969,658 tons, while Michigan is second in the list, and Alabama the third in the production of iron ore.

Leaving the general view of the industry in the United States and coming to the State of Michigan, we find that in 1904 the Lake Superior iron ore region alone yielded 21,000,000 tons, and in 1907 42,000,000 tons, doubling the output. The shipment from ports of the Northwest shows that from six ports in the Lake region there were shipped to the various United States ports where used 42,000,000 tons out of an entire output for the whole country of about 52,000,000 tons. I submit a table as follows:

Shipments by ranges of Lake Superior iron ore.

Gross tons.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Marquette Range.....	2,843,703	4,210,522	4,057,187	4,388,073
Menominee.....	3,074,848	4,495,451	5,109,088	4,964,728
Gogebic.....	2,398,287	3,706,736	3,641,985	3,637,907
Vermillion.....	1,282,513	1,677,186	1,792,355	1,685,267
Mesabi.....	12,156,008	20,153,699	23,792,553	27,492,949
Miscellaneous.....	67,480	111,391	123,742	76,146
Total Lake Superior.....	21,822,839	34,354,985	38,521,910	42,245,070

LOCATION.

Marquette Range, wholly in Michigan; Menominee and Gogebic ranges, in Michigan and Wisconsin; Vermillion and Mesabi ranges, in Minnesota.

Shipments by ports, 1907.

	Gross tons.
Escambia.....	5,761,988
Marquette.....	3,013,826
Ashland.....	3,437,672
Two Harbors.....	8,188,906
Superior.....	7,440,386
Duluth.....	13,445,977
Total.....	41,288,755
Water.....	41,288,755
All rail.....	956,315
Total.....	42,245,070

The extent and value of this industry, existing as it does in 29 States and Territories, is very important. The number of mines opened and in operation in 1902 was 525; operators employed, 332; the number of officials, 2,405; their salaries, \$2,113,230; the wage-earners number nearly 39,000; the wages paid amount to \$21,531,000; miscellaneous expenses, \$8,000,000; supplies and materials, \$35,000,000; and the value of the gross output more than \$65,500,000.

In 1902 the output was over 35,000,000 tons, and in 1907 over 51,000,000. Based upon this increased tonnage, it is fair to assume that the wage-earners have increased to-day to 56,000 and their earnings \$31,500,000.

Census figures for 1902.

[Being the latest available.]

Number of operators.....	332
Number of officials, clerks, etc.....	2,405
Their salaries.....	\$2,113,230

Wage-earners.....	38,851
Wages.....	\$21,531,792
Contract work.....	\$425,290
Miscellaneous expenses.....	\$8,257,714
Supplies and materials.....	\$9,005,608
Product, gross tons.....	35,567,410
Value.....	\$65,465,321

The increase in output:

1902.....	35,567,410
1907.....	51,720,619

Increase in gross tons.....16,153,209

Based upon this increased tonnage, it is fair to assume that the wage-earners have increased to 56,528 and their earnings to \$31,328,757.

The output of foreign mines of iron ore in 1907 was 86,000,000 tons. I will submit here, in connection with my remarks, a table showing the output of foreign mines from the various countries named, aggregating the amount I have stated. The table referred to is as follows:

Foreign ore production, 1907.

	Gross tons.
Great Britain.....	15,482,984
Germany and Luxemburg.....	23,841,031
France.....	9,993,465
Algeria.....	971,985
Austria.....	2,537,308
Hungary.....	2,249,983
Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	164,647
Austria-Hungary.....	4,301,864
Spain.....	9,913,520
Belgium.....	315,787
Italy.....	517,176
Sweden.....	4,473,550
Russia.....	4,221,060
Norway.....	129,805
Greece.....	766,698
India.....	67,567
Japan.....	5,641,932

Total.....85,590,362

As compared with the domestic output for 1907 of 51,720,619 gross tons.

Mr. BURROWS. There has recently come into existence a very fierce and dangerous competitor in the shape of Cuba, whose mines are practically inexhaustible. Being near to our border, with cheap water transportation and cheaper labor, the mines of Cuba are becoming a serious menace.

I presume the Senate is entirely familiar with this matter; but I desire to read a letter dated August 3, 1907, from Mr. J. G. Butler, jr., in relation to the great ore discovery, as he calls it, in Cuba. He says:

I returned this morning from practically a week's absence in the East, taking in Pittsburg, Philadelphia, and New York, and will give the members the result of my observations and information.

A GREAT ORE DISCOVERY.

I have heard more or less recently in regard to the discovery of an enormous body of iron ore in Cuba by interests identified with the Pennsylvania Steel Company and, incidentally, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. While in Philadelphia, through Mr. James McCrea and Mr. Felton—

Whose report I will read later—

of the Pennsylvania Steel Company I was given quite full information. It is practically, in a sense, a duplicate of the Mesabi Range, and as Mr. Tenney, Mr. Felton's assistant, stated, they stumbled onto it. There is no stripping, as what would ordinarily be stripping is the ore itself. More than 10,000 holes have been bored and I was shown the general result of these borings. It is strictly Bessemer ore, averaging about 0.023 in phosphorus. It is, however, very high in moisture, and the plan is to treat the ore and expel the moisture before shipping. The ore body is on the summit of a plateau 10 miles long and 4 miles wide, and in the Province of Oriente, on the northern coast of the island of Cuba. There is a fine harbor 13 miles from the ore body, to which, of course, a railroad must be built. There are about 27,000 acres in the tract.

To make certain there was no mistake regarding the quality of the ore, 6,000 tons were brought down from the mountain on the backs of burros, taken to the seashore, shipped to Sparrows Point, Md., and converted into pig iron by working the ore alone, without any admixture, and this product again put into rails and structural work. The experiments were entirely satisfactory and the quality of the material above question.

The great mass of the ore is sort of a reddish-colored clay, something like the soil in New Jersey, which you observe in passing, but there is considerable of the ore, I was informed, that is rather hard and in the form of large shot. Whether this ore will be imported and sold to consumers has not been determined. I rather judge from what Mr. McCrea said that the use of the ore will be confined to the Pennsylvania Steel Company. There is no mistake about this information. It is certainly the largest discovery of iron ore which has been made since the opening of the Mesabi Range, and has a very important bearing, in my judgment, upon the future of the iron and steel industries of this country. I was informed that the quantity measured up is considerably in excess of 600,000,000 tons. One of the parties to whom I talked said that he thought the deposit was equal to the whole of Lake Superior.

J. G. BUTLER, JR.

* The figures for Japan are for 1906.

Mr. Felton, president of the Pennsylvania steel corporation, in a report to the stockholders of the Pennsylvania Steel Company said:

PENNSYLVANIA STEEL COMPANY,
Philadelphia, April 25, 1908.

To the stockholders of Pennsylvania Steel Company:

You will find inclosed with this a pamphlet, reprinted, by permission, from two articles which appeared recently in the Iron Age. I hope you will read this pamphlet, as it contains a full description of the iron-ore properties in Cuba belonging to the Spanish-American Iron Company, which is owned by Pennsylvania Steel Company.

The articles were written by Mr. Charles Kirchhoff, editor of the Iron Age, who visited the properties in February last.

The old properties at Daiquiri, on the south side of the island of Cuba, which have been producing ore since 1895, are fully described, but it is to the description of the new properties on the north coast of Cuba, near Mayari, that I ask your especial attention.

I feel sure that you will be interested in reading this description of the properties and gratified to know that the Pennsylvania Steel Company, through one of its subsidiary companies, has acquired this great deposit of iron ore, which will furnish more raw material of this class than your companies can use for many years to come. The development and equipment of this Mayari property is well under way, and it is hoped that shipments of ore may be made during the year 1909.

Yours, truly,

E. C. FELTON, President.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to inquire of the Senator what relation, if any, the Pennsylvania Steel Company sustains to the United States Steel Company?

Mr. RAYNER. We can not hear the Senator over here. Some of us have some interest in this question and would like to hear the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. BROWN. My inquiry was as to what relation, if any, the Pennsylvania Steel Company sustains to the United States Steel Company.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President—

Mr. BURROWS. Allow me to say, in this connection, that it is not material here. I do not know. It will appear, possibly, later; but, be that as it may, what I am now showing is to demonstrate from official sources the value of these deposits in Cuba.

Mr. DU PONT. I think I can answer that question.

Mr. BROWN. It may become very material as to who is the owner of this property.

Mr. BURROWS. It may later on. Mr. Felton, speaking further of this Cuban property, says:

The deposits themselves are unique in many respects. They are enormous in extent. They can be mined at a cost which can only be duplicated elsewhere under exceptional circumstances, for comparatively very limited areas. Suffice it to state that it is a question of excavating by steam shovel tens of thousands of acres of a deposit of ore averaging a thickness of 15 feet at least, without any stripping whatever. Suffice it to say that operations have begun with only the smaller of two tracts, the Mayari, and that for the present there is in reserve a second larger tract, the Moa, which it is not proposed to touch for the present.

This, I think, justifies the conclusion that the volume of ore in Cuba is practically inexhaustible; and whether it is in the hands of one corporation or another, or of an individual does not matter in this connection. I show this for the purpose of demonstrating that to open our ports to the free importation of ore means the impairment if not destruction of the iron-ore industry in every State in this Union where it exists.

But the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] is exceedingly apprehensive that if we do not close our mines they will be exhausted prematurely, and that we shall be left without iron ore. Fortunately, we are able to make somewhat of an estimate of the amount of ore in our mines awaiting the touch of labor and the investment of capital. I think it will be disclosed—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BURROWS. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask this question, if the Senator from Michigan will permit: Does he believe that, with free iron ore, taken in connection with the cost of production in Cuba which he has indicated, Cuban ore could supplant Lake Superior ore at Pittsburg?

Mr. BURROWS. It would lessen materially and restrict the market for our ore, if it did not entirely close our mines.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator passes into the subject he is just approaching, has he the freight rates from the Lake Superior region to Pittsburg, as compared with the freight rates from Cuba to Pittsburg?

Mr. BURROWS. I have not that information at hand.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask merely for information, because I had been led to believe that neither the Cuban nor the Nova Scotian mines could get farther west in our country than the Allegheny Mountains. Possibly I am wrong about that.

Mr. BURROWS. That may possibly be so; but whenever you restrict the market for our ores, whenever you close our mines or restrict their output and invite foreign competition, just in that proportion you will cripple the industry.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. The conclusion of the Senator from Michigan is, I think, a very correct one, if modified a trifle. It seems, if my information is correct, that while free ore from Cuba might very much interfere with the iron mines in Pennsylvania and New York and New Jersey, it does not seem to me that it could very seriously interfere with the iron mines of Michigan, Minnesota, and the South, inasmuch, as I understand, comparatively little of the Lake Superior ore goes east of the Allegheny Mountains.

Mr. BURROWS. My friend, Mr. Young, of the House of Representatives, who represents the upper peninsula, I will say to the Senator from Iowa, has just handed me a note. He is entirely familiar with the industry as it exists in his district. He states that the freight rate from the Lake Superior mines to Pittsburg is \$2.28 per ton, while the rate from Cuba to Pittsburg is \$2.35 per ton.

I was about to speak of the extent of the iron-ore deposits in the United States. I hold in my hand an advance copy of the report of the United States Geological Survey, by C. W. Hayes, made March 11, 1909. I will say that this report from the Geological Survey is embodied, although the work is not yet completed, in the report of the conservation congress, and approved by it, showing the amount of ore still available in this country. That report is as follows:

IRON-ORE SUPPLIES OF THE UNITED STATES.

[By C. W. Hayes, United States Geological Survey.]

The ore supply of the Lake Superior district available under present conditions is therefore taken to include all ore above 55 per cent iron, estimated at 2,500,000,000 tons, and 25 per cent of all ore containing between 45 per cent and 55 per cent iron, giving a total of 3,500,000,000 tons, exclusive of the Clinton ores. * * * It seems entirely probable, in view of the fact that 40 per cent ore is even now locally in demand, that the depletion of the higher-grade reserves may in time require the use of 35 per cent ore. If so, the tonnage is enormous. Planimeter measurements of areas of the iron formation, multiplied by the depths quite within the limits of actual mining at the present time, give the following results:

Table showing tonnage of iron formations.

District.	Area.	Depth.	Volume.	Quantity.
	Sq. mi.	Feet.	Cu. mi.	Tons.
Michigan:				
Crystal Falls.....	7.8	1,250	1.95	19,500,000,000
Marquette.....	28.5	1,250	7.1	71,000,000,000
Menominee.....	5.6	1,250	1.4	14,000,000,000
Penokee.....	11.6	1,250	2.9	29,000,000,000
Swanzy.....	1	1,000	.2	2,000,000,000
Minnesota:				
Mesabi.....	127	400	10	100,000,000,000
Vermillion.....	15.6	1,250	3.9	39,000,000,000
Wisconsin:				
Florence.....	.7	1,250	.175	1,750,000,000
Total.....	197.8		27.635	276,250,000,000

It is not proven, however, that this enormous tonnage will average as high in iron as these figures from the mining companies would indicate. Indeed, many parts of the formation are known to run lower than this. It is regarded safer, therefore, to use a smaller figure for the tonnage of ore running 35 per cent and over. Just what fraction of the total tonnage of the iron formation should be taken is a matter of more or less arbitrary choice. It is here put at 72,000,000,000 tons, divided as shown in the following table:

Estimates of Lake Superior ores.

[Long tons.]

	Available.	Not available.
Michigan:		
Marquette district.....	110,000,000	15,900,000,000
Gogebie district.....	95,000,000	3,900,000,000
Menominee, Crystal Falls, and other districts..	80,000,000	7,360,000,000
Minnesota:		
Mesabi district.....	3,100,000,000	39,000,000,000
Vermillion district.....	60,000,000	1,005,000,000
Cayuna and other districts.....	15,000,000	310,000,000
Wisconsin.....	40,000,000	4,525,000,000
Total.....	3,500,000,000	72,000,000,000

Summary of foreign supplies.—The total estimated supplies of ore of sufficiently high grade and accessible to mining and transportation to be at present available, and which are so located as to affect the iron industry of the United States, are shown in the following table:

Table of estimated available foreign iron ore.

	Long tons.
Canada:	
British Columbia, magnetite chiefly	30,000,000
Lake Superior district, hematite chiefly	9,000,000
Nova Scotia, Clinton hematite	4,000,000
Newfoundland, Clinton hematite	30,000,000
Cuba:	
Santiago district, hematite	5,000,000
Mayari, Moa, Baracoa, Cubitas, and Pinar del Rio districts, limonite	1,500,000,000
Total	1,578,000,000

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

The extent to which foreign ores are now supplying the market is shown by the following table of imports:

Imports of iron ore from foreign countries, 1889 to 1907.

Year.	Cuba.	Newfoundland and Labrador.	Quebec, Ontario, etc.	Spain.	Other countries.*	Total.
1889	243,255	14,450	4,091	298,568	208,209	853,573
1890	351,814	6,320	22,211	512,933	353,552	1,246,830
1891	257,189		2,126	323,771	329,778	912,864
1892	307,115		8,606	236,957	253,007	806,585
1893	349,977		872	99,640	76,962	526,951
1894	140,025		443	15,067	11,772	167,307
1895	337,255			77,594	79,304	524,153
1896	380,551	20,800		121,132	190,323	682,806
1897	383,820	29,250		66,193	10,707	489,970
1898	165,622			13,335	8,250	187,208
1899	360,813	77,770		145,206	90,093	674,082
1900	431,265	140,535	5,588	253,694	66,749	897,831
1901	526,583	79,360	163,383	180,810	16,814	966,950
1902	606,375	81,020	203,824	153,527	29,824	1,165,470
1903	613,585	83,730	169,081	94,720	15,724	980,440
1904	364,630	5,400	77,837	36,810	2,885	487,613
1905	539,985	5,600	104,696	191,831	4,150	845,651
1906	639,362	125,395	57,890	171,870	65,873	1,060,390
1907	657,133	89,685	26,878	206,318	159,154	1,229,168
Total	7,776,305	763,415	847,076	3,290,096	2,029,040	14,705,842

* Belgium, Brazil, British Columbia, England, France, French Africa, French West Indies, Germany, Greece, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, New Brunswick, Norway, Nova Scotia, Oceanica, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey in Asia, Turkey in Europe, Venezuela, etc.

† Includes Newfoundland only.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] yesterday was apprehensive that in spite of the existence in the Northwest, in the three States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, of deposits aggregating 75,000,000,000 tons of iron ore we will run short in thirty years. Some little estimate has been made in relation to that matter, and it has been stated that if the output of our mines shall continue at the same rate as for a few years past, it would take a little over 6,000 years to exhaust the ores in the United States. The Senator from South Dakota therefore, it seems to me, need not be alarmed for the generations that shall appear 6,000 years hence.

Just a word more, and I am through. I have sought to show the value and the extent of this industry and that there is not the slightest danger of exhausting it. In addition to that, I want to call attention to the importance of the iron industry to the people I have the honor, in part, to represent. I hold in my hand resolutions passed by the legislature of the State of Michigan, which I beg to submit to the Senate:

Whereas there is at present, and has been since November, 1907, a great depression in the iron-ore market, which has resulted in practically closing the iron mines of Michigan; and

Whereas the operators of the iron mines will gladly operate their mines, if they can do so without absolute loss, and are at present employing a small force of married men so that men with families may be able to buy the necessities of life for their families; and

Whereas if the duty is removed from iron ore and the ores of foreign countries are admitted free into the United States, the loss will fall upon the men now engaged in iron mining: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That all Members of Congress from this State, and also our United States Senators, are respectfully requested to use all honorable means to have the tariff or duty on iron ore maintained as at present; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward each Member of Congress and United States Senator from Michigan a copy of these resolutions.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BURROWS. I would prefer that the Senator would wait until I finish.

Mr. BURKETT. Very well.

Mr. BURROWS. Personally, I regret very much that the duty could not have been maintained at 40 cents a ton. I think

it ought to have been retained at that rate. I am apprehensive that the reduction to 25 cents a ton is going to cripple the industry and distress our people. In this connection, I also desire to present a remonstrance from the people of the upper peninsula, signed by 586 workers in the mines. This petition, dated Iron Mountain, Mich., April 5, sets forth:

We, the undersigned citizens and qualified voters of the city of Iron Mountain, Mich., protest against the removal of the duty on iron ore, as proposed in the bill recently introduced in Congress, believing, as we do, that to place iron ore on the free list would decrease the demand for the ores of the United States and consequently reduce the value of these ores and the labor required, and therefore indirectly affect the value of all farm products of this State, and we therefore urge you to use your best endeavors to have the duty on iron ore retained.

And, Mr. President, I present also a remonstrance, signed by 982 miners, and the paper bears upon its face, it will be seen, the stamp of authenticity, colored, as it is, with the touch of the mines. These people, in mass convention, say:

Whereas it is apparent to all of us that that clause embodied in the proposed Payne tariff bill, which seeks to take the tariff from imports of iron ore, will work a vital and irreparable injury to Stambaugh Township and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

Whereas we, as a body of citizens assembled, desire to protest most earnestly against the passage of any act that will remove the tax upon iron ore: It is therefore

Resolved, That we, as a body of citizens, hereby protest against the said clause in said bill, and that it is the sense of this meeting that our Senators and Congressmen do exert their utmost powers to defeat the said measure.

Mr. President, this is all I care to say upon this subject. I know of nothing more to say. A large body of our citizens is engaged in this industry in Michigan. All they have on earth is there; they are living in their own homes, built from the fruits of their own toil. Many of the mines are 2,200 feet deep; and they mine this ore and bring it to the surface, and by their toil day and night have accumulated, as I say, all they have in this world. Now it is proposed to cripple this industry, because, forsooth, to continue it is going to lessen our natural supply of ore, which, as I have already shown, will be exhausted in a little over six thousand years. This is done under the pretense of conserving our natural resources, and sometimes upon the plea of free raw material; but the humble miner who, in the caverns of the earth, brings forth the ore to the mouth of the mine presents to the manufacturer not a raw material, but the miner's finished product.

It will be a sad day for this Republic and its industries when the iron mines, the mines of lead ore, the marble quarries, and all the natural resources of this country, from which we draw the raw material for our manufactured products, shall be closed, whenever and as often as we find some place on the globe where quarrying is cheaper, where mining is cheaper, where labor is cheaper, and thus cripple our own industries and deprive our own people of employment while we pay tribute to foreigners. The protective system reaches not only to the manufactured products, but it compasses the raw material in the earth as well, strengthening and nerving the arm of labor to bring it forth for the uses of mankind. I therefore, Mr. President, insist that the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Finance ought to prevail.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I propose to discuss this question very briefly, and I want to place it in a perfectly clear light, if I can, before the Senate. We know that the House of Representatives placed iron ore on the free list. The Senate committee has amended the bill by putting a duty of 25 cents a ton on the iron ore. If we should succeed in having this amendment rejected, iron ore will be put back upon the free list, where the House of Representatives placed it.

Mr. President, before entering into the question I want to read to the Senate a few brief extracts from prominent journals, which will only occupy a few moments, and they have placed the situation about as clearly and have given to it about as much light as I can contribute to the subject-matter. I ask the attention of the Senate to the extracts. The first one that I read is as follows:

WHY THE DUTY ON ORE?

When the tariff bill as framed by the House Ways and Means Committee was made public, there was no other alteration in the Dingley tariff schedules that so greatly impressed the plain common sense of the people as being right and needful as the wiping out of the tax of 40 cents per ton upon imported iron ores. It was never for a moment imagined that the Senate committee would attempt to restore this tax upon the crude product from which steel is manufactured. The proposal of the Senate Finance Committee to place a duty of 25 cents per ton upon the ores on which the American steel plants that are located along the Atlantic coast—

This is where the controversy takes place, I will say in passing—

are entirely dependent has about it the plain appearance of an attempt to discriminate between home industries.

Discussing the matter from this view point, the Philadelphia Press, in a recent issue, declares that "the surest way to make the United States Steel Corporation a greater trust than it is at present is to keep the

duty on iron ore. The key to the whole steel trade situation is ore, for all steel comes from ore. The United States Steel Company has a monopoly of the iron ore that is known to exist in this country. It tightened its grip upon the ore supply when it acquired the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company as a "panic measure." The foregoing being the situation, the Press points out that the independent makers of steel must do one of two things—buy iron ore from the trust at a much higher price than the same ore costs the trust or else import ore from foreign countries.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. RAYNER. This extract is from the Philadelphia Press, but the article is taken from a paper the name of which I have lost; but I know it is a Republican paper, if that is any satisfaction to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator state that from his recollection, or is it a fact?

Mr. RAYNER. I say I know it is a Republican paper, but I do not know what paper. I placed a memorandum at the head of it at the time, but it does not appear to be here now. It is a Republican paper, however.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish the Senator could give the name of it.

Mr. RAYNER. I can not give the name, because I do not recall it. I have several extracts here, and I had at the head of each the name of the paper from which the extract is taken. This is from a Republican paper, and I will try to give the name to the Senator. I have sent out to see if I can get it. It is, however, as I have said, a Republican paper; but that does not make any difference one way or the other. I do not care whether it is a Republican or a Democratic paper. I want to have the truth of this business, no matter where we get it from.

The steel industries located in the vicinity of Baltimore, like those in the region directly tributary to Philadelphia, are dependent upon foreign ores or chiefly upon Cuban ores. The most valuable of these Cuban ore lands are owned by one of the large independent steel companies—

We might as well have the truth about the entire situation—And the Press very pertinently asks: "Is there either logic or justice in a tax put upon this ore which American money and American enterprise have acquired? Could there possibly be any folly greater than to strike down an independent company which wishes to bring Cuban ore that it already owns to the United States to convert it into steel by the employment of American workmen?" The inevitable conclusion is that "the Aldrich iron-ore schedule imposes an indefensible duty and gives unnecessary aid to an already dominant trust."

This is from the Philadelphia Press.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. We can not hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will observe that the reporters are unable to hear what he says.

Mr. DANIEL. I want to ask the Senator from Maryland if he can tell us what American organization controls Cuban ore? Does the Pennsylvania Steel Company—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again suggests to the Senator from Virginia that the reporters are losing his remarks.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg pardon.

Mr. RAYNER. I understand the question.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to know what is the name of the independent steel trust or company that controls the ore in Cuba. I want to get my question in the Record. It is whether or not the Pennsylvania Steel Company, or some large steel company in Pennsylvania, does not in a measure control the Cuban ore. I have seen such a statement.

Mr. RAYNER. I propose to answer that question fully before I conclude. It is a pertinent question and deserves an answer.

I am not connected in any way, directly or remotely, with or have I the slightest interest in the United States Steel Corporation or the Pennsylvania Steel Company or the Bethlehem Company, which may have a proprietorship in these Cuban ores. I would feel myself absolutely dishonored and disgraced if I were speaking here in the interest of any of these colossal corporations. I shall answer the question and give the name of the company, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not suppose there is a man in the world who is speaking in the interest of anybody except the people.

Mr. RAYNER. I understand that; and the Senator's question requires an answer. It deserves an answer. We want this question put right before the Senate. I do not know anything about these companies, and I do not believe a word that any of them say on either side, because their special interests

are involved, and I would not argue this question from any such standpoint.

A steel monopoly in this country can only be made possible by a monopoly in the ownership of home ores and by a tax upon Cuban and other outside ores. Within the past two decades a half score or so of important steel plants—

That is what I want to call the attention of the Senate to—have sprung into existence along the tidal waters contiguous to the Atlantic coast. These coastal industries, almost without exception, are dependent upon either Spanish or Cuban ores. And traffic in these foreign ores has served to increase and foster the foreign trade of Baltimore and other Atlantic ports.

This is a very important proposition, to which I want to advert hereafter:

The ships that come laden with ore go back with cargoes of coal, grain, agricultural machinery, or other exported goods. The Aldrich proposal to tax ores is a blow aimed both at the coastal industries and at coastal commerce.

I want to read just another communication, or article, from the Philadelphia Public Ledger. I wish to read just a few lines, because it puts the matter clearly. I do not want to discuss this question for hours or days, as has been done with other questions. I want to put it concisely to the Senate, so that the Senate may take whatever action it deems proper in the premises:

The duty on iron ore affords a very striking example of the difference with which any item of the tariff is viewed in different localities. Economic questions are everywhere less dependent on political theory than upon geography. The commanding position of the Pittsburgh steel interests is largely due to their control of the exhaustless supplies of ores in the Lake Superior region and the economy with which this ore is brought directly to the furnaces—

That is, the Pittsburgh furnaces—

Eastern establishments, which must transport their ore a long distance by rail across the mountains, are thus at a serious disadvantage, so far as they are dependent upon native ores.

There are great supplies of rich ores in the West Indies accessible by water that might be brought cheaply to our eastern mills, thus counterbalancing the economies of lake transportation. But the tariff puts a prohibitive penalty on their use. Thus the interest of eastern Pennsylvania is directly opposed, in this instance, to that of western Pennsylvania—

A peculiar situation, and we want the truth—

The tariff on ores "protects" the valley of the Ohio at the expense of the valley of the Delaware, which has the natural barrier of the Alleghenies upon one side and the artificial barrier of the custom-house upon the other.

Now, just one more extract, and this was a petition that was sent, I think, to the committee at the time the Wilson bill was framed. I will read only a few lines of it, because it reveals the situation. This petition sets forth:

The foreign iron ore trade which began in 1877 at this port—

That is, the port of Baltimore—

and in 1880 first became a large business, has been of incalculable value to our export trade, having furnished a large proportion of the vessels which have loaded our grain, as well as other products, at much lower rates than they could have otherwise been obtained for. Only twelve months ago, when foreign iron ore was being freely imported from the Mediterranean into the United States, ocean grain freights from Baltimore were a full shilling per quarter or 3 cents per bushel lower than they are to-day, when our grain steamers are having to come across the ocean in ballast, because under the existing tariff and changed business conditions almost no iron ore at all is being imported.

The benefits have not been wholly ours, but on the contrary have reached back to the producer of every bushel of grain raised in the country, the price obtained for the surplus fixing the price for the balance. Against the keen and increasing competition of India, Russia, and South America we shall have difficulty enough in maintaining our export trade under any conditions, and homeward iron ore freights for our grain steamers are therefore of supreme importance.

Just one other paper before I make the remarks I intend to make. It is from the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce. I have had resolutions presented to me by the chamber of commerce, by the board of trade—to myself and my colleague—and by the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, and these gentlemen composing these associations are absolutely disinterested in this matter. They are acting in what they conceive to be the public interest and the business interests of the country, and they are not connected, so far as the associations are concerned, and so far as I am able to ascertain, with any of the conflicting interests engaged in this controversy. Here is a resolution from the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce:

BALTIMORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Baltimore, April 30, 1909.

HON. ISIDOR RAYNER,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special meeting of the board of directors of this chamber, held this day, at which the question of a duty on iron ore was considered, the following action was unanimously taken, and your particular attention is directed thereto, viz:

Whereas so long ago as February 12, 1894, when the Wilson bill was under discussion, and the House of Representatives had proposed, as it has now in the Payne bill, to make iron ore free, the directors of this chamber, then known as the "Corn and Flour Exchange," unanimously adopted a memorial setting forth in detail the advantages of the Med-

Itteranean ore trade to the export trade of the Atlantic seaboard and the incidental advantage to the sellers of every product of our country of which a surplus was being exported; and

Whereas the argument is unanswerable to-day, as it was then, and the situation has only changed to the extent that the Mediterranean iron ores have been displaced by the Cuban iron ores, and exports of coal to Cuban ports and other ports in the West Indies and Central America have correspondingly increased—each has fostered and made the other trade possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the foreign iron-ore trade of the Atlantic seaboard being already of supreme importance as return freight for vessels carrying exports, in spite of the present duty of 40 cents per ton, it can not be doubted that the abolition of this duty would inure to the still greater advantage of the producers and sellers of every product of which a surplus is exported; further, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Maryland, with an earnest request of them to strenuously oppose the imposition of any duty on iron ore by the Senate or any conference committee that may be called to consider the tariff bill as a whole.

Yours, truly,

H. A. WROTH, *Secretary*.

The House of Representatives put iron ore on the free list. Let me read just a few lines from the leader of the Republican party in the other House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, upon this subject. I am reading now from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23:

We have put iron ore on the free list after full consideration by the committee. I do not think I will go into that in detail, but I want to say that the evidence of Judge Gary, president of the United States Steel Company, was that in the production of pig iron 2 tons of our iron would go as far as 3 tons of the iron imported from across the sea; and that is true also of the Nova Scotia iron, they yielding about 40 per cent and ours about 60 per cent. Of course, while that is true, it follows that there would be no occasion or necessity of a duty of 40 cents a ton on iron ore.

He says that the Cuban ore yields a better percentage.

The gentleman was solicitous about the steel trust for some reason or other in the hearings, and there has been some fear in some quarters that the steel trust might ultimately drive the smaller concerns out of business. Some of the smaller concerns are located near the Atlantic seacoast—the Pennsylvania Steel Company at Sparrows Point—

That is in our State—

and perhaps this company is at more disadvantage than some of the others who are manufacturing iron and steel goods. If they can get their iron ore a little cheaper on account of the taking off of this duty, it would strengthen that company and help them to keep on in the uneven race which it has with the great concern, the United States Steel Company.

Mr. President, that gives the situation so that anyone can understand it. The mills and furnaces on the Atlantic coast are at an absolute disadvantage as compared with the mills and furnaces west of the mountains, and there is no reason on this earth, as a general proposition, why the enterprises upon the Atlantic seaboard should not be placed upon a par and a level with their western competitors.

I do not think there is a particle of danger in the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa this morning, or rather in the question asked, that such ore will go west of the mountains, but they will go upon the Atlantic coast, and they will go there so as to enable the eastern enterprises honestly and legitimately to compete with their competitors who have now an absolutely undue advantage over them.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN. Who are the competitors on the Atlantic coast of the United States steel trust?

Mr. RAYNER. The controversy, a controversy in which I am not at all concerned and to which I shall presently refer, is between certain companies. Before the Senator's question is answered, I will say that the competitors in the East are the enterprises in my State and in eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware—Wilmington—and other places, perhaps. The Wilmington works and the eastern Pennsylvania and Maryland works are competitors with the other enterprises that not only get their ore much cheaper, but absolutely own the products themselves, as I think I can show in a few minutes. I think I am right on that proposition. If the Senator from Virginia will remain here, I will therefore answer the question he asked me, or I will wait until he returns.

I say free ore puts them upon an equality, and, furthermore, I say, as I think I have shown, that it benefits every shipper in the United States by enabling the ships that leave the eastern ports with the products of the United States to come back with iron ore instead of ballast, and thus lessens the freight rate upon the products exported from the United States. It is a universal benefit, and if it were not I would not stand here for the purpose of taking the position I do. It is a benefit to the shippers of the United States. It is a benefit to the interests that are competing with the United States Steel Corporation, and which should have an opportunity to compete, and I

think it is absolutely a benefit to those who become the owners of the products, because when you lessen the duty on the raw material you lessen the price of the product when it comes into the market.

The Senator from Michigan is right in what he says about the revenue, but I do not think that need terrify us to any extent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If it will not interrupt the Senator—

Mr. RAYNER. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to suggest to him that one of the principal owners of Cuban ore, Mr. Schwab, testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means that it would not make any difference in the price of the manufactured product.

Mr. RAYNER. Who testified to that?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Schwab.

Mr. RAYNER. I do not believe anything from interested parties. I will come to that in a minute. This country is filled with tariff liars. There seems to be something about the tariff that seems to make it impossible for a man interested in it to tell the truth. It seems to pervert the faculties of the human mind and the aspirations and longings of the soul for the truth.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. DICK. May I inquire of the Senator if that includes importers as well as producers?

Mr. RAYNER. I place no credence in the testimony of any one of these tariff witnesses who is specially interested either in having the tariff reduced or raised. I must get my information from disinterested parties who are not affected by the schedules, either one way or the other, and I say this with the greatest respect to the witnesses who appeared before that committee. I never in my life saw anything like the situation here. You can not get the truth out of anybody. So far as that is concerned, I am very fond of liars generally. I have studied them by day and by night, and I have met them in every vocation and pursuit of life, but never in my life have I met such an aggregation of them as are assembled to-day in the streets of this capital and the halls and corridor here and before the committees, and the peculiarity about the matter is that they lie with equal facility upon both sides of the same question.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. DICK. The Senator has read from journals and quoted from bodies or representative citizens in his own State. Does he hold that they are disinterested; and if not, are they truthful?

Mr. RAYNER. I can not hear the Senator. There is so much noise around here that I could not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. DICK. My question was this: The Senator has quoted from certain journals and has read resolutions of certain bodies in his own State, or from his own State. Does he insist that they are disinterested witnesses?

Mr. RAYNER. Undoubtedly the resolutions which have come from the commercial bodies are disinterested. Those people have a public interest in it, and their interest is in connection with the business interests of the country. But they are not interested in it like the United States Steel Company and the Pennsylvania Steel Company and the Bethlehem Company or the Spanish-American Company, which have a direct interest either in keeping the duty on Cuban ore or in having it admitted free. It is an entirely different situation as between the gentlemen who compose these commercial bodies and the gentlemen who compose the other concerns, who are directly interested in the schedules now before the Senate. I think I have answered that question. I am trying to get my information from disinterested sources.

So far as the journals are concerned, of course the Senator will have to conclude whether they are reliable. They are his own journals. They are Republican journals, and, if they are not telling the truth, it is not my fault. I think they are telling the truth.

Mr. DICK. The Senator makes the broad assertion that all the men who testified on tariff matters, if interested, are liars.

Mr. RAYNER. I did not make the statement quite so broad as that, although very close to it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Close to it.

Mr. RAYNER. If I was in a court of justice and a man would come up and give his testimony, a man who was deeply interested in the profits of a concern whose business was at stake, I could not place entire reliance on his testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In the case of Mr. Schwab, he was under oath and was giving testimony, which, if accepted as true, was directly opposed to his own interest. Under such circumstances does the Senator from Maryland give credence to what he said?

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from South Dakota quoted Mr. Schwab yesterday and showed that Mr. Schwab had taken, if I mistake not, two conflicting positions in regard to this matter. If you will give me Mr. Schwab's statement, I will tell you whether it is true or not, because if it is in his own interest, I must ignore it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Senator from Maryland will admit that Mr. Schwab is a large owner of Cuban iron ore.

Mr. RAYNER. As I understand, the owners of these Cuban deposits are the Bethlehem Steel Company and others—whether the Bethlehem Steel Company means Mr. Schwab or not I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The hearings before the House committee show that Mr. Schwab is not only a very large stockholder in the Bethlehem Company, but that he is president of, and speaks for, that company. That company does own these Cuban ores, and Mr. Schwab admits it.

Mr. RAYNER. Let us take it for granted.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And when Mr. Schwab says in his sworn testimony that to put iron on the free list would not reduce the price of manufactured steel products, will the Senator from Maryland believe his statement to be true?

Mr. RAYNER. I will believe one or the other of his statements to be incorrect; which one I do not know, and I do not care.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The question asked—

Mr. RAYNER. When was that testimony given before the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It will be found on page 1671 of the testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to his colleague?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I ask the Senator from Michigan whether the Bethlehem Company is the sole owner of that ore?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think the Pennsylvania Steel Company, also.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. You stated that they owned the Cuban ore. I think there are others besides the Bethlehem Company.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will read from Mr. Schwab, at page 1671, Schedule C, part 1, of the hearings. After giving the price of steel rails, which he says is in obedience to the understanding between the steel-rail manufacturers, and after fixing the price at \$28 a ton, Mr. CLARK said:

Suppose you put the market price of rails and steel products down to the home consumer to the same basis you did to the foreign consumer, do you not think the home consumption would have swelled to the extent of this foreign export?

Mr. SCHWAB. I do not think it would have increased a ton.

Mr. CLARK. I believe, then, there is no hope of getting a lower price.

Mr. SCHWAB. No; I am afraid not. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, if I do not interrupt the Senator against his will—

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator is talking about steel rails, and I am talking about iron ore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am talking about the products of iron ore.

Mr. RAYNER. I am talking about an entirely different thing. That has no connection whatever with the discussion I am now pursuing. I am talking of iron ore, and to tell me that when you take the duty off of iron ore we would not get it any cheaper than if we kept the duty on is a proposition I would not listen to for a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the proposition of the witness.

Mr. RAYNER. The witness, as I caught the Senator, is not talking about iron ore at all. He is talking about steel rails.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Maryland knows the consumers of the country do not want iron ore; they want the finished product. The Bethlehem Company buys this iron ore—

Mr. RAYNER. Suppose it does?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (continuing). The Pittsburg Steel Company buys this iron ore.

Mr. RAYNER. Does that change the proposition I am discussing? I am discussing the proposition that the eastern manufacturers should be put on a par with the manufacturers west of the mountains, and that does not touch that proposition. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, I am not talking about the product at all. That is another question. The question might come up whether if you lower the duty on the raw material that you get you ought not to lower the compensating duty that they receive upon the finished product. That is quite another question, and it is a question I am not discussing at all now, if the Senator will permit me to proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly; I will not interrupt the Senator against his wish.

Mr. RAYNER. I have no objection, but it does not seem to throw any light on the particular subject I am discussing.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not see any light from that side.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator perhaps may give us some light on the United States Steel Corporation. I am certainly willing to receive all the light I can get. I should like to have light, and illuminating light, as to how much control there is in the Senator's State by that corporation, and whether it is not absolutely owned and controlled by as great a monopoly to-day as there is in the United States, and that is the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am prepared to answer that in one word. The United States Steel Company owns comparatively little iron-ore land in my State. It is owned by individuals and small companies, who have leased their product to this company, but the Steel Company does not control by lease more than 45 per cent of the iron ore now in sight in the mines of our State.

Mr. RAYNER. Then, I understand the United States Steel Corporation does control by lease 45 per cent of the entire product of the Senator's State. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Probably less than that.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator said 45 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Not to exceed 45 per cent.

Mr. RAYNER. By lease.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. All the leases are made to the steel company. I have no interest in the United States Steel Company—

Mr. RAYNER. I am satisfied of that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But I speak for the thousands of men who work in those mines, and I ask the Senator from Maryland if the price of manufactured iron products is not to be reduced to the consumer, who will be the beneficiaries of this open-door policy for the free importation of iron ore?

Mr. RAYNER. The consumer will be the beneficiary, unquestionably.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the Senator prepared to hand over to Mr. Schwab as a present the millions of dollars that ought to go to the Treasury of the Government from the duty upon iron ore?

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I care as little about Mr. Schwab as I do about the United States Steel Corporation. I care as much about one interest as I do about the other.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to his colleague?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that the United States Steel Company controls about 85 per cent, directly or indirectly, of the ore west of the Allegheny Mountains, and they are not dependent upon any mines whatever except their own for their steel products.

Mr. RAYNER. And of course they do not want any free ore to come in competition with them, although I do not think for a moment that the Senator from Michigan is speaking for the interests of the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan for some information in regard to these leases. Are they long leases, so far as to involve practical ownership?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Some of them run for twenty years; some shorter. None of them run for over twenty years, as I am informed.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the State of Minnesota and in the State of Michigan the "steel trust," as it is called, operates under the name of the Oliver Mining Company. If you will examine Senate Document No. 2 of this session, it will show you the extent of the iron ore owned by that company, especially in Minne-

sota and Michigan. I say they operate there under the name of the Oliver Mining Company. Down in Alabama they operate under the name of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the United States Steel Corporation, if that is its corporate name, absolutely controls the product, and it is the corporation that is contesting a reduction of the duty. I do not think for a moment that the Senator from Michigan, however, is representing the steel corporation in any capacity whatever. I think he is representing the industries and the interests of his own State, and I find no fault with him. But I am absolutely satisfied in my own mind that the United States Steel Corporation is fighting the placing of these ores upon the free list, and would like to have a much higher duty even than the Senate committee proposes to give.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland very much for his kindly reference to my position, and to bear it out I want the Senate to know that not an officer, stockholder, member, or other person interested in the ownership of the steel company has ever written or spoken to me about this subject. I speak for the thousands of miners now working underground, whose little homes and daily vocation is bound up in this great industry; for the thousands of wage-earners who make up the cities in northern Michigan and from whose comfortable, happy homes is radiated all that is purest and best in American life. These honest, hard-working men have met in general convocation and asked the Representatives and Senators from Michigan to help retain their employment, and as a public servant I am proud to obey.

Mr. RAYNER. I am as satisfied of that as I am that I am living. The Senator from Michigan is speaking honestly for the interests of his own State, and I am speaking for competitive interests that have a right to compete with the industries that are west of the mountains and to be put on an equality with them. I am not only speaking for them, but I am speaking for those who ultimately come into the possession of the finished product, because I think when you lower the price of the raw material you necessarily lower to the ultimate consumer the price of the finished product.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President—

Mr. RAYNER. I do not care now to pursue this subject any further. I will hear what Senators have to say upon the other side. I think it is at least the duty of the Senate to stand by the conclusion the House of Representatives reached upon this subject. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who preceded me, spoke of these large interests. I am satisfied that he does not stand here representing the United States Steel Corporation, and he is speaking just as his colleague will speak for the interests of his State, and he has a right to speak for them.

The Senator says it will take six thousand years to consume the iron ores in this country. Are we to have protection here for the next six thousand years to protect them? When is this thing to cease and terminate? Is there any limit to it at all? Is it honest and just to stand with the industries on the Atlantic seaboard that are absolutely powerless in their competition with the western enterprises that obtain their ores before they reach the mountains, and in point of fact do not need to obtain them at all, because they own, as my colleague has said, the greater part of the natural product?

I may have something further to say as this discussion proceeds, but I will not say anything more now, except to add that this is the just side, it is the perfectly honest side, it is the right side, and it will not affect the industries of the State of the Senator from Michigan a particle, because they will still sell all they control to the enterprises that are now protesting against the decision of the House putting iron ore upon the free list. There is no reason why all of the enterprises on the Atlantic seaboard should not be put upon an equality. I have heard no defense at all to the claim that they should not have equal rights and privileges.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this question that, it seems to me, this is a special condition requiring special consideration. We find on the one side the corporations west of the Allegheny Mountains manufacturing steel that have a very great advantage over those east of the Allegheny Mountains. We find that their situation is such, owning, as they do, you may say, 85 per cent of all the ores west of the Allegheny Mountains, controlling the products of the mines, that they are enabled to crush out almost entirely the manufacturers east of the Allegheny Mountains if those east of the Allegheny Mountains are prohibited from importing ore into this country free.

I am informed that the difference in the cost of the ore of the eastern manufacturers in getting ore west of the Allegheny Mountains amounts to \$1.60 per ton. It seems to me that the

people of this country ought to want to stop monopolies, if possible, and that the manufacturers west of the Allegheny Mountains, under these conditions, will have a monopoly in the manufacture of steel products.

There is no reason in my mind why we should not have free iron ore, with the small revenue that is received for this product. The duty on the importations of iron ore would amount, I understand, under the bill that is before the Senate to-day to about \$116,000. There is no reason why Congress should not give free iron ore to the manufacturers east of the Allegheny Mountains and on the Atlantic coast. The amount of \$116,000 is a very small sum when compared with the great advantages that would accrue to those east of the Allegheny Mountains in the manufacture of steel products. In the first place, it would give a competition which all Americans ought to want, and it would help to beat down a monopoly which practically controls the manufacture of the steel products of this country.

Not only that, Mr. President, but it would give a very great consideration to those growing the cereals, to the people who cultivate the land, in giving them vessels to export their surplus products. We have evidence that when a vessel comes into this country laden with iron ore the farmers in the West can ship their products very much cheaper sometimes, about 3 cents cheaper per bushel, than when they have to bring the vessels here. This applies not only to the people raising grain, but to the people raising cotton and tobacco and the manufacturers of all products.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a question which has two sides to it, even when we consider the revenue that the Government may get from the importations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. With pleasure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Quoting Mr. Schwab, who seems to be more interested in Cuban ores than anybody else, he says that with the present duty of 40 cents a ton he can put the Cuban ores into Pittsburgh at the same cost as the Lake Superior ore. If you take off the duty, he can do it at 32 cents a ton cheaper. If that will not make any difference in the cost to the consumer, we are practically presenting him with a very nice bonus that the Government needs.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know anything about Mr. Schwab's ideas of these matters or what his tendencies are and what he is driving at. I do know that the manufacturers east of the Allegheny Mountains feel that they should have iron ore free. I can not see how it can affect the manufacturers west of the Allegheny Mountains, because this ore can not be carried west of the Allegheny Mountains. It can only be used by those east of the Allegheny Mountains and along the Atlantic coast.

It does seem to me that under these conditions the manufacturers of the iron products on the Atlantic coast should be put upon an equal basis as far as possible with the manufacturers west of the Allegheny Mountains, in order that there may not be a monopoly, in order that the people upon a general principle may get the products of the steel manufacturers for less money, and in order that the exporters of grain and other products of the land may be enabled to have their exports made for less money.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, there are two phases of this question to which I should like, in a very few words, to call the attention of the Senate. The imports of Cuban ore during the year 1907 were 584,000 long tons. The value placed upon that averaged \$3.65 per ton. I have not the exact figures as to the cost, but I am satisfied I can obtain them. If that ore was worth at the port of shipment in Cuba an average of \$3.65 per ton, I can say, from my own knowledge of the iron and smelting business as it exists in western Pennsylvania, that that ore can be brought in and pay a duty of 20 cents per ton, which is the duty that was levied under the Cuban reciprocity treaty, and pay all freight, and be laid down at the port of Baltimore at a less price than the cost of the ores to the owners of smelting furnaces in western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio. That, I think, can be absolutely demonstrated by showing the cost, with freight added, of Lake Superior ores brought down to the furnaces in our district.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Is it not necessary to get some ore from this country in order to mix with the Cuban ore so as to make the proper steel product? If that is the case, you will have to take into consideration the additional cost of the ore that they have to get in this country to mix with the Cuban ore in order to bring about the result.

Mr. OLIVER. In the smelting of iron, as in the smelting of all products, different kinds of ore are necessary. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the character of the Cuban ores to know whether they can be smelted by themselves or not, but I will say to the Senator from Maryland what perhaps he is not aware of, that the Pennsylvania Steel Company and the Bethlehem Steel Company also control large reserves of ore in eastern Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Steel Company, I am informed—and I think it is correct—own the large Cornwall iron mines in Lebanon County, Pa., and they can use them for mixture if necessary. I do not know that any ores are necessary for this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand it is required to have a mixture for Cuban ores, and that taken into consideration increases the price of their product; that is, the mixture with the Cuban ore makes the product higher in price.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer positively upon that point.

Now, Mr. President, upon the question of labor. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], in the philippic which he delivered a week ago against the United States Steel Corporation, said that the wages paid in the Lake Superior region were very low; he said he thought the wages were about a dollar and a quarter a day. I think I quote the Senator correctly. If I had had the figures at hand at that time, I would have interrupted the Senator. I have since been informed, and I find that the minimum rate of wages paid in the mines of Minnesota and Michigan ranges to-day from \$2.44 to \$2.51 a day; that in 1902 they ranged from about 12½ to 20 per cent less than that, but there have been successive advances which have brought them up to the present rate. So the minimum rate is just about twice the amount that was estimated by the Senator from Iowa.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], in his address this morning, stated that the wages paid in Cuba amount to about \$1 a day. So the American miners have to stand the difference between \$1 a day and, say, \$2.50 a day, and they should be protected to that extent.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say one word to the Senators who still adhere to the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only. If we were to-day considering this bill upon a revenue basis simply, I do not believe there is a Senator in the Chamber who would vote for a lower duty than at least 50 cents per ton upon iron ore, when considered upon a revenue basis simply and solely. Upon that point I have found that in taxes alone in the States of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin the subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation, which do its mining, last year paid over \$2,000,000. This year their taxes will amount to about 5 or 10 per cent more than that. Their taxes last year averaged them on the amount of ore brought down nearly 15 cents per ton. Last year they brought down comparatively a smaller amount than usual, but taking the average of 1907 and 1908, their local and state taxation amounts, on an average, to over 10 cents per ton on all that they bring down. I have also made the same inquiry from a lot of independent operators, and I find that to them it amounts to from 8 to 15 cents per ton. The Senators who propose to remove this duty, who propose to put this handicap upon our home miners and to allow ores to come in free from Cuba and from Spain—because there is about the same amount imported from Spain as from Cuba—would charge up against our home miners not only the taxes, which amount to approximately more than half the duty proposed, but, in addition, to lay them under the handicap of the additional amount they pay for wages.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending paragraph—paragraph 115½.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 115½, page 32, line 10, strike out the word "five" and the hyphen after the word "twenty."

Mr. McLAURIN. This amendment, if adopted, will cut the present law half in two and make the tariff on iron ore 20 cents instead of 25 cents a ton.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the subject of iron ores. In the matter of imports it does not seem that the Cuban ore has cut much of a figure. Document 1504, second session, Sixtieth Congress, entitled "Imports and Duties," shows that the imports for 1907 were only 511,000 tons, while away back in 1902 and 1903 it was more than twice that amount. There can not be much of a question of revenue about it. The total amount of revenue we derived from it was \$204,000, and cutting it down to a rate proposed in the bill would leave us with \$127,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is, provided the decrease in rates did not increase the exportation.

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it will.

Mr. GALLINGER. The probability is that it will.

Mr. NELSON. They have conjured up the story about Cuba being covered with iron ore. I do not take any stock in that. It is gotten up for the purpose of creating a little counterbalance in favor of their argument.

The way I look at it, Mr. President, the ores in the Northwest and in the Lake Superior region absolutely need no protection. We have in Minnesota the greatest body of ore in this country. Over one-half of all the ores produced in the United States in 1908 was produced by the State of Minnesota. If we look at this document, and I quote from Document No. 2, first session, Sixty-first Congress, nearly all that iron ore was mined by what is, in general parlance, called the "steel trust." Up there the mining company operates under the head of the Oliver Mining Company, and in Michigan it is the Oliver Iron Mining Company. Most of the iron ore shipped from our State is mined by that company, while the steel trust owns most of the mines that are being worked in our State. It either owns them or has leased them. While it operates under that name, the steel trust owns several lines of railroad running from the mines down to the lake shore. The rates of transportation on the ore from these mines on their railroads were so enormously high that it practically froze out all the independent miners; they could not compete with the steel trust because the transportation rates were so high. The steel trust could stand that, because the very interests that own and operate the mines under the name of the Oliver Mining Company also control the railroads. So the excess in rates they paid on the transportation of the ore from the mines to the lake shore they got back through the companies owned by them.

Proceedings were instituted before our railroad commission some years ago to reduce these rates. I can not recall the figures, but the rates were almost prohibitive. Proceedings were instituted before our railroad commission in Minnesota for the purpose of securing a lowering of the rates, because the rates were so excessive they froze out practically all the independent mining companies. That proceeding proved to be a failure, because the steel trust billed the ore as one continuous shipment from the mines down to the lake shore, and in their ore boats down to the ports on the lower Lakes at Chicago and Lake Erie. Hence the point was made that our state commission had no jurisdiction; that the shipment was an interstate shipment. The fact is, Mr. President—and I am telling what I know of my knowledge to some extent—that within our State, in the matter of railroad transportation of the ore, it is almost impossible for the independent mining companies to operate. They are at a disadvantage.

Constantly new iron deposits are discovered. It was supposed until recently that all our iron region was east of the sources of the Mississippi River, but recently discoveries have been made west of the Mississippi River, and they are even approximating to within 75 miles of my own home. But in all these cases, when the explorers who buy the land discover a mine, no matter how valuable it may be, their only salvation is to sell it or lease it to the steel trust, for it is utterly out of their power to undertake to operate it in competition with the trust.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. KEAN. I only wanted to ask the Senator, does not the State of Minnesota get a royalty on all the ore mined?

Mr. NELSON. No, sir; we have in Minnesota—

Mr. KEAN. I merely wanted to ascertain whether that was a fact.

Mr. NELSON. I will give the Senator the information. The legislature of Minnesota has, for several years, been trying to enact what we call a "tonnage tax"; that is, to tax the iron properties by a tonnage tax upon the ore mined. At present iron properties are assessed in Minnesota on the same principle as are farming lands; that is, according to the valuation of the land. It is true they have been increasing that assessment and that the mines are now paying a pretty good tax. The legislature has been trying for years to substitute a system of tonnage tax in lieu of the present crude system. After a great deal of effort, the legislature passed such a law at the last session, but the governor, who is a candidate for the Presidency, or a sort of candidate for the Presidency [laughter], vetoed that bill. I have nothing to say now, however, about that question.

I want to present to the Senate in a nutshell how I look at this matter. In the first place, I do not believe that our iron mines up there need any such protection, for the reason that they have the matter of transportation entirely in their favor. As I understand, along the Atlantic seaboard there are a few

independent concerns. I do not know their names, but I know there are quite a number of them who are trying to compete in manufacturing pig iron and in manufacturing steel billets, or whatever it may be, with the big steel trust, but can not do so owing to the excessive rate of transportation, which appears from the hearings here, to be from \$2 to \$2.50 a ton. From the Superior mines down to a point where that ore is reduced, the transportation rates are from \$2 to \$2.50 a ton. That railroad transportation is so heavy that it makes it difficult for the small concerns east of the mountains to compete with the steel trust.

Another proposition—I may be at sea on that; and, if I am, some Senator will correct me—as I understand, is that the Cuban ores, while they do not yield as much iron as our best Mesaba ore, yet it has a property, which I believe they call “nickel”—there is a nickel property in it—in other words, it is a harder ore and is used to mix with the ore that we produce in our State in the manufacture of Bessemer steel to harden it and make it better. I may be mistaken as to that. If I am, perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] can correct me.

I believe in fair play. We do not need this protection in Minnesota. It is a small matter. It amounts, in respect to Cuban ore, to only 20 cents a ton. We do not need this protection for our mines on Lake Superior; but it may be of some help to the competitors of the steel trust on the Atlantic seaboard, and I, for one, am quite willing to give them that advantage in order that we may have competition. That is the way I feel about it. I shall not attempt any revolution if you make the duty 20 cents a ton; but I think, if we want to build up independent competitors of the steel trust, we ought to give them this advantage; and the people of Minnesota are perfectly willing to give the independent concerns east of the Allegheny Mountains this slight benefit and advantage. I hope some of the representatives from other parts of the country, when it comes to other properties, will feel as generous as do the people of Minnesota.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Minnesota to say that this duty would not hurt the people of Minnesota anyway. So this is a gift that may possibly benefit the people of Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. It will indirectly be an advantage to the State of Minnesota. If the Senator is very inquisitive, I will say it would be an indirect advantage to the State of Minnesota to this extent: It is to the interest of the State of Minnesota, as it is to all parts of the country, that the great steel trust shall have a competitor in this country. If we can stimulate and keep up competitors who are independent of the steel trust by this little gift, why, in God's name, not give it to them?

Mr. GALLINGER. Just a word, Mr. President. In early days New Hampshire did some mining of ore; but it was long ago abandoned. It was in the White Mountain region; and there is a very charming history connected with it that I shall not rehearse.

I have no interest in this question so far as my people are concerned, unless free iron ore should give a benefit to our manufacturers; but I am not here, Mr. President, alone representing the interest of New Hampshire or New England.

The Senator from Minnesota says “Our iron mines up there do not need protection.” Mr. President, I am not going to vote for “up there” on any schedule in this bill. I am going to vote for what I think is for the best interests of the entire people of the United States. I am a protectionist, and, as such, it will give me great pleasure to vote to put a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore. I only regret that the duty fixed by the Senate Finance Committee is not the duty which is in the present law.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I favor the proposition of the House bill, that iron ore should be placed on the free list. I do so for two reasons, which I shall briefly state.

The report of the National Conservation Commission, which is attached to the President's message of January 22, 1900, under the head of “Minerals,” contains the following:

The known supply of high-grade iron ores in the United States approximates 3,840,000,000 tons, which at the present increasing rate of consumption can not be expected to last beyond the middle of the present century.

Mr. President, I am not unaware of the speculative character, of course, of this information transmitted to us by the President, but I think we ought to take into consideration the probability that, if this information is correct, within a comparatively short time, measured by the life of a nation or the life of a republic, the high-grade iron ore in this country will be exhausted and the American people will be at the mercy of foreigners.

The other suggestion, Mr. President, to which I have to invite the attention of the Senate is the testimony of Judge Gary before the House Committee on Ways and Means last December, in which he states that the United States Steel Corporation, which is the greatest combination of capital ever organized in this country, now practically controls the iron-ore supply of America. At page 5515 of the hearings these questions and answers appear:

Mr. COCKRAN. You practically do control the ore supply of the country?

Mr. GARY. No; not now; not for the immediate future.

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, the ultimate supply?

Mr. GARY. Yes; I think so—that is, pretty nearly. It is not absolute control.

Mr. President, taking this testimony as true, as I do, we have this great monopoly already in control of the ultimate supply of the iron ore in this country; and if we place a tariff upon foreign ore which may come here, no matter how high or how low, the tendency of that imposition will be to increase the value of this monopoly and to extend the power of the monopoly. Not only that, Mr. President, but it might well have a tendency to shut out competition on the part of whatever independent companies there may be. This imposition of 25 cents a ton or 40 cents a ton will, I repeat, have a tendency to increase the value of the property of this combination, and have a tendency to fix its monopolistic powers upon the American people and to deny to the independent iron people the power to compete with this existing monopoly.

For these two reasons, stated succinctly, I intend to vote against the duty, notwithstanding, as a general rule, I am in favor of a revenue tariff practically upon everything which may come into the United States. This case is an exception, in my judgment, because of the control already obtained by this corporation of the ultimate supply of iron ore in this country.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas takes his seat, I should like to ask him or some other Senator here, if anybody feels authorized to speak, to answer the inquiry as to whether we, as a Senate, intend to sit quiet forever and make no effort to dissolve the illegal purchase of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company by the Steel Corporation? I want somebody to say whether or not we are going to quietly lie down and quit.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, of course the Senator from South Carolina is familiar with the fact that the question of the legality of the absorption was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and while no report, in a purely technical sense, has been made by that committee, at the same time the views of the majority of the committee—seven members—have been submitted in writing and are before the Senate for its consideration. My recollection is, Mr. President, that six of the members of that committee stated in writing that, in their judgment, the absorption was illegal, and one of them—the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Foraker—withheld an opinion upon that point.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understand that. I remember that broken-up, disjointed kind of report, without any force or effect; but even if only one man in this body who is a great lawyer will continue to fight, the people will not forget, and possibly there may come a time when a change in the complexion of this body or something at the Attorney-General's office will bring about an effort to destroy the monopoly which now exists.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will state to the Senator from South Carolina that my mind, at least, has not been idle upon this suggestion. If he will look at the RECORD of this morning, he will see a suggestion on my part that it is time to know what the purpose of the Department of Justice is as to the execution of the antitrust law of the United States. I think that the present Attorney-General has this information about the steel trust and the merging of the Tennessee Iron and Coal Company, but if he has not, Mr. President, and no one else will do so, I will give him direct and official information with respect to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. In that connection, Mr. President, I desire to say that the speech of the Attorney-General, to which the Senator from Texas called attention yesterday morning, would indicate that he had set out on a new departure from that of his predecessor, and if obedience to the law shall be the condition of peace, we ought to have him determine one way or the other, either by an opinion or by some authoritative utterance, whether or not he considers there is any occasion for a suit against this combination or this monopoly. I hope the Senator, who is a great lawyer, will not pursue this inquiry by intimation, but by some kind of positive action whenever, in his judgment, there is any opportunity or chance of securing any result.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, if I were sure of the facts as intimated by the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], I would vote for free iron ore, but I think I can say that I reasonably know that there is a great deal of iron land and ore in this country and in my own State that is not con-

trolled by the steel trust. I believe that to be true, and I believe also, like the Senator from Texas, in direct methods to put down aggressors upon the law of the land, and I rejoice that he is persisting in methods to ascertain the facts and to apply the law in the case which he has mentioned.

As the matter stands, I shall vote for the very modest tax of 25 cents a ton on iron ore. It is a revenue tax and nothing but a revenue tax. It is a small tax of 10 per cent, about half what was the average tax in the well-known Walker tariff act, enacted before the war. It is true the amount realized will not be very great, only some \$127,000, but it is consistent with the principles of all parties to vote for this tax, and well to do it. The fact that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and his colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] deduced their title through protection opinions and that I deduce mine as the result of an opposite view makes no difference. We shall all find before this tariff bill is concluded that there are interlocks of party votes, as there is one now. Where these occur, it makes no practical difference in result from what source a man may deduce his opinion. I think that incidentally—and I have no thought on the subject that I am not willing to proclaim—I think that incidentally this will be of some benefit—not very great, but some—to the owners of iron lands in my State and in other States of this Union. I know, furthermore, that what the trust wants, and what it proclaims that it wants, is free ore. One of Napoleon's maxims of war was not to do things you knew your enemy wished you to do. While I do not esteem myself the enemy of any man, I am the opponent of certain propositions and of certain men who, as I conceive, abuse the law. There is good reason in all directions for this tariff; and, so believing, I shall vote for it at 25 cents a ton.

Mr. RAYNER. Before the Senator sits down, may I ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DANIEL. Very gladly.

Mr. RAYNER. Does the Senator really think that the United States Steel Corporation wants free Cuban ore?

Mr. DANIEL. I only get my information, as the Senator does, from the newspapers.

Mr. RAYNER. What is the Senator's own opinion about that?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know.

Mr. RAYNER. I do know that they most decidedly do not want it.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I shall support the committee's proposition on iron ore. I do not think that 25 cents a ton is too much. I am for a revenue tariff, and it seems that I am about the only man who cares for nothing else but a revenue tariff. I have nothing in the world that I want to protect, and I would not protect it if I had, because we have no authority from any source to do it. But in this particular article it is a revenue producer to some extent, and I do not see why we should not get that revenue.

There has been a great deal said here about the reasons why a protective tariff should be levied. Some have said that they wanted to protect every American industry. We have the authority of the chairman of the committee for that. Others, who are called "progressives," insist upon adherence to the Republican platform, which fixes the measure of protection as the amount which marks the difference between the domestic and the foreign labor wages. Others still want a protective tariff that will reduce the price to the consumer. I believe the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island committed himself to that statement the other day. I will not hold him to it, for I thought, in view of what he had said before, that it was an extremely improvident utterance.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the statement to which the Senator refers?

Mr. MONEY. That the object of protection was to lessen the price of an article to the consumer.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator did not say that? I myself thought I must have been mistaken as to that.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator was mistaken. I said that the effect of protection had been, in the great majority of cases, to reduce the price to the consumer.

Mr. MONEY. I accept that statement as at least a correction; but, at any rate, it defeats the purposes of protection when it does that, for there can be no object in protecting an American industry in order to make its products cheaper.

Mr. President, I have here a table, very carefully prepared by an expert. It takes up the different schedules in the bill and gives the total value of the product and the total wages paid under each schedule. The schedule now under consideration

embraces not only iron ore, but steel and many other articles of metal.

The table only gives the total wages for the whole schedule. The wages under Schedule C, the metal schedule, are \$650,000,000 and the output is worth \$3,130,000,000, making the cost of the labor 20.8 per cent of the value of the product; so that, to meet the demand of the Republican platform, as stated on this floor very frequently, the tariff should be just that percentage, 20.8 per cent, that being the percentage of the amount paid to labor in comparison with the value of the whole finished product. I shall ask permission of the Senate, as I can not read the table, to have the Secretary read it. I do so because I want to get the table into the RECORD in order that other Senators may have the advantage of it. If it is not correct—and I can not vouch for any statistics on earth or any book that I have not seen; it may not be correct all the way through, though I believe it is as nearly correct as it can be made—it certainly approximates the truth; but, as I have said, I do not myself pretend to vouch for any table or any statistics on any subject whatever.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Average labor cost of production of all articles under each schedule and the total of all schedules of the Senate bill.

Schedule—	Total wages.	Total value of products.	Per cent.
A—Chemicals.....	\$56,796,143	\$767,401,417	7.4
B—Earths and glass.....	154,632,713	420,944,049	36.7
C—Metals.....	652,109,633	3,130,258,195	20.8
D—Wood.....	378,461,021	1,393,489,978	27.1
E—Sugar.....	23,536,189	413,333,428	5.7
F—Tobacco.....	62,640,303	331,117,681	18.9
G—Agricultural products.....	100,839,004	2,194,833,894	4.6
H—Spirits, etc.....	43,934,676	474,487,379	9.3
I—Cotton.....	217,955,322	1,614,094,237	21.5
J—Flax and Hemp.....	27,223,574	185,094,092	14.7
K—Wool.....	135,069,063	767,210,900	17.6
L—Silk.....	26,767,943	133,288,072	20.1
M—Pulp, paper.....	123,903,633	548,957,239	22.6
N—Sundries.....	273,959,320	1,495,686,437	18.3
Total of all schedules.....	2,277,838,543	13,270,192,088	17.10

In the above there is no cumulative cost of labor, as it covers all the labor—in one schedule or another—that goes to the production of the finished or manufactured article.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, the reason why I have introduced this table at this particular moment is not because of its particular bearing on the metal schedule more than on any other, but believing these facts to be approximately as true as can be had, I want them to be in the RECORD for the examination of Senators who want to ascertain the truth. The difficulty that I have had in ascertaining the truth with regard to any item in the tariff bill has troubled every Senator. With an honest desire to get at the facts, I have found it almost impossible to get a fair and candid statement of the truth from anybody. People have conversed with me about the different schedules in the tariff bill on both sides of the question, and I have never yet been satisfied by the statement that anyone made, even though he agreed with me as to what was wanted. I know the infirmities of human nature. These gentlemen come here with the purpose of advocating their own special interests, and it would be unreasonable to suppose that they would not suppress every fact against them and magnify every one in their favor. It is almost impossible—I would not quite say "impossible"—to find a candid statement on any item in this bill.

I do not intend to speak long. I for one am persuaded that this bill does not provide the revenue demanded by the deficit of \$90,000,000, and which is likely to be \$100,000,000 within a very short time. You can not reduce the expenditures of this Government; and I venture to say that your next budget, instead of being a billion and thirty-two million dollars, will be a billion one hundred million dollars. The expenditures are going on, and they are going on increasingly, and this deficit must be met;—and in view of that fact I have declared here that I am for revenue. I am one man, at least, who is for the United States of America, and of course next I am for the consumers, who constitute the greater part of the population of the country. It is not with any particular reference to the iron schedule that I am going to speak, but I can not see for my soul why one article should not bear the burden of taxation as well as another. Why should raw material be exempt from taxation and wrought material be taxed? If there are benefits from this system, they should be as generally diffused as the burdens, and if we do anything else it will not be fair to the consumer. We can not shut up the United States and, like two men in jail, become opulent by swapping pocketknives. Every man is willing to

pay that which is to support his Government and secure protection of life, liberty, and property, which is insured to him by the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States. I can not understand how a man will want a tax on the things he makes and want free the material which he buys. What is the raw material of one is the wrought material of another, as has been shown here over and over again a dozen times.

I want to say that I am for a tax upon that which will bear taxation and bring revenue, with some consideration for the burden that will rest upon the great mass of the American people, desiring, as I believe everybody should and I hope most do, that the burden should rest most lightly on the poor and most heavily upon those able to bear it and who secure more from this Government than anyone else.

It is embedded in the fundamental law of every nation in the world, however civilized or however barbarous, that all the processes which conserve property interests and that which needs protection should be paid for by the class which has the money with which to pay.

Certain persons want hides put on the free list. In every mail I am receiving such letters, and I have received thousands of letters, most of them prepared by one concern in Chicago, in favor of free hides. It is a stereotyped letter. I believe I will just have that read, if I have it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MONEY. I did not get up to make a speech; but I yield for a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understood the Senator to be for the Senate amendment because it furnishes a revenue, whereas the House bill would furnish none.

Mr. MONEY. I did not say anything about the House bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You did not; but I understood you to say you were for the Senate amendment because it would furnish revenue.

Mr. MONEY. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the position of the Senator from Virginia. If that be the purpose, I find that the revenue to be produced by the Senate amendment will be only \$127,000, whereas under the duty provided by the present law it is nearly double that sum, if not quite that. I will ask the Senator whether, according to his logic, they should not be for forty instead of twenty-five?

Mr. MONEY. I am very much obliged to the Senator for the information, which I had before, however.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator wants revenue, the present law produces nearly twice as much as the proposed rate.

Mr. MONEY. We are not considering the present law. We are amending the present law; and if we are not to amend it, why all this preparation; why all these meetings and hearings if we are to go back to the present law? I do not suppose anybody wants to readopt the Dingley bill. It is totally unnecessary. We have it already. It only needs to be left alone, if that is what you want. I am merely saying, including the iron schedule incidentally, that I will vote for the duty on iron as I do for these other things.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will permit me to go on with the remarks I was making, not on iron especially, I ask to have published here, and I am going to have read, this page. This is a circular. I do not want the arguments read; they are not particularly interesting; but I do want this particular page read.

I want to say that a fictitious sentiment—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. MONEY. I hope the Senator will pardon me. I do not want to be discourteous, but I desire to finish and sit down. I am suffering considerably with neuralgia. However, I will hear the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire merely to ask a question. In answer to a question, the Senator said very clearly that we ought not to go back to the present law; that we were revising it. If the Senator wants revenue, why revise it on this item, when the present law will produce nearly twice as much as the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. MONEY. That would be a pertinent question if I belonged to the majority of the committee. But as the minority never has been asked to help frame the bill, I do not consider myself responsible for the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Therefore the Senator is voting for the amendment.

Mr. MONEY. I am not voting for it "therefore." I am voting for it for the reason I gave and not the one that you gave.

I think I will be able to make clear my reason, when I come to discuss this question. But right in this line I want to send up and have read this page. I desire to say that a fictitious sentiment is being created by machine work, by this endless-prayer business. Some gentlemen somewhere have set to work a bureau and they are flooding the country with cards and papers, with the result that Senators have been bombarded here as they were in the House of Representatives on these matters, and a great clamor has been set up by people who do not know what is involved, and half of whom do not read the communications sent to them.

I am not here to listen to anybody's clamor. I am here to vote for revenue for this country, which is sadly lacking and which I do not believe will be furnished by this bill. I will ask the Secretary to read the circular which is sent out through my State by this company.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DO THIS TO-DAY!

WRITE, AND HAVE YOUR FRIENDS WRITE, EVEN IF YOU HAVE WRITTEN BEFORE—WRITE AGAIN.

Kindly fill out and return this blank.

_____, 1909.

THE FLORSHEIM SHOE COMPANY.

Adams and Clinton streets,
Chicago, U. S. A.

GENTLEMEN: I have to-day written Senators ANSEL J. McLAURIN and H. D. MONEY, as suggested. I have also secured the promise of the following friends who will write them.

Signed _____,
Address _____.

Mr. MONEY. That is simply the endless-prayer business.

The other is simply asking for free hides. If they will give us free hides and free leather and free shoes together in one lump, I might be induced to vote for it, and lose what revenue might otherwise accrue. I can not see why one thing should be taxed and another thing should go free. What, as I said, is the raw material of one is the finished product of another. Lumber is considered a manufacture. The furniture made of lumber is considered a manufacture. Wool is the finished product of the shepherd. The wool is the raw material of the carder, and the carded wool is the raw material of the spinner. Yarn is the raw material of the weaver, the cloth the raw material of the clothes manufacturer. I do not see why things manufactured should be taxed for the benefit of somebody and the raw material which they use should come in free, to the detriment of others. We must consider the consumer, who, perhaps, ultimately pays the tax. I believe that is the generally accepted doctrine.

I repudiate the idea that it is a Democratic policy to have a big free list. I had a letter, a very remarkable letter, from a gentleman who said that all his life he had been a Democrat, and that he was for a tariff for revenue, and he immediately proposed a free list as long as my arm, which would not bring in any revenue at all. There is nothing Democratic in the idea that raw material should be untaxed. I suppose every Senator here is familiar, more or less, with the great struggle with free trade in England, begun by Huskisson and continued for twenty years, until Sir Robert Peel, yielding to the irresistible logic of Cobden, accentuated by the famine in Ireland demanding cheap food, in 1848 reversed the rule and gave them free trade to some extent—not what we call "free trade," by any means, but what they call "free trade," which is free competition and not free from duty. We speak of free trade. The English have a tariff two or three pages long, and they get more revenue from it than we do from our tariff. Their population is only half as large, and yet they get more revenue than we do. They call themselves "free traders" because they permit competition. When they put a tariff on imported articles, they put an excise tariff on the domestic article. Their principal revenue is derived from articles not produced in England, such as tea, coffee, tobacco, sugar, cocoa, and so forth. Their best tax is the income tax, which last year produced \$65,000,000.

During the progress of this strife Sir Robert Peel received a letter from the north of Scotland, the eastern coast, on the German Ocean, and the old Scotchman wrote him:

I am a free trader from the top of my head to the soles of my feet; I want free trade in everything; and you will do the greatest service you have ever rendered to the poor of the Kingdom if you will put everything upon the free list and impose no tax at all, except upon Scotch herring. If you do not put a tax on Scotch herring, the Norwegians will drive us out of our trade.

I find a great many north of Scotland men in this body. They want everything to go on the free list except the things they have to sell.

I recollect another letter also that they say was received by Sir Robert Peel from a wealthy merchant in Bristol. The high tariff made smuggling such a profitable industry that the Gov-

ernment could not put it down; it became, not an enterprise, not an adventure, but the business of desperate scoundrels, just as robbing in this country has become a regular business and has become legalized. The letter was from a noted smuggler, who became so famous that he was a favorite along both sides of the channel. This man proposed to him to purchase any bill of goods in the French market, bring it over, and deliver the invoice to him, and all he wanted was 10 per cent of the bill as his profit for transportation. He did not want any smuggling profits; the smuggler would be satisfied with that. Would the robbers under our tariff system to-day be satisfied with a profit of 10 per cent? I do not think so.

That reminds me of a story which I think apropos. A very poor clergyman who had a family and very little else was preaching to a very frugal-minded set of parishioners. They managed to keep the man poor and humble by not paying him much salary. Every time he went into the pulpit he asked the leading member of his church, who was a wealthy man, to lend him \$5. He put it in his pocket. When he descended from the pulpit he repaid the sum. That went on with great regularity. One day the deacon said:

I should like to ask you a question. Why do you borrow \$5 every time you preach and pay it back as soon as you get out of the pulpit?

Shamefaced, the preacher said:

I can not preach at all unless I feel some money in my pocket, even if it belongs to somebody else.

And so we have the testimony of Senators and of people who manufacture goods that the manufacturers can not do business at all unless they feel somebody else's money in their pockets. They are not at all satisfied with their profit. They want, by the express command of the law, to compel others to pay something to another man in business in which the man who pays is not interested at all.

I know very well what a tax is. Yet the Supreme Court has declared that there can be taxation without taxes. In other words, that Congress can impose taxation upon the people not justified by the Constitution, and therefore it is not taxation; and the Supreme Court has said that whenever this Congress lays the hand of the Government upon one man, to take a dollar from him and give it to another man to advance his enterprise or private fortune, it is robbery in the form of law. In other words, the court says it is not legislation, but it is a legislative decree.

I am reminded now of the declaration made by my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, I believe, at the opening of this debate—no; it was when pressed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who made such an admirable speech yesterday, until he was about to finish. He asked repeatedly of the Senator from Rhode Island—and it seemed to me the Senator from Rhode Island lacked his usual readiness to mix the issue; he seemed to be reluctant to answer, but he did answer the question as to what was the controlling principle in this bill—was that it?—the controlling principle and motive in framing this bill; and my friend from Rhode Island said the controlling principle in making this bill was to protect every American industry. That was supplemented a little by saying he wanted everybody to be given a chance. I dare him to put that in the title of this bill. I dare him to write it at the head of this bill, "A bill primarily to protect every American industry; incidentally or secondarily to raise revenue for the Government." If the court passed on such a bill, it would declare that it was an unconstitutional measure. Heretofore the title of the bill has never been evolved from the character of it. It had been arbitrarily put there—to do what? To make the court accept as its character that to which it was not entitled by the reading of it, because the court, a co-ordinate branch of the Government, would never say that Congress had lied about the title to a bill. It will say: "We must take the legislative branch of the Government at its word; and when it entitles a bill, 'to raise public revenue, and for other purposes,' it must mean primarily for public revenues, and that is what it reads."

What does the Constitution authorize the Congress to do? It says that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, imposts, duties, and excises. What for? To pay the public debt, to provide for the common defense, to provide for the general welfare—of whom? Of the United States. To pay the public debt of the people? No. It is ridiculous. For the Government of the United States; and Webster has placed the definition of a tax to be an imposition or charge levied upon the people belonging to a society, to defray the expenses of that society. I want to say that Webster is about as good at definitions as any lexicographer. While he is not so good on derivations, he is on definitions.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Mississippi remember the first act passed by Congress?

Mr. MONEY. No; I do not. I have not studied it. I will take your word for it.

Mr. RAYNER. It was an act to encourage manufactures. If the Senator will let me say a word about that—

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator had forgotten that act.

Mr. RAYNER. The first act was an act to encourage manufactures. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to say that if an act demonstrated upon its face that it levied prohibitory duties under the taxing power, it would be unconstitutional. I agree with him entirely upon that proposition. Can the Senator from Rhode Island show any authority or decision to the contrary? If the act said upon its face that while it purported to be an act to impose duties, it was really an act to prohibit importations—and that is what I think the Senator from Mississippi meant—I say the act would be unconstitutional.

Mr. MONEY. I trust the memory of the Senator from Rhode Island more than my own. Was that ever brought to the consideration of the Supreme Court? I believe it never was.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will tell you what has been brought to the Supreme Court and decided by it, and that is that the question of the right to levy duties and lay imposts is a matter the character of which is to be decided by Congress and not by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MONEY. I have said that before.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I merely desire to say to the Senator from Mississippi that the first act passed, to which the Senator from Rhode Island refers, leveled an average duty of about 7½ per cent. The general rate was 5 per cent. Some duties ranged a little higher than that; up to 15 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Oklahoma will study economic history a little further, he will find that 7½ per cent under conditions then existing was higher than any tariff that has been imposed in this country since.

Mr. GORE. Many of those duties were specific. On shoes, for instance, it was 7½ cents a pair, nothing like so high a rate as is imposed now; and if the Senator from Rhode Island is willing to return to the example and the precepts of the fathers, I have an idea he will find a good deal of company on this side willing to return to their standpoint.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want to say, in further answer to the Senator from Oklahoma, that the duties imposed by those early acts were more nearly prohibitory in their character than those of any act passed since; and that can be established historically beyond question.

Mr. MONEY. There was no decision by the court with respect to that bill, nor any issue ever raised upon it, for the reason that we were then not only in the infancy of our industries, but in the infancy of our national life, and the great care of the people of that day was to make this country self-sustaining for its defense. We were then alarmed about the condition of things because we had lately been emancipated from the yoke of Great Britain, and every student of American history will recognize the fact that the whole Revolution was not about freedom nor independence. It was resenting taxation. It began in resenting taxation without representation, and at least one-third of the American Congress did not believe we had any right to do it. A great many went to the West Indies and Canada and Ireland and elsewhere. Even Mr. Jefferson, who afterwards repudiated the whole idea of protection, said he would like to see a wall around this country for a while, in order that it might get on its feet and establish those industries which make an independent nation; in the sense of a nation which is not dependent on any other nation. That idea he yielded entirely, because he did not believe in the taxation of one man for the benefit of another.

It has been said here, I recollect, I think by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], a very able and clear-headed man—and I do not know a man more clear-headed in debate—that it is useless to go into definitions. But I think it is always useful to refer to first principles, general principles. We have been going on with schedules and working on details until we have lost sight of every principle except that each man can write in it very largely what he wants.

I was amused by a part of the magnificent speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], which, I believe, lasted two days, and I was rather astonished to hear his narrative of the pressure brought upon Mr. McKinley by those wanting protec-

tion, and that he threw up his hands in despair and said, "Write what you want." I had heard the story, but it was not that way. There was no despair, but an invitation to everybody to come in and write what he wanted into the bill, and they all did. It was exactly in accord with the wishes of the chairman of the committee, because he was the foremost protectionist in this country. He went so far that protectionists had to draw him back. He went into the bounty business, you will recollect, and that had to be undone by the courts.

Mr. President, I did not rise to speak long. I am not fit to speak to-day; I have a severe neuralgia. I have been led on to these remarks, which I hope I will be permitted at some time to continue, because I should like to speak on this bill purely on the general principles which gentlemen think are unworthy of notice. I am not going to support the bill nor follow the committee. I want a revenue for this Government. It is my duty so far as it lies in me to raise a duty by taxes of this sort, and when we have reached that duty I want to stop, and I want the burden and the enjoyment of the incidental benefits to be extended as equally as possible, as a matter of common justice and of common sense, because there is no morality in taxing one part of the country for the benefit of another, and there is no morality in taxing one man for the benefit of another man. It is not only unconstitutional, but it is immoral.

Mr. President, I will say, as a result of my observations upon the different tariffs of the world (and I do not pretend to be wise or deeply read about this matter), that wherever there is a protective tariff it has built up a system of morality of its own, and I never found that its rules of morals were in accord with any other rules of morals, either religious or secular, ever framed in this world. It has built up a system of morality in this country that not only is wicked, but it allows to be done by authority of law what the man who does it would never do in his private capacity as a citizen. It permits a man not only to covet his neighbor's goods, but to take them away from him by force of law. When we consider that we collected a little over \$300,000,000 last year, and the people of this country pay in taxation to these protected interests \$2,100,000,000, I think it is about time we are considering whether we are not taxing the American people a little too far. It is well enough to pay one tax, but when the people are bowed down under two burdens it is time that they should be relieved of one of them at least. I do not know a man who is unwilling to fill up his quota to support the Government. I do not know any man anywhere who will not go out to fight his country's battles. There is no lack of patriotism and no lack of common courage. It is one of the commonest attributes of human character. Men go to battle as cheerfully as they go to feast. They are willing to pay taxes to support the Government. But when you tell a man he has to pay to another man, in whom he has no interest, then he halts and asks you to consider the fairness, the justice, and the morality of it, and I will say the common honesty of it.

I am not going to talk about robber barons of the tariff and all that sort of thing. I do not impute dishonesty to men who want protection by law. Men think about it like the better part of humanity—the women—think. There is no woman in this country, in good society, at least, who is not better than the best man in it. Everybody knows who has practiced law that when a good woman goes into court she thinks everything is right that the law will give her, whether it is right or wrong. So it is with the protected interests. The law will give it to them, and though they are the moving power behind the law-maker, they are perfectly satisfied, and will take the profit—or plunder, I will say—from other people that they would not take under any circumstances if left to themselves.

So I do not intend to indulge in any crimination here against either Senators or their constituents or their interests. It is a simple question whether or not we will do justice to the people of the United States—the 90,000,000 that I think the next census will give us. Here, with 90,000,000 people, we raise a revenue not as great as Great Britain raises out of the 45,000,000 people in the United Kingdom. But there the tax goes into the treasury of the Government; here, three-tenths of it goes into whose pocket? Not into the Government's. We all know it does not, lest we should have a superabundant Treasury; and there is no surplus of the Treasury, but, on the contrary, there is a deficit.

I want to speak for a moment upon the necessity of raising revenue; and I want to show, as I think I can, that the attempt to raise revenue sufficient for the Government by this bill is a failure. You will be compelled to adopt such a measure as that proposed by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], an income tax, and probably you will have to call in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], a head tax upon immigrants. You will have to do something besides what there is in this bill. There will

be tax enough put in the bill, but it will not go to the Government. It will go elsewhere. It will swell the already exaggerated wealth of men who made their fortunes by this unjust legislation which we have had upon our statute books so long.

Of course, it is a great thing for us to point with pride to the fact that no suffering has been the result of protection. I am not one of those who believe that protection is the cause of the wealth of the country. I think the country has increased in wealth in spite of protection, and not because of it. If it has prospered, that is no argument in favor of protection. You can not say because the country prospers and the people have this burden, it has grown faster than if they had no burden at all. That is a ridiculous inference.

I can show that every free port in the world has enormously increased, faster than any other port. Take Singapore, the great entrepôt of the world there in the Malakka Strait. Look at Hongkong and other ports. The trade that goes there is as large as that which goes to New York, Hamburg, or any other great port in the world. Why? Because it is a free port. Look at the great Venetian commercial republic of the middle ages. See what a splendid exhibit of wealth and what glory of literature and art and science was attained because of the enormous wealth. It is not the best thing in the world to have \$114,000,000,000 of wealth. We would be very much better off if the 90,000,000 people in this country had it, instead of it being congested in the hands of a few people. Whenever you make a millionaire, according to the division of property in the country, you make paupers of about 1,000 men, and when you make 100 millionaires, you pauperize 100,000 men. When they are worth twice that much, it is 200,000 men. It produces a feeling of unrest all over this country and begets socialism, which never should have been transplanted from the soil of Europe to this free and independent Republic, where the avenues of wealth should be open to every one of its citizens.

But I do not expect to accomplish anything except to let the country understand, as far as I can make it, that it is not the most desirable thing to accumulate wealth in order that a few may get it. It is the great diffusion of wealth that is best for the country; not the greatest accumulation in a few hands, but the general distribution to all, where the benefit comes from it of education, of time for reflection and for reading, for the contemplation that comes to the man surrounded by objects of art and learning and all those things which have the greatest influence for good upon every growing mind.

Now, Congress should tax for the benefit of the greatest number. Have you arranged this bill for that purpose? I think not. I do not believe this bill has been prepared in a single schedule for the great masses of the people of this country. If it be said that the Republican platform calls for just that tax that would pay the cost of the difference between labor abroad and at home, what does that mean? Does it mean the cost of labor to produce an article or does it mean the weekly or daily wage? If it means the wage, it is very deceptive and misleading. If it means the cost of the labor that goes into the production of an article, it is very different; and you will find not as much difference as you probably suppose, because the mass of testimony that I have examined on this point has been cooked to a great degree and does not represent the truth.

I recollect very well that, I think in 1896, we had this Bureau of Labor just organized under Carroll D. Wright and had experts sent all over Europe to get the wages of labor for use in the great campaign that Mr. McKinley was leading, to show that the cost of labor in this country was so much better than it was abroad, and that our people prospered in the American mode of life as against the pauper labor of the whole world.

The reports were made. They were printed in a large edition. Did anybody ever see a copy of that edition? Some few got it, but it went to the Republican executive committee. It did not suit the necessities of the campaign, and that edition was destroyed and a new edition with enlarged figures to meet the exigencies of that campaign was used. It had an effect, I have no doubt, upon the voters. Yet we have information which is not always considered. There is too much haste generally, but we are told that in some of the protected industries, at some of the large mills, there were placards stating that the mill was closed until it was known that Mr. McKinley was elected.

Just think of that! That was a persuasive argument to the man who had worked and was anxious to work, and though he had been carrying torches and transparencies and hurrahing for Bryan, at the last moment, under this pressure, he was brought to vote for McKinley. That is not a good condition in a free country.

Now, Mr. President, I want everybody to prosper by this tariff. I am not one of those men who dislike to see anybody do well. I hope every protected industry will do well. It will

be a sad thing, indeed, if nobody gets the benefit of this protective scheme. So I hope they will prosper. I do not grudge them one solitary cent. But there must be something done for the United States Treasury, and it ought to be relieved. The 90,000,000 of people who are paying this tax do not get a single compensatory feature. They do not get anything by it. They are not expected to do so, either, and nobody seems to care very much whether they do or not.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything. I will close. I leave the floor with the hope to return to this subject again.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have been almost startled by the divergence of opinion in the Senate about the amount of available iron ore in the United States. The very foundation of all our arguments upon the question of the tariff on iron ore is based primarily upon the amount of available iron ore in the United States.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] quoted from a recent speech made by the president of the Great Northern Railway, in which he stated that the available or merchantable iron ore in the States of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin amounted to only about 1,500,000,000 tons. Immediately we had figures given by the Senator from Michigan to the effect that those three States have available iron ore amounting to about 265,000,000,000 tons. There is quite a difference between 1,500,000,000 tons of available ore and 265,000,000,000 tons in the same area. Until we can find something about the real fact we are at a little loss to find a basis for any logical argument.

I want to call attention to a portion of the address by Mr. Hill which was mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to say in connection with it that the man who can tell you at a moment's notice the exact number of pounds of coal that it takes to move one ton of merchandise between any two points upon his entire line of railway and who computes so closely that he is able to figure out the power that is necessary to lift a given amount of merchandise over a hill and a mountain, and then estimate with mathematical accuracy the cost of what it will take to move that mountain or go through it, and to demonstrate then whether it will be profitable to still go over or to go under, is liable to be conservative in every one of his estimates.

I have no reason to believe from my acquaintance with the man, and from my knowledge of his broad views on every national and international question, and on every point affecting our resources and our commerce, that it is possible for him to have got so far away from the truth as is indicated in the arguments upon this floor. I want to call attention, as I suggested, to his remarks upon the available iron ore in the United States. Speaking on this subject he says:

The prospect of the mighty iron interest is even more threatening and more sure. Our available iron deposits have been carefully catalogued. All the fields of national importance have been known for at least twenty years. Within that time their boundaries and probable capacity have been estimated, and the whole country has been prospected for this kind of minerals. The most reasonable computation of scientific authority affirms that existing production can not be maintained for fifty years, assuming that all the available iron ore known to us is mined. In fact, the limitation is likely to be less than that period.

In speaking of the same deposits, and I especially call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to that proposition, he says:

Now, the main iron deposits in this country are those in the Lake Superior region. These furnish nearly or quite three-fourths of the entire product of the United States. Deprived of these, our output would shrink to a beggarly 10,000,000 tons or so a year—

This was September 3, 1906—

and these deposits are not veins of unknown depth and richness, but moles or pockets of ascertainable volume. There is within reach possibly 1,500,000,000 tons of merchantable iron ore in the deposits of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. This will keep our industry going, supposing consumption to remain stationary, for thirty or forty years. In the year 1950, as far as our own resources are concerned, will approach an ironless age. For a population of 200,000,000 people, our home supply of iron will have retreated almost to the company of the precious metals.

The very day after that argument is made upon the assumption of the available ore in the United States come the Senators from Michigan and show or attempt to demonstrate, at least, that there are about 265,000,000,000 tons of iron ore in those three States. Am I correct there?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly; I want to get a correct statement, as nearly as I can.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want to quarrel with the statement of Mr. Hill. He undoubtedly thought he was making a correct statement. But I do not understand that Mr. Hill is

in the iron business or that he is as familiar with that business as he is with the cost of transportation.

However, I wish to say for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, that we have in the State of Michigan alone 135,000,000,000 tons of iron ore, and if we exhaust it at the rate of 42,000,000 tons a year, which is the present output, it will take, as anyone may figure it, about three thousand years to exhaust our supply.

It is a well-known fact that the deposits in Minnesota are greater than ours, and it is well known that the deposits in Wisconsin, Tennessee, and Alabama are very large.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am in the time of the Senator from North Dakota.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will yield. I am trying to get information on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to ask the Senator if the people of Minnesota can get along without a duty on iron ore, why can not the people of Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. With all due respect to the voice you have heard, I think it would be a misfortune to the people of Minnesota. But if the Senator from Kansas will give me his attention for one moment I will demonstrate to him, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota, that every single penny you take off from the duty on iron ore will inure to the personal, direct advantage of Mr. Schwab and his associates. If the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Minnesota desire to present Mr. Schwab with the millions that the Treasury of the United States needs, well and good. I can not prevent it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand from the schedule furnished that the revenues would not be one million, but only about one hundred and some-odd thousand dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am trespassing upon the time of the Senator from North Dakota, but there is so much misinformation on that subject, I just want to halt long enough to correct a false impression. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] said there were 585,000 tons of iron ore imported from Cuba last year, according to this statement.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to have some information. I see that in the hearings on the schedule of "Metals and manufactures of" one Mr. Frank Samuel says:

The importation of iron ore to the United States paying a duty of 40 cents per ton for the year 1906 was 1,060,390 tons, and for 1907, 1,229,168 tons. Of the tonnage specified, 639,362 tons were shipped from Cuba in 1906 and 657,133 tons in 1907. The production of iron ore during the same period in America was 47,749,728 tons in 1906 and 51,720,619 tons in 1907. The greater part of ore imported was for special purposes, for which the American ore could not be used, and a further tonnage of the ore was again exported in finished material, for which the manufacturer received in return the 99 per cent duty. The revenue derived by the United States for the importation of ore is, consequently, a small factor.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to answer that statement? It is so simple that I do not want to have to repeat it again in this Chamber. All of the ore that has been received into this country from Cuba has come from Santiago, about 587,000 tons. The duty on that is very small, but in the Province of Cardenas, where Mr. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Company own these ore deposits, they say, in their own sworn testimony, that the deposits are greater than on the Mesabi Range, and that the quality is better than the iron on the Minnesota Range. Suppose we open the door and let this ore in without restriction. Suppose there is now taken from the Mesabi Range 26,000,000 tons of ore a year. Suppose you throw the bars down and that there is received from Cuba 10,000,000 tons of ore, the supply necessary for the Bethlehem and the Pennsylvania Steel Company's works. What would be the duty that this Government ought to collect upon this ore from Cardenas? On the basis of the present amendment it would be \$2,500,000. On the basis of the present tariff it would be \$4,000,000.

Mr. Schwab says they own that iron ore, and that they can get it here 32 cents a ton cheaper with the duty off than they can get it now. He also says that they can put the Cardenas ore into the Pittsburgh market at the same price as the Lake Superior ore now, with duty added. Then why should we put into the hands of Mr. Schwab two and one-half million dollars of

duty, at 25 cents a ton on 10,000,000 tons of Cuban ore, when we need the revenue to run our Government? Does any Senator here wish to make a present to poor Mr. Schwab of two and one-half million dollars a year?

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] said this afternoon that if he believed that the removal of the duty would insure competition, he would favor its removal, as he wanted to break down this monopoly. Mr. President, Mr. Schwab, in his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, said that he was a stockholder in the United States Steel Company. Every man in this Chamber knows that he was once the president of that company.

The testimony shows that he took pay for the Carnegie steel plants in the bonds and stocks of the United States Steel Company, and there is no evidence to show that he has disposed of them. If Mr. Schwab owns the Cardenas mines and the Steel Company owns 45 per cent of the Lake Superior and Mesabi mines, by throwing down the tariff you join and strengthen these two interests. That there is a certain community between them there can be no doubt; and if the Government is willing to hand over to Mr. Schwab the duty that we ought to collect from him for the benefit of all the people of our country, I mistake the temper of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have trespassed altogether too long upon the courtesy of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. He is very patient, very kind, and indulgent. The Senator from South Dakota yesterday, standing in his place, spoke, as he said, for the people, asking why should the American people want Mr. Schwab to pay any duty on his foreign iron ore. I ask, Mr. President, in the name of reason, why we should augment his huge fortune at the expense of the Treasury of our country?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, having disposed of Mr. Schwab, I now return to the topic of our conversation before we reached that illustrious gentleman. We were speaking at that time about the available iron ore in the United States, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] said that while Mr. Hill was a man of large experience, and due credit might be given to his testimony, he was not a dealer in or a manufacturer of iron. Well, Mr. President, as the head of a great transporting company, his life study has been concerning the resources of this country which his company must transport, and he has studied that question very thoroughly. If the Senator will turn to the last sheet of this little pamphlet [exhibiting] containing his argument, he will find here about twenty different authorities, including the Iron Age, the Mineral Industries, the Scientific American, and so forth, which have been studied by him in getting up this prospectus for the American people; and he states that every pocket of iron ore in the United States has been carefully surveyed and catalogued, so that he knows about how much there is.

Now comes another statement—and I agree with the Senator, extravagant as the statement seems—that instead of thirty years' time being required for the consumption of the iron ore in the United States, at the present rate of consumption it will take three thousand years to exhaust it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is, for the exhaustion of the ore in Michigan alone.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the ore in Michigan alone, but I am estimating it upon the basis, as stated by the Senator's colleague [Mr. BURROWS], of there being about 300,000,000,000 tons in the United States. If the present output would exhaust in thirty years a supply of 1,000,000,000 tons, 30,000,000,000 tons would require thirty times as long, and 300,000,000,000 tons would require very much longer.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely wanted to call the Senator's attention to the slight discrepancy of three thousand years between his estimate and that of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] this morning, about three hours ago. It would take, according to the senior Senator from Michigan, six thousand years to exhaust the iron ore—

Mr. GALLINGER. That was all the iron ore in the country.

Mr. BEVERIDGE (continuing). But later, according to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], it will take three thousand years.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator from Michigan also included another output in Cuba, which would run, perhaps, a hundred or more years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It was six thousand years two or three hours ago, and it is three thousand years now. Maybe the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] was not so very

far wrong after all. When we find six thousand years reduced to three thousand years in two short hours, maybe we shall find in a few hours more that the six thousand years will dwindle to the few score of years stated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Evidently the Senator from Indiana did not listen to what my colleague [Mr. BURROWS] said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I may be wrong about it, and, if I am, I will withdraw it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What my colleague said was this, that the estimated amount of iron ore in the United States was about 365,000,000,000 tons, and on the basis that we are now consuming, it would last about six thousand years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And now the Senator says it will last three thousand years. So I say six thousand years is—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Indiana is confused.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not know but that I am. Anybody would be—six thousand years reduced to three thousand years in two hours. It is awful.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That related to the iron ore in the entire country. The iron ore in the State of Michigan alone is 135,000,000,000 tons, and in the county of Marquette alone, one single county of our State, it is 71,000,000,000 tons. On the basis of 42,000,000 tons a year, the Senator from Indiana, who is very good at figures, may figure for himself how long it would last in Michigan alone.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will permit, I am figuring on some other things, and I will let other Senators do their figuring upon this. I just called attention—it was confusing, I am confused, and everybody is confused—to the fact that about two hours ago, according to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], it would take six thousand years; and now, two hours later, according to the Senator from North Dakota, it will take three thousand years.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; not according to the Senator from North Dakota. I beg the Senator's pardon. I made the estimate which I stated—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. You said three thousand years.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I said according to the estimate made by Mr. Hill upon the same basis, computing the tonnage that is given by the Senator from Michigan, that, instead of thirty years, it would take three thousand years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senators are tossing figures of thousands of years around here very recklessly. I heard six thousand years fixed this morning as the period when it would be exhausted, and now it is placed at a period of three thousand years when it will be exhausted. So I am not so sure that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] was not right after all. Maybe it is forty years, because at this rate of geometrical progression it will not be ten years, if we keep in session until 5 o'clock.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not denying the statement of the Senator. I am—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to remind Senators that the stenographer can not report the speeches when four Senators are talking at once.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I had the floor, with the permission of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. Now, we learn that the Senator from North Dakota does not agree with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am afraid I can not allow the Senator from Indiana to say just what my position is on that point. If the Senator will give me time, I will perhaps elucidate it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will be all right, if the Senator will only reconcile these thousands of years that the Senator from Michigan and others are tossing around here, so that we can get down to the Senator from South Dakota's estimate of forty years.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator must understand that it is impossible to reconcile such wide divergences.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought so.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the reason I am quoting them.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I see.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], once for all, that the deposits of iron ore could not be exhausted in the time stated by Mr. James J. Hill, for the simple reason that our borings and our development, and the present ore in sight in one county in our State, with which I am very familiar, and

through the mines of which I have been, demonstrate that there are 71,000,000,000 tons in the mines in Marquette County alone; and, if worked at the present rate of 40,000,000 tons a year, would run considerably over the estimate suggested. We have 275,000,000,000 tons in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Dividing that upon the present basis of output, it would last upward of six thousand years.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is not that enough? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It does not seem to be enough to convince some people that there is no danger of immediate exhaustion.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. TILLMAN. Had we not better address ourselves to taking care of the present Americans and leave our remote posterity to look out for some substitute for iron ore if the mines of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin can not furnish enough?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from South Carolina understands that the Senator from North Dakota—

Mr. TILLMAN. Was lamenting the probability—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (continuing). Was quoting from an authority which contended that we must conserve our iron ore, because it would disappear in fifty years. To offset that, which I do not believe is correct, I made this comparative statement, based upon the reports of the Geological Survey.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understood all that; and I have been very much interested to discover that we are so wealthy in iron ore; that we have got such an immense quantity of it. We have also got a little patch or two of it down in South Carolina.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There was just a little difference, Mr. President, according to Senators, as to this process of exhaustion, of five thousand nine hundred and fifty years—just a little discrepancy of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. There seems to be a little bit of difference of opinion about the amount of iron ore left in this country.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. RAYNER. I desire just now to make a correction.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. RAYNER. There has been a controversy as to the supplies of iron ore. If Senators will look back at the speech of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] they will find that he was not talking about iron ore at all, but that he was talking about lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken. He spoke about both iron ore and lumber.

Mr. RAYNER. Just wait. It will not take me a moment. I will read the colloquy. It is as follows:

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the Senator, earlier in his very admirable address, indicated at what period of years in the future our stock of iron ore will be exhausted if the consumption keeps on increasing as at present. I merely want to ask now, so that I may fix it in my own mind, how soon that will be? Did the Senator say about forty years? It is very important.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I referred to lumber—seventy years, if the consumption goes on at the present rate; but if the accelerated ratio of increase is maintained it will be exhausted in thirty years.

The Senator from South Dakota was talking about lumber; he was not talking about iron ore at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator will find—

Mr. RAYNER. No; I will not find it, either.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator will find, when he goes through the entire address, that the Senator from South Dakota also discussed the question of iron ore, as well as lumber and other products. But if he failed to put in the figures, I will give them again for the benefit of the Senator from Maryland and for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RAYNER. There is such a great discrepancy between thirty years and six thousand years that I think we might agree on some compromise.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well. I am trying to give the Senator the material upon which he can base his compromise, and I shall be very glad if he will give us the definite information.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. RAYNER. I should like to know, Mr. President, whether we are to be protected for the next six thousand years? That is the information I am after.

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps I can suggest the proper basis for a compromise. In the Iron Age of April 29, 1909, published just a few days ago, the chief geologist of the United States Geological Survey, Mr. Hayes, makes an estimate of the amount of iron ore that is in sight in the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think that was given by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. ALDRICH. All right. Mr. Hayes estimates the iron ore in sight at 80,000,000,000 tons, and at the present rate of production that would only last for fifteen hundred years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is a new figure. First, we had six thousand years, then three thousand, and now one thousand five hundred.

Mr. KEAN. But that refers to the iron ore in sight.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is ore now in sight.

Mr. RAYNER. Then we will have to levy a duty on it, according to the Senator from Rhode Island, for one thousand five hundred years. I just want to get straight on this matter.

Mr. ALDRICH. And that ore, I will say to the Senator, is contained in 36 different States.

Mr. RAYNER. No matter in how many different States it is contained, the duty will have to continue for one thousand five hundred years, and to increase as the product diminishes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think that we would find our line of compromise not upon the extremes, but by taking into consideration what was in the mind of Mr. Hill as evidenced by his remarks as to what was the amount of the available iron ore. Some Senators would say that the available iron ore to-day, or the merchantable iron ore, is that which contains about 50 per cent of pure iron, and that which does not contain that percentage, although it is greatly in excess of high-grade ore, is at present unmerchantable iron ore, which we may reach by some system in the future. At some future time, when we have exhausted our 90 and our 50 and our 40 per cent iron ore, it may be profitable to use 25 per cent ore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was speaking, if the Senator will permit me, of 30 per cent ore.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCUMBER. In a moment. The Senator from Michigan makes his basis upon 30 per cent ore, but we can scarcely call that available iron ore under present conditions.

Mr. NELSON. I wanted to call the attention of Senators, while they are on this subject, to the fact that I read in a newspaper a short time ago that, by the aid of the modern telescope, they had discovered large deposits of iron ore on the planet Mars; but there is a question as to how it can be utilized. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEAN. Just overcome the law of gravitation and they can utilize it.

Mr. GALLINGER. They need not overcome it; they can just tumble it off.

Mr. McCUMBER. I want to call the Senator's attention now to the basis of Mr. Hill's calculation. He says:

In 1870 the United States produced a little more than 3,000,000 tons of iron ore. It increased by about 150 per cent for each decade to 1890. As late as 1895 it was a trifle short of 15,000,000 tons. In 1902 and 1903 it was, in round numbers, 35,000,000 tons, and last year—

That is, the year 1905—

it rose to about 42,000,000 tons. At this rate, as all the trade statistics indicate, and as our present policy and growth in population require, it will reach 50,000,000 tons almost immediately.

That prophecy is borne out by the statement of the Senator from Michigan, who, I believe, said it amounted last year to about 58,000,000 tons, or over 50,000,000 tons.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. About 42,000,000 tons from Michigan alone.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but I mean the production in the United States.

Mr. Hill proceeds to say:

By every possible means we are stimulating consumption, especially by a tariff that places a bounty on the exhaustion of the home supply of both coal and iron, thus prohibiting recourse to outside supplies and compelling the exhaustion of our own reserve.

Mr. President, I am a little inclined to doubt the statement that the iron supply of the United States is going to last for thousands of years. I have as much confidence in what I have read here from the statement of a man who has given the matter especial study as to the available iron ore in the United

States as I have in the statistics that have been read here today. I know concerning the things which I can see. I can tell, as any other man can tell, something about the supply of timber and its rapid exhaustion in the United States; but I must leave to those who have made special study of the subject the question of the supply of ore under the surface of the earth. Believing, however, Mr. President, that the available iron supply will be exhausted in probably less than one hundred years, with the accumulating population of the United States, still I am not prepared to say that a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore would seriously, if at all, affect the importation of such ore.

I said a few days ago, in discussing those great resources of the country which I believed were likely to be exhausted in a comparatively few years, that we ought not to levy any duty that would accelerate that exhaustion. If I believed that a small duty upon iron ore, such as 25 cents a ton, would seriously interfere with its importation, from my standpoint I would not even vote for the 25 cents per ton duty. In the lucid argument of the Senator from Michigan upon that subject, he said that iron ore from Cuba could be placed in Pittsburgh at a less cost for transportation than the Mesabi mines could place their own product in Pittsburgh. If that is true, the duty of 25 cents a ton will not prevent the importation.

He also showed, Mr. President, how cheaply iron ore could be mined in Cuba, calling especial attention to the fact that it needed only the removal of a slight covering for a space of 15 feet when ore could be taken out by a steam shovel, transported only about 13 miles, there loaded into a vessel for water transportation to New York and to every place on the coast. With the cheaper production in Cuba—and I believe it is slightly cheaper—then, even with a duty of 25 cents a ton, iron ore could come into this country in competition with American iron ore east of the Alleghenies, but it could not, in my opinion, come in serious competition with the iron ore produced on the shores of Lake Superior.

I do not believe that iron can be produced any place upon the face of the earth cheaper than it can be produced along the shores of Lake Michigan. That being the case, Mr. President, as I said some time ago, I do not believe that we will prevent the importation of Cuban iron ore by the small duty of 25 cents a ton. Therefore I will vote for that small duty, as our Democratic friends would say, on the basis of a tariff for revenue only, because I think we will get some revenue without in any way injuring or accelerating the destruction or the exhaustion of our mines in this country.

Mr. RAYNER obtained the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. RAYNER. I do not think I want to speak any more at this time on this subject. Does the Senator from Nevada desire the floor?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should be glad to make a few remarks now.

Mr. RAYNER. Very well; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I find from the schedule which has been presented to us by the committee that the total duties collected on iron ore under the present law amount to about \$400,000 and that the estimated revenue on iron ore under the Senate committee amendment will be about \$250,000. I assume that that estimate is based upon the assumption that the importations will not increase, but that the importation in tons will be about the same as under the present law. I take it for granted that under any reduction of this tariff the importations will increase, and it is altogether probable that the duties collected under the proposed amendment will equal the duties collected under the existing law. It is true, Mr. President, that the existing duty and the proposed duty are revenue duties; and, so far as I am concerned, I am disposed to vote for all revenue duties; but there are exceptions to that general rule.

There never has been a tariff bill framed, whether by the Republican party or by the Democratic party, that did not contain a large free list; but the question in this case is, whether there are conditions which warrant us in sacrificing this revenue of \$250,000 under the estimate of the committee and putting this article upon the free list. So far as I am concerned, I think that such conditions do exist.

We were all amazed at the statement made by Mr. Gary, the president of the steel trust, to the effect that that organization practically controls the iron supply of this country, or will control it in the future. We all realize that that is the greatest combination and trust and monopoly that has ever been organized in the history of the world. We have the statement of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], who comes from a region familiar with the organization of trusts and monopolies, that it is almost impossible to organize one of these great combinations unless you can control the raw material;

and we have the statement to that effect of another Senator who is familiar with the operations of these great organizations. This accounts for the power and strength of the steel combination. It has added to that power and strength during the last year by acquiring the properties of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company.

Now, just to the extent that we encourage the importation of foreign ore we will diminish the control of the steel trust over the supply of iron ore, admittedly the very basis of the monopoly which it exercises. The only argument urged against that suggestion is that the iron ore on the outside is also owned by a great organizer of trusts, Mr. Schwab, and the suggestion is made that he was originally interested in the steel trust; that it is not as yet disclosed that he has parted with that interest, and we are led to infer that ultimately these two great trusts will come together and will control the supply of iron, both foreign and domestic.

It is true that that contingency may occur, but it is not upon us now; and I do not propose, so far as I am concerned, to vote upon an apprehension regarding the future, to vote upon an assumption which is not yet realized, and may not be realized. I assume that when that contingency does take place, the Government, driven by public opinion, will act decisively with a view to the dissolution of that trust and that the inquiry set on foot by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] regarding this domestic trust, if it at present halts, will not halt when it adds to its present great property not only the acquisition of the Tennessee Coal and Iron property, but the acquisition of the entire source of foreign ore supply.

I shall therefore not be led away from my purpose by the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, that, in endeavoring to escape the monopoly of the domestic trust, we will throw ourselves in the arms of Mr. Schwab, who, according to his claim, owns the sources of foreign supply. But I can not believe that these sources in Cuba are the only sources. There must be sources of supply elsewhere—in Central America, in South America, in Africa, in various regions of the world—which have not yet been scientifically explored, and just to the extent that we relax the grasp of the steel trust upon the raw material, which stands at the base of its trust organizations and which gives it the means and the opportunity of monopolistic control, just to that extent will we impair its efficiency in monopolistic control.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for putting this article upon the free list, as the House committee did and as the House itself did; and failing in that, I shall vote for the lowest duty possible.

I understand the parliamentary status to be that there is a committee amendment providing for a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore, which is intended to take the place of the House provision putting iron ore upon the free list, and that the Senator from Mississippi has moved an amendment to that amendment reducing the duty to 20 cents per ton. I imagine at this stage of the proceedings it is not possible to make any further amendment, and that the only thing left for us to do is to adopt, if we can, the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, and then refuse to adopt the entire paragraph. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether it is possible as a matter of parliamentary proceeding now to have a vote on the question of putting it upon the free list, and what the form of the amendment should be?

Mr. ALDRICH. It can be gotten at very easily by voting down the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi and of the committee. We would thereby practically put it on the free list.

Mr. NEWLANDS. By voting down both amendments?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The difficulty with that would be that those who are opposed to any duty at all would refuse to support the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and then the duty fixed by the committee would stand, and if we had not enough votes to put it on the free list and at the same time had enough votes to reduce the duty we would lack the accomplishment of both. I do not profess to be much of a parliamentarian. I am only anxious to reach this question in some practical way, and I do not want to divorce those who are in favor of a reduction of duty in such a way as to make the committee amendment practically triumphant, although a majority of this body may be in favor of a reduction of the duty.

I should like to have the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire as to the method of procedure.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nevada was looking my way, and I smiled in return to his gracious look, but the only matter that was in my mind at that point was to ask the Senator if he would not be willing to let us have a vote now.

Mr. KEAN. Let us have a vote.

Mr. PENROSE. Question!

Mr. BAILEY. I will oblige the Senators in a moment.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for a duty of 25 cents per ton, which is equivalent to an ad valorem of 10 per cent on imported iron ore, and I desire very briefly to state my reasons for doing so.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] has very well stated what I think ought to be the position of every Democrat. I think we all ought to favor every duty which is fixed below a protective rate and which will produce any revenue to the Treasury. I am utterly unable to comprehend how a Democrat who professes to believe in a tariff for revenue can obtain his consent to vote to place on the free list the raw material of the most gigantic trust on the American Continent. I understand, of course, the force of the suggestion that the trust, having its raw material, may be interested in having a duty imposed upon the imported article, but a moment's reflection will convince us that that is a mistake. If you make it possible to import iron ore below the cost of production to the steel trust, the steel trust will simply close up its mines and import the ore, if it can import it cheaper than it can produce it.

Besides, if there is any present danger of the exhaustion of the iron mines, then the best investment the steel trust could make would be to lock up its own mines and import its ore free of duty.

Suppose fifteen years ago a lumber company having timber lands of its own and timber lands from which it could purchase its mill supply had left its own forests untouched and bought the timber of its neighbors; it would have realized a much larger profit on the lumber which it kept than it would have realized on the lumber which it cut. In other words, the increase in the price of the raw material would be an immense profit upon the investment. And so it would be as to iron ore. If there is any real danger of the early exhaustion of the iron mines, the trust could well afford to discontinue the operation of its mines, reserving them for use after it had exhausted its near-by sources of supply, as it would be certain to do if it could import from abroad cheaper than it could produce it itself. As long as the trust is left to import iron ore free of duty, I can not conceive how you are going to facilitate competition against it by giving to others only the privilege which the trust itself can and will exercise.

Mr. RAYNER. How does the Senator from Texas explain, then, that the United States Steel Corporation is fighting free iron ore and taking every possible step it can in favor not only of 25 cents but of a higher duty? I know that to be a fact.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that to be a fact.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator may be able to explain it.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know it to be a fact, and therefore I would not undertake to explain it. I have not myself seen any evidence of it.

Mr. RAYNER. I know it to be a fact that the United States Steel Corporation is not only in favor of 25 cents, but of more than that.

Mr. BAILEY. How does the Senator know that to be a fact?

Mr. RAYNER. I have heard it from a hundred different persons and read it in a hundred different newspapers.

Mr. BAILEY. I understood the Senator to say to-day that he would not believe anything he heard on this question.

Mr. RAYNER. I might not believe anything I heard when the witnesses were before the Ways and Means Committee, but when by the common information that is imparted to us we know that to be a fact, I am bound to give some credence to it. I do not say it can not be explained, but I am talking of the fact itself. I will ask the Senator from Texas whether he does not believe that the United States Steel Corporation would be in favor of a duty of 25 cents rather than to have iron ore free, owing to the fact, as explained this morning, that it has monopolized the deposits to the extent of nearly 85 per cent of the Lake Superior deposits.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe any such thing, for the reason that I have no basis for that belief. I am a member of the committee that framed this bill, although I was relieved wholly from the labor and the responsibility for its provisions, and excluded with all other Democrats from the committee room, about which we have heard something and about which I do not propose to say anything now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Excluded by consent of the Senator himself.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no; not excluded by consent, but excluded, with a very frank statement on my part, which I have made once before in the presence of the Senate, and which I will repeat whenever the occasion arises, that if we had had the majority we would have excluded the others. I would not think

of going into a committee room with five Republicans and seven Democrats to make a tariff bill, because the Republicans would from time to time—and that is the way they would spend their time—find some schedule on which they could take two Democrats away from us; take two Democrats on this and then two Democrats on that, and then two on the third one and, finally, they would make the tariff bill with the Republican minority solid and a defection in the Democratic vote. If we had been in the committee room we would have come near making this tariff bill. I violate the secrets of the full committee room to the extent of saying that it was admitted by the majority members that if we had been present to assist in framing this bill we might have profited by their divisions.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Texas that he does not know that the United States Steel Company desires this duty retained is exactly in harmony with my own view. I can see very great advantages that might accrue to the company by its removal; for instance, among others, those given by the Senator from Texas. This additional reason occurred to me. Suppose the Steel Company should have difficulty with its men on Lake Superior and the Mesabi Range, how quickly could they transfer their operations to a foreign State, located as advantageously as is Cuba to our coast?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true and is worthy of consideration. But, returning to the Senator from Maryland, I will say, that though I am a member of the Finance Committee, I do not now recall that I have ever received any documents, written or printed, from anybody whom I suspected was an officer, employee, or stockholder of the steel trust, advocating placing iron ore on the free list.

I can understand how a Senator who represents one of the Atlantic seaboard States would want the duty taken off, so that they could bring in iron ore from other countries and take back exports from this country, but after all the remission of duties to encourage commerce is not very different in principle from the levying of duties to encourage commerce. In other words, it is using the taxing power either by assertion or by omission to encourage and promote industry or the commerce of a particular place or a particular section, and that does not appeal to me with any great degree of favor.

What I believe is—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask the Senator from Texas whether he believes in any free list?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe in a free list, except as to the absolute necessities of life, and never with my vote will any commodity go on the free list except it be an article of universal use and be in a shape ready for the actual consumption of the great multitude of our consumers. I believe in a tariff for revenue, and I will never vote for a duty so high as to be intended for protection, and I will never vote to put any article except a necessary of life on the free list. There are two classes of articles which produce no revenue; one is on the prohibitory list and the other is on the free list; the one is as barren of revenue to the Public Treasury as the other; and if I ever consent to put anything on the free list, the last thing I will vote to put on it is the raw material of the greatest trust ever organized in the history of this Republic.

Mr. President, I am very free to say, so far as I am concerned, it does not satisfy me to say that we are going to punish this trust by a tariff rate. The duty is only 10 per cent. It can well afford that, and it would be, in my opinion, somewhat more favorable to it if the duty was nothing and it was permitted to import iron ore free in an ordinary or extraordinary emergency and leave its great iron deposits for the touch of future generations.

But I have a better way of dealing with that great corporation than through the tariff. If the men who are charged with the duty of administering this Government keep their oaths faithfully to execute our laws, the steel trust must be and will be dissolved. I think it plain that it is a combination in restraint of trade. I go further. I think it is a combination in unreasonable restraint of trade, and even if the soft shells who want the antitrust law's teeth taken out of it and want it reduced to that condition of harmless impotency when a man can only be prosecuted for making an unreasonable combination in restraint of trade—even under a statute like that this corporation could be prosecuted and dissolved and its officers could be and ought to be punished.

I think it is not well for us to be remitting the revenues of the Government upon the expectation that the steel trust is to be perpetuated, because if great monopolies like that are to be

permitted in this country, if they are to be perpetuated either under the law as we make it or under the law as at the other end of the Avenue they administer it, then it is of precious little consequence what kind of a tariff law we frame, because, with the power which they possess to subtract from the earnings of the people, what the Government leaves us the trusts will take, and, for my part, unless there is another remedy, more drastic, more certain, and more effective than the mere difference between no tariff duty at all and a tariff duty of 10 per cent ad valorem, the whole subject loses its interest. If the men who now control this Government do not enforce its laws, mark my words, the people of the United States will engage a new set of men to enforce these laws.

We are told by the latest judicial oracle that the price of peace is obedience to the law, and yet in almost the same sentence that great law officer of the Government declares that he will prosecute no man who happens to violate the law without knowing it. In the same speech there is still the further statement that every man in the country now knows the Sherman antitrust law and that every railroad manager now understands the interstate-commerce law. Yet with that statement on the lips of the Attorney-General, he proceeds to declare, if he has been correctly reported by the newspapers, that he has no purpose of prosecuting anybody, and by that, I assume, he means criminal prosecution, because, without intention, they violate either the antitrust or the interstate-commerce act.

Mr. President, I will tender my good offices to this administration. I will show that I am more of a patriot than a partisan; and God knows I am as much of a partisan as any good citizen ought to be. Yet I am willing to see the Republicans do right, and I am even willing to help them do right.

I will tell them how they can make obedience to the laws of the United States certain. The plan is simply to send one of the malefactors of great wealth to the penitentiary. That will do it. Send one of them there for violating either the interstate-commerce law or the antitrust act, and he will be the last one of his kind to violate it. You can not restrain them by levying a fine, because when the court fines a trust the trust fines the people. They pay the sheriff with one hand and they take a double sum out of the pockets of the people with the other hand. As long as their punishment can be measured in dollars and cents they will continue to violate your laws, because men will take the chance of a pecuniary loss in the hope of a greater pecuniary gain. But send one of them to the penitentiary, and it will operate like magic. The millionaire trust magnate values but one thing in this world more than he does his fortune, and that is his liberty. He does not seem to love justice. He does not seem to love that repose of mind for which other men toil. He seems bent, after having many millions, upon acquiring many millions more.

I never have been able to understand it. It has always seemed to me that when a man had acquired an ample fortune, he ought to buy a farm and sit down like an American gentleman and take life easy. But they will not adopt that advice. They will not follow my prescription. Being rich, they want to be richer, and there is but one thing that will deter some of them from the accumulation of riches in defiance of the law, and that is the open door of the prison house. Long before tariff can produce any serious effect upon the industrial conditions of this land, I hope to see, and I expect to see, the steel corporation problem solved. I expect to see it dissolved, and I expect to see its officers obey the law or I expect to see them sent to prison or become fugitives from justice. That will come to pass, for if the men now charged with the due administration of the law fail to perform their duty, I have an abiding faith that the American people will call into their service another set of men, I hope a set of men from another party; but if not, another set of men from your party.

The stalwarts of this day will become the insurrectionists of that day to come, and the insurgents of this generation will be the stalwarts of the next generation. That is as certain as any event in the future can be, with this single qualification, that in this division and wrangle among yourselves a returning sense of wisdom and of justice among the people will call the Democratic party to power instead of either faction of the Republican party.

Senators sit there now and smile complacently. They feel so secure in their strength and power that they think these things can never be; but remember our fate. We were more united in 1892, incomparably more, than you are now. We were more united in 1892 than you were at the last presidential election, and there has not been a twenty-four hours since that presidential election that you have not been more disunited than we have. When you call the roll, you may find 2 or 3 Democrats over here who agree with you—honest, upright men,

doing their duty as they understand it—but when you call that roll and find 2 or 3 of our membership who agree with you, we find 14 or 15 of your membership who agree with us. They are brave and honest and fearless and patriotic, trying to do their duty.

But you ought to be admonished, gentlemen of the Republican party. Your lease of power is not what you dream it is. You are sleeping on a volcano, and at the next election there will come the eruption.

It is rather a hazardous thing to prophesy, but I want to put a prophecy in the Record here and now. I am going to say to you now, that if you pass this tariff bill, without an income-tax amendment and without a substantial reduction in duties, the next House of Representatives will be Democratic by 40 majority. I believe that so well, Mr. President, that I am ready to vote on the income-tax amendment. Will the Senator from Rhode Island now agree upon a day to take that vote?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, what day would the Senator suggest?

Mr. BAILEY. The third day from this. That gives everybody who may be absent, and there are not many absentees, an opportunity to be here.

Mr. ALDRICH. Can we get at the same time a date fixed for the final vote upon the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I have no right to speak for others, but I will agree to vote—

Mr. ALDRICH. I will agree now to both propositions.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I will make this proposition—

Mr. ALDRICH. Taken together.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the income-tax amendment be taken on Saturday before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. ALDRICH. And that the vote on the bill and all amendments shall be taken on Monday.

Mr. BAILEY. No; you can not vote then on the bill, I think, but I will make it the 1st day of June.

Mr. DANIEL. The amendment is not yet offered, I understand.

Mr. BAILEY. You could not possibly get that agreement. Let us not try to do the impossible. Let us not make a proposition that is certain to provoke an objection. I believe that we will agree on this side to take the vote on the 1st day of June on the bill and all pending amendments not disposed of before that time.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BAILEY. I will ask the clerks at the desk to see what day of the week that will be.

Mr. GALLINGER. Tuesday is the 1st day of June.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, there is not any use to take up time with a request for unanimous consent to vote on the bill the 1st of June or at any particular time. Every man here, I take it, is equally anxious to get through with the bill just as quickly as it possibly can be done. The bill will be voted upon when Senators get through carefully examining and discussing it. It must be manifest to the Senator from Rhode Island that it would be impossible at this time to get half the Senate to agree upon a date to vote on the bill. I say, with reference to the proposition of the Senator from Rhode Island—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Rhode Island has made no proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Texas, then. I think the Senator from Texas perhaps—

Mr. ALDRICH. I said I was willing to accept the proposition of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It will not be accepted.

Mr. BAILEY. Then I will modify my request. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I am anxious, of course, that this work be well done most of all—I have no hope of it being well done as long as you are to do it—but next to that, I am anxious that it be speedily done. Of course, I know that the business prosperity of this country waits upon your action, and I am no obstructionist. I will not delay the vote one moment. But the Senator from Rhode Island will understand that if he can get out of his way disputed points of a kind like the income tax, he makes the way for the final vote easier and smoother. So far as I am concerned, I would vote to take the vote on the 1st day of June, if that were permissible; but as, under the rules of the Senate, that can not be done, I will constantly exert my good offices to that end. With that statement, I now ask that the vote on the income tax amendment be fixed for Saturday next before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not willing at this moment to assent to that proposition, but I may be willing to-morrow morning.

Mr. BAILEY. I will be very glad to have the Senator sleep on it, and I will renew it to-morrow.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from Texas that I am even more anxious than he is upon both points he suggested; first, that we shall have a good bill, and, second, and above everything else almost, that we shall have that good bill promptly. So far as I am concerned and as far as I am able to speak for the committee and their friends, they are anxious to have the bill voted upon at the earliest possible day.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am not interested in schedules. The only value of a schedule is that it illustrates a good or a bad principle. No election ever was, no election ought ever to be, and, in my judgment, no election ever will be carried in a contest over schedules. The schedules are merely the details by which and according to which principles are applied. I have no sympathy with the tendency manifested here and elsewhere to reduce the difference between the two great parties of this country to one of schedules. It is a difference of principle, sir, or it is not important. All I care about the discussion of a schedule is that I can thus exemplify and illustrate the justice or the injustice of a principle; and all the time we occupy in discussing the schedules of this bill is wasted unless it is made to illustrate the injustice and the vice of the policy of protection.

Of course I can understand how some might be high protectionists and some might be low protectionists and some might be medium protectionists. We have three schools of protectionists upon the Republican side. Eight years ago you had only one; you "stood pat." That meant you did not intend to change your law. But you were compelled to promise a change, and now you are compelled to make a change in order, at least, to keep the shadow of the promise if not the substance. But when you finish, your bill will not be appreciably different from the law which now exists. You can not make it much different. Where are you to get your revenue? The majority of you will not accept my income-tax amendment that would supply some \$80,000,000 or more, though I rejoice to believe that enough of you are willing to do so to make it possible of adoption. But the Republican majority refuses to accept an income-tax amendment.

The Republican majority of the Finance Committee have stricken from the bill as passed by the House the inheritance-tax provision. You are relying solely upon customs duties to raise the amount of money necessary beyond the other present receipts to sustain the Government, and that reliance can not be safely made with any serious change in the duties imposed by the present law. It makes no difference if the majority of the Republican Senate believe in lower duties, they could not levy them without either bankrupting the Treasury or resorting to the sale of bonds, and in that you would be warned by our example and by our fate. We sold bonds in time of peace to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives was reduced until it disappeared, and in its stead there came one of the largest Republican majorities that ever sat in that Chamber.

Now, remember my words. If you follow our example, you will experience our fate. You dare not sell bonds to meet the expenditures of the Government, and therefore you can not materially reduce your tariff duties. It is a fiscal impossibility. Reduce duties and you will have a bankrupt Treasury, and if you have a bankrupt Treasury you must either allow your obligations to go by default or you must sell our interest-bearing securities. The men who prepared the bill in the House and the House both understood that, and the men who reported the bill to the Senate understand it. Whatever may be said about the extreme protection tendencies of the chairman of the Finance Committee, he not only knows what he wants to do, but he knows what it is possible for him to do, and that can not be said of all Senators who sit on the other side. Some of them will talk like they will not vote, because if charged with the responsibility of framing and passing a bill to get a given amount of revenue they know the bill for which they speak will not raise it. I know it. I will not say they know it, because I impute no lack of sincerity to any Senator; but any man who understands the revenue necessities of this Government, and every man who understands the collection under these tariff laws, knows perfectly well that a serious reduction in rates is out of the question, and therefore the country need not expect when this bill becomes a law that there will be any material change from the present rates.

If that happens to be the case, and then you do not shift these eighty millions from the consumer to the abundant incomes of prosperous people, I am ready to take the vote. When you pass the kind of a bill you think you are going to pass, and which I think you are going to pass, I will be just as ready to take the judgment of the country then as I am ready to take the judgment of the Senate now.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, except we use them to illustrate the iniquity of the principle, the time we occupy in discussing these schedules is a useless waste. It is worse than a useless waste. Its tendency is to bring the American people to consider the difference between the Democratic and the Republican parties to be a difference in rates instead of a difference of principle. I never have myself thought it worth while to argue with our friends on that side whether protection builds up certain industries or not.

I never have gone beyond the basic proposition that this Government has no right to take a dollar I have earned and give it to someone else, even if it does build up the business of the country. I do not believe that you can build a great and enlarging industrial fabric upon a foundation of injustice. I think every time you pass a law which takes the money I earn and gives it to some other man who did not earn it you perpetrate a foul injustice. No industrial system, though it be as broad based as this continent and though it should rear its splendid head until it reached the skies, can be permanent and sound if it is based upon a wrong. I denounce any law that takes what one man earns and gives it to another under the shallow and selfish pretense of building up a general prosperity. Unless all moral laws are at fault no real prosperity can come out of any system founded upon an injustice to the humblest of our fellow-citizens.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not desire to participate in the debate about the income tax or other revenue-producing aspects of the problem which we have before us. In fact, I intend to do everything I can to prevent the present tariff controversy from becoming a mere speculative discussion about new modes of taxation, and that resolution would prevent me from giving consent to the disposition of the pending bill at any fixed day or hour, for I believe it to be the duty of the Senate to make a very careful examination of all the questions that are suggested by the paragraphs of this measure. The very fact that what we do ought to stand the test of years makes our duty all the more serious in fixing the schedules of this law.

I am afraid I do not agree with everybody about the trust system in the United States, but I confess that the most serious strain upon the popular confidence in the protective tariff has been the rise within the last ten or fifteen years of the speculative trusts. It has filled my mind with so much anxiety that I have been trying to study in a practical way, the origin, development, and final outcome of the trust organizations in our market place.

I have said more than once on this floor, and I believe it to be a fundamental proposition of practical economy, that no trust organization can permanently succeed in the face of the present abundance of capital and in view of the existing enterprise of our people without a substantial monopoly of the basic materials out of which the product made by the trust is manufactured.

I traced that doctrine in connection with all the trusts that were organized, beginning about 1898; I was especially interested in the history and misfortunes of the linseed-oil trust, which turned out from the beginning to be entirely unable to control either the supply of flaxseed or the price of oil. I have examined the history of the alcohol trust, which has been re-organized four times within our recollection. I took especial pains in the study of those trusts which had grown up in industries which owe their existence and their life in the United States to the protective tariff.

In 1900 there were four, or possibly five, well-organized glass trusts in the United States—the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company, the American Window Glass Company, and two smaller corporations engaged in the manufacture of domestic utensils of glass, mainly kitchen ware and tableware. At the time they were organized everything looked bright, cheerful, and hopeful for the future, but the existence of sand everywhere and the existence of fuel everywhere and the existence of good money everywhere within four years reduced every one of them to a minor position as a productive agency in that field of industry. They hoped to control from 90 to 100 per cent, because some of them started out by buying every existing institution engaged in that branch of business; but within a few years every one of them had fallen to a minor relation to the total production in that field. The trouble with the glass situation in the United States now is that the trusts are practically powerless. The production is very great. The control of output and of prices seems to be impossible. The result is that we have the interesting spectacle of glass being manufactured and sold in many cases below the cost of production, and in very many cases below the level of the tariff rate of 1897.

I have reflected for so many years about this matter that my confidence has taken the form of a general principle. American capital will undermine and destroy the influence of the greatest of our trusts, if you give the young men of the United States access to the basic materials that enter into production in these lines of industry. I speak of a great corporation—I will not say an unlawful corporation, because great lawyers differ about that. I am not willing to say that my friend from Texas is right in suggesting that the officers of such a corporation as the United States steel ought to be sent to the penitentiary. I think that would turn out to be a very difficult undertaking for the courts of the United States. I do not pass an opinion upon that, although it does not seem to me like a practicable suggestion in the present state of our affairs. But there is one thing which, in my judgment, will gradually shoot through and through the steel monopoly, if one exists in the United States, and that is to give American capital, wherever located, an easy access to the materials out of which iron and steel are made.

For that reason I believe the House of Representatives did a wise thing, a thing not damaging to the industries of the United States in any sense, when they took iron ore, produced here according to all the testimony that we can get more cheaply than it is produced anywhere in the world, and put it upon the free list, so that in the next generation, if anybody desires to go into that business and has the money, if anybody has the enterprise to build up even a little industry based upon this material anywhere in the United States, he will not be subjected to embarrassment and expected to make the negotiation now required of independent producers of steel who are not at the same time the owners of ore supplies that brings the so-called "independent" to the business office of his competitor to buy the material without which his enterprise can not proceed. I do not believe the House of Representatives ever did a wiser thing than when it took into consideration what is due to independent capital interested in this business in view of the fact that this magnificent resource, which God in his wisdom put within the reach of all the people, has practically been taken possession of by one corporation, a corporation that is not even using their own supplies but the material that lies by the side of them, so that within a few years all that portion of the iron-ore deposit owned by outsiders will be used up, and the steel works of the United States will be dependent entirely upon the ore which lies within the control and possession of the United States Steel Company.

I think no wiser thing can be done than to say to American capital, wherever it desires to start this business: "You have the right, if you are not dealt with on fair terms by your competitors in the United States, to search the world for that material without which an independent steel industry can not be built up in this market place."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. While the Senator is applauding the action of the House in placing the raw material for the steel trust and other steel manufacturers on the free list, what has the Senator from Iowa to say about the action of the same House in leaving a duty of more than 50 per cent upon such articles of common necessity as chains? If it be true that the iron itself in its raw state can be mined in this country cheaper than it can in other countries, how is it, then, that the steel can not be manufactured cheaper here than elsewhere?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, there is a good deal of testimony, some of it very famous—whether it is as reliable as it is famous I do not know—to the effect that the products of iron and steel can be produced and are produced here as cheaply as they are anywhere in the world. That trace chain, which has come down to us in the traditions of the tariff debate from the time of a venerable gentleman from Kentucky, who always made his annual speech on the subject, very well illustrates the effect on our prices here of building up a great iron and steel industry in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I happened to be glancing down the list of these articles, and I thought I found the highest duty that is here, and that happened to be 67 per cent. I found that it was on chains. But there are a number of duties here of 40, 41, and 78 per cent. I made a mistake. If I had looked a little more carefully, I should have found one duty of 78 per cent in that column. If they will take the duty off everything made out of iron, then I will vote to take the duty off of iron.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But, Mr. President, the duty on iron ore has no relation to that proposition. Nobody ever pretended

that the duty on iron ore made iron more costly here than it is elsewhere.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator mean to say that the duty on any raw material or any basic material does not at least affect the price of everything made out of it?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say to the Senator that my studies of the question have convinced me that where the market for the raw material is here, the man who brings it in from the outside pays the duty to get into the market; but where the market is made elsewhere, a duty here lifts up the price of the home product to the level of that market plus the duty.

Mr. BAILEY. Why not apply that philosophy to the products of iron ore the same as to the iron ore itself?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The little handful of iron ore that comes in here, or has hitherto come in, is sold, if it is sold at all, at the price of iron ore that prevails here, and it affects it, I think, in no way whatever, except that it costs a man something to get it in here.

Mr. BAILEY. Then the fact that you take the duty off of it will not affect the price of it?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not think so. Otherwise I should probably be found in line with my honored friend from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BAILEY. Then, if it does not affect prices, it is simply a proposition to take this more than \$100,000 out of the Treasury and present it to the men who bring the iron ore in.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And at the same time to arm ourselves in this market place with the right and the opportunity to build up an independent steel industry in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am very much more interested, of course, in protecting the thousands of people who use steel than I am in protecting the hundreds of people who produce it. That is my view of the matter. But I think the man who produces steel in one form is entitled to precisely the same kind of treatment as the man who produces it in another form.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Outside of the Lake Superior country, the iron ores of the United States are used at furnaces situated near the ore beds. They neither buy nor sell iron ore.

Mr. BAILEY. I think every community is entitled to the advantages that God and nature gave it; and Michigan has so few of that kind that I would not deprive—

Mr. DOLLIVER. You are in great error about that.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not deprive them of that. In other words, I can hardly reconcile it with my idea of the office of legislation to deprive any people of an advantage that God and nature gave them, or to confer on any people some advantage that God and nature did not give them. If the people of Michigan happen to have that advantage, I would not try to deprive them of any part of it or to increase it. I would not vote to levy a tax or to repeal a tax for any such purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEFEW in the chair). The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to the fact that the principal owner of the iron-ore deposits on the north coast of Cuba is Mr. Schwab, who says that if he is permitted to bring his iron ore into this country free, it will make a difference to him of 50 cents a ton. When asked by a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means if that would reduce the price of his commodity to the consumer, he answered with a laugh that he did not think it would.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, he had a good right to say that, when he knew that this kind of a tariff would be made to protect him against European competition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He did not attribute it to that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not care to what he attributed it. He knew what was coming.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. He said that the reason why steel products would not be reduced, was because there was an agreement practically between the steel manufacturers, and that agreement would be just as potential if you were to strike off every dollar of duty.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why not let us try it?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Because this Government needs the revenue, and the Senator from South Carolina knows it.

Mr. TILLMAN. How much revenue do you get from steel products?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. According to the statement now before us, the duty upon iron ore is very slight, but since that statement was made, these people have acquired these tremendous holdings, which they say are equal to the great holdings upon the Mesabi Range.

Mr. TILLMAN. How much duty do you get on steel rails or on chains or on wire?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want the Senator to—

Mr. TILLMAN. I know the Senator does not want to touch that point, but that is the crucial point.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Because we are dealing with the iron-ore schedule.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understand that right across in Canada, from the Michigan border, there lies unexplored a very large body of iron ore. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think it is.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Which is larger possibly than the body of ore that lies on this side?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I shall not admit that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But not as good as the ore on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is said not to be.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It has something in it, and they have not found a way of getting it out, in order to make it really as good as the Michigan ore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well.

Mr. DOLLIVER. My notion is, in view of the fact that enterprising persons who did not consult my honored friend from Michigan have staked out claims on these iron-ore ranges of the lake country, that it would be a very good answer for the Government of the United States to open to the people of the United States easy and free access to all that material that there is in the world.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if I could be as easily deluded as the Senator from Iowa, I might subscribe to that fallacy; but I am advised that those deposits across the Canadian line are owned by the Steel Company under lease, and I believe further that if you strike down this duty and any difficulty should arise between the men employed and this company they will simply transfer their operations to a foreign state for a time, leaving the thousands of men behind. Does the Senator from Iowa desire that condition to arise?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; but I do not notice in the report and statement of the assets of the Steel Company any claim for ranges except on the American side.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Steel Company have had their men through Canada for years, just as they have had them in Cuba for years; and we are to get from Cuba each year from eight to ten million tons of ore as soon as developments are complete. That ore is to come from the north coast, and it is owned by strong companies, one of whom is admittedly one of the largest stockholders in the United States Steel Company. Who is to say, if the Government relinquishes its right to ask this contribution to our revenue, that it will not inure solely to the benefit of these gigantic corporations?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me, I have been examining the estimates in relation to this schedule, and I find that the revenue derived by this Government from iron rails was the magnificent sum of \$215.43, and from steel rails \$30,670.02.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and, Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. And that the duty was \$7.84 a ton. Why do you put any duty on them at all?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I firmly believe that if you strike that duty down you will simply encourage an understanding between the European steel producer and the American steel producer that will still maintain the price at \$28 a ton.

Mr. TILLMAN. Have we not got that same combination now on armor plate?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You have got it on steel rails.

Mr. TILLMAN. We have got it on everything else, and yet you levy a duty. Why not throw open the markets of the world and let the American railways buy their steel wherever they can?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, let me answer. It is because, if we are to have European steel here at all to take the place of that made by American workmen, I want the importer to contribute something toward the expenses of this Government.

Mr. TILLMAN. Two hundred and fifteen dollars on iron and a little over \$30,000 on steel rails.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Many millions of dollars might result from this duty on iron ore, now that desirable deposits have been found so near our shore.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not talking about iron ore. I am willing to vote with you on iron ore. I will vote for your duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, Mr. President, with the assurance of the Senator from South Carolina, I am ready to vote.

Mr. KEAN and others. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN].

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from Mississippi moved an amendment to lower this duty, but I think the Senator from Mississippi has agreed with me that I may make a motion to strike this schedule out. I want to strike out paragraph 115½.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that all he has to do is to vote against the adoption of the committee amendment. The question will be on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RAYNER. Are we to take a vote on the adoption of the amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the amendment is voted down, then iron ore will go to the free list.

Mr. RAYNER. It does not necessarily go to the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is on the free list in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. RAYNER. It will be put on the free list, then?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is on the free list in the House bill.

Mr. RAYNER. But the Senator has reported to take it from the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the amendment of the committee is rejected, that will put it back on the free list.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I offered an amendment which, if it were adopted, would reduce the duty from 25 cents to 20 cents. The amount is not great; but I thought if the duty were reduced to 20 cents, I could vote for the paragraph as it would then be. But as it would not reduce the duty to any great amount, with the permission of the Senate, I will withdraw the amendment which I offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi withdraws his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I want to be perfectly fair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. I have just been handed by my colleague the Representative of the Twelfth Congressional District of my State this statement, and of its verity I have no doubt:

The steel company's leases of Canada ore beds or deposits all contain a provision that if the tariff is reduced the royalty shall be increased 50 per cent of the reduction of the tariff.

In other words, if we reduce the tariff, those leases shall respond to Canada for it.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Let us vote.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I just want to point out two things. Two or three Senators on the other side have said that they would vote for the duty provided in the committee amendment because of the revenue it would produce. The revenue it will produce, according to the statement furnished us, is the magnificent sum of \$127,000. If it is for the purpose of revenue, the amendment of the Senators who propose to vote for the committee amendment for that reason should be to amend the committee's amendment by inserting the rate of the present law, which is 40 cents a ton, which produces, according to this statement, nearly twice the revenue estimated to come in under the committee amendment. If Senators on the other side are voting for a revenue tariff on iron ore, they must vote for the present duty instead of the committee amendment, for the latter will produce only a little more than half the present law produces.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me a moment. I observe that the argument presented by the Senators from Michigan for this same duty was precisely the reverse of the argument of the Democratic Senators who propose to vote with the Senators from Michigan on this tax. The Michigan Senators want the duty retained solely as a protection to the industry. The Senators on the other side who are going to vote for it are going to do so solely because it produces revenue. We saw the same processes of reasoning by equally intelligent and sincere Senators in connection with the lumber schedule. The Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and notably the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] wanted a duty of \$2 on lumber because it was a revenue duty, whereas the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] and other Republican Senators wanted it because it was a protective duty.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. TILLMAN. Put in "North Carolina" for "South Carolina," if you please.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me; I meant to say the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], instead of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I would not make a mistake about that. The truth about it is that, whether it is called "revenue" or "protection," the result is the same. "A rose by any other name," as I said before, "will smell as sweet."

Now, just one other point before the vote, and that is this—

Mr. KEAN. Can we not have a vote?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will restrain his impatience, or I shall have to say something upon the matter of hurrying this bill; and I am much inclined to do it.

Mr. KEAN. I desire to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. I understood the Senator from Indiana to say that he was desirous of getting through with this bill?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am desirous of getting through with this bill, but I am still more desirous that when we do get through with it we will get through with it in a way that we will be through with it for the next ten years.

Mr. KEAN. Does the Senator think he is giving us any information on this bill now?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I had not intended to go into this matter again, but the Senator compels me. A moment ago, when the mutually and equally entertaining eloquence of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] engaged our attention, I was about to send to the Secretary's desk something upon that point; but I want a vote to-night, and, therefore, I will not do it. I will say, however, that the Senator's anxiety for a vote is not the method of hastening this bill. This bill is being hastened every day. A great improvement is beginning to be made.

Yesterday the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] brought in an amendment greatly reducing, as he explained, the duties on a certain article. I congratulated the committee then. I understand that another amendment is to be brought in to-morrow morning, or as soon as may be, making another reduction. I congratulate the committee on that. That is the way to make permanent progress with this bill. And the progress we want to make is permanent progress. How would the Senator like, when the bill is through, for the entire tariff discussion to be raised again within four years? Does he want to see that? I do not, nor do I believe that any business man in this country does.

Now, since the Senator has brought this thing up, I have in my pocket—and I will stop to have it read, because I think I can do it and still get a vote to-night—an editorial upon this very point from the New York Sun of May 11, which I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read; and if time is taken by doing so, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] whose close friend I am, personally, is responsible, because I did not intend to say a word about it, until his impatience forced me to do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let it be printed without reading.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I think we will have it read.

Mr. SCOTT. I suggest to the Senator that I think all of us have read it.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have all read it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At this particular moment I did not intend to press it, but right at this particular moment I think it is opportune as referring to this excessive haste.

Mr. SCOTT. I think it would be well—

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that it be read, because this is the psychological moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

AN OPINION OF TARIFF REVISION.

A good many solid citizens, all the self-sacrificing patriots into whose pockets the Dingley tariff empties, men of business generally, who want every shadow of uncertainty removed and know how readily in good times business adjusts itself and picks up when that shadow disappears; seasoned Republican politicians, who set no great store on promises made to get votes—mere springes to catch woodcocks—all or most of these powers seem persuaded that the sooner the tariff bill, "any old" tariff bill, is passed and signed the better for everybody. A mercurial people, easily excited, easily amused, humbugged easily, and not without a cynical consciousness of the humbug, what do Americans care in 1900 for the tariff bait which the Republicans threw at them in 1908? So long as business is good and money can be made, who cares? Screw certain important duties up in the House; screw them down in the Senate; palaver; let everybody in the Senate speak his piece; confer, concur—with or without the aid of Democratic snappers up of protection manna—pass, sign; let the Dingley law live under a new name and get to business.

In a rough way that seems to be the argument, and there is a good deal in it as a practical, instant way of soothing business. The danger is that the Middle West, for instance, may decline to accept a settlement that does not settle and a revision that, in the judgment of many, does not revise. We are not speaking of the justice of such a complaint, should it be made, but the nucleus of economic and political

trouble is there. Business might not be especially tranquilized or encouraged if tariff agitation should spring up as soon as it was supposed to be laid.

On these points we offer no opinion, and an opinion which we take the liberty of borrowing is not, we regret to say, that of a business man. Possibly, too, it is out of date and negligible now. It was given on December 16, 1908:

"Unless we act in accordance with our promises, or if we only keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope, we shall be made accountable to the American people and suffer such consequences as failure to keep faith has always been visited with. It would be better to have no revision at all unless we are going honestly and fairly to revise the tariff on the basis promised by our party."

This is or was then the view of a rather conspicuous Cincinnati. His name is William H. Taft.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That editorial, Mr. President, is from the New York Sun of May 11, a protectionist paper and preeminently a business man's paper.

Mr. President, the incident which called forth this part of the discussion, which will be brief, calls to my mind three or four statements that I have heard to-day from both sides of the Chamber, and with which I heartily agree, that the bill should be hastened to its conclusion because the great business interests of the country wait. Everybody agrees to that; nobody disputes that; but, as this editorial of the New York Sun so well says, would not the great business interests of the country be better served by taking a little more time, if necessary, and having the matter settled so that there will be no tariff disturbance for ten years to come?

Always, so far as I have observed, a revision of the tariff is delayed until it is demanded and ordered by the people; and then when Congress, immediately after the election, meets, the order is given to hurry the hearings in the committee, because "business waits." Then, when the bill is reported, the cry is, "Hurry the bill—hasten it—because 'business waits.'" Business does wait; but the country, and business, too, waits to see this thing well done. Insistence upon unintelligent haste does not further the bill.

I venture to say that every Senator here on both sides will agree with me that more progress has been made in the last three days, with the patient and kind consideration of the various questions that have come up, than has been made in any three days since the bill was taken up for consideration.

I referred a moment ago to the amendment reported by the committee yesterday, and to the amendment which is to be reported to-morrow. That hastens the consideration of the bill. These mutual discussions, frank and fearless and honest, about the various items of the schedules, and not the discussions about the theories of protection and revenue tariff, with which we are all familiar, hasten the bill. Let us hasten it by all means; but hasten it by patience and industry and exchange of views, so that the truth may be known as far as possible.

Let us pass it as quickly as we can do so in justice. But when we have passed it, above all things let it be passed so that business will not be disturbed again in two years or four years, or sooner than ten years. This was called out merely by another evidence of the insistence for a sudden putting on of steam when we were rapidly approaching a vote.

There is one other point, Mr. President, to which I wish to call attention in this singular discussion.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator think that any further discussion is going to enlighten us on the paragraph we have been considering all day, and are we not prepared to vote on that paragraph?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In view of the enlightenment in which Senators seem to be, I do not think any amount of discussion will further it, but I may be permitted to call attention, not with respect to our enlightenment, but of our darkness, to this single point. I have heard the steel trust denounced to-day most heartily, and one of the chief arguments made against the House provision for free ore is, that "it will help the steel trust." I am beginning to become familiar, from many repetitions, with the argument that any reduction is going to "help some trust" and never hurt it. I heard the other day that if we took the duty off lumber it would be a tremendous help to the lumber trust, and because we must not help the lumber trust, therefore we must not take the duty off of lumber. I heard the same thing about the lead trust the other day—that a reduction of the duty on lead ore would be a help to the lead trust. It seems to be very popular ground on which to oppose the reduction of a duty to say that it "will help" some "trust." This really deceives nobody, I suppose.

I may be wrong—I often am—but this occurred to me as a curious thing in the intellectual process of reasoning. It has appeared in the hearings and debates that the steel trust owns

and controls—one of the two, according to the testimony which has been read—practically all the ore beds in the country.

Mr. ALDRICH. That statement is simply absurd.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There are the statements.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have heard no such statements.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; such statements have been made; and, second, that the competitors of the steel trust have acquired great deposits in Cuba. Now, to what end would the steel trust want free ore in order to let in, to compete with the ore it owns here, the ore abroad which its competitors own? I cite that merely as a curious illustration of the intellectual operation by which some people see an advantage to the steel trust in free ore. It is a remarkable mental process that reaches that conclusion. The steel trust owns or controls the great body of ore in this country. According to the statements—was it not of Mr. Gary—before the committee—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. According to the lowest estimate mentioned here, there are 80,000,000,000 tons of iron ore in sight in the United States. Now, can the Senator conceive of the Steel Company or anybody else controlling that body of ore?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator can not conceive of 80,000,000,000 tons, neither can anybody else. There have been so many large figures used to-day—three thousand years and six thousand years and one thousand five hundred years, according to the Senator from Rhode Island, and forty years, according to some other person, and hundreds of billions and trillions of tons of ore, and calculations that no human being can follow. The question of the Senator is reduced by that illustration to the consideration, politely speaking, that it deserves.

I can conceive that the Weyerhaeuser lumber trust with its associates controls most of the stumpage of the country. I can conceive of certain other trusts, one or two of which I have examined into, as I shall point out later, controlling the vast majority of the products in which they deal. I do not know whether the Steel Company owns all this ore or not. I do not know what it owns. But the statement has been made here and the testimony is that it controls most of the ore in the country, and therefore it would appear as a rather curious process of reasoning that the steel trust should want free ore in order to let into competition with itself the ore in Cuba owned by its competitors.

Mr. President, I did not intend when I got up to speak more than one moment and to do more than to call attention to the fact that my friends over on the other side who are voting for revenue favor a rate of 25 cents, which will not produce half the revenue now produced, and to call attention to this process of reasoning, all of which would, perhaps, have taken two sentences. But the incident compelled the extension of my remarks.

Mr. President, just one word further. I called attention the other day to the fact of the House committee having had extended hearings. It does not appear that there has been one new fact or one new reason before the committee of the Senate or the Senate that the House did not have before it. The House committee was composed, as I said before, of protectionists. They fixed the duty on the ore at nothing at all. They provided for free ore. It appears to me that the argument here to-day has shown that the House idea on this particular item is right, since no new fact or reason has been presented that the House did not already have. Therefore, I shall vote in any way that will sustain the House action and put ore on the free list.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] whether he believed in a free list, and his answer was that he did not, except as to the necessities of life. I wish to say that I concur in that view as a general rule, but I can imagine special conditions where the free list should be enlarged, even if it does not involve a necessary of life. I believe we are confronted with one of those conditions with reference to this commodity, and that condition is that the production of this particular commodity, this raw material, is practically within the control of one great organization, and that the only way of giving freedom of opportunity to the independent maker of steel and of iron is to give him his raw material from foreign countries without imposing upon it a duty.

For that reason, and with reference to this special condition, I would enlarge the general rule to which the Senator refers by including iron ore as an article entitled to be put upon the free list.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, when he speaks of the enormous amount of iron ore in sight—80,000,000,000 tons—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. One hundred and eighty billion—

Mr. ALDRICH. Eighty billion. I was quoting from the chief geologist of the United States Geological Survey. I have myself no knowledge of it.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask whether it is not true that a great portion of that is too expensive to be worked, and that from an economic point of view it may be considered as practically negligible?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is enough in sight and available to last, according to the figures I have, ninety-three years before the second class shall be reached, and when that is reached there is enough to last fifteen hundred years after that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DU PONT. What is the question?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Mississippi withdrew his amendment. The question now, I understand, is on the committee amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. Under a statement made by that Senator, I feel at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 61, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Aldrich	Cullom	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bacon	Daniel	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Bailey	Depeew	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Dick	Kean	Smoot
Bradley	Dillingham	Lodge	Stephenson
Brandegee	Dixon	McCumber	Stone
Briggs	Elkins	McEnery	Sutherland
Bulkeley	Fletcher	Martin	Taliaferro
Burnham	Flint	Nixon	Taylor
Burrows	Foster	Oliver	Tillman
Burton	Frazier	Page	Warner
Carter	Frye	Paynter	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	

NAYS—24.

Beveridge	Clarke, Ark.	du Pont	Newlands
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Overman
Bristow	Culberson	Gore	Rayner
Brown	Cummins	Hughes	Shively
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Clapp	Dolliver	Nelson	Smith, S. C.

NOT VOTING—6.

Bourne	McLaurin	Owen	Richardson
Davis	Money		

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH obtained the floor.

Mr. McLAURIN. As I am compelled to leave the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to present two amendments and to have them printed in the RECORD, and I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to pass paragraph 123 when it shall be reached. I ask that the two amendments be printed in the RECORD and be considered as pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McLAURIN to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Amend paragraph 123 by striking out all of line 19, after the word "commodity," and inserting in lieu thereof the following words, to wit: "when imported shall be exempt from duty."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McLAURIN to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Amend paragraph 350 by striking out all after the words contained in brackets, and the brackets, and insert in lieu thereof the following words, to wit: "when imported shall be exempt from duty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit an amendment, with the same request—that it be printed in the RECORD, and likewise printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. GALLINGER to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

After line 6, page 9, insert the following paragraph: "301½. There shall be paid in lieu of the tax of \$1 now imposed by law a tax of \$1.50 on all beer, lager beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquors, brewed or manufactured and sold, or stored in warehouse, or removed for consumption or sale within the United States, by whatever name such liquors may be called, for every barrel contain-

ing not more than 31 gallons, and at a like rate for any other quantity or for the fractional parts of a barrel authorized and defined by law. And section 3339 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended accordingly: *Provided*, That a discount of 7½ per cent shall be allowed upon all sales by collectors to brewers of the stamps provided for the payment of said tax: *Provided further*, That the additional tax imposed in this section on all fermented liquors stored in warehouse to which a stamp had been affixed shall be assessed and collected in the manner now provided by law for the collection of taxes not paid by stamp."

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 14, 1909, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 13, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, source of all wisdom, power, and purity, we come to Thee not as we would, but as we are able; we bring to Thee our devout offerings. Cleanse us from all guile; pour down upon us Thy spiritual gifts, that we may do the work Thou hast given us to do in accordance with Thy will and good purposes. We thank Thee for all the blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us, especially for our homes, the bulwark of our Republic, the center of all that is nearest and dearest to our hearts on earth.

Touched by the invasion of death into one of our congressional homes, our hearts go out in sympathy to him who has been deprived of a companion who has walked in loving confidence by his side, sharing the joys and sorrows of many years, the mother of his children, the solace of the home, and joy of the fireside; one who endeared herself to all who knew her by the grace, dignity, and sweetness of her manner in private and in public life. Comfort, we beseech Thee, the stricken husband, the bereaved children, by the sweet memories of the past, and help them to look forward with bright anticipations to the heavenly home, where they shall be again united in one of the Father's many mansions. And blessing and praise and honor be Thine, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 10, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOWERS, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DAVIS was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Frank L. Bennett, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HAMMOND was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the Committee on Invalid Pensions the papers in relation to H. R. 28065, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PORTO RICO.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9541) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of section 31 of said act the following additional proviso:

"And provided further, That if at the termination of any session the appropriations necessary for the support of government shall not have been made, an amount equal to the sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for such purposes shall be deemed to be appropriated; and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer may, with the advice of the governor, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid."

Sec. 2. That all reports required by law to be made by the governor or members of the executive council of Porto Rico to any official in the United States shall hereafter be made to an executive department of the Government of the United States to be designated by the President; and the President is hereby authorized to place all matters pertaining to the government of Porto Rico in the jurisdiction of such department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

Mr. OLMSTED. The request is for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has not been printed yet, has it?

Mr. OLMSTED. It has not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And never referred to the committee?

Mr. OLMSTED. It has not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. OLMSTED. I wish the gentleman would withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will withhold it, but I am going to make it.

Mr. OLMSTED. I endeavored to see the gentleman from Missouri, show the bill to him, and consult with him before the meeting of the House, but I did not succeed in finding him.

This bill does not provide for the changing of the form of Porto Rican government in any way or for interference in any of the troubles existing there now, except to provide against the suspension of all the functions of government pending their adjustment. It simply provides that where, as in the present case, the legislature has adjourned without making appropriations for the current expenses of government the moneys appropriated for that purpose for the current year shall be considered as reappropriated for the ensuing year or until the Porto Rican legislature shall act in the matter. It does not interfere with or attempt to change the government of that island. As the matter now stands the legislature has adjourned without making any appropriations for the necessary expenses of government. The civil department, the educational department, the judicial department, in fact, every department of the government, will be hung up on the 30th of June, when their present fiscal year ends. There has been no appropriation made which will be available after that date. Unless something is done, and done promptly, by us the Porto Rican government will be absolutely paralyzed. This is simply to tide over that contingency. The language of the first section of this bill is identical with the language which the House has already adopted providing for the government of the Philippine Islands, and it is also similar to that adopted for Hawaii. In other words, this precise provision for just such contingencies has already been twice adopted by Congress and approved by the President. I hope the gentleman will not object, because the emergency is such as to require prompt action in this case. Whatever other legislation may be necessary for Porto Rico may safely be delayed until the next regular session, but this bill or something of this nature must be enacted and approved promptly or the Porto Rican situation become intolerable.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not see that the emergency, is such as to do away with the printing of the bill and referring it to the committee. This bill is exactly what the President asked for in his message; the message has never been referred, and the bill has never been in evidence. Therefore I object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker—

JOHN R. WILLIAMS.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Yes, sir. I will say for the information of the House that it is a funeral resolution, and that there will be no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. It is not a report from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 59.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the executors of the estate of John R. Williams, late file clerk of the House, an amount equal to six months of his salary, and an additional amount not exceeding \$250 to pay the expenses of the funeral of said Williams.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. This is the customary resolution in such cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

ANTHONY J. FARRELL.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I also offer a similar resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 52.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Elizabeth J. Farrell, widow of Anthony J. Farrell, late a private on the Capitol police force, an amount equal to six months' salary of said Farrell, and an additional amount not exceeding \$250 on account of the funeral expenses of said Farrell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia if this is usual?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. That is the usual resolution, and has been thoroughly investigated by the clerk of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not setting any new precedent?

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. No, sir; not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] rise?

Mr. GARRETT. To offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] rise?

Mr. PAYNE. To make a privileged motion. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] did rise.

Mr. PAYNE. I rose before the gentleman from Tennessee rose. I was trying to get the attention of the Chair for the last seven minutes. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9135—the Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. One moment. It is not a recognition of individuals, but a recognition of business, and the Chair will ascertain which business has precedence, in the opinion of the Chair, subject, of course, to the requirements of the rules of the House.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will state his resolution.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to appoint the Committee on Insular Affairs forthwith.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not a personal privilege.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, this resolution, as well as the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], is privileged under the rules, yet it occurs to the Chair that the resolution of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] affects the organization of the House and would take precedence of the privileged motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GARRETT. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 85, yeas 118.

Mr. GARRETT. I respectfully request tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and tellers reported—ayes 74, yeas 104.

So the resolution was rejected.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, can we agree on the time for general debate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, I would suggest that we run along to-day until the whole of them that want to may talk. I have only had two applications for time, one for three-quarters of an hour and one for an hour, with perhaps an extension of a quarter of an hour.

Mr. PAYNE. If they confine it to this bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that they want to confine it to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he make the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri a part of his motion—that all debate be confined to this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. We can not do that. The rule provides for that. My understanding of the rule is that in general debate any subject can be debated.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be confined to the bill under consideration.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Before agreeing to that, I would like to know first whether we are to be confined to debate on the Philippine tariff for a colonial possession, or we may talk about the tariff or any other question that may arise as to holding possession of the islands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that debate may be confined to the bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I raise the question that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas—

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that we take a viva voce vote on this motion; and then, if he wants, he can raise the question. He can do so when we have a viva voce vote. I request that he defer it until we can vote upon going into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would rather insist upon it at present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas suggests that a quorum is not present. The House has just divided by tellers, and it appears 178 were present a few moments ago. It requires 196 to make a quorum. Assuming, which the Chair will not assume, that perchance all did not vote, the Chair will ask that Members arise and stand until counted, for the purpose of ascertaining a quorum. It is impossible for the Chair to determine whether there may not be some present who are not Members. So that, if Members will arise and all others remain seated, the Chair will count and see if there is a quorum. The Chair will request all Members to rise. [After counting.] The Chair has counted, and finds that there are present 201; but 196 constitute a quorum. A quorum is present. As many as favor the motion will say "aye."

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] will take the chair.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. A parliamentary inquiry. Was unanimous consent granted that debate should be confined to the bill?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will now present the request of the gentleman from Mississippi for consent that debate on this bill be confined to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry before that consent is given, and to ask what will be the subject for discussion—simply the matter of a Philippine tariff, or the policy of the Government with reference to the Philippines?

The SPEAKER. It is impossible for the Chair to say what the range of debate would be, because the Chair has not even read the bill. It would be for the committee on the one hand, and the chairman presiding over it on the other, in the event the question should arise, to determine as to whether the Member was confining himself to the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OLMSTED). The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9135) to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9135) to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for this legislation at the present time arises out of the passage by the House, I hope on its way to become a part of the laws of the Nation, of the general tariff bill, which provides in section 5 in reference to the trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States.

As the House will remember, section 5 provides for free trade on all goods going from the United States to the Philippine Islands and coming to the United States from the islands, after the passage of the act, with the exception of a limited amount of sugar, tobacco, and manufactures of tobacco, and also with an exception as to rice.

The passage of that bill will make a deficit in the amount of revenue to be obtained under the present tariff acts relating to those islands. For instance, the duty collected under the present law for the fiscal year 1908 between the islands and the United States amounted to \$999,666, or, in round numbers, to \$1,000,000. Of course with free trade between the islands and the United States that entire revenue will be cut off.

There are other deductions that will arise on account of this legislation, some of which can be definitely stated, and some of which can only be estimated. But that is the principal item of reduction when you compare the imports and the exports with the proposed legislation. There is a duty on some of the exports from the islands.

At present the revenues are sufficient to pay the expenses of the islands and a little more, and of course the Congress of the United States does not for a moment desire to curtail in any manner the appropriations made yearly for education, for instance, in the Philippine Islands, because that is one of the great works and objects which this Government is carrying out in our relations with those islands.

Public improvements are going on. Road building has increased and docks have been constructed, which have been paid for out of the revenues of the islands. It is necessary for the Government to take care of all these things which are not yet complete by providing sufficient revenues.

They have now in the islands an internal-revenue system. I think the tax imposed there on tobacco and its manufactures, especially the manufactures of tobacco, and on alcoholic liquors, amounts to about one-quarter of the rate imposed by our internal-revenue tax in the United States, and about half of the rate imposed in the island of Porto Rico.

As is well known, these people in the Philippine Islands are great consumers of cigarettes. It is estimated that they now consume about 11,000,000 cigarettes a day, which would mean about one cigarette every day for every man, woman, and child in the Philippine Islands. They propose (and this is a matter for insular legislation and not for Congress, because we have delegated that power to them) to increase the tax upon cigarettes so that the internal-revenue receipts from this source will amount to \$375,791 more than under the present law. It is not supposed that this small increase in the internal taxes will at all interfere with the consumption of cigarettes. The increased consumption there has arisen out of the prohibition of the smoking of opium in the islands. Both the importation and manufacture of opium are prohibited, and the opium fiend has turned to some kindred amusement in order to compensate for the loss of the opportunity to smoke opium. The Filipinos have the cigarette habit worse than some Members of Congress whom I know.

There are other increases which will also be made with reference to internal-revenue taxation, and it is believed that they will increase their receipts from taxes upon distilled spirits \$800,000, making a total increase of \$1,175,791 in internal-revenue receipts.

In addition to the amount of import duties upon goods coming from the United States to the islands, there was also collected a duty on Philippine products imported into the United States amounting to \$269,000 in the last year; making the total loss about \$1,851,320 and a gain from internal-revenue receipts of \$1,175,791, leaving still a decrease in revenue of \$570,956.75.

Now, the internal revenue has been apportioned between the general government and the municipalities in the Philippine Islands. It is proposed hereafter to turn over those revenues in the general tariff bill to the insular government, and let them make the apportionment and not have them apportioned according to the present law. Economies have been instituted in the municipal governments in the Philippine Islands by the substitution of Filipinos for Americans. Of course it costs a Filipino less to live, and it is impossible to get an American to go over there and live, unless he gets at least double the salary that a competent Filipino would require for similar services.

So you see the constant effort of the United States is in the direction of the education of these people, not alone in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the ordinary school lessons, but also in industrial education, and also, as the opportunity offers, as they show capacity, to give them a chance to engage in real government in various capacities and to participate in the general government of the islands.

The people are making progress, and we hope that under the beneficent influences of the general tariff bill, giving them free trade and a market for their products to the United States, there will be the same growth in the Philippine Islands that there has been in Porto Rico, and that imports and exports in the course of the next ten years will increase tenfold or more, as they have in the island of Porto Rico since the year 1900.

In Porto Rico, after the passage of the bill giving them free trade, the industries and prosperity of the island were so greatly enhanced that they began to increase their imports from foreign countries on which duties were levied, and they increased from considerably less than \$2,000,000 to over \$3,000,000 in the past year.

Before we took up the government of the island of Porto Rico seriously the expenditures were about \$3,000,000 a year and the revenues \$3,644,000. Now the expenditures are a trifle over \$4,000,000 a year and the revenue about \$4,250,000, so that there is a handsome surplus at the end of the year. The principal item of increase in connection with the island of Porto Rico is the million dollars that we pay annually to support the schools in the island. There are some 87,000 children in the schools, and they are constantly advancing. And so in the Philippine Islands we have established schools for four or five hundred thousand children. I have not read the statistics lately, and I may not be correct, but I think there were over 500,000 the last time that I looked the matter up. We propose to keep on in this direction until these people are educated up to the point where they will be enabled to engage in self-government, either as an independent republic or under the United States, as the people of the United States and the people of the islands shall agree when the time comes that they are ready to take up self-government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that under this bill, which proposes a moderate revenue duty upon nearly all the items, there will be an increase of exports from the United States into the islands. There may be a decrease for the time being of imports into the islands from foreign countries on which duties are paid. It is impossible, of course, to estimate what that difference will be, but those people who have direct charge of the insular affairs believe that, with these excise taxes, internal-revenue taxes, turned over to the general government of the islands, they will not have to economize in any way beyond what is legitimate economy in running the government of the islands, and that the bill, from the start, will give them enough money to pay the expenses of the government.

Judging from the parallel case of Porto Rico there is no doubt that in the course of a very short time the bill will yield ample revenue for the support of the government.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, was prepared in the first instance by Colonel Colton, who is at the head of the customs service in the Philippine Islands, assisted by Mr. Hord, who is at the head of the internal-revenue service, and after open discussion and hearings in Manila, and with the concurrence of 10 or 15 tariff experts, who were active in the preparation of the bill, and also under the direction and final revision of General Edwards, of the Insular Bureau in the War Department.

I introduced this bill as it was prepared by these gentlemen, and it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. A subcommittee was appointed, who carefully went over every provision in the bill. The subcommittee recommended a large number of amendments, most of them in the phraseology of the bill, some as to punctuation, and only a few making material changes from the original draft of the bill.

For instance, they had provided for a duty upon petroleum and its products of every kind on a graduated scale. The committee could see no reason for putting a duty on petroleum or any of its products, so they put the whole thing on the free list. Then a high duty was put upon a certain kind of rails of light weight, for use in making tramways or railroads to be used in the sugar plantations, and also a high duty upon the cars and equipage of such a railway, and also a higher rate of duty, not in balance with or corresponding to the other duties of the bill, on sugar machinery. The general duties upon the iron schedule average about 15 per cent ad valorem. On sugar machinery the duty was put at 30 per cent.

The committee, being still of an inquiring mind, found out that some American manufacturers had insisted upon these high rates of duty, and these gentlemen had accommodately given way to them, one of them told me, on the threat of the manufacturers that the bill would not be allowed to pass unless they did, though I do not know whether that is so or not. The committee were not intimidated by the report of any such threat, and they cut down the duties on this sugar machinery from 30 to 15 per cent, and put the duty on these lighter rails at the same rate that was put on rails in general in the bill.

There is one item that they wanted as a protective duty. They have organized a company in Manila, and have a shop in operation there employing a thousand Filipinos in fitting up and making the bolts and nuts, and so forth, for structural steel used in building in the islands. They import the rough blocks and fit them up in their shops, and in that way they employ a thou-

sand people there, and desired a high rate of duty upon this structural material in order to keep this shop in operation, so that that is a protective feature of the bill.

The bill continues the present law in regard to export duty. As the House will remember, when the law was passed we put light export duties on hemp and copra, the product of the coconut tree, and upon tobacco and its manufactures, and upon sugar. This produced considerable revenue, although we excepted from its operation any of these articles coming into the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I will state that the gentleman spoke of the application that was made by the proprietors of a machine shop for a protective duty on structural material which they were making. I do not think the gentleman from New York said what the committee did with respect to that.

Mr. PAYNE. The committee did not amend that. It left it as it was reported by these gentlemen at what was considered sufficient protection. I think we did not change it. We left it as reported by these gentlemen, in order to protect that industry in the islands and keep these men at work.

Some objection has been raised to this form of taxation, export duties. Of course it is foreign to our Constitution and our system of government, so far as the United States proper is concerned, to levy any export tax, but the conditions are quite different in the Philippine Islands. The Constitution does not extend there. They have upon their statute books, and have had for five or six years, a land-tax law making subject to assessment and taxation all improved lands in the islands. When they came to look about for an enforcement of this law it was found that there were a large number of holdings of real estate, and that many of them, most of them, were small holdings, where the proprietor raised a little rice for his family, and that is about all the income he got out of it, and that to enforce that tax meant simply the seizure of these lands and sale for taxation. Of course that would produce not only confusion, but a great deal of distress in the islands. So the operation of that law was suspended. Now, the people who cultivate the coconut and the hemp and the tobacco, and the sugar especially, with the impetus that may come to that industry—and there is some exportation to other countries besides the United States of all of these articles beyond the limited amount that may come to the United States under any circumstances—are the people who get money out of their lands. They get an income from those lands. They are able to pay the small tax which was exacted under the law as now upon the statute books, but not enforced. When the committee came to look into this matter it appeared to them that this small export tax at worst was only a tax upon the land, and a very moderate tax upon the land, of those who were able to pay it.

That is, if it all comes back upon the owner of the land. Of course it is claimed there, and there is some reason in the argument, that it does not come out of the landowner, but comes out of the customer who buys. He has to stand this export tax when he buys the manila hemp; but whatever way it is there is no injustice if the owners of these lands that produce are compelled to pay this small tax upon the land. These islands have a complete monopoly of the manila hemp industry. The provision exempting the United States from the payment of this tax has worked a revolution commercially in regard to hemp. When it commenced, I think there were only \$2,000,000 worth of hemp coming to the United States, and ten or twelve million dollars' worth coming mainly to London. Now the greater portion of it comes to the United States, six or seven million dollars' worth, and the balance of it goes to England and other foreign countries and pays the export tax. So that this has worked for the benefit of the people of the United States and the people who use manila hemp in manufacture.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is not changed at all in this bill.

Mr. PAYNE. That is left exactly as it is in the present law. Yes; I was right. In 1901 there was \$2,400,000 worth of hemp coming into the United States and \$12,050,000 going to other countries. In 1907 there was \$11,326,000 worth coming to the United States and \$9,758,000 worth going to other countries, and that proportion existed in 1905 and 1906. In 1908 there was a slump in the hemp business in the United States and we received \$7,684,000 and the other countries \$9,247,000.

Mr. 1 ES. Will the gentleman yield? Is the export duty collected on that manila hemp shipped to the United States as well as to other countries?

Mr. PAYNE. It is collected and refunded when it goes into consumption in the United States. I hardly see myself how they interpret the law that way. There is an expressed proviso that those products shipped to the United States and entering into consumption should be exempt from the export

duty, but they have a practice down there of collecting the export duty, and they pay it back whenever proof is made that the hemp has been manufactured in the United States and goes into consumption, and our people are not complaining about it; and while I, glancing at the law, should interpret it the other way, still down there they interpret it this way, and we have left it exactly as it is. They want it left as it is, and our people are not complaining about it and everybody seems to be satisfied. We put hides on the free list; there was a duty on hides in the Colton draft.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I find this curious provision on page 80 of the bill, and I desire to ask the gentleman from New York about it. It is virtually this, that the governor-general, by and with the advice of the commission, may suspend the duty on rice. For what purpose is that inserted?

Mr. PAYNE. It is for this purpose: The gentleman knows, of course, that the principal food there is rice. Now, they have not raised enough rice to feed the people of the islands in a number of years. One year, I think, they imported \$11,000,000 worth of rice and only raised three or four. That was the year after the scourge among the carabao, and 80 per cent of the draft animals there were blotted out in that year; and while they have increased to a better condition somewhat, still they are not able to raise enough rice in the islands now to support the people of the islands. People there think that when conditions change so that they can raise sufficient to support the islands a duty ought to be imposed upon it, and so we have provided for that duty in this bill, and they wanted this provision in it that it could be suspended any one year at the instance of the government, so as to guard against a rice famine. These people are poor people—

Mr. MURDOCK. In such event the rice importations are from China, are they not?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; some from Japan, I think, too, and other oriental countries. Of course they are surrounded by countries that can send them rice. I do not know whether our growers in the United States will ever send them rice. We are supplying the needs of our people, and I take a very cheerful and hopeful view of the rice planting in the Southern States, because I believe with our facilities and our machinery and the facilities for flooding the fields at any moment they desire and then being able to draw the waters off and harvest, not in the wet but in the dry, and use of machinery for the harvesting of it, I can not see any reason why, with the ingenuity and inventive genius of the average American applied to the cultivation of rice, we would not be able in a few years to meet the conditions in oriental countries, even with their cheap labor, in the supplying of rice. I think that, with this duty upon it, there is good reason to believe that our people may export rice to the islands some time in the future and without crippling the industry there, because there the people in a small patch, sometimes no larger than a rod square, raise the rice for the family. They wade around in the water, plant the rice, cultivate it, and afterwards they gather it by wading in the water, because they have no means of flooding except the floods that come from heaven, and they have no means of draining the water off at any time.

There is one item in the bill that is not strictly a tariff measure, but they were very anxious to have it put in. They claim, and I think they are probably right about it, that the general trade-mark law passed by Congress two or three years ago applies to the Philippine Islands, and while there is a provision in the general law to enforce rights under it in the courts of the United States, there is no provision to enforce the rights that grow up in the Philippine Islands in reference to trade-marks in the courts of the islands. So we have put in a section giving jurisdiction of these courts over trade-mark cases arising in the Philippine Islands.

I think I have stated all the features of the bill, unless some gentleman wishes to ask me in regard to it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Before the gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him one question. If I understood him correctly, he stated that the expenditures on account of the Philippine government have increased under the American occupation from \$3,000,000, or about \$3,000,000, to approximately four millions, and that is chiefly due—

Mr. PAYNE. That was in regard to Porto Rico.

Mr. ROBINSON. The gentleman stated, if I understood him correctly, that the policy of this Government, or, at least, the policy of the committee and of this legislation, is to continue the process of education until these people become capable of self-government. I would like to ask—

Mr. PAYNE. I speak more for myself, perhaps, on that than for anybody else.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. I would like to ask if he can give the committee an idea as to how long it will be necessary to continue that process?

Mr. PAYNE. I can not, and I say that, too, after a trip to the islands three or four years ago, with unusual facilities there to find out and ascertain how far these people had proceeded. We had hearings, and some gentlemen appeared before us and thought that they were fit for self-government now, but the most of them demonstrated that they were not up to the ideas of a 10-year-old child on government.

I do not know how long it will take. We attended some banquets on the islands, where the waiters were young Filipinos, who were students in the schools, because they could speak the English language, and we found a great many of the younger generation had gotten so that they were speaking the English language, the language which bids fair to become the common tongue in the Philippine Islands. Now, there are 60 or 70 different dialects spoken in the islands, so different that a man speaking in one and another speaking in another can not understand each other any more than I can understand their dialects.

Mr. ROBINSON. Notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman has given careful consideration to that subject, he is unable to give the committee any idea how long it will be necessary for this Government to continue its occupation there?

Mr. PAYNE. The hopeful thing is they are being educated and uplifted; that they are getting a sense of responsibility. The native constabulary there has gotten to be a most respectable police force and a most efficient one. Many of the Filipinos, who compose a minority of the commission in Manila, are men of exceptionally high character and ability. I wish they were all so, but unfortunately they are not. I think they are getting that way. It may be that the next generation will be the generation to carry it into effect and will succeed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the gentleman worked out to his own satisfaction the degree of education and the generality of education necessary to entitle Filipinos to self-government?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I could not lay down a cast-iron rule on that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the gentleman lay down any?

Mr. PAYNE. There are various degrees of fitness for self-government. Sometimes I look over a community in the United States and wonder how long it will be before they get up to the plane of self-government; but our people generally, the great mass of them, are fit for self-government. I hope to see the Filipinos that way.

Mr. ROBINSON. The gentleman in this connection asserts that in his opinion there are many communities in the United States that are incapable of governing themselves.

Mr. PAYNE. I should have said "some," if I said "many."

Mr. ROBINSON. Some; and yet he is utterly unable to give any idea as to how long it would require this Government to educate them to his standard for self-government or to give us an idea as to what standard of enlightenment is necessary to constitute the right to self-government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not the gentleman be surprised if the gentleman from New York had indicated any opinion on the subject?

Mr. ROBINSON. I would state that I would be surprised at the members of the Republican party announcing a definite policy toward the Philippine Islands. I will state in that connection, with the permission of the gentleman from New York, that he certainly knows that we acquired the Philippine Islands and assumed control of them upon the theory that we owed those people the duty of enlightening them sufficiently for self-government; and now, after ten years of increasingly enormous expenditures for that purpose, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the leader of the Republican party on this floor, declares that, after years of investigation of this subject, he knows no more about it than when he began. I think it is time for some determination on the subject.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is stating his interpretation of something I did not say. There are those who can jump up in Congress or anywhere else—those who are in the minority—and declaim and say that after fifteen years, or ten years, or one year, they are going to give the Philippine Islands the right of self-government. We have made one experiment in giving self-government to a people near by, and we have had to intervene and keep them from cutting each other's throats; and I am not sure whether we will not have to do it again or not. I do not know. But so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, I do not want to repeat that experiment.

I do not want to get them into a position where they will be cutting each other's throats. I want to do what is best for

them. I never wanted them, and never would have gone into the Cuban war. We struggled against it until it was inevitable; while there on the other side, without a particle of responsibility to the country, they were urging and egging on for war. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] And then there was the blowing up of the *Maine*; there was the finding of the commission that it came from the outside; there was pressure everywhere. There was the opinion of the people; there was the demand of the people, heated up by demagogic cries that came from Washington, for war with Spain. We could hold out against it no longer. If we could have held out a little longer, we would have secured the freedom of the Cubans without the loss of a drop of blood or the expenditure of treasure. But, no; the minority had their way, helped by some misled gentlemen upon this side of the Chamber; and we went into the war; and when the war had closed, after we had assumed these responsibilities, then you gentlemen said: "Stay away; let the people alone, and let them cut each other's throats." They have no responsibility. But we, on this side of the Chamber, recognize the force not only of public opinion in this country, but we are responsible to the Providence that had placed those people in our keeping. We are trying to work out the problem, and all the time we are met by bickerings and criticisms from gentlemen whom the people have not seen fit to give the responsibility of this Government to; but still we are trying to work out this proposition, and we are succeeding. We are lifting them up, and I hope to see the day when they will exemplify the great benefit to them, given to them because under the providence of Almighty God they were given over to the care and custody of the American people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a statement?

Mr. PAYNE. I reserve my time; the gentleman can obtain time from gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to say anything in this connection at this time. The very remarkable speech just made by the leader of the Republican party has induced me to reply to some of the statements he has made. He says that it is all right for members of the minority, without any responsibility, to make inquiries as to the conduct of the Government in the Philippine Islands and to ask how long it will require this Government to educate the people of the Philippine Islands so that, in his judgment, they will become capable of self-government.

I want to say to him in that regard that while I am an humble member of the minority, I can not divest myself of some degree of responsibility for the proceedings of this great body. Already the idea has prevailed to too great an extent here and throughout the United States that men in positions of leadership, men who are intrusted with the responsibility of leading great political organizations and directing legislation, should have the sole responsibility of its conduct. We have here exemplified to-day the fact that no Member of this House can divest himself of his responsibility in this body. The gentleman says that after ten years of occupation of those islands and a careful study of conditions there the Filipinos are as yet mere children 10 years old, incapable of governing themselves, and that an indefinite policy is to be pursued by the United States, to the end of time if necessary, by implication, by which the people of the United States are to discharge what he assumes to be an obligation to the people of the Philippine Islands to educate and control them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Philippine Islands are now capable of self-government. I do not agree with the gentleman from New York that there is any part of the United States, under the flag of the United States, either in New York or elsewhere, where the people are incapable of self-government. I believe in the progress of right, but I do not believe that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ought to arrogate to himself or to the Republican party the right to determine just when any people are capable of self-government.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask my friend a question?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman include the negroes in his statement that all are capable of self-government?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. HAMILTON. Then why do not you let them?

Mr. JAMES. They are not capable of the government of other people, however.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The gentleman spoke of communities governing themselves.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is very easy for one having the dignity, the rank, and the power of the gentleman from New York to make an insinuation of that kind. I know what he means. I know what he attempts to say; and I say to him now, that while I regard the negro as capable of self-government, I do not believe he is capable of governing the world, and I do not intend that he shall do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is quite obvious.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is contended here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and some of his associates that in speaking for the right of self-government I am inconsistent. That insinuation is made because I do not proclaim the doctrine of negro supremacy in the South. You do not believe in it, you do not stand for it, and you dare not announce it. It has nothing whatever to do with this Philippine tariff bill. There is no relation between it and the so-called "race problem."

The gentleman has undertaken to divert the issue. You gentlemen on the other side have undertaken to justify what you may yourselves determine to be misgovernment in the Philippine Islands by the insinuation that I stand for the misgovernment of some people. I want the gentleman from New York to understand that I resent the imputation which he makes, that my community or any other community in the United States is less capable of self-government than the community which is honored by having him represent it here. I believe in the right of self-government as inherent in all races and in all peoples; and I believe that the time has now come—as shown in the confession which the gentleman makes when he says, in substance, that he deplores the situation now existing in the Philippine Islands and regrets that this obligation is upon us—when the people of the United States should give to the people of the Philippine Islands the right and power of self-government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a member of the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States have no heart for the colonial form of government. They seem to appreciate neither its advantages nor its responsibilities. The Congress takes but a cursory interest in this measure, which affects the economic existence of 8,000,000 of subject people. Our own new tariff bill provides for free trade with the Philippine Islands, and therefore it is necessary for us now to revise the tariff of the Philippine Islands in order to make up for the deficit which will arise from a cessation of the collection of custom duties upon imports from the United States. We are thus called upon to create a new revenue measure for those islands, and yet in this emergency I venture to say that there are not a dozen men in the House of Representatives who can speak with any authority upon the subject of the Philippine revenues.

Now, this bill was not prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means. It is true that we have revised some of the schedules first offered us, but in the main this is the creation of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department, especially of the chief of that bureau, Gen. Clarence Edwards, and of Colonel Colton, of the army, the collector of customs for the Philippine Islands. These two gentlemen appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and showed most profound knowledge of the conditions in the Philippine Islands, for which they are entitled to much praise.

But the people of the United States, as they are represented here in this Chamber, know little about this bill, and care less. Now, that shows one of two things, either that we are unfit to carry on a form of colonial government, or that we are not prepared to accept as definite our present colonial policy. I hope that the latter is the true statement of the case.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. Does not this lack of interest which the gentleman speaks of indicate, or might it not be reasonably said to indicate, a confidence in the membership that the House has in the great Committee on Ways and Means, of which the gentleman himself is an honored member?

Mr. HARRISON. I acknowledge on behalf of the committee and on behalf of myself the somewhat backhanded compliment the gentleman is paying us, but it is not the customary course of legislation in this body that a bill affecting the economic existence of 8,000,000 of people should arouse so little interest in the House.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman complains that there is not a greater interest on the part of the membership of the House in this particular bill?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I think that perhaps the gentleman misconstrues the sentiment of the membership, and I believe that while we all recognize that we can not consider everything in detail, when we have the committee able to do it properly, with the ability that the committee has, we sometimes show a lack of interest.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman has been a Member of this body a number of years, and I have been here a few years myself, and I venture to say we never saw another measure of equal importance directly affecting an equal number of people arousing so little interest on this floor; on that account I said I hoped that it meant a lack of acquiescence in the permanency of our present colonial form of government rather than the unfitness for colonial government on the part of the American people.

I think myself that the proper tribunal to frame this bill is not the House of Representatives of the United States, but the Philippine assembly. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we have given these people the form of self-government, we might just as well give them the substance.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the gentleman will pardon an interruption. It was shown the subcommittee who had the bill in charge that for six months, by public advertisement and by public hearings in the city of Manila, all parties, without regard to political consideration, were summoned and were present, and that the discussion of the rates of duties continued for over six months. This was in the city of Manila, and not only the people of the Philippine Islands, but foreign merchants, residents there, participated in that discussion; and the rates of duty were fixed, not by Colonel Colton and General Edwards, but in effect by the people of the Philippine Islands, and then these were submitted to the Insular Bureau and approved and then sent to the House of Representatives of the United States of America for revision and enactment. Now, it may well be, in view of the fact that free trade is to exist between the United States and the Philippine Islands, and naturally so, that the American people do not take the interest in it that the people of the Philippine Islands do; but these people have taken a lively, personal, active interest for between six months and a year, and this is the result of their conclusions.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, granting that all the gentleman from Connecticut says is substantially correct, the fiscal policy embodied in this bill was created, controlled, and directed by the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the army. My opinion is that the people of the islands, as represented in their assembly, are the people who know most about this measure, who care most about it, and are the ones to whom should have been given the responsibility for framing their own fiscal policy.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will permit a further interruption, I asked Colonel Colton whether the various residents, foreign merchants, and representatives of European industries had been consulted in regard to this bill. He told me that while they were opposed, of course, as they naturally would be, to free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States, if free trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands was to exist, they were in accord with the rates of duty laid down in this bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, I know; but the mailed fist of the Department of War directed the framing of this fiscal policy. We do not know what the merchants of the islands or the residents of the island have testified before the army officers who collected this testimony. It was not submitted to us in the committee. It is not submitted to the people of the United States. We derived all the information we have upon this subject from the Department of War.

Mr. HILL. The best information the subcommittee had was that the particular items the War Department injected into this bill were reviewed and rescinded and very much lower rates given, and that the views of the Filipino people themselves were embodied as the final result of their action.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the fiscal policy that this bill expresses rather than to specific rates. To that policy I object, and I voted against it in the committee. What the committee had in the way of evidence upon which this policy was adopted was very slight indeed.

I have already said that these two officials of the Bureau of Insular Affairs in appearing before the committee showed a very profound knowledge of conditions in the Philippine Islands and answered satisfactorily the questions asked of them by the members of the committee, but the fact remains that this measure affecting the economic existence of the Filipinos should have been framed by the Philippine assembly and not by a Congress which knows little about it and cares less.

To deny the Filipinos the right to enact serious legislation is to make a farce of the toy government we have given them. The situation is illogical and absurd; it positively hampers the hoped-for plan of self-government in those islands.

Taxation without representation was abhorrent to an earlier generation of Americans. How signally have we failed in the application of the golden rule. If we are in earnest in our professions of ultimate independence for the islands, let us, at least, be honest with them now, and prepare them for that glorious occasion. Restless as we are under the burdens of our colonial empire, we must retain our hold over the Philippines until that time shall come. To deliver over the Filipinos to another country would be recreancy to our trust. To give them over as pawns to the Japanese would be abhorrent to our sense of justice. To abandon them now to their own resources, a prey to foreign nations, would be equally an act of cowardice.

Therefore, as a Democrat, I say that I believe that we must at present postpone the day of severing our bonds with the Philippine Islands until they have reached, approximately at least, a condition fit for self-government. Now, if it were to be shown to us that that condition exists to-day, I say give them their independence to-day. If it appears that they are not yet fit for independence, we must retain our hold upon them until they do become so, and when they do, educated and civilized by us, we shall have the proud feeling that we enabled them to take their place among the brotherhood of nations.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the gentleman given the subject sufficient study, so that he has formed an opinion satisfactory to himself as to whether the Philippine people are sufficiently far advanced for self-government now?

Mr. HARRISON. I should be inclined to think that they are not.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the gentleman a definite idea as to when—could he fix a time—we should turn them over to themselves?

Mr. HARRISON. The very first moment it does appear to our satisfaction that they are able to take care of themselves.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the gentleman fully on that proposition, but as to being more definite, can the gentleman state the time in the future when that should occur?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course I do not propose to deal in prophecy. I can not fix this matter by clockwork, but since the gentleman has given me this opportunity to express my own opinion I believe that the proper solution of the question is the speedy internationalization of the islands, so that a condition may exist similar to that which recently existed in the island of Crete. Then, guaranteed their independence and protected from interference by any of the world powers, they can take their proper stand among the nations of the earth.

Now, for that I believe they are pretty nearly ready. I believe that their present fiscal condition is one of the most serious drawbacks to that solution, and instead of solving the question in this bill, I believe we are still further complicating it and still further postponing the day of independence.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the gentleman fully that we ought to give them their independence at the earliest possible moment, and I was moved to ask the questions I did from the questions asked by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that he wanted definite ideas. It seems to me we can not state definitely the time when that independence should occur, but we ought to keep in mind and work toward the end of bringing independence about for them as soon as possible.

Mr. HARRISON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to detain the House by a detailed discussion of our colonial policy. This is an economic question, and as such it deserves our close scrutiny and attention. In the first place the bill is a triumph of complexity.

The first 15 pages of the bill are given over to a complex discussion of how the customs duty shall be administered and a great deal of it is absolutely incomprehensible to the ordinary American mind. Perhaps it may better suit the subtleties of the Filipino or Chinese merchant. Lax as we are in our understanding of it, this vice which I have pointed out exists chiefly because we are trying to apply to them our own incorrect system of taxation. We could give them a tariff bill as short as the English tariff bill, which in 5 pages of ordinary pamphlet size contains the provisions for raising an enormous revenue, and yet in raising the revenue for the Philippine Islands we have here a bill of 125 pages, enumerating nearly every object under the sun which could be taxed. If we offered them a tariff for revenue only upon a few specific articles sufficient to raise that revenue we would be giving them a fair start upon their fiscal career instead of giving them a tariff which will be incomprehensible to them and to us.

Now, as a revenue raiser, I believe this bill will fall very far short of what is expected by the committee. The revenues of the Philippine Islands to-day are about \$11,000,000 to \$12,000,000 a year. Most of that they spend, the money being appropriated by the Philippine Assembly. Now, less than \$7,000,000 of their revenues comes from customs duties. This is collected on an average ad valorem of about 20 per cent on over \$31,000,000 of imports.

Now these exports come, about \$6,000,000 from Great Britain, about \$5,000,000 from us, about \$2,500,000 from China, about \$2,000,000 from Germany, about \$1,500,000 from Spain, about \$1,250,000 from the British East Indies, and so on. What I regard of importance in these figures is the fact that a comparatively small proportion of their customs revenues at present comes from the United States, say about 17 per cent. Now, this 17 per cent of their revenues, or about \$1,300,000, will be at once entirely lost as soon as free trade between our country and the Philippines is adopted. In addition to that the \$500,000, which in round figures is about what is refunded to the Philippines as their share of the export tax on commodities imported from them into the United States, will also be stricken out. This makes somewhat less than \$2,000,000 of compensatory revenue to be provided for. Now, the Bureau of Insular Affairs, in offering this bill assumed, I believe, that greatly increased prosperity will exist in the Philippine Islands because of the increased importation of American goods there, and that will increase the purchasing power of the Philippine people, thus providing a source from which the deficit will eventually be offset.

In addition, they have a gold-standard fund which is rated at 40 per cent. Officials of the department believe that half that amount would be sufficient, and they claim they will have at least \$3,000,000 available for use. Now, all this is true so far as the arithmetic of it goes, but the common sense of the situation is that as the advantages of free trade with the United States will at once become apparent importations will almost cease in many items from other countries, and consequently a great deal more than 17 per cent of their revenues will immediately cease; probably 25, 30, or 50 per cent.

A fair estimate, then, of the future customs revenue, in comparison with the revenue for the last fiscal year, would be as follows:

Imports, 1908, \$30,918,745; duties collected, \$6,691,485; average ad valorem, 20.64 per cent. Estimated revenue under proposed law: Imports, 1910, \$15,000,000; duties collected, \$3,750,000; average ad valorem, 25 per cent. Loss from imports to United States, \$15,000,000.

If this estimate is approximately verified, the receipts will decline nearly \$3,000,000, and that sum must be raised by other modes of taxation, such as increased and enlarged internal-revenue taxes. It is quite possible that the importers and business men of Manila contract some months ahead for the foreign goods they sell, and therefore the loss of revenue in consequence of free trade with the United States will not accrue until another year has passed, or even later; but it would seem to be inevitable that this loss of revenue must soon occur, and a still greater loss from year to year as the dealers and consumers discover the benefit of the lower cost of free American products over the tariff-taxed products of other countries.

If this great deficit is to arise, new sources of revenue must be provided. Now, how are they going to do it? The Filipinos can not amend this tariff bill. We are unlikely to take up the subject here for another ten years. It will have to be done by the Filipinos imposing some more forms of direct taxation upon their own people. The Bureau of Insular Affairs itself proposes to collect some of this deficit revenue by an increase in the internal-revenue taxes. Mr. Chairman, I think that a very grave and serious deficit, extending over a number of years, will at once come into being as soon as free trade is created between the two countries.

We are accustomed over here self-complacently to believe that the Philippine Islands are economically, as well as in all other ways, a great deal better off under American rule than they were under the Spanish. In my opinion, this is a grave mistake. We have been a great deal harder taskmaster to the Filipinos in an economic sense than was Spain. We forced upon them a land tax, the operations of which we had to suspend. We forced upon them our barbarous navigation laws, the operations of which we had to suspend. We forced upon them, almost at the point of the bayonet, our internal-revenue taxes, and now we propose to saddle them with a system which, in my opinion, is a grievous injustice to them. The fact is that trade in the Philippine Islands is almost stagnant, because they lost their market with Spain. We did not give them anything like the same preferential rates the Spaniards had given them,

and our own trade with the Philippine Islands has been substantially the same since 1901. Of course, it will increase now, but it will increase at the expense of the Philippine revenues.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. HARRISON. With pleasure.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the gentleman's argument, he is protesting against the free-trade policy as carried in the Payne bill between the Philippines and this country?

Mr. HARRISON. I am not. I would vote for that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, what is the purpose of the gentleman's protestations?

Mr. HARRISON. I am coming to that, if the gentleman will allow me to unfold my argument. I have but ten minutes more, and I hope to conclude in that time. My protestations are not against the free trade; I am in favor of that. My objections are directed to this tariff bill as a fiscal policy.

I am now coming, Mr. Chairman, to my chief objection to this bill, and thereby I hope to answer satisfactorily the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. This bill, instead of being drawn for the purposes of the Filipino people, is drawn for the purposes of the industrial monopolies in the United States. Instead of being drawn for the purpose of collecting revenue for the Philippine Islands, it is drawn to render aid, assistance, and comfort to industrial combinations in our own country. The best evidence of that is the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the officials of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

With engaging frankness officials of that bureau testified before the committee that all the special interests of the United States had been consulted, their advice taken, and their desires appeased at every step. Like seasoned politicians, they proceeded along the lines of least resistance. General Edwards, the chief of that bureau, said this in describing the methods by which they framed this bill:

Take the iron schedule, for instance, and it would be sent to the Iron Age—

That is a periodical published in the interest of the iron manufacturers—

the jewelry schedule to the special jewelry magazine, the watch schedule to the watch magazine, and so forth, and invite recommendations and comment.

Further he says:

Specifications were drawn so as to favor United States goods, especially as to cotton or other goods in regard to the width of looms, and other things. In that way we got quite an intimate association between the special interests of this country. We had a great deal of correspondence with them. I have always given them our proposed schedules.

And above he says:

I think we have reconciled all special interests of the United States except such as have come up, of which I have no knowledge.

Not one but what was to have a finger in the pie if he has his say! Every single special interest in the United States was invited to come forward and to have a hand in framing this tariff bill. Now, I have no doubt that that is the usual way that Republicans frame their tariff bills, but such an amazing exhibition of the machinery by which it is done has never before been given to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman bases his opinion entirely on the testimony of General Edwards? Has he examined the schedules themselves to see whether they have been manipulated in that direction? The metal schedule, the report says, has not been changed an iota. It is 16 per cent now, and it was that under the old law.

Mr. HARRISON. I will give the gentleman two instances of what I referred to, and in doing so I will call his attention to the fact that he is not arguing fairly when he refers to any goods in this bill being taxed at the same rates as those at present existing in the Philippine tariff law, because free trade with the United States will upset the whole balance of trade and rates which may have been fair before will, as against the new condition of affairs, be absolutely unfair. I see the gentleman acknowledges his assent to that proposition.

Mr. HILL. I will concede that here; but I will concede, too, that no exploitation will be permitted in any changes made by the committee; that it is purely a revenue measure, intended to raise enough to meet the current expenditures of the Philippine Islands. I would ask the gentleman to specify a single item in which a rate has been made to exploit the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HARRISON. I will state two items in which I consider that to be the case, and if the advocates of high protection in the Philippines had any justification it should be in these two items. Upon analysis, however, their whole position will collapse. Those two items are structural steel and matches.

Those are two instances in which they might have claimed that infant industries exist in the Philippine Islands. The plant in Manila for making structural steel used really to import steel from the United States and assemble it there to the extent of putting in steel bolts and screws.

Now, the rate on structural steel in this bill is fifty-six one-hundredths of 1 cent. The rate on structural steel in the Dingley bill is one-half of 1 cent. The rate on structural steel in the Payne bill is three-tenths of 1 cent. Therefore it will be obvious that the rate upon structural steel in this bill is not only a higher rate than in the Payne bill, but even higher than the rate of the Dingley bill, and is, in all human probability, utterly prohibitive as to any importations in competition with American structural steel.

But does it protect the infant industry in Manila? Most certainly not, because American structural steel will now be imported completely finished, free of duty, and no protection against this is afforded to this so-called "infant industry." So it is obvious that the thing is a ridiculous farce.

Now, take up the match schedule. That was another instance of an infant industry. The officials of the Bureau of Insular Affairs—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the committee the amount of the present duty on structural steel?

Mr. HARRISON. I believe it is fifty-six one-hundredths of 1 cent.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the proposed rate?

Mr. HARRISON. Fifty-six one-hundredths of 1 cent; the same rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit another inquiry?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does it follow from your argument that there is going to be a swamping by reason of American manufactures being sent there, when this bill continues the same rate of duty and such condition does not exist at present?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; because in the present law the duty applies against the importations of structural steel from the United States, but under the new conditions of affairs they will come in free. I observe that my time is nearly out.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have ten minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRISON. The other item as to which I claim this bill provides protection for American industries, not Filipino, is in the instance of the match industry in Manila. Officials of the Bureau of Insular Affairs testified that representatives of the match factory came before them and asked for protection.

In response thereto he says:

We gave them the Payne rate.

Now the testimony shows that the match company in Manila uses American match machinery, and therefore prohibitive protection is given to them. In other words, so long as they are helping to exploit an American industry they are entitled to a protection which is admitted to be prohibitive as to all the rest of the world.

These are two examples, Mr. Chairman, which show most clearly the real purpose of this bill. It is from top to bottom simply and solely a selfish exploitation of the islands in behalf of certain American industrial monopolies.

Now, a few words more, Mr. Chairman, and I am done. We had a magnificent opportunity here. We could have started the Philippine Islands now upon the straight path of economic reform. There were no great industrial combinations existing there, insisting upon high protection or strong enough to secure the enactment into law of their will and desires. We could have given the Philippine Islands a tariff for revenue only. We could have collected that tariff upon a few items, which would have supplied sufficient revenues to run their government, and as to all the rest of the items of this bill we might have in the Philippine Islands free trade as wide as the world. A tariff for revenue only is possible now. Will it ever be so again? This, in my opinion, would have benefited not only the people of the Philippines, but the people of the United States, beyond their wildest dreams of commercial empire. It would have made out of the city of Manila an entrepôt for American commerce.

It would have made that city the rival of Hongkong in the East. It would have made of Manila a door through which would open up to us the commerce of all the vast markets of Asia. In this way we could recoup ourselves for our stupendous expenditures in the Philippines. But instead of doing that,

willfully, without any rational excuse, we are thrusting upon them a system which will be a curse to future generations. And this is done not for the purpose of raising revenue, nor for the purpose of protecting Philippine industries, which are practically nonexistent, but in order to shut out competition with the tax-free American commodities. Thus we instill into the islands the elements of future discord and corruption. We are sowing the dragon's teeth from which armed forces will hereafter spring. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to make any speech, but by request of certain parties I want to have a resolution read, so that it will appear in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read in the time of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the honorable the House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The following resolution was adopted by and for the Anti-Imperialist League at a special meeting of the executive committee, Boston, May 11, 1909:

Whereas it is proposed that the Congress shall, by enactment, lay a tariff on goods entering the Philippine Islands from other countries, without consultation with the Philippine assembly, a body organized by our own Government to represent the Filipino people; such enactment meaning taxation without representation; and

Whereas it is proposed that the tariff on goods passing between the Philippines and the United States shall be either lowered or abolished; and

Whereas every commercial favor between the Philippine Islands and the United States not granted to other countries constitutes a tie which prejudices the independence of the islands: Therefore

Resolved, That the Anti-Imperialist League, through its executive committee, recommends respectfully that all reference to the Philippine Islands be stricken out from the tariff bill now under consideration. If, however, any action be taken to modify the Philippine tariff, the league urges that, as a proper notification to investors under the law, either a promise of independence at a definite period be incorporated as an amendment to any such enactment or that an amendment may be added thereto directing the Executive to make arrangements looking to the neutralization of the Philippine Islands when their independence shall be declared.

MOORFIELD STOREY, President.
ERVING WINSLOW, Secretary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know how much of my hour I have used? I yielded thirty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and then this little time has been used in the reading of this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty-three minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, does some gentleman on the other side of the House desire to occupy the time?

Mr. HILL. I understand that there is no one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the bill we have before the House, to establish a new tariff law for the people of the Philippine Islands, is by any means a perfect bill; but it is so much better than the tariff laws we have enacted for our own people that I feel that the people of the Philippine Islands are entitled to be congratulated upon this piece of legislation.

I do not agree with my colleague on the committee [Mr. HARRISON] as to the views he has just expressed to the House in reference to this bill. It is true there are a few prohibitive items in the bill. I agree with him as to the two that he referred to—the duties levied on structural steel and matches; but in the main this is a revenue bill. It is written along revenue lines. It would be practically impossible for this Congress to enact a bill to raise revenues for the Philippine government along the lines of the British customs-revenue laws. The British customs-revenue laws levy their duties on four or five articles. The principal sources of income are from duties levied on alcoholic spirits, tobacco, tea, and coffee. Now, excepting some of the Americans in the Philippine Islands, people there do not drink alcoholic liquors. There is, comparatively speaking, a small consumption of alcoholic liquors in the islands. It would be impossible to raise any great amount of revenue from duties levied along the lines of the English customs laws. The rates of duty now imposed on these articles could not be increased to any extent without reducing the revenue. The revenue derived from these sources for the year 1908 was \$54,380 on coffee, \$28,620 on tea, \$5,083 on tobacco, \$39,874 on malt liquors, \$258,259 on distilled spirits, and \$135,165 on wines, making a total of \$481,507.

They are producers of tobacco in large quantities and exporters; they import very little; therefore you raise very little revenue on tobacco. As to tea and coffee there is a small amount of revenue raised from those sources, and it could not be materially increased.

So that it would be impossible to raise a million dollars of revenue from the sources suggested by the gentleman from New

York or from any other limited number of articles, much less the \$7,000,000 that it is necessary to raise at the custom-house to support their government.

Of course, with a great consuming nation like Great Britain, the economic principles they apply to their revenue laws are determined by their material conditions at home, and in writing a tariff bill for the Philippine Islands we must consider the economic and social conditions of these people. We must take our position and govern our legislation with a view to articles that will be imported into the Philippine Islands and that the people want to purchase from abroad. To do that and raise sufficient revenue it is necessary to levy your taxes on a large number of articles.

Now, as to the revenue rates of this bill, outside of the tax on distilled spirits, which amounts to 140 per cent, there is no tax levied in this bill on any class of articles that exceeds 38 per cent, which is collected on manufactured silks. The average rate of duty collected by this bill, in my judgment, will not exceed 20 per cent ad valorem.

A statement of revenue from import duties under this bill was prepared by the Bureau of Insular Affairs, which I desire to call to the attention of the House:

Statement of revenue from import duty under the proposed Philippine tariff law of 1909.

Commodity.	Imports for fiscal year 1908 from—			
	United States.		All other countries.	
	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.
Cattle.....			\$1,055,236	
Breadstuffs, except flour.....	\$94,717	\$3,773	234,915	\$88,062
Flour.....	507,235	43,598	537,335	47,489
Cement.....			331,143	11,346
Coal.....	63	3	567,157	54,361
Chemicals, drugs, and dyes, except opium.....	100,724	22,130	324,522	56,642
Cotton goods.....	685,919	121,713	7,825,915	1,898,110
Manufactures of fibers, vegetable.....	6,335	1,665	607,804	151,372
Fish and fish products, including shellfish.....	138,904	17,289	255,756	32,383
Iron, steel, and manufactures of.....	802,313	106,091	1,962,594	222,340
Leather, and manufactures of, including boots and shoes.....	462,756	54,415	209,206	45,984
Malt liquors.....	43,756	12,022	46,836	10,219
Illuminating oils.....	619,545	302,561	186,567	55,174
Paper, and manufactures of.....	167,928	32,010	858,506	92,119
Provisions, including beef, hog, and other animal and dairy products.....	195,027	22,450	1,325,342	86,149
Rice.....			5,861,256	1,254,515
Distilled spirits.....	68,760	47,643	171,406	170,742
Silk, and manufactures of.....	12,978	6,003	521,633	199,631
All other articles.....	1,172,710	204,300	4,555,886	1,265,241
Total.....	5,079,070	999,666	25,839,075	5,691,819

Commodity.	Ad valorem rate.		Estimated duty under proposed tariff.	Probable loss through increase in United States trade.	Revenue under import tariff rates, proposed law, 1909.
	Present. ^a	Proposed.			
	Per ct.	Per ct.			
Cattle.....		.8	\$85,000		\$85,000
Breadstuffs, except flour.....	16	15	35,237	\$10,000	25,237
Flour.....	9	10	53,734	47,000	6,734
Cement.....	3	5	16,557		16,557
Coal.....	10	10	54,361		54,361
Chemicals, drugs, and dyes, except opium.....	17	20	66,904	40,000	26,904
Cotton goods.....	26	26	1,898,110	300,000	1,598,110
Manufactures of fibers, vegetable.....	25	25	151,372		151,372
Fish and fish products, including shellfish.....	13	13	32,383	5,000	27,383
Iron, steel, and manufactures of.....	16	16	222,340	100,000	122,340
Leather, and manufactures of, including boots and shoes.....	22	25	52,301	40,000	12,301
Malt liquors.....	22	22	10,219	10,000	219
Illuminating oils.....	30				
Paper, and manufactures of.....	26	29	71,701	45,000	26,701
Provisions, including beef, hog, and other animal and dairy products.....	7	15	198,801	85,000	113,801
Rice.....	21	26	1,523,983		1,523,983
Distilled spirits.....	99	140	240,052		240,052
Silk, and manufactures of.....	38	38	199,631		199,631
All other articles.....	27	26	1,173,025	250,000	923,025
Total.....			6,085,661	982,000	5,103,661

^a Computed on basis of 1908 imports from other countries.

^b After May 1, 1910.

^c Opium duty of \$100,000 eliminated.

When we consider that not in three-quarters of a century have the people of the United States enjoyed as low rates of duty at the custom-house as the taxes named in this bill for the people of the Philippine Islands; when we consider that the Walker tariff bill, the ideal Democratic tariff, carried duties to the amount of 30 per cent ad valorem, you can realize that this bill as a whole is a great boon to the people of the Philippine Islands as compared with the laws we have written on the statute books for our own people at home.

I agree fully with the assertion that this bill is experimental, to a large extent, as to its revenue features, because when we grant the people of the Philippine Islands absolute free trade with the United States we change the economic conditions and channels of trade entirely, and as to how far certain rates that were revenue rates in the past will become prohibitive rates in the future, by reason of this change of economic conditions and changes of the channels of trade, is problematical. No man can determine it from any fixed standard, and the only possible way that it can be determined for the future is to put the bill on the statute books and ascertain hereafter at the custom-house by the customs receipts what rates in this bill have become prohibitive and what are revenue rates.

I do not think the committee have altogether written the bill along correct revenue lines. I think they have made mistakes in some instances, but I say that the bill as a whole is, in the main, correct. As to the proposition the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] refers to about structural steel, I do not think there is any justification whatever for that item in this bill, either as a protective-tariff item or a revenue-tariff item.

Under the present tariff laws of the Philippine Islands all goods going into the Philippine Islands from the United States and foreign countries go in on equal terms; all pay the same duties at the custom-house. Under that condition of affairs, where it was necessary for the producer of structural steel in the United States to meet his competitor at Manila on equal terms, the United States producer of structural steel absolutely controlled the Philippine market. That being the case, of course a duty levied on structural steel that is higher than the Dingley bill would be prohibitive; if we reduce the rate to the Payne bill—three-tenths of 1 per cent—in my judgment, it would still be prohibitive. I am inclined to believe that if we reduce the rate to the minimum, the American producer of structural steel will still have control of that market.

So that as a revenue matter I do not think it makes much difference to a Filipino what the rate is, but I do object to that particular duty, because it raises a wall behind which the American producer can exploit his goods in the Philippine markets at the expense of the Filipino, without any opportunity for competition. There were several instances in this bill when it came before the committee in which similar prohibitive rates were found. It was so on sugar machinery and on rails, and it was so on petroleum; but the subcommittee that considered the bill went through it, and reduced the rate on each one of those items until they came to structural steel, and there a majority of the committee balked and refused to cut the rate. In most of the schedules they cut out the prohibitive rates that were in the bill when it first came before the committee.

Now I want to call the attention of the committee to a few of the rates in the bill, showing the rates of duty that the Ways and Means Committee deem to be sufficient for the people of the Philippine Islands as compared to the law on the statute books to-day in the United States. Under the head of "Stones and earth"—the first paragraph as to marble, onyx, jasper, alabaster, and similar fine stones; subdivision A, in blocks, rough or squared only, and marble dust, 20 per cent ad valorem. The old rate in the Philippine bill on this item was 50 cents a hundred kilos, or equal to an ad valorem rate of 40 per cent. This bill cuts it in two and makes it 20 per cent. Yet on the same articles in the Dingley bill we find that the American people have to pay a tax of 42.46 per cent at the custom-house. The next subdivision, B, is slabs, plates, or steps, sawed or chiseled, polished or not, but without ornamentation, 30 per cent ad valorem. The old rate was \$2 a hundred kilos, or 31 per cent ad valorem. The Dingley rate on that same class of goods is 48.15 per cent. Turn now to paragraph 15, common hollow glassware, articles of general use throughout the United States and the Philippine Islands. Subdivision A provides—

On demijohns, carboys, jars, bottles, flasks, and similar receptacles, whether empty or in use as containers of merchandise dutiable by weight or measure, except in those cases in which a classification of such containers is otherwise specially provided for, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The old duty was 80 cents a hundred kilos, or an ad valorem rate of from 15 to 20 per cent. Here again is a reduction in this

bill from the present law in the Philippine Islands of one-half. The people of the United States on this class of articles pay at the custom-house from 40 to 50 per cent ad valorem. We next consider paragraph 16, "Glass, crystal, and glass imitating crystal," in decanters, glasses, tumblers, cups, goblets, saucers, plates, dishes, pitchers, bowls, candlesticks, pillar lamps, bracket lamps, and so forth. The rate of duty fixed in this bill is 25 per cent ad valorem. The rate of duty under the old law amounts to 56 per cent ad valorem, a reduction of that duty one-half. The duty under the Dingley bill that the American people pay on such articles amounts to 45 per cent ad valorem, showing that this bill is a radical reduction in many particulars over the present law in the Philippine Islands and levied at nearly one-half the rates of the Dingley bill in most instances.

Let us consider now common window glass, neither polished nor engraved; the rate is 25 per cent ad valorem. Under the old Philippine bill it was \$2.25 a hundred kilos, or 50 per cent ad valorem, and the American people pay on common window glass at the custom-house from 14 to 155 per cent ad valorem.

So that it seems to me that our wards in the Philippine Islands, those for whom we hold this trust, are being better taken care of by this bill than a Republican Congress has ever attempted to do for our own people. Mirrors of all kinds, framed or mounted, are taxed 35 per cent ad valorem. The rate under the Dingley bill is 45 per cent ad valorem. Of course I am not going into all the articles in each schedule, but in the main there is an equal difference between the rates in this bill and those in the Dingley bill. Now, on jewelry, plate and goldsmith's work, under the old Philippine bill and this bill the tax amounts to \$12.50 a hectogram, or an ad valorem rate of 26 per cent. The Dingley bill provides an ad valorem rate of 45 per cent on similar articles. On steel rails the rate of duty is 40 cents a hundred kilos. The present Dingley rate is \$7.84 a ton; at 40 cents a hundred kilos it would amount to about \$4 a ton, or practically the same rate that was fixed in the Payne bill when it passed the House of Representatives.

Terne plate and tin plate, 100 kilos, \$1.20, which would amount to \$12 a ton. The present duty on tin plate and terne plate in the Dingley bill amounts to \$33.60. In other words, on tin plate that was at one time a national issue—at one time our friends on the Republican side of the House contended that unless there was an enormous rate of duty placed on tin plate it would be impossible to manufacture the same in the United States—when they came to write a tariff bill for the Philippine Islands, a part of the territory of the United States in which the American producer must pay an ocean freight rate to reach the market as the foreign producer, a disadvantage that he does not have at home, they reduce the rate on tin plate and terne plate from \$33.60, as fixed in the Dingley bill, to \$12 a ton in this bill.

Note that on manufactures of terne plate and tin plate we find a great contrast between the rates fixed in this bill for the Filipino and the taxes assessed in the Dingley bill on the American people. "On copper and alloys thereof, in wire," paragraph 46, we find a 15 per cent ad valorem rate in this bill. Under the old Philippine law the ad valorem rate was about 10 per cent, an increase in this bill, but greatly under the rate in the Dingley bill, which is 45 per cent ad valorem. In pigments, paints, dyes, and varnishes we find in paragraph 58 that mineral pigments of common, natural occurrence, and so forth, are taxed at the ad valorem rate of 10 per cent. Under the Dingley bill the customs duties alternate from 19 to 38 per cent. Pigments and paints not otherwise provided for, as shown in paragraph 59, white or red lead, dry, 15 per cent ad valorem, the same as in the present law, but the Dingley rates change from 38 to 80 per cent ad valorem on these commodities. "In animal oils and fats," paragraph 82, crude, 10 per cent ad valorem; refined, in receptacles weighing each more than 2 kilos, 15 per cent ad valorem, as compared with the old rate under the Philippine law of 25 per cent and the rate under the Dingley law of from 24 to 33 per cent ad valorem. Starch and dextrin, paragraph 87, in this bill pays \$2 a hundred kilos, the same as it was under the present law, or an ad valorem rate of 31 per cent. Under the Dingley bill the tax at the custom-house on these commodities runs from 27 to 60 per cent ad valorem.

On explosives, dynamite, giant and blasting powder, and similar explosives, miners' fuses and caps, and explosive signals, paragraph 89, 10 per cent ad valorem. Under the present law the duty amounts to about 17 per cent ad valorem. Under the Dingley bill the ad valorem rate on dynamite amounts to about 30 per cent; blasting powder, 24 to 43 per cent; miners' fuses, 90 to 124 per cent, as compared with 10 per cent at the custom-house for these articles for the Filipino. As to the cotton schedule, I must say that this schedule in this bill, like

the cotton schedule in the Dingley bill and the Payne bill, to a large extent is Greek to me. In the Dingley bill and the Payne bill they fix the rate according to the number of threads in each square yard. In this bill they fix the rates according to the number of threads in each kilogram, and for one who is not an expert in the cotton business it is practically impossible to compare the two rates of duty all the way through. The average rate of duty on manufactures of cotton under this bill is 26 per cent ad valorem, and the average rate of duty under the Dingley bill is 44.84 per cent ad valorem. The Filipino will pay about one-half the taxes at the custom-house on his cotton goods that the American citizen pays under the benign rule of the Republican administration. Paragraph 92 provides that yarns, not otherwise provided for, in hanks, cops, or bobbins, shall be taxed 15 per cent ad valorem. Under the present law this rate amounts to about 24 per cent ad valorem. Under the Dingley bill it runs all the way from 9 to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Now, as to knitted goods, and in view of the recent fight we had in the House over the Payne bill and the rejection in the Senate of some of the schedules in the Payne bill in relation to stockings and gloves, it is interesting to note the rates of duty fixed in this bill on knitted goods. Paragraph 105 reads as follows:

Knitted goods: (a) In the piece, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The old rate in the Philippine law amounted to 25 per cent ad valorem, while the Dingley rate amounts to 56 per cent ad valorem.

The second subdivision of this paragraph reads:

(b) In jerseys, undershirts, drawers, stockings, or socks, 25 per cent ad valorem.

In the present Philippine law the tax amounts to about 29 per cent ad valorem. The rates under the Dingley law are from 50 to 64 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose that was to induce them to wear stockings over there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely; but our legislation in this country seems to indicate that the American people should not wear stockings. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I think there is something in that, too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because when we look at the Dingley law we find that the rate of duty on this class of goods runs from 50 to 64 per cent, and the Payne bill raises that rate. But when we come to legislate for the Filipino, who has been paying a duty of 29 per cent, we reduce the rate to 25 per cent, as my friend from Nebraska says, so that he may wear stockings.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does that mean that they want to discount the use of stockings in America?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It looks so from the late action of this House. It is very evident to my mind that this bill was not written by the members of the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of giving the foreign manufacturers the advantage in the Philippine market. It was undoubtedly written to give the American manufacturers a fair, equal chance, and yet raise some revenue for the Philippine Islands. When you find so great a discrepancy existing in the rates of duty between the bill we have under consideration and the present law in the United States, it seems to me that it is an argument that goes without answer that our friends on the other side of this Chamber realize that the duties fixed in the Dingley bill and in the Payne bill were far above the difference in labor cost, the difference in the entire cost at home and abroad, or they would not cut the rates of duty on these particular classes of cotton goods practically half in two.

Here is another paragraph along the same lines, namely, paragraph 125:

Knitted goods: (a) In the piece, or made up into jerseys, undershirts, drawers, stockings, or socks, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The old duty under the Philippine law amounted to 41 per cent ad valorem on stockings and socks, and they reduced it for the benefit of the Filipinos to 30 per cent ad valorem, and yet we find the Dingley law bears on these articles an ad valorem rate of from 47 to 67 per cent, and the tax to the American consumer has not been reduced in the Payne bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. In reference to the cotton schedule, is the gentleman aware of what revenue it is expected to bring in on cotton and manufactures of cotton under this proposed bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, I can not tell you that absolutely, but the amount of duty collected for the year 1908 on the articles I named a while ago, namely, jerseys, undershirts, drawers,

amounted to \$9, and on stockings and socks it amounted to \$43. The very small amount collected indicates the reason for the reduction in this bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not expected by the manufacturers in this country to control the trade in cotton goods?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I presume that our friends on the Republican end of the Ways and Means Committee and on the other side of this House have not written this bill for the purpose of allowing the foreign manufacturers of cotton goods to have the advantage of the American manufacturers; and they evidently believe that rates of duty, one-half of those collected under our law, will not be a serious menace to the American manufacturer. If we can pay the ocean freight rate, carry our manufactured cotton goods to the Philippine Islands, and compete with the foreigner there at one-half the rate of duty charged at home, it seems to me self-evident that we can reduce the rates here where we do not have any ocean freight rate to pay and the foreign manufacturer has a freight rate to pay in order to come to our shores.

Mr. CRAIG. Is there any pretense on the part of the committee that this bill is written for the protection of Philippine industries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My Republican colleagues on the committee claim that there are a few items on which they have put a protective tariff—for instance, on structural steel; and there is no doubt in that instance that they have done so. But considering the bill in all its detail, I am of the opinion that it is written along the lines of a tariff for revenue and not for protection.

Mr. CRAIG. I think so, too; but what I want to find out is, whether or not the committee had in its mind that the infant industries of the Philippine Islands did not require as much protection as the infant industries of this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As to many of these articles there are no infant industries in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CRAIG. But those that they have, as I understand; they are protected in this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are.

Mr. CRAIG. Are they protected as fairly in this bill as the same industries in this country are under the Payne bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are so represented, although I can not tell. There is fifty-six hundredths of 1 cent a pound on structural steel for the protection of a plant out there. I think that the duty in that particular is far above a protection basis. There is also a protective—a very high protective—duty on matches, but these are isolated cases, and do not indicate the general character of the bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. As the importation of iron and steel products from the United States to the Philippines amounts to only about two-fifths of the consumption of those articles there, is it not a fact that the new rates will so disturb the revenues as to make it difficult for the revenue to be sufficient for the exigencies of the government of the islands? In other words, is there anything in this bill to supply the loss of revenue by reason of the increased amount of iron and steel and products thereof from the United States which will go in free?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will say to my friend it is problematical as to what effect the changed conditions will have on the revenue. For the fiscal year 1908 the value of iron and steel products entering the Philippine Islands from the United States amounted to \$802,313, and from all other countries to \$1,362,594, showing that the foreign producers of iron and steel had somewhat the advantage under the then existing conditions.

You take pig iron that was imported into the Philippine Islands. Practically every pound was purchased in foreign countries, showing that in the low-grade products of iron and steel, where labor was matched against labor, the foreign producer had an advantage over the home producer.

But in the higher grade of products, such as structural steel, where advanced methods and improved machinery eliminated the difference in the cost of labor, we were enabled to compete with them on equal terms. Now, that is one fault I have with this bill. The report of the insular collector of customs, which I hold in my hand, shows that all pig iron that went into the Philippine Islands came from abroad. This bill puts pig iron on the free list. If I had been writing the bill according to my own ideas, I would have put a small tax upon pig iron, because I think under these conditions it would have produced some revenue for the insular government; but the committee did not agree to that proposition. But that illustrates and answers my friend's question.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. You mean the members of the majority did not agree to that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I mean.

There are some things in the cotton-goods schedule that are produced abroad which are not produced in the United States, and which the Filipino prefers to similar articles produced in the United States that will be imported into the Philippine Islands and will be a source of revenue.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to ask the gentleman a question as to the operation of the sugar schedule. There was a duty on sugar in the old law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have not that at hand, but I will say this to the gentleman: The Filipinos are producers of sugar and producers of rice, and are exporters of sugar and of rice. We left the duties in this bill at the same rate as the Dingley bill or the Payne bill that will be enacted, in order to prevent the importation of sugar into the Philippine Islands to take the place of sugar exported to the United States. And therefore the rates on sugar and the rates on rice, the rates on tobacco and the rates on alcohol, are along the same basis as the rates in the United States.

Now, in paragraph 177, boots and shoes, we find that on boots and shoes made of cowhide, horsehide, calfskin, and canvas a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem is levied under this bill. The duty under the Dingley bill amounted to 25 per cent ad valorem. In other words, to encourage the Filipinos to wear shoes, they will be enabled to purchase their shoes from abroad much cheaper than the American people can purchase theirs.

On draft harness and parts thereof the rate of duty fixed in this bill is 20 per cent ad valorem, the same rate of duty as in the present Philippine tariff law. The American people pay a rate of duty of 45 per cent ad valorem.

Here is a paragraph that will interest every housekeeper in the land, paragraph 190:

(b) Cooking and heating apparatus and utensils, chandeliers, desk and table lamps, flatirons, soldering and curling irons, thermocauteries and cauterizing instruments, surgical, dental, and therapeutic appliances, including so-called electric belts, X-ray machines, vibratory apparatus, electroplating outfits, cigar lighters, other instruments, implements, utensils, and articles used in connection with, for, or by the application or production of electrotechnical, thermoelectric, galvanic, or galvanic-magnetic force, and detached parts for any of the foregoing, not otherwise provided for, 20 per cent ad valorem.

In the United States the rate of duty on the articles named is 45 per cent. In other words, when the housekeeper in the Philippine Islands desires to purchase her cooking utensils or heating apparatus or flatirons from abroad, she pays a rate of duty of 20 per cent ad valorem; but when the housekeeper in the United States desires to replenish her kitchen, she pays to the custom-house officer here a rate of 45 per cent.

Mr. CULLOP. Going back a little, I should like to ask the gentleman a question: Does not this seem to be a bill more to discourage infant industries in the Philippines than to encourage them, if they make a difference of 20 per cent on the articles he has named?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not say that. I think the foundation for the great industries of America was laid before the civil war. As I said a while ago, under the Walker tariff bill the highest rate of duty we had was an ad valorem rate of 30 per cent. We did not have a great population to feed or to supply; we did not have the necessity for the use of the great amount of capital or the employment of the great number of workmen that we employ to-day; but before the civil war, under duties nearly as low as these named in this Philippine tariff bill, the American manufacturer was enabled to meet foreign competition, to build up his infant industries—and they were real infant industries then—and compete with the foreign manufacturer.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, does not that sustain the argument that the tariff is not levied for the purpose so much of encouraging infant industries as it is to keep up the overgrown industries?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You mean the tariff here in this country?

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; and the same over there. Our people get a monopoly of that market.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, of course when we go into the argument of the question as to whether our people get a monopoly of the Philippine market, then we come to the argument of a question that is foreign to this bill. Under the tariff laws of the United States the manufacturers of the Ohio have a monopoly, so far as the tariff allows them to have it, of the markets of Alabama and Georgia.

The man who produces steel rails in Birmingham has a monopoly of the markets of New York, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, and it is a right difficult question for us to determine to what extent he is entitled to this same amount of control of the markets of the Philippine Islands. But what I do say is this,

that when the manufacturer here at home meets his foreign competitor, whether he meets him in Porto Rico, Hawaii, New York, or Ohio, he meets him under a tariff rate of 46 per cent on an average standing between him and that competition; but when he meets him in the Philippine Islands, he meets him with an average tariff rate of less than 20 per cent ad valorem. So that I say this law is to the interest and advantage of the people of the Philippine Islands, a distinct advantage over what the legislation here at home is giving to our own people.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the tariff is prohibitive, no matter whether it seems high or low, whether it is 45 per cent or 30 per cent, no revenue will be produced.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Now, if it be prohibitive to the importation of goods from other countries except the United States, then the Filipinos get no revenue; and does it not show that if the tariff is sufficient for those people, it is an admission that the tariff on the same articles, in reference to the imports into this country, is not for the purpose of protection of the industry, but to exploit the market?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my argument; that is what I have been contending for for an hour.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is what I understood the gentleman to mean.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have been contending for that conclusion for an hour. If the duty we are levying in the Philippine tariff bill is sufficient there, where we have to pay the freight to get into the market across the sea, it should be sufficient here, where we have no freight rate to pay and our competitor has to pay the freight rate to meet us.

Now, on wagons and carts and other merchandise the rate fixed for the Filipino is 15 per cent ad valorem. The rate under the Dingley bill is 45 per cent. On automobiles, the rate for the Filipino is 15 per cent ad valorem, and the American citizen has to pay 45 per cent ad valorem.

Now, then, as to the breakfast table. Our friends have discriminated in favor of the Filipino. It is true under this bill they have raised the duty above what it was under the old Philippine customs tax on poultry, meats, and fish, but it was necessary to do that in order to get revenue. I do not myself agree that that is the best form of taxation, but there was doubt about how much revenue could be raised on iron and steel, because they are not great consumers of iron and steel. Practically no revenue could be raised on woolen goods, because it is a warm country.

Very little taxes could be raised on cotton goods on account of the heat and habits of the people, so it was necessary to raise a large portion of the revenue for the government on food products, and for that reason the members of the committee increased in this bill the rates of duty over and above what they were under the laws now governing the Philippine Islands.

I find on poultry and game (paragraph 201) not otherwise provided for, dressed or not, \$4 per 100 kilos. Under the old law it was \$3, amounting to a duty of about 10 per cent ad valorem. The present rate will be an ad valorem rate of about 12 per cent. Under this rate it will amount to \$40 a ton, whereas the Dingley rate amounts to \$112 a ton. Fresh meats under this bill amount to \$1 per 100 kilos, or \$10 a ton, and the Dingley rate amounts to \$22.40 a ton.

In other words, the gentleman in Manila when he orders a beefsteak for breakfast will only be confronted by a tax at the custom-house of one-half of what the American consumer will be required to pay at home. The same thing is true in reference to all classes of meats. On ham and bacon the tax under this bill is \$4 per 100 kilos, which amounts to \$40 a ton. Under the Dingley bill it is 5 cents a pound, or \$112 a ton. The tax on hams and bacon in this country amounts to three times as much as the Filipino will have to pay, and yet we are the greatest home producers of that kind of meat almost in the world, and ship it to Germany and Europe and to the Philippines, and yet one-third of the duty is a sufficient tax for the Filipino to pay, whereas the American consumer must have the price of his breakfast table raised by a tax three times that which we levy for people in the Philippine Islands.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Alabama tell us what reason there is, either in the Dingley bill or the Payne bill, or the Payne-Aldrich bill, when it comes out, for a tariff tax on fresh meats coming to this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I do not think there is any necessity at all. We are great producers of fresh meat. We ship it abroad, compete on even terms in the markets of the world, and collect practically no revenue from the taxes imposed at home. I think it would be wise to very greatly reduce the tax on all food products in the United States, and especially on those that we can produce more cheaply than any other country in the world.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: What is the theory upon which hides are put upon the dutiable list in this bill and on the free list at home?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend is mistaken in respect to that. The bill, as reported to the House, has hides on the free list.

Mr. CLAYTON. The bill I have gives it at 10 per cent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the old bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That was the bill originally introduced; but the bill I have before me is the bill that was reported from the committee, and is No. 9135.

Mr. CULLOP. That is the one I have, No. 9135.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman must have the bill that was introduced by Chairman PAYNE.

Mr. CULLOP. I have the one numbered 9135.

Mr. GREGG. Well, they would carry the same number.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Possibly my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] can answer the question.

Mr. HILL. Hides are on the free list.

Mr. CULLOP. This is the copy that was handed to me this morning.

Mr. HILL. Under the present law they are dutiable at \$1.50 a hundred kilos, and under the new bill they are free.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true. I did not read the paragraph carefully when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] first called attention to it. Under this bill raw hides are on the free list, and it is only tanned or manufactured hides that are dutiable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for the courtesy shown me, and I shall not take a great deal more of the time of the House on the bill. I have endeavored to point out a number of instances where this bill is a reduction in its rates from the present Philippine tariff law, and to show the House how greatly the rates are below those fixed by the Dingley law for the United States. There are two other questions, however, that I desire to call to the attention of the House before I take my seat.

This bill reenacts the present law and provides for a duty on exports of hemp, sugar, copra, and tobacco, and at a rate varying from 5 cents to 50 cents per 100 kilos. My objection to this clause in the bill is that it is not justified by any economic principle of government; that an export tax has been abandoned by practically all the civilized nations of the world as a means for raising revenue. There was a time one hundred years ago when many of the great governments of the world levied an export tax and in that manner collected revenues for their treasury.

Our forefathers in writing the Constitution of the United States, recognizing the false principle on which an export tax was based, put it in the fundamental law of our land that the United States Government should not levy export taxes. Since that time I think it has been abolished in all the great nations of Europe. I know of no instance where a great European nation has adopted an export tax in recent years except one, and that was during the recent Boer war, when the English Government adopted an export tax on coal, but with that exception it has been abolished by all the great civilized nations of the world. The reason for the change is very apparent. Whenever you put a tax on your people for engaging in an export trade, to that extent you limit their ability to successfully meet their foreign competitor and reduce the territory in which they can successfully dispose of their surplus products abroad. Take copra, dried coconut. It is a product of the Orient. A great many other nations produce copra besides the Philippine Islands. They can produce it as cheaply with the same class of labor and can reach the foreign markets as easily and as cheaply as can the people of the Philippine Islands. When you put a tax of 10 cents a hundred kilos on copra you say to the Filipino, "You

have got to pay that before you can meet in competition the copra from China or other oriental countries."

It means that he must take that tax out of his pocket, not out of the foreigner's pocket, and pay it to the government. It means that he has got to produce that copra that much cheaper than the foreigner does in order to compete with him; that he must reduce his cost of living to that extent below the foreigner or he can not face competition and succeed; and therefore it discourages him in the production of all commodities on which he has to pay an export tax. I say that the export tax levied in this bill is not fair to the American producer of articles that compete with similar products from the Philippine Islands. A large amount of the sugar from the Philippine Islands will be admitted into the United States free of duty. If there were equal terms and equal conditions in the sale of the export sugar from the Philippine Islands between this country and the Orient, I have no doubt that a large amount of the Philippine sugar would not come to the United States but would go to the markets of the Orient; but when you put an export tax on Philippine sugar of 5 cents a hundred kilos, you drive that Philippine sugar to the American market and out of the Orient, because when it comes to the American market it comes free.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do I understand the gentleman from Alabama to say that there will be an export tax on Philippine sugar of 5 cents a hundred kilos?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is 5 cents on 220 pounds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Five cents on a hundred kilos—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Five cents a hundred kilos.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is 5 cents on 220 pounds. Does the gentleman believe that will affect the destination of that sugar?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will, to the extent of the tax.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why, it is negligible.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not consider it so.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Five cents on 220 pounds is such an infinitesimal small fraction of additional charge per pound that it appears to me to be negligible.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman must remember that the greatest fortunes that have been made in this world have been made by saving a cent on a very large product, and a few cents difference in the cost of a product will determine to which market it will go.

It may not amount to a great deal here, but the tendency would be that way. Of course, the tax on copra and tobacco amounts to a good deal more. On tobacco it amounts to \$1.50 a hundred kilos in some classes of tobacco. On copra it amounts to 10 cents on a hundred kilos; but the tendency of this export tax would be to drive other exports to the American markets and interfere with their having fair competition in the markets abroad.

Now, the contention is made by the gentlemen of the committee who desire to levy this export tax that it is necessary to do so in order to produce revenue. I have no means of ascertaining the amount of revenue this bill will produce myself; the only way by which I can come to a conclusion about it is to accept the report of the collector of customs in the Philippine Islands. He says that the enactment of the bill that we have presented to the House will reduce the import duties \$1,537,000, export duties, \$44,000, and duties collected on Philippine products in the United States, \$269,000, making a total reduction of \$1,851,000.

Now, the total duties that were collected heretofore by an export tax only amounted to \$743,000. Of course, some of those goods will of necessity come to the United States; but assuming that we lose all of that difference by repealing the export tax and add it to the \$1,851,000 the collector of customs says they will lose, it would make a loss of duty under this bill of \$2,551,000.

Under the law as it stands to-day, the insular government has been collecting from internal-revenue taxes \$5,542,022, but a large proportion of these taxes has been turned over to the provinces and municipalities. The insular government had a surplus of about \$3,000,000, which was turned over to the local governments for local improvements. The insular government only received \$2,458,000, leaving a total of \$3,000,000 that went to the provinces last year and under this bill will now be retained by the insular government. Now, subtracting the loss of revenue as figured by the collector of customs, with the \$700,000 they now collect from exports added to it, amounting to \$2,551,000, from the \$3,000,000, it leaves \$525,000 in excess of their expenditures. So, if the figures that are given by the collector of customs for the Philippine Islands by the Insular

Bureau that presented this bill to the House and to the committee originally are correct, then from a revenue standpoint there is no necessity whatever for maintaining the present duty on exports. When the proper time arrives in the consideration of the bill, I shall make a motion, not to wipe out the export duties at once, but allow them to operate for two years as they are, and then to reduce them one-fifth each year for a period of five years, so that we may not disrupt the machinery of the government there, so that we will take no chances in the matter, so the approach to the abolishment of these duties shall be gradual and no one could be injured by it, and so that this legislation will march up to the standards of civilization of all of the great countries of the world.

To-day, if we enact this law, we write into the statute books for the Philippine Islands legislation that is little short of barbarism, legislation that no government in the civilized world, except Turkey and Persia and other second-class nations, countenances to-day. But if we repeal these duties as I have indicated, there is no chance in the world of its working an injury, because it will come gradually and systematically to the Filipino. He will realize in advance that he must prepare for the future. If his present revenues are not sufficient to meet the needs of his government, he must either economize and cut down expenditures to meet them or seek for sources of revenue somewhere else; and we will give him seven years in which to gradually adapt himself to the new standard, and then we will have on the statute books of the Philippine Islands a law that is worthy of the standard of civilization and is not besmirched with the marks of barbarism, as this law will be if we put on these people a tax on their ability to compete with the nations of the world in foreign markets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] be granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BENNET of New York addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HILL. I do not intend to take the time of the committee, except to offer a word of explanation concerning the item of structural steel. It is true that the rate in the old law on unperforated and unassembled structural steel is 60 cents per hundred kilos; under the new law it is 40 cents per hundred kilos. On finished or assembled structural steel the rate is \$1.25 in this bill, as against \$1 in the present law. This will make a slightly greater differential than now exists. The reason for it is this: Gentlemen have an idea that the conditions of the Philippine Islands are like the conditions in the United States, and that a rule that is applicable here is equally applicable there. You may travel for hundreds of miles in the Philippine Islands and will not see a house that has any iron in it; that is, among the mountains and in the agricultural section. Structural steel is not an ordinary article of commerce in the Philippine Islands. Only \$200,000 worth all told was imported last year, and that was chiefly for bridges or public buildings built by the government.

Now they have got one establishment in the Philippine Islands that is engaged in the steel and iron industry and that employs a thousand Filipino people in the manufacture or bringing together of steel and iron of various forms. It is exceedingly desirable that these people should be continued in their employment. The great bulk of their output is bought by the government for use in the construction of bridges, in harbor or dock improvements, and things of that kind. This change was made at the request of and insisted upon by the collector of the Philippine Islands, to give this differential of \$8.50 a ton, in order that these people might be continued in their employment. The rate on the unfinished article is just the same as it is in the Payne bill—\$4, or \$3.92 in the Payne bill. On the completed and finished structural iron it is somewhat larger than in the Payne bill.

Now, as to the general range of duties in this bill, I heard the gentleman from Alabama claim that they averaged 25 per cent. While the gentleman was making that statement, I figured it out. Striking out the spirit schedule—and it always should be eliminated in ascertaining the average rate of a bill—the average rate of this bill is 18 per cent, as against 19 under the old law. In the cotton schedule there is no change. Under the old law it was 26 per cent, and under the new law it is still 26 per cent.

This is purely a revenue measure. So far as the export duties are concerned, it is absolutely necessary to have these duties continued. It would not be safe to make the experiment of

eliminating the duties heretofore received from the American trade and striking off the export duties at the same time. It is in reality a land tax. It is a tax upon the products of the land, payable by the large producers, who are the only ones who are able to pay it. These people are very poor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Connecticut how he reconciles that statement with the statement of General Edwards, of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, that is contained in this report. Now, my friend knows under this bill the insular government will receive \$3,000,000 more from internal-revenue taxes than it is receiving now.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is in the report.

Mr. HILL. He reports it \$920,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. HILL. They only get about \$3,000,000 in all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here is what the report says, published here in the statement made by the insular bureau:

It should be noted that while in the statement of revenues of the Philippines internal-revenue collections accruing to the insular government for last year amounted to \$2,458,915.94, the entire collections made by the bureau of internal revenue for the same period were \$5,542,022.18, the difference being turned over to the provinces and municipalities of the islands under various acts of the Philippine Commission.

Now, if the gentleman recollects, Colonel Colton, when before the committee, stated that they had \$3,000,000 on which they could rely for the conduct of insular affairs, and the surplus they turned over to the provinces.

Mr. HILL. I think if you will read the report clear through, you will find that the increased internal revenue does not amount to anything like \$3,000,000, but that it was added to somewhat by an increased tax on cigarettes, on tobacco, and malt and spirituous liquors.

Mr. PAYNE. May I suggest right there that these municipal governments must still be supported out of this internal revenue?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Although the control is turned over to the general government, still they must appropriate to support these municipal governments. It will be done more economically, and there will be some saving, but not the entire amount.

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Connecticut will allow me, I will call attention to this fact: That when the witnesses from the Philippine Islands, Colonel Colton and the collector of internal revenue, Mr. Ford, were before the committee, they stated that the municipalities and the local governments would use other sources of revenue, and that this \$3,000,000 could be used to supply any deficiency. That was absolutely the testimony before the committee.

Mr. HILL. I think the gentleman is mistaken; and if he will read the report again, he will find that this is simply referred to in this way: The Philippine assembly used half of the internal-revenue receipts, and, if I am not mistaken, paid over arbitrarily to the various towns, whether they needed it or not, the other half. Now, this reverses that rule and provides that the internal revenue collected by the general government shall be paid into the Philippine treasury, and the assembly shall use their discretion, so that, in case there is a deficiency, he simply says that that \$3,000,000 could be made available; but the same necessity for the payment will exist in many cases as exists now, so that it is impossible to assume that that \$3,000,000 is to be used in that way. Now, if you will go on and read further in the report, you will find this—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, the report says—

Mr. HILL (continuing). He will find that certain increased rates of internal-revenue tax are prescribed and intended to be used to make up this deficiency, but there will still be a deficiency of six or seven hundred thousand dollars even then. At the same time, the hope is expressed that they will be able, by increased prosperity and increased business, to make up that deficiency. Now, there is one other thing—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to have my friend take this report that he has there on his desk and turn to page 4, where the insular bureau says:

Summarizing, there will be under this bill the following losses in the customs revenues:

Import duties	\$1,537,824
Export duties	44,468
Duties collected on Philippine products in the United States	269,028

Total estimated loss ----- 1,851,320
Against which there will be in wharfage dues an increase of \$104,572.25, giving under this bill an estimated decrease of customs revenues of \$1,746,747.75.

Now that is all that the same bureau estimates the loss will be, and yet on that same page down here they say this, referring to the increased internal-revenue collection:

This would immediately give an increase of \$3,083,105.24 in the receipts of the Philippine insular government—

Out of which this deficit may be made up.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is still mistaken. If he will read down through page 4, he will find that the increase in revenue is expected to amount to \$375,791 from malt liquors, distilled spirits, and so forth, and about \$800,000 from the internal-revenue tax on cigarettes. Then it says to meet this remaining deficit, as compared with the revenues of the last fiscal year, there will be the increased receipts of \$3,083,105.24 heretofore paid into the municipal and provincial treasuries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My friend does not understand me at all. I never contended that they were going to increase the amount. I said that they were now raising \$3,000,000 more than they needed.

They were giving that to the municipal governments in the provinces. It is exactly the same proposition as under the Dingley bill we raised \$100,000,000 more than we needed and we gave it to the States, as we did in Jackson's time. It is the duty of the provinces and municipalities, and always has been under the Spanish régime, and after the Americans arrived there, to raise their own taxes, but the insular government had these \$3,000,000 surplus, and therefore they divided it out for improvements of the municipalities. Now they have got other uses for it, and they can hold it in the insular treasury, and that is what General Edwards and Colonel Colton testify to before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HILL. Now, in regard to the match question, all I have to say about that is this: I was in the Philippine Islands in 1900 and they had a match factory there, and I presume they have got it still. It is not an industry, it is an isolated case.

They want to keep it there and I guess they have made the duty high enough to keep it there. It is 20 cents a kilo under the present law, and, I think, the same under the new bill. It is nowhere near as high, and they do not pay as much as they did for matches under the Spanish régime, when, as I understand, the manufacture of matches was a monopoly.

The whole bill has been made with reference to two things—one a revenue bill for the Philippine Islands, and the other, I think, influenced a good deal by the hope of bringing trade to the United States, without exploiting the islands, and that is what we ought to do and that is what we have a right to do, without wronging them at the same time. If you can disassociate these two things and give the trade where it belongs—to the United States—we ought to have it. It has come to us in Porto Rico. Under the old Spanish régime Porto Rico had \$22,000,000 and now she has \$56,000,000 of trade with the world. Under that régime we had one-fifth of that trade, and to-day we have five-sixths of it, and it belongs to us. We are responsible for the islands, and if, without wronging them we can get it, we ought to do so.

You can not go to any country in the world to-day; you can not go to any Province, any municipality, or any sphere of influence and find a neutral market—not one. I remember in 1900 I was coloring a map of the world showing the monetary systems of the world at a glance, and was amazed to find that Africa had been all carved up and parceled out. I have been to Hongkong, to Hamburg, and other so-called "free ports," and every one gives a preferential rate, by port charges or in some other way, to its own people. We have got to do the same thing or we shall get left in the race.

I would not exploit them one particle, and the best evidence of that is that I voted for free pig iron in the Philippines, notwithstanding some of my friends favored a duty. At the same time, I say that their trade belongs to us; we have a right to it, and it is our duty to the American people to make this tariff bill without wronging them, being absolutely fair to them, so that that trade will come to us, and I think it will do it under this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no further time desired for general debate, the Clerk will read the bill by paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That the rates of duties to be collected on articles, goods, wares, or merchandise imported into the Philippine Islands shall be as follows: *Provided*, That no article bearing evident signs of being for sanitary construction shall pay a higher rate of duty than 20 per cent ad valorem: *And provided further*, That no article shall pay a higher rate of duty than 100 per cent ad valorem, except and unless the same shall be classified under paragraphs 92, 260, 261, 263, or 264, in which event the rate of duty thereby resulting shall be collected, anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding: *And provided further*, That articles of foreign growth, produce, or manufacture shall be dutiable upon each importation, even though previously exported from the Philippine Islands, except as otherwise specifically provided in this act.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, lines 16, 17, and 18, strike out the words "ninety-two, two hundred and sixty, two hundred and sixty-one, two hundred and sixty-two, two hundred and sixty-three, or two hundred and sixty-four," and insert "ninety, two hundred and thirty-seven, two hundred and fifty-seven, two hundred and fifty-eight, two hundred and fifty-nine, two hundred and sixty, two hundred and sixty-one, or three hundred and one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

GROUP 4.—COPPER AND ALLOYS THEREOF.

46. Copper and alloys thereof, in bars, pipes, and sheets, and alloys of copper (except Muntz metal), in lumps and ingots, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 5, strike out "(except Muntz metal)"; and in line 6, after the word "ingot," insert "any of the foregoing except Muntz metal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

58. Mineral pigments of common, natural occurrence (including ochers, haemites, barytes, and manganese), substances prepared for calcimines and whitewash, any of the foregoing when dry, 10 per cent ad valorem.

NOTE.—Any substance otherwise subject to classification under this paragraph shall, when imported in the form of a liquid or paste, be dutiable under clause (d) of paragraph 61.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 39, line 10, strike out the word "sixty-one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty-nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

77. Opium in any form, and preparations thereof, for medicinal purposes, not otherwise provided for, subject to the provisions of section 6 of this act, 35 per cent ad valorem.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 43, line 1, strike out "six" and insert "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

114. Ribbons or bands for the manufacture of any of the articles enumerated in paragraph 115, 15 per cent ad valorem.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 53, line 20, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "thirteen."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

132. Ribbons or bands for the manufacture of any of the articles enumerated in paragraph 133, 20 per cent ad valorem.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 60, line 5, strike out the words "thirty-three" and insert "thirty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

153. Books and albums of lithographs, engravings, etchings, photographs, maps, or charts, not otherwise provided for, and painted designs, pastels, and ink drawings, made by hand, for use in manufacturing and in the industrial arts and sciences, 30 per cent ad valorem.

NOTE.—This paragraph shall not apply to works of art introduced for use as such, even when imported for sale, which shall be classified under paragraph 326.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 63, line 19, strike out the words "twenty-six" and insert in lieu thereof the words "twenty-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

167. Straw for manufacturing purposes, rushes, vegetable hair, genista, osiers, bamboo, broomcorn, rattan, reeds, piths, not otherwise provided for:

(a) Crude, or not further advanced in manufacture than cut into straight lengths suitable for sticks for umbrellas, parasols, sunshades, whips, fishing rods, or walking canes, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 23, after the word "canes," insert:

"And straw braids suitable for making or ornamenting hats, neither bleached, tied, colored, or stained."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, after line 24, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"NOTE.—The term 'straw' as used in this clause shall be understood to mean that substance in its natural form and structure, and not the separated fiber thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

188. Automatic slot machines, not otherwise provided for, and detached parts thereof (subject to the provisions of section 6 of this act), 35 per cent ad valorem.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 71, line 23, strike out the word "six" and insert the word "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

199. Detached wooden parts for any of the articles classified under paragraph 197 or paragraph 201.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 75, lines 6 and 7, strike out the word "ninety-seven" and insert the word "ninety-four."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

Also the following committee amendment:

Page 75, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "two hundred and one" and insert the words "one hundred and ninety-eight."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That upon proof satisfactory to the collector of customs that adequate facilities are not afforded in the Philippine Islands for such repairs, the same shall be subject to the provisions of paragraph 351 of this act; and

With the following committee amendment:

Page 75, line 24, strike out the word "fifty-one" and insert the word "fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

204. Hams, bacon, other meats, and sausages, dry, cured, or smoked, not preserved in cans, including weight of immediate containers, 100 kilos, \$4.50.

Provided, That sausages classified under this paragraph may be imported in any kind of package exceeding in weight 10 kilos each; and
Provided further, That salt used for the packing of any article classified under this paragraph shall be dutiable under clause (c) of paragraph 74.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 77, line 12, strike out the word "seventy-four" and insert "seventy-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

206. Canned or potted meats, such as beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, ham, and bacon, plainly prepared and simply preserved, not otherwise provided for, common preparations thereof, with or without vegetables or other simple ingredients, such as Irish stew, corned-beef hash, chili con carne, hog and hominy, dry chipped beef, and the like, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, page 77, line 20, I move to strike out the words "such as" and insert "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 20, page 77, strike out the words "such as" and insert the word "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

(c) Fish, shellfish, sea food, and preparations thereof, such as anchovies, merluza, angulas, awabi, sardines not otherwise provided for,

lampreys, whiting, turtle, fish roe, eels in jelly, sharks' fins in any form, shrimp, bloater, and fish pastes and butters, similar products of delicatessen class, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, on page 78, line 23, I move to strike out the words "such as" and insert the word "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 23, strike out the words "such as" and insert the word "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to page 77 and offer the same amendment to line 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

237. Sugar:

(a) Raw, gross weight, 100 kilos, \$3.70.

(b) Refined, including weight of immediate containers, 100 kilos, \$4.20.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 84, line 18, strike out "seventy" and insert "seventy-two;" and in line 21, strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

278. Horn, bone, whalebone, celluloid, and imitations of any of the foregoing, or of any of the substances enumerated in paragraph 281, including weight of immediate containers.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 93, line 2, strike out "eighty-one" and insert "seventy-seven."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

301. Tobacco:

(a) Wrapper tobacco, filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 15 per cent of wrapper tobacco, leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together, any of the foregoing unstemmed, kilo, \$4.80.

(b) The same, stemmed, kilo, \$5.50.

(c) Filler tobacco, not otherwise provided for, unstemmed, kilo, 77 cents.

(d) The same, stemmed, kilo, \$1.02.

(e) Cigars, cigarettes, cheroots, paper cigars and cigarettes, including wrappers, kilo, \$9.90 and 25 per cent ad valorem.

(f) Other tobacco, manufactured or unmanufactured, not otherwise provided for, kilo, \$1.20.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 99, line 4, strike out "eighty" and insert "eight."

Line 5, strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-two."

Line 8, strike out "seventy-seven" and insert "seventy-eight."

Line 10, strike out "two" and insert "eleven."

Line 14, strike out "ninety" and insert "ninety-three."

Line 18, strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

304. Cost of repairs upon articles of easy identification (except those provided for in paragraph 203), exported from the Philippine Islands and reimported therein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That any such article, exclusive of the repairs thereon, shall be free of duty when reimported, upon the compliance with the regulations of the insular collector of customs governing such exportations and reimportations, otherwise the terms of section 12 shall apply.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 100, line 12, strike out the words "and three;" and in line 20 strike out the word "twelve" and insert the word "nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NOTE.—Store, office, and business signs, otherwise those for advertising local business houses, firms, offices, associations, corporations, trades, or professions, shall not be classified under this paragraph.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 103, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "otherwise those" and insert in lieu thereof the word "used."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

328. Public documents issued by foreign governments, correspondence, manuscripts, and typewritten documents, not prohibited by section 6 of this act, and collections of stamps of national issue, used or unused.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 103, line 17, strike out "six" and insert "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

337. Supplies and materials imported by or for the use of the United States Government, or the government of the Philippine Islands, or any of their subordinate branches: *Provided*, That title shall have passed to one of said governments before such supplies are released from customs custody: *And provided further*, That any article (except those enumerated in paragraph 218) which would otherwise be classified under this paragraph shall, if imported for sale to private or corporate persons, be dutiable under the corresponding paragraph of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 106, line 22, strike out "eighteen" and insert "fifteen."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

338. Wearing apparel, articles of personal adornment, toilet articles, books, portable tools and instruments, theatrical costumes, and similar personal effects, accompanying travelers or tourists in their baggage or arriving within a reasonable time, in the discretion of the collector of customs, before or after the owners, in use of and necessary and appropriate for the wear or use of such persons according to their profession or position for the immediate purposes of their journey and their present comfort and convenience: *Provided*, That this exemption shall not be held to apply to merchandise or articles intended for other persons or for barter or sale: *And provided further*, That the collector of customs may, in his discretion, require a bond for the exportation of or the payment of duties upon articles classified under this paragraph within the time and in the manner prescribed by paragraph 340.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 107, line 18, strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

340. Professional instruments and implements, tools of trade, occupation, or employment, wearing apparel, domestic animals, and personal and household effects, including those of the kind and class provided for under paragraphs 339 and 340, belonging to persons coming to settle in the Philippine Islands, in quantities and of the class suitable to the profession, rank, or position of the person importing them, for their own use and not for barter or sale, accompanying such persons or arriving within a reasonable time, in the discretion of the collector of customs, before or after the arrival of their owners, upon the production of evidence satisfactory to the collector of customs that such persons are actually coming to settle in the Philippine Islands, that the articles are brought from their former place of abode, that change of residence is bona fide, and that the privilege of free entry under this paragraph has never been previously granted to them: *Provided*, That neither merchandise of any kind, nor machinery or other articles for use in manufacture, shall be classified under this paragraph: *And provided further*, That officers and employees of the United States Government or of the government of the Philippine Islands, or religious missionaries taking station in the islands shall be considered as "coming to settle" for the purposes of this paragraph.

Also the following committee amendment:

Line 12, page 108, after the word "paragraphs," insert "338 and." Line 13, page 108, strike out "and 340."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

341. Vehicles, animals, birds, insects, and fish, portable theaters, circus and theatrical equipment, including sceneries, properties, and apparel, devices for projecting pictures and parts and appurtenances therefor, panoramas, wax figures, and similar objects for public entertainment, upon identification and the giving of a bond with sureties satisfactory to the collector of customs in an amount equal to double the estimated duties thereon, conditioned for the exportation thereof or payment of the corresponding duties thereon within the time and in the manner prescribed by paragraph 340.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 23, page 109, strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

345. Pumps for the salvage of vessels, upon identification and the giving of a bond with sureties satisfactory to the collector of customs in an amount equal to double the estimated duties thereon, conditioned for the exportation thereof or payment of the corresponding duties thereon within the time and in the manner prescribed by paragraph 340.

Also the following committee amendment:

Page 111, line 1, strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

346. Wearing apparel and household effects, including those articles provided for under paragraphs 339 and 340, belonging to residents of the Philippine Islands returning from abroad, which were exported from the said islands by such returning residents upon their departure therefrom or during their absence abroad, upon the identity of such articles being established to the satisfaction of the collector of customs, under such regulations as the insular collector of customs shall prescribe; articles of the same kind and class purchased in foreign countries by natives of the Philippine Islands during their absence abroad and accompanying them upon their return to said islands, or arriving within a reasonable time, in the discretion of the collector of customs, before or after their return upon proof satisfactory to the collector of customs that the same have been in their use abroad for more than one year.

Also the following committee amendment:

Page 111, line 10, after the word "paragraphs," insert "338 and." And in line 12, page 11, strike out the words "and three hundred and forty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPORT DUTIES.

SEC. 13. That upon the exportation to any foreign country from the Philippine Islands, or the shipment thereof to the United States or any of its possessions, of the following articles, there shall be levied, collected, and paid thereon the following export duties: *Provided, however*, That all articles the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming directly from said islands to the United States or any of its possessions for use and consumption therein, shall be exempt from any export duties imposed in the Philippine Islands:

354. Abaca (hemp), gross weight, 100 kilos, 75 cents.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment that will affect all of section 13. I want to know if it will be in order to offer it at the end of paragraph 361, as it affects the whole section?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to have the bill read to paragraph 361, and then let the gentleman offer his amendment and have it considered as pending, and I shall make a motion to rise.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to offer it at the end of paragraph 361, if it will be in order to the whole section.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask that the following paragraphs, down to and including 361, be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting at the end of section 13, on page 115, line 21, the following:

"*Provided*, That the export duties authorized to be collected under section 13 of this act shall remain in force and be operative for two years, and thereafter the amount of the duties named in said section shall be reduced one-fifth each succeeding year for the period of five years. Seven years after the enactment of this law no export duties or other charges shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the exportation of any articles from the Philippine Islands."

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9135, the Philippine tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order previously adopted, adjourned until Monday next, May 17.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of a drainage survey of certain wet, overflowed, or swampy lands ceded by the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota (H. Doc. No. 27)—to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, transmitting the report of Special Agent Charles M. Pepper on British iron and steel industry (S. Doc. No. 42)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, an estimate of an appropriation for subsistence of the army (H. Doc. No. 28)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 9504) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 9505) to provide for the erection of a monument to mark the location of the De Vries Dutch settlement near Lewes, Del.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9506) for the relief of members of the Fifth and Sixth Regiments of Delaware Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) to provide for the acquisition and improvement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9508) to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9509) to amend sections 4924 and 4927 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9510) to amend an act relating to the sale of gas in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9511) to determine powers of United States judges as to instructions to juries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9512) granting a pension of \$30 per month to United States soldiers, war with Mexico—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9513) to add 31,000 acres of land by purchase or condemnation to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating \$761,000 for that purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9514) granting right of way for road through government reservation north of national cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9515) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status under all pension laws of the United States to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9516) authorizing juries to fix punishment of defendants convicted in United States courts in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9517) to limit the jurisdiction of district and circuit courts of the United States in law and equity to sums exceeding \$5,000—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9518) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9519) to provide for the erection of a public building at Athens, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9520) to provide for the erection of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9521) to provide for the erection of a public building at Winchester, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9522) to appropriate \$50,000 to complete custom-house and post-office building at Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9523) to provide for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 9524) to add 31,000 acres of land, by purchase or condemnation, to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating \$761,000 for that purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9525) to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, to facilitate the entry of vessels, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9526) defining the offense of train wrecking, or attempts so to do, and providing punishment therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9527) to establish a fish-culture station in New Mexico—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9528) for the purchase of a site and the erection of an electrical power plant for irrigation purposes in Portales, N. Mex., or vicinity—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 9529) to purchase a dredge for use in the harbor and channel at Gulfport, Miss., and for the maintenance thereof—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9530) to extend the application of the several acts to regulate interstate commerce to certain public-service corporations and persons engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9531) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9532) to subject intoxicating liquors transported from one State into another for delivery or sale to the laws and regulations of such latter State, and to prohibit the issuance of federal licenses to sell same in such localities where such is prohibited by the laws or regulations of such State or locality—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9533) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9534) to appropriate \$500,000 for the prosecution and extension of the work of the Bureau of Soil Surveys in the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9535) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the Sixth Congressional District of the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9536) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point on the Gulf of Mexico in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9537) to acquire certain ground in the District of Columbia for a government reservation—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9538) to establish an experimental wood-distillation laboratory—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9539) for the relief of acting (volunteer) officers of the United States Navy in the civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9540) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 9541) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9542) to provide for the erection of a public building at Brownwood, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9543) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to loan naval equipment to certain military schools," approved March 3, 1901—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9544) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Rosebud Indian Reservation in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots, tents, and appliances for the use of the forty-third national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Salt Lake City, Utah—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 16) accepting invitation to Congress to attend the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, and authorizing the appointment of committee to attend—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Resolution (H. Res. 70) calling for report on Mississippi River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9545) granting a pension to John D. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9546) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Clarke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9547) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Gilbreath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9548) granting an increase of pension to George W. Medick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCLAY: A bill (H. R. 9549) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Evers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9550) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9551) granting an increase of pension to John R. Lemon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9552) granting an increase of pension to Newton Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9553) granting an increase of pension to George R. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 9554) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert B. Ketterman and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Robert Shull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 9556) granting an increase of pension to James F. Thurman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 9557) for the relief of the estate of J. M. Fortinberry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9558) for the relief of Emily Donnelly or her legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9559) for the relief of Martha B. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9560) for the relief of Louis T. Barnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9561) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Bolino, late of Pass Christian, Harrison County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9562) for the relief of the estate of Nevin Phares—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9563) for the relief of the heirs of Wright Mann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9564) for the relief of the heirs of John Fornea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9565) for the relief of heirs of John W. Ford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9566) for the relief of June Poitevent, administrator of the estate of William J. Poitevent, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9567) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John C. McDaniel, administrator of John W. McDaniel, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9568) to correct the military record of Elias H. Lewin, alias William Harrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9569) to correct the military record of J. E. Mariner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9570) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain lands to the city of Biloxi, Miss., for street purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9571) to grant American registry to the Norwegian bark *Mizapora*, to be used as a barge or lighter—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9572) for the relief of the heirs at law of Samuel Hollingsworth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9573) granting a pension to Delia Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 9574) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay arrearage to Thomas F. Haywood, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 9575) granting a pension to John White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 9576) granting a pension to Laura C. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9577) granting an increase of pension to William E. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9578) for the relief of the personal representatives of John Wharton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9579) for the relief of Martin Maddox—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9580) for the relief of W. J. Tapp & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 9581) granting an increase of pension to James Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWLES: A bill (H. R. 9582) to correct the military record of Jacob M. Pruitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9583) to correct the military record of Smith F. Carroll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 9584) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gimber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9586) granting a pension to Daniel W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Junius Thomas Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9588) granting an increase of pension to John Klay—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 9589) granting an increase of pension to Joshua T. Parrish—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9590) for the relief of James Wiley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9591) granting a pension to William German—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9592) granting an increase of pension to Christian W. Abbaduska—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN: A bill (H. R. 9593) for the relief of Thomas D. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9594) for the relief of Alexander McKenna—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMER: A bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to Albert Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 9596) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9597) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9598) granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9599) granting an increase of pension to William Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9600) granting an increase of pension to Bradford G. Ostrander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9601) granting an increase of pension to William B. Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9602) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9603) granting an increase of pension to David W. Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9604) granting a pension to James Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 9605) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 9606) for the relief of the estate of Robert R. Berry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9607) for the relief of Ezer W. Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9608) granting an increase of pension to O. P. Shanafelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9609) to grant to John Rivett privilege to make commutation of his homestead entry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9610) granting a pension to Annie M. Tinsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9611) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 9612) for the relief of Charles S. Mills—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9613) for the relief of the estate of Samuel C. Hull, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9614) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 9615) to amend the military record of Stephen A. Merrill, alias George Holmes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 9616) granting an increase of pension to William B. Houck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 9617) granting a pension to Angeline Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9618) for the relief of Charles Hassett, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9619) for the relief of R. H. Sively—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9620) for the relief of James Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9621) for the relief of W. P. Qualls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9622) for the relief of Jasper N. T. Hamilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9623) for the relief of James Nipper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) for the relief of Hansell Hatfield, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9625) for the relief of Isom M. Qualls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9626) for the relief of William M. White, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9627) for the relief of Lovenia Hodges (née Grant)—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9628) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Eblen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9629) for the relief of George W. Penney and the heirs of Thomas Penney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9630) for the relief of G. R. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9631) for the relief of Sarah E. Abernathy, widow of J. J. Abernathy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9632) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Y. B. Williams, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9633) for the relief of D. J. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9634) for the relief of Lydia A. Newby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9635) for the relief of James B. Hoge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9636) for the relief of Sarah Crabtree and the estate of Eli Crabtree, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9637) for the relief of James B. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9638) for the relief of John H. Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9639) for the relief of John Coppinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9640) for the relief of Jesse Walling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9641) for the relief of Mrs. Laura Barrett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9642) for the relief of Jesse A. Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9643) for the relief of James B. Hoge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9644) for the relief of George W. Penney and the heirs of Thomas Penney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9645) for the relief of P. H. Schoolfield, of Pikeville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9646) for the relief of Ruth Ann True—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) for the relief of Abner Souder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9648) for the relief of Joseph G. Richardson, administrator, etc.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9649) for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. Daniel C. Trewhitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9650) for the relief of John M. Heard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9651) for the relief of Edward D. Pickett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9652) for the relief of Nathaniel R. and William C. Carson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9653) for the relief of Ruth Holder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9654) for the relief of William Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9655) for the relief of James B. Brown, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9656) for the relief of James N. Davis, administrator of William Davis, deceased, of Mount Airy, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9657) for the relief of trustees of the Boiling Fork Baptist Church, of Cowan, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9658) for the relief of William H. Bean—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9659) granting a pension to James M. Ikard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9660) granting a pension to Mary J. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9661) granting a pension to Peter Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9662) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hollaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to Tilman Giles, alias Robert Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) granting a pension to Margaret J. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9665) granting a pension to Sarah E. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9666) granting a pension to Robert Axmacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9667) granting a pension to Sarah J. Watson, or Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9668) granting a pension to Harriet E. Aiken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9669) granting a pension to Seborn J. Mullins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9670) granting a pension to J. L. McDowell, alias Leander Dickey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9671) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Cole—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9672) granting an increase of pension to Benedict Ellis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9673) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9674) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9675) granting an increase of pension to Matison M. Kilgore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9676) granting an increase of pension to Milton J. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9677) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9678) granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Blackman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9679) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Stansberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9682) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9683) granting an increase of pension to James L. Dungan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9684) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Dauchy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9686) granting an increase of pension to James A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9687) granting an increase of pension to John Skelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9688) granting an increase of pension to James T. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9689) granting an increase of pension to Gideon T. Denton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9690) granting an increase of pension to Charles May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) granting an increase of pension to Rachel S. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9692) granting an increase of pension to William F. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9693) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Stoops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9694) granting an increase of pension to Foster Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9695) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Teague—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9696) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9697) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Pryor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9698) granting an increase of pension to Scott Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9699) granting an increase of pension to Burnett M. Trew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9700) granting an increase of pension to William R. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) granting an honorable discharge to Marion Hixson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9702) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Gabriel P. Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9703) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Thomas J. Schrimphser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9704) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Samuel J. Rayl—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9705) to remove charge of desertion against Henry H. Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9706) for the relief of the estate of William Roberts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9707) for the relief of the estate of N. T. Power, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9708) for the relief of the estate of Hamp-ton Hudgens, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9709) for the relief of the estates of Asa Faulkner, deceased; Lewis L. Faulkner, deceased; and S. B. Spurlock, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9710) for the relief of the estate of William Duncan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9711) for the relief of the estate of Patrick Henry Watkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9712) for the relief of the estate of Aaron Murdock, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9713) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9714) for the relief of the estate of Martin Hartman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9715) for the relief of the estate of P. W. Key—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9716) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9717) for the relief of the estate of John A. Pickett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9718) for the relief of the estate of Casandra Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9719) for the relief of the estate of Mary A. Henderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9720) for the relief of the estate of Robert Langford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9721) for the relief of the estate of Austin Hackworth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9722) for the relief of the estate of Preston Gann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9723) for the relief of the estate of H. B. Henegar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9724) for the relief of the estate of John A. Heard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9725) for the relief of the estate of George M. Carroll, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9726) for the relief of the estate of Washington Turner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9727) for the relief of the estate of Washington Pryor, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9728) for the relief of the estate of Louisa M. Kirklin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9729) for the relief of the estate of Daniel B. Harold, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9730) for the relief of the estate of Bur-rell L. Bennett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9731) for the relief of the estate of W. G. Hoge, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9732) for the relief of the estate of George P. Carmichael, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9733) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon Graves, deceased, of McMinn County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9734) for the relief of the heirs of James C. Connor, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9735) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Wood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9736) for the relief of the heirs at law of Robert Worthington—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9737) for the relief of the heirs of Erban Powell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9738) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Sivley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9739) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James E. Meacham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9740) for the relief of the trustees of Hennegans Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Dunlap, Sequatchie County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9741) for the relief of Rachael C. Stief-vater, of Chattanooga, Tenn., to reimburse for the use and destruction of property by United States Army in 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9742) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Laura E. Raulston, administratrix of James W. Raulston, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9743) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of John Chitwood, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9744) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of John Henson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9745) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of W. W. Sharp, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9746) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Josiah J. Bryan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Cleveland, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9748) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9749) to correct the military records of the United States so as to muster in and out of service in United States Army James Kirkland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9750) to complete the military record of Daniel Cook, deceased, and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) to amend and correct war records so as to muster in and muster out of service in United States Army Joshua E. Carlton, of Charleston, Tenn., and to grant to him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9752) granting a pension to Michael Gibney, alias John Gibney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: A bill (H. R. 9753) granting an increase of pension to Alton E. Cobb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 9754) granting a pension to Mary Bay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9755) granting a pension to Kenneth Stewart Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 9756) granting an increase of pension to John F. Staley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9757) granting a pension to Salem Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 9758) granting a pension to Bernice L. Frink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TENER: A bill (H. R. 9759) granting a pension to Sarah Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9760) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9761) granting an increase of pension to Jesse K. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9762) granting an increase of pension to Nathan R. Mathis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 9763) granting a pension to Thomas C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 9764) for the relief of T. Alonzo Walker and Augusta C. Todd—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9765) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kinner—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 the SPEAKER: Memorial of Jose Templo, of Lipa Batangas, Philippine Islands, in relation to certain claims for losses sustained by destruction of property—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Leroy Baker Post, No. 120, Also, petition of citizens of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, favoring Ashbrook bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, favoring creation of tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of New Philadelphia and Baltic, Ohio, opposing duty on raw and refined sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Petition of citizens of the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia, opposing parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Ione Council, No. 765, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring exclusion of all Asiatics save merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of many citizens of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania and of East Lynn Grange, favoring a duty of 2½ cents per pound on casein or lactarene unground and 2½ cents on casein or lactarene ground—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARLIN: Petition of Francis P. B. Sands, favoring bill in aid of volunteer officers in civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of city government of Neenah, Wis., against reduction of duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (by request): Petition of Anti-Imperialistic League, against all reference to the Philippine Islands in the present tariff bill—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of National Association of Master Bakers, transmitted and indorsed by Colvin's Baking Company, of Jonesville, Wis., against gambling in food supplies—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWLES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob M. Pruett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIG: Petition of S. Z. Champion, favoring reduction of duty on raw sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Farmers' Union No. 221, of Shelby County, Ala., against gambling in cotton futures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petitions of common councils of Stevens Point and Neenah, Wis., favoring present duty on print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of Keasbey & Mattison, favoring an amendment to tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Buffalo Envelope Company and Michael M. Brook, opposing an amendment of Post-Office Department to act of Congress approved June 26, 1906—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of L. J. Callahan, in favor of duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of B. F. Lincoln, of Ottawa, Ill., favoring duty on plate glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Carter Macey & Co., John Emmans & Co., F. D. Malt & Co., and L. J. Callanan, all of New York City, favoring a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the cities of De Kalb, Hincley, Kirkland, Lee, Malta, Sandwich, Shabbona, Somo-nauk, Sycamore, and Waterman, in Dekalb County, Ill.; and of Durand, Pecatonica, and Rockton, in Winnebago County, Ill.; and of Belvidere and Capron, in Boone County, Ill.; and of Oswego and Yorkville, in Kendall County, Ill., in opposition to the enactment of the proposed parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Edmund J. James, president of the University of Illinois, opposing an appropriation for George Washington University, in District of Columbia—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. C. H. Eddey and others, of Winnebago County, Ill., in favor of proposed postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of state legislature of Illinois, favoring an investigation of old-age insurance and old-age pension—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cincinnati Manufacturers' Boot and Shoe Association, favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Durbrow & Hearne Manufacturing Company, of New York City, concerning duty on embroidery machines and needles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of wholesale dry goods merchants of New York City, concerning proposed cotton schedule—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. D. Peacock, Chicago, Ill., against a higher duty on diamonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Industrial Union of America, against free cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles A. Stewart, of Fox, Ill., against a change in tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pyro One Light Electrical Sign Company, of Chicago, Ill., against a tax on display signs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George A. Townsend, jr., Aurora, Ill., concerning tariff on bristles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Keasbey & Mattison Company, of Ambler, Pa., favoring duty on magnesite, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Employing Lithographers, favoring tariff on lithographic products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Farm Life, of Chicago, Ill., against increase of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Republican Club of New York, against a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Raymer Sarver, of Pecatonica, Ill., for retention of the tariff on wool—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Immigration League of New York City, against increase of \$12 head tax on immigrants—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., for commercial reciprocity treaty with Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Casein Manufacturing Company, of New York City, favoring placing casein on dutiable list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas Cooney, secretary of Amalgamated Wood Workers' Council of Chicago, against reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American manufacturers of Fourdrinier wire cloth, concerning duty on wire cloth—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hutchens & Potter, of Johnstown, N. Y., concerning proposed duty on men's and women's gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of American Newspaper Publishers' Association of New York, against increase of tariff on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Hall & Rucker, opposing increase of duty on soda ash—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Publishers' Association of Lancaster County, Pa., opposing supplying general public with en-

velopes and other printed matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of cigar manufacturers of Lancaster County, Pa., opposing free importation of tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Tobacco Growers' Association, opposing free importation of tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Jones-Robinson Company (Limited), of Montpelier, and Conant & Dunning and 31 others, of Burley, all in the State of Idaho, against duties to be assessed under H. R. 1438 on articles of wearing apparel, particularly leather gloves and cotton hosiery—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEALD: Petition of Board of Trade of Wilmington, Del., for a change of date of Inauguration Day—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of committee of trade and commerce and the legislative committee of the Wilmington (Del.) Board of Trade, against maximum and minimum provisions of tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Amelia J. Perkins, against the Payne bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers Local Union No. 407, against duty-free cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of citizens of East Norwalk, Conn., favoring dredging north end of Norwalk channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of New Hartford, Conn., favoring reduction on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of New Haven, Conn., favoring reduction of duty on wheat—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of California Jewelry Company and 14 other jewelry importers of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a 10 per cent ad valorem duty on cut diamonds and other precious stones and 20 per cent on imitation stones—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hinz & Land (Incorporated) and 8 other residents of San Francisco, Cal., favoring maintaining Dingley rates on gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of business men of Buffalo and Howard Lake, Minn., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of Tri-City Typographical Union, No. 107, of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, favoring reduction of duty on wood pulp and news print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Society Italiana di M. S., S. Pietro Celestino Cittadino d' Tsernia, Society Italiana di M. S. Del Santissimo Salvatore, Society S. Marzidu Maria S. S. Dellrose, all of Philadelphia, favoring adoption of October 12 as a legal holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to S. J. Mullins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to W. R. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Scott Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Burrell M. Trew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to William M. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of James M. Davis, administrator of William Davis, of Mountairy, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany H. R. 9247, granting a pension to Catherine E. Tainter, widow of John B. Tainter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Surbrug & Co., opposing additional duty on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles Adler & Sons, of New York City, opposing an increase of duty on diamonds and precious stones—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George O. Street & Sons, of New York City, opposing tax on uncut diamonds and other precious stones—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Republican Club of New York City, opposing a tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Lauterbach, of New York, opposing an increase of head tax—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. C. Wirtz, of New York City, opposing an increase of duty on matings—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of Denver Chamber of Commerce, opposing reduction of duty on lead and lead products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: Petition of American Society of Equity, of Cedar Dale, Ky., opposing tax on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Monday Club, of Needham, Mass., against increase of duty on gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Retail Lumber Dealers' Insurance Association, of Wisconsin, favoring removal of duty on lumber and creation of a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of common council of the city of Portage, Wis., favoring an appropriation to repair the levee on the bank of the Wisconsin River at Portage—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of Cedarburg, Wis., favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, favoring a treaty of reciprocity with Dominion of Canada relative to the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 14, 1909.

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

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THE BROWNSVILLE AFFRAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, inclosing an application dated the 10th instant from Lieut. Gen. S. B. M. Young, United States Army, president of the Brownsville court of inquiry, requesting the reference to that court of certain exhibits filed in the office of the Secretary of the United States Senate in connection with the Brownsville affray (S. Doc. No. 44), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication of the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Gettysburg, Pa. v. United States (S. Doc. No. 43), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution petitioning Congress for the establishment of a permanent, nonpartisan, expert tariff commission.

Whereas for many years the tariff has been the subject of political contention which has led to periodical upheaval and uncertainty in the commercial activities of the Nation; that it has not always been adjusted in manner to best promote and protect the industrial interests as a whole, and has too often been dealt with as a purely political question, without giving full consideration to the grave economic principles involved in the same.

Whereas a study of the methods under which other great commercial nations of the world are handling these subjects leads to the conclusion that the United States must call into its service in the near future the aid of a trained body of men to enable us to meet intelligently the various perplexing questions arising out of the general adoption of maximum and minimum tariffs by several of our strongest competitors for the world's trade: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to speedily enact such legislation as will create a permanent, nonpartisan tariff commission, with semijudicial functions, such as the power to summon witnesses, which shall make an unbiased investigation of the operation of our customs duties, regulation, and classification; hear complaints; study domestic and foreign market conditions; and report to the Executive and to Congress from time to time such modifications as in their judgment may safely and properly be made in the interests of the general welfare.

JOHN STRANGE,
President of the Senate.

F. E. ANDREWS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

L. H. BANCROFT,
Speaker of the Assembly.

C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.