TEXAS.

Frank L. Irwin to be postmaster at Terrell, Tex., in place of Francis M. Barton, deceased.

Luther B. Johnson to be postmaster at Celina, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William J. Crutcher to be postmaster at Holden, W. Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1908.

Lancey W. Dragoo to be postmaster at Smithfield, W. Va., in place of Ezra A. Edgell. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1908.

Mary Hateley to be postmaster at Follansbee, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1909.

CONSULS.

Henry P. Coffin to be consul at Mazatlan, Mexico.
Augustus E. Ingram to be consul at Bradford, England.
Marion Letcher to be consul at Acapulco, Mexico.
George B. McGoogan to be consul at Progreso, Mexico.
George H. Scidmore to be consul at Kobé, Japan.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SUPREME COURT NEW MEXICO.

Alford W. Cooley to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Charles B. Elliott to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Philippine Islands.

CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF NAVIGATION IN THE NAVY.

Rear-Admiral William P. Potter to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation in the navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Herbert Winslow to be a rear-admiral in the navy.

Commander William Braunersreuther to be a captain in the navy.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

George W. McFall, at Sheffield, Ala.

ARKANSAS.

Richard P. Chitwood, at Magazine, Ark.

OHIO.

Howard B. Jameson, at Dalton, Ohio.
Solomon Rousculp, at Thornville, Ohio.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 3, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10.30 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.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIM.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the findings of the court relating to the vessel schooner *Friendship*, Patrick Drummond, master (S. Doc. No. 73), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of Local Union No. 11, of Buffalo; of Local Union No. 17, of Syracuse; of Local Union No. 189, of Ticonderoga; and of Local Union No. 130, of Watertown, all of the International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen; of the Board of Education of Fort Edward; of members of the Brooklyn Citizen composing-room chapel of Brooklyn; of the stereotypers, pressmen, and mailers of the Star Gazette, of Elmira; of the compositors, stereotypers, and pressmen of the Troy Record, of Troy; of Local Union No. 20, of Piercefield; of Local Union No. 5, of Ticonderoga; and of Local Union No. 1, of Fort Edward, of the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mills Workers, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against a reduction of the duty on print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of members of the Martin B. Brown Company book chapel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying that print paper and wood pulp be put on the free list, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bath, Pembroke, Wellsville, Pavilion, Newstead, Hammondsport, Penn Yan, Phelps, Akron, Stanley, Branchport, Oakfield, Romulus, Victory, Mount Morris, Syracuse, Holley, Troy, Hornell, and Canandaigua, all in the State of New York, praying for the restoration of the duty on foreign oil productions, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Oakland, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to secure a valuation of all railroad property in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of General George Washington Council, No. 49, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fresno, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the immigration into the United States of all Asiatics, except merchants, students, and travelers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

BILL INTRODUCED.

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIXON:

A bill (S. 2523) for the establishment of a new land district in Chouteau County, State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

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 Secretary will state the pending amendment.

Mr. NELSON. 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.	Foster	Penrose
Bacon	Clay	Frye	Perkins
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Piles
Bradley	Culberson	Hale	Scott
Brandegee	Cullom	Hughes	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Cummins	Kean	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	La Follette	Stone
Bulkeley	Daniel	Lodge	Sutherland
Burkett	Depew	McCumber	Taylor
Burnham	Dick	Martin	Tillman
Burrows	Dillingham	Nelson	Warner
Burton	Dixon	Nixon	
Carter	Dolliver	Oliver	
Clark, Wyo.	Flint	Page	

Mr. PILES. My colleague [Mr. JONES] is necessarily absent for a short time this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate and of the chairman of the Committee on Finance to the fact that we were informed the other day that the committee had in contemplation a further report on the paragraph relating to wood pulp and print paper. I wondered if we could have some idea this morning of the character and tenor of that contemplated amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the committee have not arrived at any definite conclusion with reference to that matter. My impression is that the rate which the committee will report will be above the House rate and below the existing law; but that is as definite a statement as I am able to make at this moment.

Mr. BROWN. I simply desired to know for the reason that I myself have in contemplation an amendment to the paragraph. I give notice now to the committee that I intend to propose an amendment putting wood pulp and print paper on the free list, and I expect to submit some reasons in support of that amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee will report an amendment as soon as possible to that paragraph. I realize that it is a matter of great public interest. The Senator can rest assured that the report of the committee will be within the limits which I have suggested.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to interpose at this point to say a few words about a matter which I deem important. I tried to get the floor yesterday for this purpose, but could not, and so I avail myself of this opportunity.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Last Saturday during a half acrimonious debate in the Senate, growing out of an effort made by several Senators to have a certain report relating to German wages furnished by the German Government to our State Department sent to the Senate and printed for the use of the Senate, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], among other things, said:

It is the first time in the history of the United States, I assume, when a foreign government has undertaken to send through diplomatic channels to the United States anonymous testimony of manufacturers to answer statements made before a committee of Congress.

A little later on the same day, during the course of the debate, the Senator further said:

If I were not afraid of saying something which might be considered harsh, I would say that the attempt on the part of the representatives of any government or the manufacturers of any country to influence the legislation of this Congress in this way is, to say the least, impertinent.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Rhode Island made these somewhat petulant and extraordinary declarations every one here took notice, and I think everyone regarded his utterances as impolitic, if not impolite. The Senator from Rhode Island is known everywhere——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is impossible for me to hear the Senator from Missouri. I hear my name mentioned occasionally, but I can not hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. STONE. I wish the Senator to hear what I am about to say, for this I know is true.

Mr. ALDRICH. I assume the statement the Senator is making is true.

Mr. STONE. There were statements made by the Senator that were incorrect. The Senator from Rhode Island is everywhere known as one of the great leaders, if not, indeed, the leader in chief, of the majority party as represented in the Senate. These remarkable utterances, therefore, naturally attracted attention, both here and abroad, and I am not surprised that the German Government and people have taken notice of them and have felt offended because of them. I desire to read the following cablegram printed widely throughout the country on yesterday:

BERLIN, *June 1.*

The charge made at Washington by various American Senators that the German Government was endeavoring to influence tariff legislation in the United States by supplying official information regarding wages, which, upon examination, proved them to be much higher than the wages attributed to German manufacturers in the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee, has caused a disagreeable impression in governmental offices here. This is especially the case at the ministry of the interior and the foreign office, where the information in question was prepared, in reply to a request sent in by the State Department.

The German Government has been subjected during the past two months to attacks by German trade journals for having supplied America with German trade secrets. This knowledge of German wages, it is alleged, made it possible to adjust the new tariff to a level where German goods could not be exported to the United States. An abstract of the foreign office's communication, through Ambassador Hill, to the State Department was cabled from here March 29 and was reproduced in the German newspapers. It brought out savage attacks on the Government for yielding to "the impudent demands of the Yankees."

The State Department, in formulating its request, sent through Ambassador Hill, is understood to have emphasized the point that Germany's advantage lay in supplying trustworthy information with regard to wages so that the United States could frame its tariff schedules equitably. Otherwise, it was argued, Germany could not complain if erroneous information was used as a basis. This request was received December 10, and was made the subject of a communication to the Federated States of Germany, each of which ultimately obtained the information desired from the official chambers of commerce. The mass of reports was first collated in the ministry of the interior and then in the trade division of the foreign office. It was transmitted about March 27, and arrived at Washington about April 8, being sent in duplicate, both through Ambassador Hill and Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador at Washington.

Some surprise is expressed here that for two months the material apparently did not reach the American Congress, or if it did reach either House, it must have been pigeonholed.

German officials have been enduring attacks at home, but they are amazed at the accusation from America that they acted strangely in complying with the request of the American Government. The matter is likely to come up in the Reichstag.

Thus it will be seen that this indictment by the Senator from Rhode Island directed against the German Government has caused a disagreeable impression in governmental offices in Berlin.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator desires to be absolutely accurate, as I am sure he does, and if he rereads my statement, he will see that I made no charges against the German Government. I was talking about German manufacturers who were furnishing information here and whose names were kept from us, with no means of verifying the information received and information furnished us, with the express understanding that it was not to be used in the enforcement of our customs laws. The Senator may himself consider of value information furnished by manufacturers whose names are withheld, and furnished with a distinct understanding that the information was not to be used in the enforcement of our laws. The Senator can put whatever value he pleases upon that information.

Mr. STONE. The Senator will pardon me——

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no question about the German Government involved here. The German Government forwarded this information, but forwarded it under two express conditions. One was that the names should not be disclosed. The other was that we could not use the cost of any production to raise the invoice values of merchandise imported into the United States contrary to our laws.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss, nor do I intend to discuss, the value of this report. I shall certainly do what the Senator graciously says I may do—attach such importance as I please to the report, if I ever have a chance to see it. My purpose in rising at this time was to give the Senator from Rhode Island an excuse and opportunity to make an explanation, which I think is due from him.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stand upon the statement which I made before, and if the Senator sees fit to make any kind of——

Mr. STONE. I will read what the Senator said. He suggested that I should read it. I have read it already, but I will read it again. The Senator said:

If I were not afraid of saying something which might be considered harsh, *I would say that the attempt on the part of the representatives of any government* or the manufacturers in any country to influence the legislation of this Congress in this way is, to say the least, impertinent.

That is what he said.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stand by that.

Mr. STONE. The Senator stands by it, and yet here is, in effect, a charge that what was done by the German Government was done to influence legislation here, and he characterized it as impertinent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I repeat——

Mr. STONE. I say——

Mr. ALDRICH. I repeat that any attempt on the part of any government at any time to influence the legislation of Congress upon tariff matters is impertinent. I say that of any such attempt. I do not say that the German Government has made any such attempt in this case; but I say, if it has, it would be impertinent, or if any government makes that attempt it would be impertinent.

I will say further that an attempt to influence the legislation of Congress by furnishing anonymous statements which can not be used by the Government itself for the enforcement of its own laws is a thing which should be deprecated by every Senator of the United States, whatever may be his views upon this question.

Mr. STONE. I agree, everyone must agree, that if a foreign government should of its own motion seek to interpose in our domestic affairs with a view to influencing legislation here or to influencing the administraton of our laws, it would be worse than mere impertinence. But when the Senator made that remark we had before the Senate at that time and were discussing this very report.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, we were not only discussing this report, but a large number of other communications which had been received by the Finance Committee from the representatives of various governments. We were not discussing the German situation alone by any means.

Mr. STONE. I beg to differ——

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, the Senator can differ as much as——

Mr. STONE. I do differ on the facts.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am speaking of the facts.

Mr. STONE. No; the Senator may think he is, but he is not.

Mr. ALDRICH. I had in mind no particular thing in connection with this matter by the German Government. I did not say that the German Government was trying to influence tariff legislation; but I said (and when the statements are printed the Senator will see for himself) these manufacturers whose names are withheld were trying to answer testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee of the House for the purpose of influencing the action of Congress.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I repeat, the one thing before the Senate at that time in question was the report transmitted to our State Department through diplomatic channels by the German Government. We were not discussing anything else. The Senator from Rhode Island, somewhere in the course of his remarks, and, as I recall it, after he had made the statement I have quoted, did say that other reports of like kind from other governments had been sent to the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. But that was a mere statement in the course of debate.

Mr. ALDRICH. There can be no question about my position in this matter. I said then, and now repeat, that any attempt

on the part of any government, whoever it may be, to influence the tariff legislation of the United States is impertinent, and I repeat it with all the emphasis at my command.

Mr. STONE. Of course, the remark of the Senator from Rhode Island, to which I am adverting as an "impertinence," was made, necessarily, with reference to the matter then before the Senate, and to nothing else.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I had no such purpose. I had absolutely nothing of the kind in my mind. I was discussing the abstract proposition as to the interference of any government by any methods as to our tariff legislation.

I did and I will now so characterize the attempt of the German manufacturers, whose names are withheld, to furnish information to answer statements made before the Ways and Means Committee for the purpose of influencing tariff legislation given under such circumstances, when there is no way of ascertaining the correctness of the information they furnished and given with the express provision that it should not be used to punish those same importers for undervaluation at our ports.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no wish to press the Senator unduly; and if he intends what he has said to be in explanation and in effect a withdrawal of the charge of impertinence against the German Government, and if he means to assure the Senate that he did not intend by what he said to offend the German Government or its representatives, I am willing to leave it there and drop the matter.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there was nothing in the language used or in anything connected with the statement that would lead any reasonable man to suppose that I intended an affront to the German Government. That is ridiculous and absurd; and I think that that idea could find lodgment in no man's mind, unless the Senator from Missouri has that impression.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I did have that impression, and I have it yet.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask whether the document which is causing this discussion has been printed? It was ordered to be printed, I think, on Monday last. It surely does not take all this time to translate it, unless it is very voluminous.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was sent by the Committee on Finance to the State Department with the request that it should be translated.

Mr. STONE. It has not yet been translated here, but I do not want to start that discussion. It has not been translated.

Mr. ALDRICH. But that is not the fault of the Finance Committee.

Mr. STONE. That is not the question in hand, and, if the Senator from South Carolina will pardon me, I had rather not be diverted by a discussion on that subject.

Repeating, I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I not only had the impression he deprecates, but it seems that the same impression prevailed in official circles in Germany. The dispatch I have read informs us that this disagreeable impression is especially manifest at the ministry of the interior and the foreign office, one of which prepared the information and the other of which transmitted it, through the American ambassador, to Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to state that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] made a speech, in which he said that this information was sent here voluntarily. I asked him where he got such information, and he said he was told so.

Mr. STONE. I remember that, and I expected to refer to it later.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stated in my remarks that the information was sent at the request of the American ambassador at Berlin to the Finance Committee, transmitting certain statements in German for the information of that committee. Those statements reached the Finance Committee about the middle of April. I sent at once to the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics for a man to come up and see what was the nature of these statements.

Mr. STONE. The Senator has stated that before.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let me go on a little further. A part of these documents reached the committee about the middle of April and another part about the 10th of May, just about twenty days ago. In the meantime the Senator from Missouri, who seems in some way, in this matter, to be the accredited representative of the German Government—I do not know what else he is—made certain statements as to what those——

Mr. STONE. That statement, I will say, is an impertinence.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, let me say why I think so.

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Missouri——

Mr. STONE. It is worse than an impertinence.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Missouri, in the course of the discussion, made certain statements, that these documents contained information of this nature. He read here a statement from the Assistant Secretary of State, or the Acting Secretary of State, that the statement presented by him was a correct transcript of the document which had been furnished the Finance Committee.

Mr. STONE. That part of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. That part of it. How the Secretary of State and the Senator from Missouri knew what was in that statement I can not even guess——

Mr. STONE. I will inform the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. For the only copy which was received by the State Department was sent to the Finance Committee, and was in their possession. How could the Secretary of State know that it was a correct transcript, or how could the Senator from Missouri know what was in that document? The Senator appears this morning and reads, not from any official statement of the German Government, but from a newspaper report, that Germany is aggrieved, and he calls upon me—I do not know in whose behalf he makes the demand—to retract the statement which I made about the impertinence of any government coming here and trying to influence tariff legislation. Now, the Senator from Missouri can explain to himself, or to anybody else, if he wants to, why he takes such great interest in this matter, and why he does not let the German Government, if they are aggrieved, notify our Government through the usual diplomatic channels.

Mr. STONE. So, Mr. President, the Senator says that it appears to him that I am in some way representing the German Government.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, Mr. President, I should like to know——

Mr. STONE. The Senator must permit me to proceed.

Mr. ALDRICH. All right.

Mr. STONE. The Senator made a statement he had no right to make. I am an American Senator, representing American interests, and I resent a statement of the kind he has made. To characterize it mildly, it is a gross impertinence.

The Senator says he does not know how I obtained the information. He ought to know, for only the other day he asked me here on the floor where I got information of this German report, and I told him how I got it, and when and from whom. That is in the RECORD of that day. Therefore there is absolutely no excuse for his statement respecting that matter. He says I call upon him to retract. I do not; but if I did, it would be because I do not think, under the circumstances of this case, the Senator should have offered an unprovoked affront to a great and friendly power.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. STONE. Well, I can not refuse to yield, but I would rather proceed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly have no desire to interrupt the Senator, except with his consent.

Mr. STONE. I will yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri, in all good faith, suppose this question was reversed; suppose that certain manufacturers or producers of the United States, interested, as they all are, very greatly in the German tariff, for the German tariff is the one tariff of all others that affects our great exportations of meat products and all of our agricultural products; suppose the people engaged in the raising of cattle and in the production of agricultural products should undertake to send statements, not verified by their names, to the German Reichstag when that body had under consideration a German tariff, with an express agreement that it should not be used by the German Government and that the names should not be disclosed, what do you think the Kaiser would say of that kind of interference on the part of the American manufacturers?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that is a different question. However, I will say that if the German foreign office had sent a request to our State Department for information as to our industries, and our State Department had sent out to the best sources of information available, and which it deemed the most reliable and trustworthy, and thus obtained statistics and then collated them, and afterwards transmitted them to the German Government with a request that the names of informants should not be used, I do not think that any member of the German parliament or any minister of the German Government would

have denounced the action as an impertinence on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, as to the statement now made by the Senator from Missouri there is no question; and I certainly would not have undertaken to criticise the statements which were sent to us if they had simply furnished facts without reference to legislation which was going on in the United States; but these gentlemen were not satisfied with furnishing facts, they undertook to answer statements and to deny statements made by American producers with a view of influencing our legislation. That is what I am objecting to, and that is where the impertinence in this case comes in. I have as great admiration for the German people and for their great Emperor as any man can possibly have. Nobody on the face of the earth, no government on the face of the earth has ever——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I want to be courteous, but I can not——

Mr. ALDRICH. All right; go ahead.

Mr. STONE. I can not yield the floor entirely.

Mr. ALDRICH. All right.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Rhode Island stated here last Saturday—I am not sure but that he has repeated it this morning—that he did not know what was in that German report, as it had not been translated.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I stated on several occasions that an abstract of the nature of these various statements was made by the experts of the Department of Commerce and Labor for the committee. That is all of the knowledge I have about it.

Mr. STONE. Yes; but the Senator also first made the other statement.

Mr. President, this is a regrettable circumstance. It is to be regretted that any Senator, and especially one holding a position of such prominence as the Senator from Rhode Island, and a Senator so widely known and of such large influence, should have so far forgotten himself and so far forgotten the proprieties, however great the immediate exigency, as to offend a friendly government in so gross a manner and with so little provocation. Indeed, this offense of his is without provocation. The German Government was not guilty of any "impertinence" or impropriety. The German Government is represented by gentlemen of great ability, learning, and experience, and who understand the proprieties of international intercourse as well as we or as well as any people in the world. They would have been among the last to officiously obtrude themselves upon matters relating purely to our domestic concern and which addressed themselves solely to our judgment and our national policy. And they did nothing of that kind. So far from that, it has now become well demonstrated that our own Government, acting through the State Department, several months ago instructed our ambassador at the German court to request the German Government for authentic information as to the amount of wages paid in different industries in the German Empire. Since this charge was made here by the Senator from Rhode Island, the German ambassador at Washington, Count von Bernstorff, in defense of his Government, has given out the following statement:

> As I understand it, the American ambassador in Berlin last December requested my government to have the German Chamber of Commerce provide certain information concerning German wages for the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. Accordingly this information was provided and sent to the State Department. This is, so far as I know, the only connection Germany had with the matter.

And so it seems, Mr. President, that our own officials, desiring to obtain information upon this important subject for the use of the House and Senate committees, and, I assume, also for the use of the Congress itself, requested the German Government to furnish the very information in question. We were about to engage upon the important business of making a new tariff law, and I presume that this information was asked for to be used for what it might be worth when the committees of Congress and the Congress itself should engage in the preparation and enactment of this legislation. The German Government did not thrust itself upon us; all they did was to courteously and obligingly comply with our request. The data, whatever it is, was prepared under the eye of the German interior department, was then delivered to the German foreign office, and thereafter turned over to our ambassador by the German foreign minister. The ambassador in turn transmitted it to our State Department at Washington, and the Secretary of State later on put it into the hands of the Finance Committee. That is all there is to it, so far as the German Government is concerned. With these facts before us, it is amazing that a great Senator should stand on the floor of this Chamber and use the language he did, substantially charging the German Government with an act of impertinence.

The Senator from Rhode Island said that this is the first time in the history of the country that a foreign government had attempted to furnish such information for the use of the American Congress. In that statement the Senator was as far from the fact as in the other statement he was, as I think, far from propriety. Why, Mr. President, on the same day, and later on in the same debate, the Senator said:

> The report which is now under discussion—call it a report or whatever you may—

It was the very report in question—

> the statement was sent to the Committee on Finance, as were two or three hundred, at least, in my judgment, similar statements from foreign governments or representatives of foreign governments, bearing upon the tariff.

Two or three hundred similar statements from other governments bearing on the tariff! And so it seems, Mr. President, that what the German Government did was not exceptional, although the Senator said that it was the first time that such a thing had been attempted within his knowledge. On the contrary, according to the Senator's own subsequent avowal, numerous reports of like character from other governments were furnished the Finance Committee. They have not been furnished the Senate, and the Senator objects to having them printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, no.

Mr. STONE. He did, distinctly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the RECORD shows—I have the RECORD before me——

Mr. STONE. I am not talking about the German report, but the other reports.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was listening carefully, and I thought the Senator was talking about the German report as well as the other reports.

Mr. STONE. But I said—and the Senator from Rhode Island nodded his assent—that he would object to the printing of these two or three hundred reports furnished by other governments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There has been no request for them.

Mr. STONE. Yes; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] did make a request of that kind. Whether these other reports were furnished as this German report was furnished—that is, at the request of our Government—I do not know, but I suspect that they were. I have been reliably informed that last summer the Ways and Means Committee, or at least members of that committee, requested the State Department to communicate, through diplomatic circles, with foreign governments with a view to obtaining certain information, and, among other things, information about wages, and that these requests were made with a view to this then contemplated legislation.

Moreover, Mr. President, this course has been pursued in former times. The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], in the course of this same debate, last Saturday called attention to the fact that reports of like kind were laid before the Ways and Means Committee in 1897, when the Dingley bill was under consideration. Why the Finance Committee and others who knew of these reports, and at whose instance, I am told, they were primarily obtained, have sought to smother and suppress them I do not know. Perhaps, if the information had been what they desired, we would have had the reports published and paraded upon the desks of every Senator and Member of the House, and had them heralded abroad through the columns of our virtuous and impartial press. However, Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss that feature of the subject. My chief purpose in speaking is that attention might be called to the matter here, so that the Senator from Rhode Island might set right, not himself alone, but the Senate of the United States, before the country and the world.

He complained a moment ago that if the German Government felt offended, I and others might remain silent and let the German Government itself seek redress through diplomatic circles. But the German Government can not, nor can anybody in this country, call the Senate of the United States or any Senator to answer for what may be said or done in this Chamber. That position is untenable.

Mr. President, I am through, but I want the German Government and the German people to understand, as I hope they will, that in what the Senator from Rhode Island said, and in what the senior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] said, when, still following the Senator from Rhode Island, he spoke after the same fashion, they stand alone in the Senate of the United States, and that in these unfortunate utterances they do not have the sympathy or support of their colleagues.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there is no mystery about this matter at all. The right of the United States to ask foreign governments or foreign manufacturers to furnish them with facts as to the cost of production or the rate of wages is not in question. Nobody has made any suggestion as to that matter. Our Government certainly had a right to ask, and it was entirely proper that they should ask, the German Government to furnish them statistics in regard to the cost of production and the wages of labor. It was entirely proper that the Government of Germany should send that information here. I am not calling that in question at all. It has been done, and it ought to be done always. It is entirely proper to get this statistical information.

I want to call attention to the particular case in point. This request of the German Government was made last November. The information furnished was sent to the Finance Committee about the middle of April, after the bill had passed the House and after the Committee on Finance had reported their recommendations to the Senate. What I find fault with is that suddenly, upon the floor of the Senate, in the discussion of one of the items of this bill, a Senator rises in his place and undertakes to furnish a part of this information to affect the action of the Senate upon that particular item. If the expert who gave me an abstract of the contents of these statements is correct—and of course I shall wait to get the translation of the entire document—but if the expert who furnished me the abstract of what these papers contained is correct, they were statements which undertook to answer arguments on the part of American producers and American manufacturers in favor of higher or lower rates in the tariff schedules—statements to influence the action of Congress upon those matters entirely outside of the question of the cost of production or the rate of wages. That is what I call impertinence. I am not charging impertinence upon the German Government, but I am only saying that an attempt on the part of anonymous manufacturers to influence the action of Congress is impertinent, and I care not whether they live in Germany or France or anywhere else. We are here engaged, I suppose, in legislating for the people of the United States. Germany is our principal industrial competitor.

When the Senator from Missouri interrupted me, I was expressing my admiration for that great statesman who presides over the destinies of the German Empire. If there is one thing for which he is entitled to the praise of his own countrymen and the admiration of the world, it is that, under all circumstances, he has supported and encouraged by every means in his power the industries of the great German Empire. He has been the one conspicuous ruler who has, under every circumstance and under all conditions, made the interests of the German people in every field supreme. I honor him, and I admire him, for those qualities; and I, myself, realize that he would be the last man in the world to suggest that German interests should control the action of the Congress of the United States. I am confident, if he could have known the use which was being made of the statistics to influence the legislation of a friendly power, that he would have been the first man to have repudiated any such application of the statements which were sent to the United States.

No. It will not do to say that I made any attack of any kind upon the German nation or upon its representatives. They have followed the policy of protection in recent years to an extent that no other nation in the world has, not only by their legislation, but by regulations, by rebates in freight, and in a thousand different ways of which we have never thought. They have built up the industries of Germany to an extent which is greater than that of any other nation except the United States. They are entering the markets of the world in competition with Great Britain, and with France, and ourselves. They are entering those markets encouraged and protected by the full force of the German Government on all occasions, and the representatives of that government would be the last people in the world to expect their interests to be paraded in the Senate of the United States as reasons why we should not follow the policy which the interests of this people and of their interests dictate. They have a right to be friendly with us. But they are rivals. They are our greatest rivals in the industrial and commercial world, and while they are protectionists, while they are carefully guarding the interests of their people, they would never consent, in my judgment, to have the interests of their manufacturers sent here to help a party here or a policy here which would be destructive of the interests of the United States.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is something mysterious to me—it may not be so to others—in this matter. Why can not we get at the exhibits and judge for ourselves what all this racket is about? The Senator tells us that he has an abstract from which he has drawn certain deductions, and he gives us those deductions here. The Senate ordered the printing of this document, and the abstract, too—I mean the translation and the abstract, too—several days ago, and the abstract immediately, and it has not come.

Mr. ALDRICH. That order was not entered. The papers themselves arrived while the discussion was going on, and the Senate ordered their publication. They were sent to the State Department for translation, and they have not yet been received from the State Department.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is there some hocus-pocus about this delay? Is it honest and clean?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is absolutely honest and clean.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know it is, so far as the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned.

Mr. ALDRICH. And so far as the committee is concerned. It is a very large and voluminous document, and very few men——

Mr. TILLMAN. Would ever undertake to read it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have never said that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I undertake to say it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Except a very few Senators here. But it requires some man who understands technical matters. I do not know in whose hands the State Department put the translation.

Mr. TILLMAN. But when the Senate orders a document printed——

Mr. ALDRICH. It has to be translated. The committee had to order somebody to do it, and it was left to the State Department. The committee did so on the theory that if it was sent to the State Department, there would be no criticism. If we had selected some one else and there had been any difference of opinion, the committee might have been criticised for employing a man to translate it. It seemed to me better to send it to the State Department for translation.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all right, provided we get it and get it promptly. There is this phase of the situation which presents itself to me: There seems to be something in the figures presented by the German Government that the Senator from Rhode Island does not like.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no knowledge whatever of the contents of this paper, except the short abstract furnished the committee by an expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor as to what the contents were. I have no knowledge of any other kind as to what its contents are. The Senator must remember—I think I have stated it once or twice upon this floor—that there is more literature of various kinds coming to the Finance Committee in one day than it is possible for me to read, if I had nothing else to do, in a month.

Mr. TILLMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have to be here. My duties are on this floor. This bill has been reported. It has been reported with the action of the committee upon it. I can not undertake to read all the material sent to us every day.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is well understood.

Mr. ALDRICH. The paper has gone to the State Department for translation. We will ask the State Department to hurry up the translation.

Mr. TILLMAN. And bring in the abstract, too.

Mr. ALDRICH. The abstract was not furnished by the State Department.

Mr. TILLMAN. We want to see why the Senator has been so angry about it——

Mr. ALDRICH. I have not been angry.

Mr. TILLMAN (continuing). Bordering upon the line of discourtesy and lack of respect to the German Government.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator from South Carolina had known me long enough to know——

Mr. TILLMAN. But the Senator from Rhode Island is set in his purpose——

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not set in any purpose.

Mr. TILLMAN (continuing). To pass his bill in a certain way, and he has certain figures presented by his lieutenants which, I think, are contradicted by the facts. I can not conceive of American labor getting four times as much as German labor.

Mr. ALDRICH. There have been statistics by the hundreds and thousands of pages——

Mr. TILLMAN. I have gotten so I do not believe what they say. My belief in the statement of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], that there is an awful lot of lying going on, is growing stronger every day.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator is in haste——

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want any special favors. I want the Senate to know whatever I get, and I want the abstract

furnished the Senate to be printed at once, so that we may have it by morning.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to the abstract being printed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I think the RECORD will show it has been ordered printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator asks unanimous consent that the abstract be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 74). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] concluded his speech by alluding to me and the remarks which I made when this question was last under discussion. I knew nothing about this matter except what was revealed in the debate on that occasion; but from what has transpired in the discussion this morning, I am convinced that I was exactly right in the views which I expressed at that time.

The whole matter seems to be about this: That sometime last year before the meeting of the last Congress a request was made—precisely what, we do not know—by the American minister at Berlin for certain facts. It seems, if what has been stated on the floor is correct, that a document arrived here and was presented to the Finance Committee after the tariff bill had been considered in the House and had passed the House.

Mr. ALDRICH. And had been reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DEPEW. And had been reported from the Committee on Finance; and that the report, instead of being the statistics called for before the December meeting of the last Congress, was not presented to the State Department until nearly six months after. It was then in the form of a reply by the German manufacturers to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in regard to the schedules in the bill reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate. In other words, instead of a statement of the facts, it was a denial of certain testimony, and controverting other testimony given under oath by American manufacturers. The German manufacturers were not under oath, and their names withheld, so the communication was anonymous.

Another singular thing occurred to me in regard to this matter, and that was that this was alleged to be an official communication from the German Government, coming through the ordinary diplomatic channels, that it was in German, that it was confidential in regard to the authors of the statistics which it contained, and that it was transmitted to the Finance Committee and returned immediately to the State Department because it was not translated and because it was anonymous. Nevertheless, it is claimed by the Senator from Missouri that it was a state document, furnished by the German Government. But before that document was transmitted to the Finance Committee, the Senator from Missouri was enabled, in a speech upon a particular schedule in this tariff bill, to quote from that confidential governmental communication in the hands of our State Department and to say that he knew that that was an exact copy.

It seems to me strange that a solemn diplomatic communication of this kind, not yet having been communicated to the Congress of the United States, could still be in the hands of somebody who could give it to a Senator, to be used in a debate, for the purpose of affecting legislation upon articles in which Germany competes in this country with our manufacturers. I do not care where the Senator received that information. He received it undoubtedly from an importer. It must have been from an importer, for no one else would have been interested in furnishing it except a German importer; and then the question arises, How did that German importer obtain from the files of the State Department this confidential communication unless copies were furnished by German manufacturers to their correspondents in New York?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. It is strange that the Senator from New York, still walking in the footsteps of the Senator from Rhode Island, should express wonderment as to where I obtained that information, when, at least two or three times, I have told all about it in the presence of the Senate and of the Senator from New York. I will state it again. The table I put in the RECORD was handed to me by Mr. Montague Lessler, an ex-Member of Congress, who told me that it was taken from a report in the State Department furnished by the German Government. Where he got it or how he obtained it I do not know, and I did not inquire; but I sent an inquiry to the State Department as to its accuracy, and the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Wilson, wrote me a letter, which I put in the RECORD, that he had compared the table with the original text and that it was accurate.

Mr. KEAN. I should like to ask the Senator whether Mr. Lessler is the same person who, as a Member of Congress and a member of the Naval Committee of the House, was under investigation?

Mr. STONE. I can not answer that. But I will ask the Senator from New Jersey why he propounds that inquiry? In what way does the matter he inquires about affect the question?

Mr. KEAN. I want to locate him.

Mr. STONE. Suppose you do locate him. I have no objection; but how does that affect the question at issue? That does not concern the substance or the truth of the report sent to our Government.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. Montague Lessler is a friend of mine, formerly a Member of Congress from one of the districts in my State, a very honorable gentleman, a lawyer. He is practicing at the New York bar, and he was here honorably and legitimately as attorney for the importers of the article under discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What is the article?

Mr. DEPEW. Razors.

Another thing touched me, and rather on my funny bone, in this matter. There is no nation in the world for which I have a larger measure of respect and admiration than for the German nation. I have been visiting Germany for thirty years, and I have seen the marvelous growth of that Empire since the present Emperor ascended the throne.

I remember a remark made at one time when I was in Germany, not to me, but to a diplomatic representative, by Bismarck, that the great difficulty with Germany was the German cradle; that Germany did not have the industries to take care of coming generations, and therefore it was necessary for her to expand anywhere in the world, on any continent, where territory could be had for colonization. But the present Emperor of Germany energized German production; then he energized the German navy; then he energized the German merchant marine, until to-day Germany is succeeding Great Britain as the workshop of the world, and is becoming the workshop of the world because she is the most highly protected nation in the world, higher than ourselves.

She has surpassed us in this, that she has a technical school in which the German youth are educated to an efficiency and a proficiency in all manufactures and in all chemical products, technical schools that do not find their parallel in any other country, and which are turning out for German industries an army of experts whose skill is threatening the control of the markets of the world.

Then she has another thing which we have not. Germany has a merchant marine, built up by subsidies, which reaches every port in the world, and whose object and purpose are to carry German products into all countries where we want to compete; and by having their own marine, they are able to control the markets, especially the South American and African and eastern markets, against the United States.

I said this touched my funny bone, and it was in this way: In the first place, that the German Government should be the author of an anonymous communication, and in the next place—although I do not believe it was an official communication—I could not conceive how the foreign office of Germany, engrossed, as it is, on matters of the most momentous international concern, could come down to razors. I tried to think of a meeting of the German cabinet, with that most accomplished diplomat, Prince von Bulow, presiding, and there should come up the question of the triple alliance, there should come up the question of friction with Russia, there should come up the question of the Balkan crisis, there should come up the critical relations existing between Germany and Great Britain, with the fever heat that Great Britain is in with regard to German aggression, and that then Prince von Bulow should say to his associates, "Now, let us lay aside all these international questions, which involve our existence, and come down to razors." Razors! "Let us enter into negotiations with the United States in reference to razors. Let us present the statements of the razor manufacturers of Germany to the State Department, so as to teach the American Congress what should be a proper duty to be imposed by that Congress upon the importation of German razors."

Mr. President, the thing is absurd. It is ridiculous. It is lowering the dignity of a great diplomat, of the diplomatic relations which exist and are of the most friendly character between Germany and the United States. I do not believe for a moment that the Emperor of Germany or his foreign minister would consider, even in answer to a request, a communication

which could be tortured into an effort to influence the American Congress upon a bill whose sole object is to raise revenue for the support of our Government, to take care of our army and our navy, and our coast defenses, and to protect the American manufacturer and the American laborer.

That thing is too absurd to believe for a moment, and I can only suppose that the German Government, in transmitting this anonymous communication presented to it by the German manufacturers, did it with no intention of having it used as an official document for the purpose of influencing the action of the American Congress. I acquit the German Government of any such intention.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

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

Mr. DEPEW. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator used a term there that attracted my attention. He spoke of an anonymous communication. Is it not a fact that all the names of the persons who have made these communications are in the State Department and that the object in not giving them out was lest they might be used at home for their own injury?

Mr. DEPEW. I understand names are attached to these communications which have been presented by the manufacturers of these various articles, with the request that those names be kept in confidence and that the communications only, unsigned and anonymous, should be transmitted, if transmitted at all, to the American Congress.

Mr. DANIEL. Of course we do not know accurately all the details of these matters, but according to my information any Senator can go there and verify the names; but for reasons, not as between the Governments at all, the names have been withheld, lest they go to Germany and be made a matter of injury to the persons signing the statements. I do not see that it is any offense to this Government, as they can be assured of the names if they wish to. But it is not to be made, as I understand, a matter of publicity, which might injure the deponents. I should like to know if the Senator has any accurate information on that subject?

Mr. DEPEW. I only know what has been revealed in debate, and the only thing I know, and all the Senate has as to the kind of information which is contained in this remarkable document, is the statement of the chairman of the Finance Committee that the names of the authors are erased, and the communication from the State Department is that they are to be confidential; and the other statement, made here by the Senator from Missouri when we had under discussion the schedule on razors, if I remember rightly that statement, which gave the elements of cost with regard to wages and prices paid to the wage-earner, but it omitted the great essential of the hours; and if this communication, in computing the cost as to daily or weekly wages, has left out the hours of work, it is utterly worthless for comparison with American cost.

Mr. President, I did not intend to consume so much of the time of the Senate. I believe that in a day or two we will have all these communications. I only rose to say that from the information which was before the Senate when I made a few remarks the other day, and the information which has come from the speech of the Senator from Missouri in his colloquy with the chairman of the Finance Committee this morning, I stand by what I said.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a word. This communication from the German Government was not a confidential communication. If it had been, the State Department would not have sent it to the Finance Committee. If it had been, the President of the United States would not have transmitted it to the Senate. It was a communication sent by the German Government to our Government, at the request of the State Department, putting but one condition upon its use, and that was that the names of the manufacturers or persons who had primarily supplied the information, at the request of German officials, should not be made public.

I agree with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] that the document itself is entitled to be treated with respect, and I agree with him that if any Senator desires for any reason to see the names of the men who furnished the information to the German Government, I have no doubt that he can see them in confidence by applying to the State Department.

Mr. President, the pertinent and important fact must not be overlooked that the matter contained in this communication was obtained by the German Government from the sources they considered most reliable, and when that Government transmitted it here they put upon it the stamp of their approval. It will not do to say the German manufacturers have sent this information to the United States for use in Congress. These Senators can not escape the charge first made, that the German Government itself was impertinent by now insisting that the manufacturers were impertinent. Neither were impertinent.

Would it be an impertinence for the German manufacturers themselves to have responded to a request from our State Department for this kind of information if it had been directed to them in the first instance? Certainly no one would so contend. How, then, can it any more be said that they are impertinent or that they have done anything to be criticised when they furnished this information at the request of their own Government, made at our instance and for our purposes?

Our Government asked the German Government for this information. The German Government obtained it from original and authentic and reliable sources, examined it, collated it, tabulated it, and transmitted it in response to the request of our State Department, and when they transmitted it they gave to it the sanction of their authority. Does anyone suppose the German Government would deliberately send here to our State Department information that it knew to be untrue, deceptive, and unreliable? No more could we charge that against the Government of Germany than they could make a like charge against the United States if the situation was reversed.

Mr. President, I have not succeeded in having the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New York make a direct retraction of the things they said, but they have plastered them over now and so sugar-coated them with fulsome and pleasing eulogies of the German Government, the German people, and everything else remotely German that I think the bitter taste will be mitigated if it does not wholly disappear. Therefore I have not labored in vain.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, just one moment. I think whatever may be the failure on the part of the chairman of the Finance Committee and myself to say the proper thing to placate the sensibilities of the German Government, all that deficiency has been amply met by the eloquent, able, incisive defense of the German Government which has been made by the Senator from Missouri. I do not think that any Senator, nor even Prince von Bulow himself, could have better presented the case of Germany than it has been presented by my friend from Missouri. Every element of rhetoric, every resource of oratory, every creation of logic, and every appeal to German patriotism has had its full satisfaction in the admirable presentation of the German case by my friend from Missouri.

Just one word further. The detail with which the Germans are entering our country to compete in everything is evidenced in the lithographs which we have all received. Every town in the State of Missouri that has a schoolhouse that will hold 500 people, or a railway station which is the admiration of the neighborhood, has a post card revealing the beauties of this piece of architecture, and on it is "made in Germany." The same is true of every other State in the Union. The sightseer in Washington is met at every turn by a boy asking the tourist to buy a post card as a souvenir of the capital of his country, and when he admires the picture of the White House or the Capitol or the Library he discovers that it was made in Germany.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, before the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds, I should like to occupy a very few minutes, because I have some of these abstracts here that I should like to read to the Senate, even before their publication. I should like to get the opinion of some Senators as to whether they think they are impertinent or not:

Bronze powder. Nuremberg Chamber of Commerce.

Request of American manufacturers to raise duty from 12 to 15 cents per pound unreasonable. Admits that American wages are twice what they are in Germany. States that difference of cost of wages is not sufficient to warrant increase of rate asked for by American manufacturers before Committee on Ways and Means. States that only about 100 persons employed in this industry in the United States.

Does the Senator from Missouri think that that is impertinent or not?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that is not the question we have before the Senate. The Senator desires to open up a discussion on the merits of that report. We had better wait until we get it, if we ever do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The report will be here.

Mr. STONE. Then we will discuss it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri and to the Senate that whatever indignation I may have expressed in reference to this matter, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] suggested, had proper foundation so far as these abstracts are concerned which have been submitted to the committee, and that was the only point I made in reference to the matter.

Clay pipes.
Chamber of Commerce of Limburg a. d. Lahn. Statement of Mr. Kurth—

Picking out an individual—

regarding labor cost in this industry is incorrect.

That is a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The American labor cost on this same grade is 36 cents.

Going on and explaining the reasons why the Congress of the United States should not fix a certain rate of duty upon clay pipes.

Coal-tar dyes.
Mr. Schoellkopf's tables do not prove anything, as they are too general, applying to a total production of 3,000,000 pounds merely, without specifying the single products or dyestuffs. As a matter of fact, the latter are composed of the most various raw materials and are produced according to the most various methods. Prices accordingly vary considerably. A comparison would be valuable only in case it were based upon cost figures for the United States and Germany of certain well-defined dyestuffs.

Then there is the following:

WOOLEN INDUSTRY.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, *Augsburg.*

The statement of William Whitman that the wages of operatives in the carded-wool industry are three times as high in America as in Germany is incorrect.

Mr. President, my point is that the statement made to me of the contents of these papers showed me distinctly that the statements were being made to answer the statements of American manufacturers before the Ways and Means Committee of the House for the express purpose of affecting and influencing the legislation of Congress.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a moment. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he regards the samples he has selected and read from the abstract he had made of this report as impertinent?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do certainly understand that when a German manufacturer, whose name he is not willing to state, comes here and says that a rate which is fixed or proposed to be fixed in the tariff bill is too high, it is the height of impertinence.

Mr. STONE. Is it impertinent for the manufacturer in Germany to say that a statement made by any person, anywhere, as to the cost of wages in his industry is incorrect, if it is incorrect?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not say that under ordinary circumstances, if one should come here in person, if any Senator——

Mr. STONE. Are these extraordinary circumstances? This is a response to a request we made of these people.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Missouri should come here, as he has on several occasions, and make a statement that American manufacturers were wrong in their conclusions, and upon his own responsibility as a Senator say that the rates ought not to be put up, I have no objection to that at all. But the Senator from Missouri comes here with a statement, which he says is a statement of the German Government, and produces figures which he says are official figures in answer to the request of the representative of the United States in Germany. Does the Senator suppose that Mr. Hill, the ambassador of the United States in Germany, asked the opinion of the Nuremberg Chamber of Commerce whether the particular rates which we propose to fix in our tariff bill were too high? Is that the purpose of this information? I think not.

Mr. STONE. I should think it was a part of the purpose——

Mr. ALDRICH. It seems to have been.

Mr. STONE. That it was a part of the purpose of the State Department. I should think that when members of the Ways and Means Committee went to the State Department and requested this information, through diplomatic channels, it would not be improper for the German manufacturer to call attention to the fact, if it be a fact, that certain statements made were not founded in truth.

Mr. ALDRICH. But that is not the statement I am finding fault with. The statement is that the rates which are proposed in the bill are too high and are unreasonable.

Now, Mr. President, that may affect the Senator from Missouri. His action and his vote in this Chamber may be governed by that kind of testimony, if he pleases. The American people will not regard that evidence as good evidence.

Mr. STONE. The Senator has not any right to say that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Well, I think so.

Mr. STONE. The Senator ought not to say that. I will say to him that I will be influenced by whatever testimony I think worthy of credence.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I said.

Mr. STONE. And I do not care whether it is testimony coming from the lips of one man or another; nor whether he lives in America, in Germany, or in any other country. All I want to know is the actual truth.

Mr. ALDRICH. It makes a great difference to me, and I hope to a large majority of the Senate, whether we are to take the opinion and follow the advice of men who are interested in destroying American industries or those who are engaged in building them up in this country.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to say just a word to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. He seems to be very indignant, apparently, and in some phases I expect his indignation is earnest, over the idea that the labor cost of articles in Germany and America should be brought out here in this way.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not finding fault with any facts. I am now finding fault that German manufacturers should come here in the form of a statement and undertake to influence our legislation by saying that the rates are too high or are unreasonable.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator has said that often enough for all of us to get that idea. I certainly have it thoroughly fixed in my mind.

I want to call his attention to this point: The Republican platform adopted last summer expressly required or demanded or pledged that the difference in the labor cost here and in Europe should be the basis of our action in revising the tariff up or down. Was not that so?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is true; but whose testimony does the Senator——

Mr. TILLMAN. Wait a minute. Just how are we to get the best testimony available, to get the honest truth rather than garbled and distorted statements? Our ambassador in Germany requested the German Government to give information on certain points respecting labor cost. It is sent to us, and the German authorities ask our State Department to consider the names as confidential, but did not say that they did not indorse the facts.

Now, the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New York get up a great hullabaloo about the anonymous character of this information. It comes to us in the only way we could get it, unless our own consuls would be able to go to those manufacturers and get them to tell their trade secrets, which would be absurd; they could not do it. We have these things in the only way possible to get them, and because they do not conform to the ideas of the American manufacturers whom the Senator from Rhode Island represents and whose interests he is watching so closely he gets unhappy over it, and he immediately attacks the source of information as unworthy of credit, as being impertinent, and all that sort of thing.

I think the Senator is entirely unjust to the German Government or to anybody who has had anything to do with transmitting this information. We were supposed to be making an honest revision of the tariff, trying to conform to the pledges of the party which was intrusted by the people with that work, in the hands of its friends, and information comes which contradicts the statements of the manufacturers here. They say that our labor cost is so much and the German labor cost is so much. Here comes authoritative information from the German Government saying that is not true, and the Senator says the German manufacturers are intimidating Congress, arguing and pleading that the tariff is too high, and all that sort of thing. It is an injustice, to my mind.

Of course the Senator from Rhode Island has his own opinion, and he is very hard-headed and awfully set in his purpose to carry this bill through along special lines; and I predict he is going to do it, from what I have seen so far. I confess I do not see why he should grow so indignant and attempt to muddy the water and confuse the minds of the American people with the idea that the German Government is impudent to come into the American Congress and try to argue Republicans here out of their fixed purpose to arrange this tariff according to their scheme.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think I must ask the attention of the Senate. I must claim my right to the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In view of the discussion which has taken place this morning, I ask unanimous consent for the pres-

ent consideration and passage of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin sends to the desk a resolution, which will be read.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And for which I ask immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 55), as follows:

Senate resolution 55.

Resolved, That the President of the United States, if not incompatible, in his judgment, with the public interest, be, and he hereby is, requested to transmit to the Senate copies of all the correspondence which passed between the Department of State and the German Government, or between any representative of the United States and officials of the German Government, having relation to the report upon German manufactures furnished by the German Government to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to say just a word on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the resolution is not now before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If I can have the consent of the Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. I do not think there ought to be any objection to it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to say a word on the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After we obtain unanimous consent for its present consideration and passage.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It contains the usual provision.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the Senator will have to add just one thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would be glad to have the Senator state it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Perhaps not, but it occurred to me so; and that is, any communications between our Government here and our ambassador—so as to include that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will ask to have the resolution read again; and if anything was omitted that ought to be included, it can be inserted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely wish to say that it appears from the discussion here that our State Department requested our ambassador in Germany to procure this information, and then he requested the German Government, and the German Government gathered it by asking their boards of trade. Then it was placed in the hands of our ambassador in Berlin and transmitted to our State Department, which transmitted it to the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is one suggested amendment I should like to make in the resolution, and that is whether the Government of the United States asked the opinion of the German Government or any of its people as to the character of the tariff which we should enact.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will be disclosed from the correspondence.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know whether that additional source of information is desired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The resolution asks for all correspondence. There will be nothing omitted.

Mr. ALDRICH. It had better go over until to-morrow, and we will look it over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon objection, the resolution will go over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not very much surprised that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] objects to the present consideration of the resolution. It has been very difficult to get before the Senate for its consideration anything pertaining to this report from the German Government.

The Senator from Rhode Island left the floor for a few moments this morning and returned to lay before the Senate certain excerpts from an abstract which has been, or is being, prepared from this document, in order to test the sense of the Senate as to whether that document conformed to the proprieties or not. I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that it is not for him to sample that document and then call for a judgment of the Senate upon it. The Senate is as capable of judging that document as he is.

That we claim the right to do. That document was never intended, sir, for private consideration by any Senators or by any committee of the Senate. The suggestions of the Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] that this report was nothing more than a business prospectus issued by German manufacturers, he now says were predicated entirely upon what has come up in debate; and that statement is another exemplification of the spirit which has been manifested with respect to this document.

Mr. President, at one time in the consideration of this subject a good many months ago there was manifested a sincere determination to ascertain the facts upon which to predicate the making of a tariff. That is indicated by the fact that before any testimony was given to the Ways and Means Committee this Government asked the German Government for information with respect to the wages paid in various occupations in Germany.

Senators may seek now to dull the edge of criticisms of that great Government made a few days ago upon this floor, but the fact remains, and the RECORD will show, that Germany did not seek to meddle in our legislative affairs, but that somebody in authority in our Government deemed it worth while to ask the German Government to present here the facts with respect to wages in that country. That request was communicated officially to the German Government. A response was made.

Now, because of some of the matters stated in that report, the Senator from Rhode Island attempts to excite the feeling and resentment of Senators upon this floor. Although the report was called for before any testimony was taken by the Ways and Means Committee of the House the response was not made until after some testimony had been given with respect to the wages paid in Germany. Because some of the statements in this report take up the declarations made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of American manufacturers with respect to the wages paid in Germany, and claim that misstatements are contained in that testimony, the Senator from Rhode Island now endeavors to excite the resentment of Senators against the German Government on the ground that that Government is seeking to interfere with legislation here.

Because the Senator from Missouri and other Senators have risen here and asked to have that testimony presented to the Senate the Senator from Rhode Island made the unwarranted accusation—not by inference, but by direct statement—that the Senator from Missouri and others who are calling for this testimony are here representing the German Government and German manufacturers. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whom he represents on this floor?

I will show, Mr. President, by the spokesman of the Committee on Finance—not in the course of debate, where one may possibly in the heat of discussion make an overstatement, but off of the cold, printed page—a declaration by the Finance Committee as to whom they considered and whom they represented in fixing the rates in this bill. I have taken some part, Mr. President, in calling for this testimony with respect to the wages paid in the various occupations in Germany.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has called for a statement of the wages paid in Germany.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have called for the report of the German Government made to this Government in response to its request.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is a very fair request, and no one, it seems to me, can find any fault with it. I should not attempt to find any fault with the Senator from Wisconsin in that matter, but if the report which these boards of trade have forwarded deals not only with the wages paid in Germany and in America, and then argues that such wages are only two and one-half times as high in certain lines of employment in Germany as here, and undertakes to offset that disparity by showing the cost of living here and in Germany, that is going a little further, I think, than even the Senator from Wisconsin would care to have any foreign board of trade go, because the difference between the cost of living here and in Germany is of no concern to German boards of trade. That relates solely to the welfare and disposition of our own people, and is not the subject of proper argument by boards of trade in Germany.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just one moment, if the Senator from Indiana please. I will yield to him in a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have nothing to do with that, because I do not know anything about it. I feel, as a Member of this body, and I think the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] ought to feel, that I have intelligence enough to take that statement from the German Government and read it and analyze it and attach to it the importance which it deserves. I do not ask the Senator from Rhode Island for permission to do it, nor do I——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Neither do I, Mr. President.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not yield to the Senator from Michigan now. Wait for the answer. I do not ask any man in this body to interpret testimony for me. I do not need any direction or assistance from the Senator from Rhode Island with respect to it. Let me say——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I decline to yield until I shall have finished my answer.

Mr. President, this report raises a number of very important economic questions as to the weight which should be given to the difference in all the conditions surrounding labor in that country and in this country. The cost of living, the rents, the amounts paid for fuel, for clothing, for groceries, and for all the living expenses are all important matters to be taken into consideration, and are entitled to a certain measure of weight, judged by recognized rules among students of economy and finance.

I do not yield my judgment to any Senator on this floor in interpreting these facts. All I am contending, and all the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], or any other man on this floor has contended, with respect to this report from the German Government, is that the Finance Committee had no business to bottle it up.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; not at present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not know how the Senator from Michigan or anybody else outside of the Finance Committee secured information in respect to the contents of this document. It may be that the statement of the Senator from Michigan is only an inference.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But that makes no difference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has declined to yield. The Senator from Michigan can not interrupt without the permission of the Senator from Wisconsin, and he declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not yet finished my answer to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Wisconsin asks how I got the information——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not ask, and I do not care how you got it, or whether you have such information, or whether your statement with respect to it was a surmise. It does not make any difference. All there is of this business is just this: This body is entitled to whatever there is in this document, it makes no difference what it contains or whether or not it will weigh with us when we get it. It was sent here by one of the foremost governments in the world—not volunteered, not intruded upon the legislative proceedings of this great Nation, but sent here upon the formal invitation of this Government. That much has been made clear in this debate.

Mr. President, I say, first, in decency to that Government, we are entitled to have it, and have it promptly. Second, in fairness to Members of this body, we are entitled to have it and to interpret it for ourselves.

No member of that choice band chosen to sit in the sacred precincts of the Finance Committee has any exclusive privilege with respect to a document which belongs to this Government and which belongs to this body as much as it does to them.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] says that it was received after the bill had been reported. He said that on this floor this morning. He is clever in his statements. This will be discovered if you follow and analyze those statements. He will make a definite statement that cuts down to the bone. Then he surrounds it with generalizations enough to involve it, so that when you come to demand an answer for that particular statement a side door is open here and another there for opportunity to escape a definite answer and definite responsibility for what he says. But, speaking of this report, he did say on this floor this morning—and I took it down from his lips as he uttered it—

> The information came to the Committee on Finance about the middle of April, and after the report of the bill.

I say it did not. I say it came to the Committee on Finance before the bill was reported to the Senate, and, although he attempted, in the debate the other day, to invoke this question by stating that the committee had received a multitude of documents through the State Department from other governments, I will venture to say now nothing has been received here by the State Department from any government bearing upon this subject that stands on the same footing as does this report.

I want to be frank with the Senate. I do not say that upon official authority, but I say it on what I believe to be absolute authority. This report called for by this Government, furnished by the German Government in response to that call, stands today as a document entitled to consideration, at least to report to the Senate—at least to be open where everybody can see it. It did not come to the Finance Committee after they had reported the bill to this body. It went to the Finance Committee while the bill was in its possession. I will venture to say that the chairman of the Finance Committee had his attention specifically called to that document after it had been sent to him, and was asked by the Department of Commerce and Labor whether he did not want it put into such condition that it could be examined by his committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question?

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely want to ask a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand that an order has been made by the Senate, by unanimous consent, for the immediate translation and report of this document to the Senate. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the records of the Senate will show that the order of the Senate is for the printing of this document. That order and unanimous consent did not express anything with respect to translation; but after the document was received here, as the Senator from Indiana will remember, while the subject was under discussion in the Senate after the document came into possession of the Secretary of the Senate——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just one remark. I have been from the first of the very hearty opinion that this Senate was entitled to have the document, and it has been so decided. The Senator also made a unanimous-consent request this morning for the correspondence, which he put in the regular form—"if in the opinion of the President it is not incompatible with the public interests."

I think that, if the Senator will renew his request for unanimous consent, upon reflection it is likely that nobody will object, because in the end it can not be objected to. I suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin at this point that he renew his request for unanimous consent. I may be wrong, but I think it will be agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should not feel at liberty to do that, because at the time I made the request the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] was on the floor and objected. I do not see him now, and I would not like to take advantage of his absence from the floor to renew the request at this time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is only due to the Senator for me to say——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think the Senator from Indiana had noticed that the Senator from Rhode Island was absent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I did. And yet it is only due to the Senator to say that I feel so strongly that this unanimous consent should be given—as I am sure other Senators have felt, and some of us have expressed that opinion to the Senator from Rhode Island—that I do not now understand, even if he were here, that he would object. Otherwise I am sure I would not make the suggestion which I now make in the presence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. Perhaps I am wrong, and perhaps there will be objection, but I think not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought it would be helpful.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senate will consent to the passage of the resolution calling for that information; but, under all the circumstances, I do not feel that I ought to make that request at this time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will withdraw my suggestion to the Senator from Wisconsin. Perhaps, after all, the matter had better take its course.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not care at this time to say anything further with respect to this document, more than that I knew many weeks ago that it had been received from the State Department, and that I knew it was in possession of the Committee on Finance. I do think that a word or two further might be said. It looked as though there was an effort, when the subject was last before the Senate, to involve the question in some misunderstanding with respect to the character of this document, as to whether it was confidential or not. It was not confidential. It is not an anonymous document. It is entitled to the full and fair consideration of this body, coming, as it does, from the German Government. That Government did not withhold the names attached to the statements embodied in that report, further than this, that they were in the nature of trade secrets, and as no manufacturer in America would care to disclose to a competitor in business his costs of production, so no manufacturer in Germany cared to disclose to his competitors in Germany, and have it published in this country, this information in regard to his particular factory. That is all there is to it.

There is not a Senator on this floor who can not go to the State Department if he desires to test the authenticity of the facts and figures given in this report. In so far as the names of any of the men who made those statements are concerned, he can procure that information confidentially. So that the withholding of these names does not go to the matter of testing the accuracy of these statements.

Besides all that, will anyone suppose for a moment, Mr. President, that the German Government would send, in response to a request from this Government, a statement like that and then resort to an artifice to cover up inaccuracies and perversions of statement by suppressing names? To suggest that on this floor is to impeach the integrity of the German Government; and every Senator who has intimated here that, because these names are withheld, the facts stated were not entitled to full and fair consideration, has launched against the German Government, I think very unjustly, a suggestion of discredit. All the bearing that the absence of these names from this document can possibly have here goes solely to the credit of the facts stated, and nothing else; and those names are in the possession of the Department of State. They are simply withheld from publication, as stated by the German Government, for trade reasons.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I have been informed that a large percentage of these documents, or a considerable number of them, at least, are not merely signed statements, but are sworn to by those making them. Mr. President, I have been informed that the great bulk of these statements come to this Government through the boards of trade of Germany. The boards of trade of Germany are not private and local institutions, but are a part, in a qualified or quasi way, of the German Government itself. They belong to its commercial department. So that whatever documents come in that way from German boards of trade have somewhat more of approval with respect to their reliability and their credence than could be given ordinarily to the similar reports of boards of trade in this country.

Mr. President, I spoke yesterday of the new economic conditions that must be considered by the committees of both Houses in the revision of the tariff at this time, differing widely from any that had been presented to any other Ways and Means Committee of the House or to any other Finance Committee of the Senate in all the history of tariff legislation. I referred to the pledges made by the Republican party with respect to revision, and brought to the attention of the Senate Mr. Taft's repeated statements bearing upon this subject throughout the campaign. I think, Mr. President, they all were harmonious, cumulative, and strong. And I wish now to ask the attention of the Senate to the proceeding which has taken place here pursuant to the pledges made by the Republican party with respect to the revision of the tariff.

On yesterday, before I took the floor, the Senator from Rhode Island secured the passage of a resolution requiring sessions of this Senate for the consideration of this bill to be held at night as well as throughout the day. This is in line with the policy that has been pursued with respect to the bill from the beginning.

This bill passed the House of Representatives on April 9; it was received here April 10, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance. On April 12 it was reported back with amendments. On April 15 it was taken out of the possession of the Senate and recalled by the House. On April 19 it was returned by the House to the Senate. So that this body got this bill into its possession for its consideration on the 19th day of April, 1909. It was read twice, referred to the Committee on Finance, and immediately reported back to the Senate upon the same day and thrust upon its consideration, followed by a statement made by the chairman of the Finance Committee—a most remarkable statement, Mr. President—a statement that I undertake to say will find no parallel in the history of tariff legislation in this country.

Here was a great bill, not a bill dealing with some phase of the tariff question, but a bill for the complete revision of the tariff, for which an extra session had been convened. This bill was presented for the consideration of the Senate without any report or explanation concerning the changes in it, and they aggregate into the hundreds, affecting the interests of the whole people.

Senators from the New England States may smirk. If it is an increase in duty for a cotton or woolen industry in New Hampshire or Massachusetts, Senators are pleased to take the floor and say it is a matter of tremendous importance.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not at present.

That great interests are involved in those States; that labor and the homes of the laborers are dependent upon those changes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not just at present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will resume his seat for a few minutes——

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator understands that I do not yield just now.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can do as he pleases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will do as I please when I have the floor. Let that be understood.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But if changes here mark advancing rates and affect the homes of the consumers generally of this country, it provokes derision on this floor when objection is made, and questions are asked, and I propose to show why.

The statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island when he presented this bill to the Senate did not relate to the revision of duties at all. It related solely to revenue; to what this bill would do toward providing sufficient revenue to support the Government. He did say that the rates and the schedules would be explained and would be defended later.

I undertake to say that fairness to the Senate and to the country called for a full report on this bill, explaining its provisions, giving the reasons for its proposed changes as a necessary basis for its thorough and intelligent consideration. There may be Senators here who do not care about these rates or do not care especially about the reasons for its provisions, its changes, its increases; but I submit, Mr. President, that if the revision of the tariff is important, the reasons for it are important, and every man on this floor assumes a responsibility when he votes for these schedules and amendments, and we have been compelled to vote on them with very little enlightenment so far as the Committee on Finance is concerned.

CONTRAST PRESENTATION OF THIS WITH OTHER TARIFF BILLS.

Mr. President, I may be wrong in saying that the proceedings on this bill are without parallel in the history of the tariff legislation of this country. I have not been able since this bill came in on the 19th of April to exhaust this subject. But I went back far enough to get a sort of rule which might fairly be taken as a guide, and when the Senate contrasts the proceedings in the consideration of other tariff bills with the exceptional proceedings of this special session, I ask them to remember that if there ever was a time calling for deliberation, that time is now.

We ought to spend our efforts and the time for which we are salaried without stint and without limit, stay here if need be until next fall, if need be until next December, to get at the truth in the revision of the tariff. Because we are revising it under economic and industrial conditions which never before have confronted the American people when dealing with this subject that may be a reason for hurrying over it if special interests are to be served here instead of public interests, that may be a reason for not permitting the Senate to know what this bill contains or how it is to affect in the next ten or fifteen years the welfare of the American people.

In 1888, revising the tariff under conditions of competition between domestic interests and industries, there was no such haste. The conditions that prevailed at that time were the

conditions that had prevailed from the beginning of this Government, and therefore the tariff could stand investigation and examination. On the one hand we had the views of the Democratic party, clean cut and well defined. On the other hand we had the views of the Republican party concerning the bill, the rates it proposed, their effect upon manufacturers, labor, and the public. They were plain economic statements. Therefore the issue could be fought out clean handed on this floor, on principle, and nobody seemed disposed to rush consideration at that time.

The Mills bill was reported to the Senate October 3 by Senator Allison. That was the tariff bill of 1888. It was reported to the Senate on the 3d of October by Senator Allison. He asked that it be placed on the calendar, and gave notice that he would call it up for consideration upon the following Monday morning. This was the Tuesday preceding. He also gave notice that on the following day or on Friday majority and minority reports would be filed to accompany the bill. On Thursday, October 4, one day or two days after the bill was presented, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] said:

I present the report of the Committee on Finance upon the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues.

And he later said:

I ask that the report and the views of the minority, which will be presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Harris], may be printed in the RECORD, and I ask that an order be made that they be printed in brevier type for the convenience of Senators.

In those days, Senators, it was considered important enough to give the facts to the Senate, and to present them in convenient form for examination. The Senator from Rhode Island asked to have his report upon the Mills bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the type used for its regular proceedings, not in reduced type generally used for reports when printed in the RECORD; and there follows in the RECORD the report of the majority of the committee, in which there are set forth all the reasons for the revision of the tariff which was proposed at that time. The report covers 27 columns—13½ pages—of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In hastily reading over it I find more than a column of discussion under the head of ad valorem duties.

I find a long discussion of the attitude of the House in placing certain articles on the free list. More than three columns of this report are given to a discussion of the wool and woolen schedules. There are also two columns devoted to the discussion of labor cost of production and a half column devoted to manufacturers' profits. The whole report submitted was an exposition of the bill as presented to the Senate and of the differences between it and the bill which had passed the House, to which was appended a comparison of the rates of duty proposed by the House and the then existing rates, and other appendices.

There was also printed in the RECORD the views of the minority, which occupy 11½ pages of the RECORD. In addition to having this printed in the RECORD, the Senator from Rhode Island introduced a resolution to have 6,000 copies printed for the use of the Senate.

Four days later, October 8, the entire bill was printed in the RECORD, and the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, Mr. Allison, made a speech explaining the provisions of the bill, which occupies 14 columns of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD. Put that in contrast, Senators, with the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island about this bill. The people in homes that are paying 40 to 50 per cent increased prices on the necessaries of life have for years been demanding a revision of the tariff. Now a revision comes, and the bill is reported here changing the House bill in most marked particulars. When it comes for our consideration it comes from the chairman of the Committee on Finance with a brief statement with respect to revenues, with no report, no explanation of a single change in it, no reason given for raising the duties, and, more than that, we are forced to take it up for consideration on the next day after it is reported. And day after day Senators are compelled to come here with no opportunity given for the study of the provisions of the bill or the changes made by the Senate committee, and we sit here struggling to learn something about it, appealing to the Finance Committee for information. We are not treated with patience by the chairman, who seems only to feel that Senators are meddling and are very impertinent in wanting to know the basis of its various provisions, the cause for changes, and reasons for increases.

LEGISLATION IS CONTROLLED BY A FEW MEN.

Mr. President, under a system that has grown up, which puts the control of legislation and control of the Senate of the United States in the hands of two or three men, whose authority has been recognized here for so many years without question, there has developed a situation which makes it hazardous for a Senator to question this supreme power or to raise any objections, ask any information, or to fail to go along when told. I want to suggest to the autocracy of the Senate that the clock will strike presently a new hour in the legislative life of this Senate—not a new hour, but one which will chime in harmony with the earlier life of this Government. States will demand equal representation, and States will have equal representation on this floor. Do you suppose that the sovereign States of this country are always going to take their legislation from the Senator from Rhode Island? Does the Senator from this or that New England State believe that this control of legislation is to continue? No. The day of its overthrow is at hand. No one can shut his eyes to the presence in this Chamber of a new force—a body of men in the Republican organization with new ideas; that is, with old ideas; with ideas that go back to the basis of constitutional government and the equal rights of all men.

But, sir, to return to a comparison of the proceedings upon this bill and other tariff bills. Upon October 18, 1888, the following resolution was passed by the Senate, which had the Mills bill under consideration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be authorized and directed to continue during the recess of Congress the investigation of such revenue matters, including the bill H. R. 9051, as have been referred to it by resolution of the Senate, subject to the authority conferred by said resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Come down two years later. The McKinley bill was reported to the Senate by Senator Morrill, of the Finance Committee, June 18, 1890. The general debate upon the bill began almost immediately, but it was a general debate, a debate that is always helpful. The Senate was not forced to begin, without ample time for investigation, the consideration of amendments to the bill.

Mr. President, we have been under a great strain here, obliged to vote upon amendments at once, without opportunity to secure needed information. It could not be obtained from the Finance Committee, the record shows that; it was not in their possession, the record proves that. I mean to say they were not able to give any sound economic reasons—only superficial, partisan, partial reasons, or manufacturers' reasons—for increasing these rates.

Mr. Morrill said, when he reported the McKinley bill:

There has not been any written report prepared with this bill.

Why? He gives the reasons for it:

I will say to Senators that a report, a very elaborate one, was made two years ago, and as the bill is substantially the same as the measure reported by the Senate committee two years ago, perhaps there may not be any written report furnished.

The McKinley bill was reported on June 18. An attempt was made to have the bill taken up and considered by paragraphs for amendment on July 19. That was a month after the bill had been reported. There are many Senators here who were Members of one House or the other at that time. They will recall that Senators were just as anxious then, more anxious, perhaps, than now, to be free from the legislative obligations and at liberty to return to their homes. We had been in session in that Fifty-first Congress steadily from December to the 18th of June, when the bill reached the Senate. We remained in session until the 1st day of October—I think the longest session in the history of the Government.

But, Mr. President, it was not until July 28, forty days after the bill had been reported to the Senate, that the first amendment to paragraph 1 was formally read in the Senate for its consideration.

SENATE HAS NOT BEEN INFORMED AS TO EFFECT OF BILL.

No Senator can discharge the obligations resting upon him in the consideration of amendments to the bill before us, increasing or decreasing duties, without knowing whether those duties are a measure of the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. If the duty is placed too low, you wrong the labor of this country, and if it is placed too high you wrong the consumers of this country.

We should have on reliable authority the correct standard. And that is not possible, Mr. President, when a bill of this magnitude, two-thirds of it printed in italics, indicating changes in rates, is forced upon our consideration within twenty-four or forty-eight hours after it comes from the committee.

I submit to the Senate we have been proceeding without any possibility of knowing whether we are discharging our obligations to the people of this country, whether the Repub-

lican Members of the Senate are keeping the pledges made in the Republican platform and the pledges made by our candidate for the Presidency.

The Dingley bill came to this body from the House of Representatives on the 1st day of April, 1897. It was not reported from the Committee on Finance for the consideration of the Senate until the 4th day of May, 1897. One month and four days the Senate Committee on Finance had the Dingley bill under consideration.

After the bill was reported to the Senate the Senate was given two full weeks to get acquainted with its paragraphs and provisions. It was two entire weeks after the Dingley bill was reported that Senator ALDRICH, of the committee, arose in the Senate and said:

> I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill on Tuesday, the 18th instant, immediately after the morning routine of business.

That was fourteen days after it was reported and a month and eighteen days after it was received from the House. I am continuing the quotation. He said further:

> Printed statements showing the character and effect of the changes suggested will be ready for distribution to Senators within a few days.
> I desire also to state in behalf of the majority of the committee that it is their intention to present provisions in regard to reciprocal trade with other countries in place of the section which the committee recommends be stricken from the bill.

Two days later complaint was made in the Senate because the comparative statement promised had not been furnished.

Upon May 13 Mr. ALDRICH stated to the Senate that he desired to modify the statement which he had previously made with reference to his intention to call up the bill and that he hoped to be able to call it up about a week later.

And it was not until May 25, three weeks after the bill was reported, that Senator ALDRICH asked unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill should be proceeded with, paragraph by paragraph, for amendment. That being agreed to, Mr. ALDRICH then proceeded with a general exposition of the bill, covering 13 columns of the RECORD. It was not a little terse twenty or thirty minute statement about the revenue side of the bill, but an exposition of the protective duties of the Dingley bill, a statement such as has not been made for us here in the consideration of this measure.

It was on May 26, nearly two months after the bill came from the House, that the first amendment of the Committee on Finance, on page 1, line 3 of the bill, was read and considered. So from the time the bill was passed by the House and transmitted to the Senate a month and twenty-five days had elapsed and the bill had actually been in the Senate, reported from the Committee on Finance, and it had been under discussion during a period of three weeks before it was taken up to be considered by paragraph for amendment.

ONLY NATION WHICH HURRIEDLY ENACTS TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Senators, I ask you to contrast that record with the record of the proceedings upon the pending bill, and in that connection remember our new economic and industrial conditions, never before presented to the American Senate in framing a tariff bill, conditions which require the fullest study and investigation in the enactment of tariff legislation.

Yet we have this measure forced upon us for action without any report or explanation of its provisions, and only the most limited opportunity even for individual investigation. Almost every day either the chairman of this great committee, or some one in sympathy with him, rises here to admonish us that we are doing wrong in not at once passing this bill as reported; that we are interfering with business; that $10,000,000 a day is being lost to the business interests of the country because we do not join in railroading the bill through without debate.

Do Senators know that we are dealing with this legislation as no other civilized government in the world deals with important legislation of this character? As I have sat here, day after day, endeavoring as best I could to glean some reliable information with respect to these duties, I have wondered if it is a part of the plan of legislation in these days of combination and monopoly that a tariff bill shall be framed in secret and under conditions that will not admit of investigation; that it shall be put through the Senate under a pressure that renders it impossible for Senators to understand it, while those in favor of this system array behind it all the great business interests of the country, to demand, as they have by a flood of telegrams to Senators, that debate shall cease and the bill be passed immediately. I have wondered, sir, if it is a part of a great plan to write this legislation on the statute books without permitting investigation which would expose its faults, its weaknesses, its wrongs.

How easy it would be to relieve the business situation by writing in the bill, it shall not go into effect until January 1, 1910, or July 1, 1910. There is not another government of any standing in the world that passes a tariff bill providing that it shall go into effect immediately upon its passage. An amendment adopted to this bill to-day, saying that it shall go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1910, would relieve the business situation, wheels would begin to turn, and every business man would know what raw material he could buy to convert into the finished product, and sell at the same tariff level; and there would be no occasion for this haste to get the bill through without anybody knowing what is in it.

Mr. President, no government that has standing or respectability in the world to-day ever undertook to revise a tariff as we are revising this. I took a little pains to look up the methods of tariff legislation of two or three of the great powers. At the risk of having somebody here who may not be entirely willing to disclose whom he represents, charge me with representing the German Government, I am going to give the method pursued by that Government when enacting tariff legislation.

GERMANY.

In the tariff revision of 1906 in Germany the tariff commission virtually took a census of industries, obtaining information on such subjects as the cost of production at home and in the principal foreign countries, the importation of articles into Germany and exports of articles to foreign countries, prices at home and in the principal foreign markets, duties in the principal competing countries, and so forth. This information was obtained direct from the manufacturers upon blanks sent out by the commission. In the hearings which the commission held about 2,000 trade experts were examined, who assisted in sifting the material obtained from the manufacturers with a view to getting at the correct facts, and ascertaining exactly the cost of production.

Mr. President, if a manufacturer comes before one of the committees of the American Congress and says the wages in a foreign country are lower than the wages here and we must have a tariff of 75 per cent or 126 per cent to protect us, his testimony is at once accepted. That is the statement which has been made here by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, because he says that man is a patriotic citizen; he is seeking to maintain industries in America and furnish employment to American labor. There is no other place in our whole system of government, in the courts or elsewhere, where the rights of men are determined upon any such one-sided testimony as that.

Is not the American manufacturer primarily and directly interested here? Is he not a prejudiced witness? Yet you can find scores of statements made by the Senator from Rhode Island in the course of the debate in which the testimony of the American manufacturer before the committee is the only testimony cited upon which rates are based.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that the great mass of people of this country have an interest here. I do not believe the American consuming public wants these rates so reduced as no longer to protect American labor. But everybody knows that with no foreign competition combinations suppress domestic competition and put prices up and extort from the consumer what they please. The consumer has a right to demand that this shall not be done with the aid of his Government. Is he unreasonable? Why has he not a day here?

The testimony taken upon which these rates are fixed so far as the Finance Committee is concerned takes no account of the consumer. He has not been heard. The Finance Committee, through one of its exponents here, announced the committee's programme by which they excluded the consumer from all consideration in framing the bill which they reported.

But let us see how the German Government proceeded.

In securing the information upon which to base legislation, it spent six years, if I remember rightly. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] has given much time in the investigation of that matter, and he will know whether I am right in my recollection as to the time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator is correct from the beginning to the end. It took six years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Spending six years in the investigation of the tariff, there was no disturbance of business and no occasion for a disturbance of business in Germany, the people understanding that when a bill was introduced there they would be still given, before that bill would go into effect, ample time to adjust their business to the new rates. The German Government, I say, spent all that time gathering information, and this information was not suppressed. It was not kept behind the closed doors of a Finance Committee. They got the

rates of wages in foreign countries. What did they do with it? Put it in a pigeonhole and never look at it? No. They published it. Contrast that with the record here of the effort that has been necessary to get published for the use of the Senate similar information furnished by the German Government through the State Department to our Finance Committee. And we have not got it yet. We may get it, Mr. President, but it will be after most of the schedules have been passed. Yet the Finance Committee received it on the 3d day of April, according to the President in his message.

In Germany all of the information was published in readily accessible form for the guidance of the Bundesrat and Reichstag, accompanied with statements of the reasons why the duty on every article of the tariff was fixed at a certain rate; that is, there was not a change of duty made—and you can get access to those volumes in the Department of Manufactures here in Washington—for which that great committee did not give its reasons. Now, can any reasonable man say, when we touch this subject only once in about ten or twelve years, when it means so much to the industries of this country, so much to the labor of this country, so much to the consumer of this country, that it is asking too much that the committees that investigate and report these bills shall give us a reason for every change of duty?

KNOW NOTHING OF DIFFERENCE IN COST OF PRODUCTION.

I have no special commission here, Mr. President, to represent the consumer. I come from a State that is one of the foremost manufacturing States in this Union. I do not want to say an unkind word of one of the members of the Committee on Finance. I have no feeling which would cause me to do so. But I say that I do not believe that there is a member of the Committee on Finance who could take the stand here before this body and furnish the facts and details necessary to establish the true difference in the cost of production between this and foreign countries with respect to six items in this great bill.

Mr. President, to determine the difference in cost of production he must ascertain, first of all, the difference in the cost of producing the raw material in our country and in the competing foreign countries, not only the gross difference in the cost of producing the raw material, but the difference in the wage cost of raw material, the difference in the overhead charges, the difference in all the items that enter into that production.

Then he must ascertain what is the difference in the cost of transportation from the European point of shipment into the principal markets here, and the difference in the cost of transportation from the principal points of production in this country to the principal markets in this country. He ought to be able to state the difference in the wage cost at each step of this development.

Mr. President, it was not so vital twenty years ago to have the exact difference in the cost of production as it is now. There was not then the possibility of maintaining excessive rates that exists to-day. Horace Greeley and the men who ground into me the belief in the wisdom of a protective tariff system did not so much fear advancing rates beyond the difference in the cost of production, because then the people had a competitive market in this country. Competition between domestic producers ultimately reduced the price to a reasonable level for the consumer. That is not so now. The time has come now when we are under obligation as never before in the history of America to know the difference in the cost of production. We ought to know one other thing. We ought to know whether the industry is controlled by a combination or a monopoly which dominates the market in this country.

Having ascertained that there is a control of markets by a monopoly or combination, a tariff committee or a tariff commission should ascertain whether there is any difference in the labor cost in that product and in the competing foreign product. Having ascertained exactly what that shade of difference is, the duty should be cut down to the bare level of that difference in the wage cost. There may be a difference in the rates of interest on capital; there may be a difference in other conditions that would make the American product cost more to produce, but the American producer is not entitled to have those things considered when, under the shield of protection afforded him by the Government, he builds up monopolies and combinations to destroy one of the vital principles of the protective system, namely, competition between him and other domestic producers.

I would not make the labor employed by trusts suffer because the trust does wrong; but I would, if possible, take away from that combination or monopoly every hair's breadth of protection except what would go to the labor.

Mr. President, I will hasten along. I had just concluded stating what the German Government has done in the way of revising the tariff, in sharp contrast with what we are doing here.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

In preparation for the revision of the Austria-Hungarian tariff, which took place at the same time as the German revision, information was obtained as to the cost of the production of every article covered by the tariff, the prices at home and in the principal foreign countries, the information filling nearly 100 volumes carefully digested. The tariff bill submitted by the Government to parliament was accompanied by a comprehensive statement, giving succinctly the reasons in every case for the various changes made in the tariff of that Government.

FRANCE.

The French parliament has been at work on a revision of the tariff for two years.

The committee on tariffs consists of 32 members of the Chamber of Deputies. This committee formed a subcommittee for each schedule of the tariff. In submitting recommendations to the Chamber for changes in the tariff, the committee accompanied them by reports, in which reasons were stated for all changes in the tariff which the committee proposed to make, the reasons going into such questions as the cost of production at home and abroad, the extent of competition, the rates of duty at home and in foreign countries, and every detail which could be necessary to determine the correctness of the rate.

These reports, Mr. President, sum up the testimony before the committee and before its subcommittees on different schedules, and are accessible in detail to the members of the legislature. Oh, there was something, Mr. President, that would give information to the members of the French parliament in guiding them in the discharge of their duty. Mark with what deliberation they proceeded! It was in February when this great committee of 32 members reported their bill to the French parliament. Were they asked in twenty-four hours to submit to seeing that bill forced to immediate consideration under the pressure and power of a one-man control? No, no; not that. The bill was reported in February. They were allowed from that time to the 11th of May—three months' time, with all possible information furnished to them—to study the bill in the light of all the testimony bearing upon the subject.

UNDUE HASTE PREVENTS SENATORS FROM MASTERING THE BILL.

Mr. President, I ask you to contrast with such methods of legislation the course pursued with this bill. The pending bill came into the Senate for its consideration on the 19th of April. It was presented here, a brief statement was made by the chairman, and at once we were called upon to take up the consideration of the bill by paragraphs. We had proceeded but a few days, the sessions beginning at 12 o'clock, when a motion was made by the chairman that the sessions should begin at 11 o'clock. Senators who wanted to know what they were doing felt severely this cutting down of their time for investigation. No Senators were wasting those hours spent out of this Chamber. It was suggested in the course of debate that a little more time be given to Senators to investigate and study these schedules in their rooms, and less time wasted on this floor in trying to force Senators to vote upon them in ignorance more or less complete, would in the end be a saving of time. But, no; that could make no appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Finance. He drove on and on with his grim determination to force this bill through. Soon Senators were called to meet here at 10 o'clock, and a little later the sessions were extended to 11 o'clock at night, thus cutting off entirely all opportunity for Senators to do any work upon the bill out of session.

Mr. President, I do not want to transgress the rules of the Senate by imputing improper motives to any man, but it is right for the country to know that Senators who have asked for more time are not laggards, are not indolent, are not wasting any time that they may have outside the sessions, but that they wanted every moment of their time, from the hour when this bill came from the Finance Committee, to devote, with such poor means as they have, to conscientious study and investigation of the paragraphs of this bill and their bearing upon the public interest.

I go further, and I say that to deny them that opportunity and to intimate that they are derelict in their duty in not willingly coming here and spending the entire day and half of the night in voting through these schedules when they and other Senators are in blind ignorance in respect to them—I say that this intimation which has been made here calls for the counter statement that somebody wants to get this bill through this Senate without its provisions being known.

Mr. President——

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not. I leave it to the Chair to determine whether it is necessary; whether any Senator, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] yesterday, has not a right to rise on this floor and demand the presence of a quorum whenever, in his opinion, the Senate is proceeding without a quorum. I should have preferred not to have raised this question; but since it comes up, I leave it to the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not yield.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Then the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] has not the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry?

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely want to make an inquiry as to whether the Senator from Kansas got recognition of the Chair? That is all I want to know.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from no State other than Wisconsin has received recognition of the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not mean "the present occupant of the chair." I wanted merely to know whether the record showed that the Senator from Kansas got recognition of the Chair. I am not talking about yielding.

Mr. GALLINGER. Regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin now has the floor, and has had the floor since the present occupant of the chair resumed the chair.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am aware of that, Mr. President; but I was merely asking for information as to whether the Senator from Kansas did have the recognition of the Chair. Of course if the present occupant does not know, I can not pursue my inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the present occupant of the chair understands that I am not seeking to embarrass him.

NO CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSUMER.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on June 1 the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] made an address on this floor. He laid down here what I think may be fairly taken as the rule which guided the Committee on Finance in framing this bill. I shall read what he said. I read from page 2614 of the RECORD, beginning at the bottom of the first column on that page:

> In the enactment of a tariff law there are other parties concerned than the manufacturers and the importers of the article. The United States Government is immediately concerned that proper and consistent revenues be collected upon all dutiable articles. The public with money available for investment is also concerned—

That is the second party in interest—

> that duties should not be levied solely for the protection of existing manufacturers or for the advantage of existing importers. Such uniform and consistent duties should be levied as will not conserve monopoly of any lines, and that all may have an equal opportunity for the investment of capital and the embarkment in every possible legitimate enterprise. In that view the committee proceeded.

The Senator from Utah stated that the Government was concerned as to its revenues and that people with money to invest were concerned. But nowhere in the list of those who were to be considered in the making of a tariff bill, nowhere in the list of the parties concerned, is the consumer mentioned or apparently thought of.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, I will.

Mr. SMOOT. I may have been unfortunate and unhappy in my expression, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to these words:

> Such uniform and consistent duties should be levied as will not conserve monopoly of any lines, and that all may have an equal opportunity for the investment of capital and the embarkment in every possible legitimate enterprise.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes; I read that, Mr. President. I think it is perfectly plain that this committee was giving special consideration to those who had capital to invest, to those who were already in business, and those who had more money to go into business. They were considered; the revenue interests of the Government were considered; but, Mr. President, the party who brought about this revision of the tariff at this time—Mr. Consumer, a numerous individual, whose interests are very considerable—is not mentioned or referred to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] as worthy of consideration. And it seems to me, from such examination as I have made of this bill, that he was not considered when the bill was framed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. May I ask the Senator what percentage of the American people are consumers that are not also producers?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, Mr. President, I am not going into any hair-splitting speculation such as that. I am discussing this question upon lines which I do not think admit of an interrogatory of that sort. The Senator from Utah, the members of the Finance Committee, the Republican party, and this administration, charged with the responsibility of revising this tariff, having that revision forced upon them by the body of the people of this country who buy the things which are protected by rates which the President himself says over and over again are too high, will answer that question at another time when the answer will be heeded.

Mr. President, that is the way it seems to me this bill is framed. I do not now propose to discuss any schedule other than the cotton schedule. I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate again when we come to the woolen schedule and when we return to certain items passed over in other schedules. With my best diligence, I have been gathering some information outside of the testimony taken by the Ways and Means Committee, and outside of any information which has been furnished by the Finance Committee. When we come to some of those items that have been passed over that are of importance to the people of this country, I shall have a few facts to lay before the Senate relating to those rates. To begin with, Mr. President, we may well consider, first of all, how the rates have been advanced in the cotton schedule.

INCREASES OF GREAT DECREASES OF LITTLE IMPORTANCE.

It has been contended here in the course of this debate, and it has been reasserted several times in the discussion of the cotton schedule by the Senator from Rhode Island, that there were no increases of duties whatever made in this schedule as reported by the Senate Finance Committee. On page 1723 of the RECORD, Mr. ALDRICH said at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]:

> I expect to show when I take the floor that there are no increases in the cotton schedule of the bill at all.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], as I now remember, reiterated that statement.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just for a question. If it is for a question, I will yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Massachusetts is not in the Chamber, and I want to say this in his behalf: In the speech or in the statement which he made, he said there was no equivalent ad valorem duty advanced.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall come to that, Mr. President. I assure the Senator from Utah that I will not overlook any material point in the discussion of this schedule. The Senator from Rhode Island said, because I have his words before me, at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Iowa:

> I expect to show when I take the floor that there are no increases in the cotton schedule of the bill at all.

Mr. President, the value of imports of cotton cloth in 1907, according to the Estimated Revenues furnished by the Finance Committee, was $13,880,614; the revenue from it was $5,362,999.40, or an average ad valorem of 38.6 per cent. Under the proposed bill the Finance Committee estimates the revenue from the same imports at $6,051,880, or an average ad valorem of 43.6 per cent. So that, notwithstanding the statement of the chairman of the committee, according to his own figures as furnished to this body, the new bill shows an increase of 13 per cent in the duty on cotton cloth over the Dingley rates.

I have not forgotten that the Senator from Massachusetts said, speaking of the bill generally, that there were something over 300 decreases and only about 30 increases in rates in this bill. I have not forgotten, Mr. President, that the Senator from Rhode Island furnished to the Senate a statement purporting to show the increases and the decreases which this bill proposes in existing rates. He gave the decreases in very great detail in his statement, but when it came to the increases he dismissed

the entire subject with a very brief reference. The list of reductions fills 23 pages of his printed document, while the increases are enumerated on less than a page, the impression being given that the increases are few and of relatively small importance. But an examination of the table of Estimated Revenues compiled by the Finance Committee will show conclusively that the increases of duty were of far greater importance than one was led to believe from the presentation made in the pamphlet submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island, and of far greater importance than the decreases.

REAL EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES.

I therefore requested the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to have prepared a table based upon the figures furnished in the Finance Committee's Estimate of Revenues, showing in separate columns the value of the imports on which the duties are unchanged, on which the duties are increased, and on which the duties are decreased, and the per cent of increase or decrease in each case. This table was accordingly compiled and summarized by schedules, and the whole recapitulated by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor. The result of this work affords the most complete and most instructive presentation yet made of the changes proposed in the present tariff law by the pending bill, so far as these changes are definitely shown on the face of the bill. There are, however, sweeping increases of duty of which such a compilation could not take account, which will be produced by changes in phraseology and new general provisions. I will refer to these hereafter.

This compilation shows how absurd it is to undertake to judge the effect of the changes in this bill by counting the number of increases and the number of decreases of duty. The utter irrelevancy of such a comparison is obvious. It can mean nothing, and it can mislead no thinking man.

I wish to say that ultimately I purpose to publish this entire table for the use of Senators who may care to consult it; but I desire to have incorporated in it day by day such changes as may be made, so that when this bill is in the final stage and the time comes for a vote upon it in the Senate it will be possible to have before us on very short order a reasonably accurate statement of the actual changes which it makes in the tariff duties.

One of the pages of this document has a recapitulation——

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will.

Mr. NELSON. It will probably be some days before the Senator's speech is published, and therefore I should be very glad if the Senator would have the statement to which he has referred, received from the Department of Commerce and Labor, printed in to-morrow's RECORD for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And as a document.

Mr. NELSON. And as a document.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just as soon as I can spare it from my work on the floor I will be very glad to have it printed. I have no duplicate of it.

Mr. NELSON. Could not the Senator have a copy made, so that we could have it printed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It would take several days to make a copy of it. It is a voluminous document. It will take about two days or three days after it goes to the printer before it can be returned; but just as soon as I can dispense with it I will have it printed. I ask unanimous consent now that I may have this table prepared by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor printed as a Senate document as soon as I can submit it to the printer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Sentor from Wisconsin? No objection is heard, and it is so ordered.

INCREASES DO NOT ALL APPEAR ON FACE OF BILL.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Turning to the recapitulation of that table I find that the total value of the goods affected by the increases of duty is nearly $102,000,000, while the value of articles affected by reductions of duty is but slightly over $66,000,000, or about two-thirds of the value of the goods upon which the duty has been raised. Furthermore, while the average per cent of reduction is 31.16 per cent, the average increase of duty is 36.73 per cent.

Nearly 15 per cent of the value of all the imports in 1907 is affected by increases of duty and less than 10 per cent by reductions of duty—over 75 per cent of all the imports remaining subject to the same rates as under the Dingley Act. The last point, however, requires a serious qualification, for while many of the articles enumerated in the tariff nominally remain subject to the same rates of duty as they did under the Dingley Act, a large number of them will, as a matter of fact, be subject to considerably higher rates, either as a result of new wording in different paragraphs, or as the result of new classification, as is notably the case with the cotton schedule, and finally as a result of the new provision for valuation, which will greatly increase the valuation for duty purposes of goods subject to ad valorem rates of duty, or subject to duties which vary according to the valuation placed upon the goods at the customhouse.

I do not know whether Senators have given consideration to this new provision, but we are soon to have a new measure for the valuation of foreign imports upon which these duties are to be reckoned. No longer is the valuation to be determined according to the rule which has always prevailed, according to the foreign value of the goods imported, but we are to have a new standard fixed, a standard which, I think, will put into the hands of interested parties in this country the fixing of the value of the imports on which the duties are to be based.

Of the 14 schedules comprising the tariff there are only 4 in which reductions affect a larger volume of goods than the increases. These are the earthenware, metals, wood, and sugar schedules.

This tabulation, prepared by the Department of Commerce and Labor, shows that the increases of duty in the cotton schedule affect imports valued at more than $10,000,000 in 1907, while the reductions affect the ridiculously small sum of less than $45,000. Nearly twenty-one and a half million dollars' worth of imports are nominally left by the bill subject to the same duties as under the Dingley law. As a matter of fact the splendid analysis of the changes in the phraseology of the cotton schedule made by the Senator from Iowa, supplemented by the illustrations by actual samples which I propose to submit to the Senate, abundantly prove the fact that the greater part of imports coming in under the cotton schedule will be subject to increased duties.

Mr. President, starting with paragraph 310, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the increases made in rates in the cotton schedule. Taking first cotton yarn, on all numbers up to and including No. 15, the percentage of increase over existing duties is 24.46 per cent. The increase on yarn No. 18 over existing duties is 41.95 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator wants to be perfectly fair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am perfectly fair. I am quoting the table prepared by the Bureau of Statistics——

Mr. SMOOT. I just wanted to call attention——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (continuing). Based upon the figures which your committee submitted to the Senate. If they are not fair, the fault lies in your own figures, and the matter must be settled some way between you and the bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. It is settled here in the Senate. And I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that an amendment has already been adopted which is a decrease on that number of yarn.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As you reported the bill the rate was a decided increase on that number of yarn. Your statement suggests one thing I did not call attention to, and that is the matter of committee amendments. I am very much obliged to the Senator——

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield, as the Chair understands.

COMPLETE BILL WAS NOT REPORTED.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Utah. I overlooked that. This bill came in April 19, and we were forced to consider it. It purports to be a "reported bill." It never was a reported bill. We have not a reported bill to-day. Every day the chairman or some other member of the committee stands up here and makes a new report on the bill. When are we to know what kind of a bill this committee will report? We were entitled to have the schedules of this bill reported complete, subject, of course, to modifications now and then to correct errors. But that is not the plan which this committee pursues. Senators go to work and investigate a schedule, and investigate it thoroughly, crowded as they are for time by this programme, meager as is the information contained in a mass of printed volumes. When Senators have done the best they can and a schedule comes up for consideration, then the chairman takes the floor and hour after hour introduces amendments changing the whole character of the schedule. Those amendments are introduced, and no Senator can tell what is

their significance or effect as they are read from the clerk's desk. Then we are called upon to vote. This daily amendment of the bill by the Finance Committee stamps the character of the bill and the work of the committee.

Mr. President, returning to the subject upon which the Senator from Utah interrupted me. No. 18 yarn is increased, as reported, 41.95 per cent over the existing rate. And upon what basis? We imported in 1907 only $46 worth of that class of yarn.

Take the next. I do not know whether they have——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator mean an increase of 42 per cent or an increase to 42 per cent?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I mean an increase of 42 per cent over the existing rate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In addition to the existing rate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I will tell you just what the two rates were. The table will show.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I see.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. One was 14.09 per cent and the other 20 per cent, and an increase in rates from 14.09 to 20 is an increase of 41.95.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And that on an article of which there have been only $46 of imports?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Forty-six dollars' worth imported into this country in the fiscal year 1907.

Look at the next item. On yarn No. 20 the per cent of increase over the existing duty is 107.25.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before the Senator takes that up——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If it does not interrupt the Senator too much——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me conclude.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And the imports of yarn of that number was $9,439.

SOME STARTLING ADVANCES IN DUTIES.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I want to ask where the increase is so enormous and the imports are only $46, what is the explanation of the Finance Committee of that raise?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to take up each one of these items, and an interruption at every line for an explanation by some one else would not only protract my discussion of this schedule for several days—and I should like to get through to-day if I can—but would, of course, destroy the continuity of my argument. Whatever criticism I make here will go into the RECORD, and if any member of the committee thinks it worth while, he can take it up seriatim and reply to it. I hope the Senator will——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I see that. That is quite true. But the Senator's first statement was somewhat startling, and I was surprised that the Committee on Finance——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg the Senator from Indiana not to be startled yet. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Occupants of the galleries will please refrain from demonstrations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On yarn No. 25 the percentage of increase is 42.76 per cent; the value of imports $26,042. On yarn No. 30 the percentage of increase is 11.42; the imports, $7,180. The next one is a small increase. You might have thought they would have overlooked it—5.6 per cent on imports valued at $2,878.

The next increase in that schedule is on yarn numbered 90; increase 17.58 per cent, and only $923 worth imported. The next increase is on yarn, colored, bleached, dyed, combed, or advanced beyond the condition of singles by grouping or twisting two or more single yarns together, and on the numbers up to and including No. 20 the per cent of increase is 36.66. The value of imports was $149,485. Of yarn No. 21 of that description the per cent of increase is 98.72 and the imports were $9,008.

On the next number, No. 22, the per cent of increase is 110.44 and the imports $8,109. On yarn No. 24 of that class the per cent of increase is 61.71; the value of importations was $73,313. On yarn No. 25 the per cent of increase is 59.34, nearly 60 per cent, and the value of importations was $25,702.

You may search the testimony given by cotton manufacturers before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, when they appeared in person before that committee, subject to cross-examination, and you will not find that they ever asked for that increase. You can not find a line of testimony from them suggesting that they desired any increase in the rates of the cotton schedule excepting a letter submitted after the public hearings were closed and which was tucked away in the appendix to the printed hearings, where is was discovered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. It was from a Rhode Island manufacturer. It was a request for a special duty on mercerization.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Several found their way into the bill, including mercerization.

NECESSITY FOR COTTON INCREASE IS DISCOVERED AFTER HEARINGS CLOSED.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But is it not strange that the cotton manufacturers did not discover that they required an increase in duties until after the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House had closed? It was only after the hearings were closed that a document emanating from one of the manufacturers disclosed the "necessity" for any increase in rates on cotton.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The document was in the form of a letter——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do. I shall be glad to have the Senator state the facts.

Mr. DOLLIVER. From Mr. Lippitt and Mr. MacColl, purporting to be a committee representing the Arkwright Club.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Asking for what?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Asking for four or five things, including mercerization, practically all of which they got out of both committees.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On yarn No. 26 of the description of which I was speaking when I digressed the increase of duty is 53.56 per cent and the value of imports for the year 1907 was only $8,865.

On yarn No. 27 of this description the per cent of increase over the existing rate is 17.10 per cent and value of imports $7,410.

On yarn No. 28 the increase is 42.45 per cent and value of imports $14,951.

On yarn No. 29 the increase is 74.58 per cent and value of imports $330.

On yarn No. 30 the increase is 36.99 per cent and value of imports $94,595.

On yarn No. 32 the increase is 22.43 per cent and value of imports only $11,375.

On yarn No. 33 the increase is 50.51 per cent and value of imports $3,192.

On yarn No. 34 the increase is 62.02 per cent and the value of imports $8,178.

On yarn No. 35 the increase is 27.42 per cent and value of imports $13,788.

On yarn No. 36 the increase is 5.44 per cent and value of imports $117,114.

On yarn No. 37, the increase is 44.68 per cent, and value of imports $236.

On yarn No. 38, the increase is 37.29 per cent, and value of imports $52,554.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Would it bother the Senator to again state what the percentage of increase is on No. 37, of which the imports are $236?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Forty-four and sixty-eight one-hundredths per cent, while on No. 40, with $266,123 of imports, the increase is 2.80 per cent.

On yarn No. 41, the increase is 12.21 per cent, and value of imports $14,774.

On yarn No. 42, the increase is 33.90 per cent, and value of imports $4,080.

Yarn No. 44, with $9,839 of imports, escaped without any increase. I do not know how it did it, but somebody must have been off duty for a few minutes.

On yarn No. 45, the increase is 12.31 per cent, and value of imports $17,135.

On No. 46, in spite of the fact that there was a whole dollar's worth imported, the duty was not increased.

On yarn No. 47, the increase is 2.59 per cent, and value of imports $2,016.

On yarn No. 48, with $24,000 of imports, the duty is not increased.

On yarn No. 50, with $107,000 of imports, the duty is not increased.

On yarn No. 52, with $28 of imports, the duty is not increased.

On yarn No. 53, the increase is 34.70 per cent, and the value of imports $202.

On yarn No. 67, the increase is 44.09 per cent, and the value of imports $196.

The next increase is on yarn No. 250. The increase is 33.33 per cent, and the value of imports was $104.

On yarn No. 270, the increase is 54.42 per cent, and the value of imports was $237.

ADVANCES IN COTTON CLOTH DUTIES.

Coming now to cotton cloth, I find some very interesting results. Of cotton cloth, not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, the total imports in 1907 were only $16,274, and yet this committee increased the duty on it 125.02 per cent. Upon cloth of that same count and kind when bleached the increase is 460.29 per cent, and the total value of the imports under the present duty was only $5,149. In asking the Senator from Indiana not to get startled awhile ago at a little increase of 42 per cent I sought in a measure to forewarn him of such things as this.

This is the class of imports which have been brought in through a loophole, as it were, in the Dingley law at very low duties—the etamines of which we have heard, by which such fearful raids have been made on the revenues. They were imported at a low duty—too low—but, low as it was, the importations in 1907 amounted to only $5,149. This is the sort of justification which has been offered here by this committee for increasing the duties on over ten millions of dollars of imports in this schedule. It would seem that these increases of 125 per cent and 460 per cent alone would cure the defect. On the dyed, colored, stained, painted, and printed cloth of that count, the increase is 50.01 per cent, and the total value of imports $5,450.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator will permit me, it will still further illuminate that item to carry out the figures. The average ad valorem of that $5,000 importation under paragraph 312 was only about 18 cents a yard, showing that the amount upon which this enormous increase arose was practically negligible, because it must have been valued at about 50 cents a yard.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, following these increases, we come next to the rates on cloth not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, but valued at over 7 cents per square yard. I find that this quality of cloth is marked with a big "L," which, we are informed by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, means luxury. When you find an "L" on a line here you want to look out for trouble. In order to make these raises or increases of duty reach as many items as possible, a new standard of luxuries has been erected here for the people of the country. According to this new standard, anybody who wears coarse cotton cloth worth over 7 cents a yard indulges in luxury, and if the people will have these "luxuries" they must pay the tariff fixed by this committee.

On this particular "luxury," coarse, unbleached cotton cloth valued at over 7 cents per square yard, the committee has increased the tariff rate 51.52 per cent, and the value of the imports for a whole year was only $17,446.

On the same count of cloth, bleached and valued at over 9 cents per yard, the duty is increased 44.60 per cent, and the value of imports was only $76,106, an importation to which the most ultra and unreasonable protectionist could hardly have objected.

MR. LIPPITT SAYS IMPORTATIONS ARE HEALTHY REGULATION.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It may fortify the Senator's view in that particular to know that Mr. Lippitt said before the House committee, distinctly referring to all the importations of cotton cloth, that they were only a healthy regulation of the cotton trade.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I remember that now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Who is Mr. Lippitt? I do not know.

Mr. DOLLIVER. He appeared there as the representative of the Arkwright Club, of Boston.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the Arkwright Club?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is the cotton manufacturers' association of New England.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Lippitt, if I may supplement what the Senator from Iowa has said, is one of six men or six families who control the great cotton industry of Rhode Island. Mr. Lippitt is a man who has been on hand here whenever tariffs were to be revised as the spokesman of the cotton industry. Mr. Lippitt is the head and front of the cotton organization in Rhode Island. He did not represent, Mr. President, the great body of the people of Rhode Island when he sent his letter up here asking for some increases, after he had appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and stated that the conditions were satisfactory to the cotton industry under the Dingley tariff, any more than he represents in his views as a member of the Republican party the rank and file and the great body of voters of that party in Rhode Island.

What excuse or justification is there for moving up these rates when the importations are so meager? You may devise some fine-spun, sophistical argument based on comparisons of the ad valorems in 1899 and 1907, but I believe that when the Senate comes to go into that fine-spun theory and analyze it and dissect it, the Committee on Finance will not find it a very substantial foundation on which to go to the country for approval of these enormous increases.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I want to get this matter clear in my mind, if I can. Mr. Lippitt, it is said, represents the cotton industry. Did I understand the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from Wisconsin to say that he first appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and expressed himself as satisfied with the present duty?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not hear his question. Will he please repeat it?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly. Do I understand that this gentleman first appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and expressed himself satisfied with the present rates, and that it was a good regulation of the cotton industry, and then later wrote a letter asking for increases?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Was that the case?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think, Mr. President, that I will be able to furnish the statements.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What reason did he give in his letter, if any?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg pardon.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is a curious situation. Did he give any reason in his letter for changing his views of a few weeks before, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will submit it at a later time in the discussion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did I understand the Senator rightly?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not got it right at hand, but I have a reference to it. The Senator is right in the assumption that he——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That he first appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and said the present rates were satisfactory——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Perhaps the Senator from Iowa may have the statement right there at hand.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And later on he said——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will recur to it again. I will see that it gets into the RECORD.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. My recollection is that the cotton hearings were held in December. Will my friend from Michigan give me the memorandum of the date?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. December 1.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Lippitt's appearance before the Ways and Means Committee in connection with Mr. MacColl was December 1, and on January 15, 1909, he writes a letter to Mr. PAYNE, chairman of the committee, containing suggestions as to amendments, in which he was joined by Mr. James R. MacColl, both representing themselves as delegates or representatives of the Arkwright Club.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Michigan says he has that statement. Is it brief?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have the statement, and I was just examining it, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me.

DINGLEY COTTON RATES HIGH ENOUGH, SAYS MR. LIPPITT.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has the Senator the letter which was presented before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Lippitt after the hearings?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I was just——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and said that the present law was satisfactory. Then later he puts in a letter to the effect that it is not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will put it in later.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The statement to which the Senator from Iowa referred, which I hold in my hand, is very important. In it Mr. Lippitt says:

The form of the present cotton tariff is the result of many efforts, and considering the wide variety of products it covers, has stood the test of practical operation fairly well. It has been the object of many legal attacks, in the course of which the terms used have, for the most part, been given careful legal definitions, and therefore should not be disturbed. Some minor features, however, are still in controversy and may need elucidation, but the present cotton situation as a whole has resulted in establishing in this country a great industry, widely distributed, employing many people and much capital. It has regulated, but not prevented, importations; has made moderate profits and reasonable wages possible to the capitalist and laborer, but is not a bonanza.

We ask, therefore, that the present schedule shall not be materially changed, and that cotton manufacturers be allowed to continue the operation and further development of this important industry under the same tariff conditions that now prevail.

I was just reading this testimony, Mr. President, and am very glad indeed to give the Senate the benefit of it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I will ask the Senator to read the last sentence in the testimony of Mr. Lippitt also.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The statement throughout indicates that Mr. Lippitt, whoever he is, and I do not have the honor of his acquaintance, seems to be largely identified with this industry, and has indicated that the present rates are quite satisfactory.

Now, Mr. President, I do not hesitate for one moment to say that if this schedule reported from the Finance Committee does raise the Dingley rates, I would not under any circumstances vote for it. I do not see any justification for it, and one of the leading cotton manufacturers says they ask no increase in rates. The Senate has not hesitated to cut the duty on the products of my State. I have no complaint to offer, but I shall under no circumstances cast my vote in favor of increasing the rate of duty upon this class of goods when those who are engaged in their manufacture ask no further assistance at our hands.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish this cotton schedule passed by the Senate until I have completed what I have to say about it. I can not conclude to-day, or, at least, I prefer to yield the floor for the present, if I can be recognized to continue at a later time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I would inquire whether there is anything in the rules that would prevent the Senator from going on? If so, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be allowed to proceed when he feels in condition to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suppose that I could do that; but before the Senate shall take up and pass this cotton schedule, I should be glad to be permitted to have completed my argument, upon which I wish to base some amendments to be offered to the Senate for their consideration; but I have spoken for a considerable time, and I do not want to go on now, unless compelled to do so.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair was waiting for the Senator from Wisconsin to yield the floor, so that the Senator from Nevada might be recognized. The Senator from Nevada has not yet been recognized by the Chair. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to the Senator from Nevada, the Chair will gladly put the request.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield temporarily for that purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is all the Chair desires to ascertain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, in view of the physical condition of the Senator from Wisconsin, that he be permitted to proceed when he is ready to proceed with his argument upon this schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is not necessary to ask that consent. The Senator from Wisconsin can yield the floor and can proceed at any time he pleases during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I do not wish to proceed with my argument against the adoption of this schedule after the schedule has been passed.

Mr. ALDRICH. The schedule can not be entirely passed to-day, I assume. There are a large number of paragraphs. I should, however, like to have a vote upon the pending proposition.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that the attitude of the Senate on these amendments will be determined by its attitude on the amendment which I have offered to paragraph 312, so far as these new specific duties are concerned. It is not my purpose to offer these amendments, but to take the sense of the Senate upon the propriety of them. Therefore I should not like to have a vote taken upon the amendment which I have offered, or even upon the amendment of the Committee on Finance to paragraph 313, until the Senator from Wisconsin has concluded his remarks.

Mr. ALDRICH. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Finance Committee to paragraph 313.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct.

Mr. ALDRICH. And the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has given notice of an amendment, which is not now in order, and which, I think, does not affect this question at all; that is, it does not in my mind. The pending amendment can be voted on. We can not certainly hold this schedule up indefinitely for Senators, as this bill must be disposed of.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would be very glad to finish to-morrow, but I should like to have an opportunity, if I can——

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be very glad to have a time fixed for taking a vote on all the paragraphs in this schedule. If that conclusion can be reached, I have no objection to having the speeches of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made at their convenience; but, unless we can reach an understanding about the vote upon the schedule, I certainly shall have to ask the Senate to proceed with its consideration.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he expects or intends, if it is in his power, to complete the consideration of the cotton schedule at the session to-day?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no expectation about it. I am desirous of getting a vote upon all these paragraphs and schedules at the earliest possible moment; but if an understanding can be reached that a vote shall be taken at some time to-morrow, without further discussion on this schedule, I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] yields for this general discussion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that the principle involved in all of the Senate committee amendments, which convert the ad valorems of the law of 1897 into specific equivalents in the Senate bill, is the same. Therefore, having only a desire to have the sense of the Senate taken upon the propriety of the amendments advancing these rates, it seems to me that no time would be gained by postponing the discussion until other paragraphs are reached. I should like the whole discussion to be confined to this first one, which involves them all, so that thereafter the amendments might be adopted without further debate and without even a roll call of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, Mr. President, I would suggest—I do not know how much more time the Senator from Wisconsin requires——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not know exactly. I could make better progress if I were a little refreshed; that is all. I can go on now if it is vital that I should do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I would suggest that we agree to take a vote upon all the items in this schedule, for I assume that, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] says, the first amendment of the committee to paragraph 313 will really dispose of the question. If the Senate should adopt the committee amendment to paragraph 313, it involves all the same questions in the other paragraphs pertaining to cloth. I would suggest that at 12 o'clock to-morrow we take a vote upon the paragraphs of the cotton schedule, without further discussion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island that it is hardly fair, when we are now discussing a particular paragraph in a particular schedule, in which there are a number of paragraphs, to insist, as a condition of the right of the Senator from Wisconsin to speak to-morrow upon this particular paragraph, that the Senate should, by unanimous consent, agree that it shall vote upon all the paragraphs.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing to extend the time if the Senator desires it. The paragraphs of this schedule are practically unchanged, except the four paragraphs in relation to extending specific duties. I want myself to explain to the Senate the pur-

pose of the committee and the effects of these changes, but I can do it in half an hour at any time. My purpose, however, is to get rid of this schedule. If 12 o'clock is too early, I will suggest 3 o'clock to-morrow. Let us fix some time at which we can come to a conclusion upon this paragraph. It has been discussed now for two days; and it seems to me that all sides of it have been pretty well covered. I assume that everybody is anxious to get a vote on this proposition sooner or later. I certainly do not expect to take exceeding an hour in any event, and I do not know of anyone else on the committee who intends to take much time. There may be some questions asked that would have to be answered.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me ask the Senator from Rhode Island why can not this schedule be passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. BURKETT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is making a general discussion of this paragraph now. Two members of the Committee on Finance have occupied considerable time, and, in my opinion, somebody ought to take more than an hour in answer to some of the things which have been stated by the Senator from Wisconsin. If we could pass the paragraph over and have some other paragraph considered——

Mr. ALDRICH. My own judgment is that ten minutes will satisfy anyone in the Senate as to the correctness of the attitude of the committee; and that will only apply, of course, to suggestions which have been made, whatever they may be.

Mr. BURKETT. Why not let it go over and take up another paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; that can not be done.

Mr. BURKETT. Then, Mr. President, it seems to me we could take up other paragraphs and to fill up the time until the Senator from Wisconsin can get some rest.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not see why we should do that. Probably other Senators are ready to discuss this matter. If we can get an agreement for a time to vote, I will say now that we shall not have any night session, but that I shall ask for an adjournment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. How can the Senator from Rhode Island get any agreement until the discussion shows some signs of nearing its conclusion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair begs to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that he may take his seat. The Chair recognizes that he has the floor and has yielded temporarily. He need not stand in order to hold the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has yielded temporarily in order that this general discussion may proceed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. My understanding, Mr. President, was that the Senator from Wisconsin had yielded to me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. But thereafter the Senator from Wisconsin stated to the Chair that he would yield for the purpose of general discussion, in the hope of reaching some conclusion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, if I am now entitled to recognition——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would say that I hardly think it fair upon the part of the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill, in view of the physical disability of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to proceed with his argument now, to exact as a condition——

Mr. ALDRICH. I am making no insistence at all. The Senator from Wisconsin has a perfect right to yield the floor or to go on, at his convenience. I have no suggestion as to when the Senator from Wisconsin shall occupy the floor or when he shall not. I am only talking about the business of the Senate, which is not to be diverted or set aside for the convenience of any Senator. I certainly do not expect the Senator from Wisconsin, if he is physically unable, to go on with the discussion this afternoon, but I do ask that the business of the Senate shall go on. That is all.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But, Mr. President, the Senator does insist upon going on with the consideration of this schedule in the hope of concluding the consideration of this schedule as quickly as it can be accomplished, and that, too, without any consideration whatever for the physical condition of the Senator who now has the floor, who has not exhausted a moment of time unnecessarily, who has not uttered an idle word, and who has addressed himself to consecutive argument, an argument, which I may say, needs reply, upon this very schedule. The Senator from Rhode Island has intimated that at some time during the consideration of this schedule he will require at least half an hour, and I think it is safe to say that that limitation will have to be enlarged. It will require at least half an hour for the purpose of addressing the Senate regarding this particular schedule and clearing up certain misunderstandings regarding it. Now, we are within an hour and a quarter of adjournment, and if the Senator from Rhode Island should take the floor now——

Mr. GALLINGER. An hour and three-quarters.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have until half past 5.

Mr. NEWLANDS (continuing). To make the statement which he contemplates, it would take a considerable portion of that time; and it seems to me it is only reasonable for the Senator from Rhode Island to agree now that the Senator from Wisconsin shall proceed to-morrow, and that he will not seek to close the debate or to secure a vote upon the particular paragraph or schedule to which the Senator from Wisconsin is now addressing himself. I ask the Senator to yield to that understanding——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator——

Mr. NEWLANDS (continuing). If not, I will be compelled to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no necessity for the Senator from Wisconsin getting unanimous consent to proceed or not to proceed; that is entirely within the control of the Senator from Wisconsin. He is not obliged to ask the consent of the Senate to go on at any particular time and he is not obliged to ask the consent of the Senate to give up the floor at any particular time. That is entirely within the Senator's own privilege and right. What I am suggesting is, that in order to suit the convenience of Senators, if a time can be fixed to take a final vote upon the paragraphs of this schedule, I am willing to consult the convenience, not only of the Senator from Wisconsin, but of all other Senators, with reference to this particular schedule. It seems to me that I am not making an unreasonable request about it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But, Mr. President, there is objection to fixing the time now for a vote upon this schedule or upon this particular paragraph. It is true the Senator from Wisconsin can withdraw from the floor; that is within his power; but all we ask is that the consideration of this schedule be continued, and not disposed of by a vote, in such a way as to secure to the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity to-morrow, when he is physically able to proceed with his argument, to address the Senate, and he assures the Senate that he will close his argument to-morrow. It seems to me that is a reasonable request. If the Senator from Rhode Island will not yield to the request for unanimous consent, there will be nothing remaining then but to make a motion upon the subject.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I ask Senators upon the other side, or upon this side, who seem to have control of the opposition to this schedule, whoever they may be, if they will consent to fix a time to take a vote upon this schedule?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this is a schedule, in which, as I hear—of course I know nothing about committee transactions, as I am only a senatorial member of it, and was not allowed to attend it, against the rules of this body—the insurgents in the committee have taken charge, not only of the bill, but of the witnesses, of the publications, and of everything else connected with our business. They come now craving——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, is the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I am addressing the Senate and decline to yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the Senator occupying the floor in his own right?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has the right to the floor. He has yielded while this discussion has been progressing, practically by unanimous consent, in order to ascertain if some agreement might be reached. That is the parliamentary status. The Senator from Wisconsin can reclaim the floor at any moment he desires.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is making a very instructive speech and is enlightening the ejected portion of the committee, as well as the rest of the Senate, on matters about which the gentlemen in haste have had full opportunity to be informed by witnesses. I have observed before to-day about such measures as this that when gentlemen have had peculiar opportunities to prepare themselves, when they have got all the mechanism of business arranged to suit themselves, and have constituents who have been fixed to suit themselves through their agency, they immediately get in a hurry to put everything through. I have also observed that Senators who wish to be informed and have not had those opportunities, as Senators who are acting upon their conscience and in accordance with the laws of this country and the rules of this body, always desire to know what they are doing before

they are forced to do it. It is a noticeable fact that some people, who are peculiarly in haste for other people to meet their wishes, are exceedingly patient with themselves and are exceedingly patient in performing their part of the functions of this body, which it was their duty first to perform before calling upon others to act under them.

The Senator from Rhode Island has not yet made a committee report on these subjects which he is now discussing. He has amendments and compels the Senate to be patient and wait for them. They still await them. He who asks equity must do equity, and he who asks haste for what he wishes to do must not be impatient with those who have not had his opportunity to know what he knows. I certainly would not think of crowding anybody, much less one who has had time, and improved it, to examine into the pending schedule, which is of the utmost moment to the consumers of this country; which is of the utmost moment to the people who are less able to provide the necessaries of life; which is of the utmost moment to the common and ordinary necessities of life, not of fashionable, but of decent living.

So, Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island must put himself in more becoming attitude and in more just attitude to this body before he can get upon his knees and pray the whole body to yield to his suggestion, if not dictation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. The Senator from Wisconsin is entitled to the floor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For a moment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator from Wisconsin, being worn out and ill and unable to proceed, desires to repose for a few moments, possibly until half past 5 o'clock, I will be glad to relieve his fatigue by taking the floor myself.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator very much; I know the Senate would be very glad to make the exchange; but I am quite refreshed by my little rest and able to go on now, I think, for another hour or two.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am very much gratified to know that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But I will yield to the Senator, at the suggestion of Senators here who are wearied at the sound of my voice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin can not yield the floor to another Senator. That has been ruled over and over again. He can not parcel out the time, except by unanimous consent, other than for an inquiry; and the discussion that has been going on, as the Chair stated, has been by unanimous consent, the Senator from Wisconsin yielding for that purpose.

Mr. PENROSE. Regular order, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Wisconsin, having yielded the floor now to the Senator from Iowa or any other Senator, has spoken once. If the Senator from Iowa should then speak, the Senator from Wisconsin, when the Senator from Iowa gets through, or any other Senator to whom he yields gets through, at any time during this legislative day could again resume the floor, and on no other legislative day. Is that correct?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is not correct.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is not correct?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Wisconsin can be recognized again to-morrow.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, certainly; but I am talking about——

Mr. GALLINGER. Can not the Senator be recognized twice the same day under the rule?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Yes; he can be recognized twice on the same day under the rule, or he can be recognized to-morrow.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Chair misapprehended me. My inquiry—I was probably unfortunate in not making it clear—was, if the Senator from Wisconsin should now yield the floor, he then has spoken once, and under parliamentary law——

Mr. ALDRICH. He could go on to-morrow.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am talking about the legislative day. Then, when the Senator to whom he yields gets through, or anybody else gets through, he may then resume the floor again if he gets the recognition of the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And that is all for that day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is the correct interpretation, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on a question of order a Senator can not yield the floor to another Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He can if nobody rises to suggest that he can not. If a Senator yields the floor and any other Senator is fortunate or unfortunate enough to get recognition of the Chair, he can go on, and the only point was whether the Senator might resume at any time.

Mr. PENROSE. Regular order!

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is the regular order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island if it is his purpose to have a session to-night?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the order of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know that is the order of the Senate; but is it the order of the Senator from Rhode Island? [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I am under the orders of the Senate——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is for the Senate to determine.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is for the Senate to determine, and not myself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It might be proper to ask as to the intention of the Senator from Rhode Island, in charge of the bill; and I take it that is what the Senator from Wisconsin meant.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stated that if I could secure an agreement to fix the time to vote upon this schedule, which certainly can not involve very many more hours of discussion—at least, it seems to me so—I would not ask for a session to-night, and that I would ask the Senate to adjourn instead of going on to-night. It seems to me that is a very reasonable request.

COTTON CLOTH OF ALL GRADES INCREASED.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, resuming my discussion of the increases in the cotton schedule, I next invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph 314. Paragraph 314 provides duties for cloth exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and it first provides for cloth of that count not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Where is the Senator reading from now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am reading from paragraph 314, and I call attention to the first description under that paragraph. Of cloth, of the description given, not exceeding 4 square yards to the pound, there were $11,104 worth imported last year, and the committee did not increase the duty upon that cloth. Of cloth of this count exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 yards to the pound there were $9,449 imported in a year, and that escaped an increase at the hands of the committee. But for some reason or other, when it reached the next class, cloth exceeding 6 and not exceeding 8 square yards per pound, the committee increased the duty 20 per cent, although the value of a year's imports of this class of cloth was only $5,601.

On cloth of the same description valued at over 9 cents per square yard, the average increase is 17.87 per cent and the value of imports was $20,028.

Coming now to bleached cloth of the same count and weight as the foregoing, valued at over 11 cents per square yard, which is considered a "luxury" by this committee, the average increase by the committee amendment is 17.23 per cent and the value of imports for one year $465,521.

The next four items of this bracket for some reason or other were passed over without increases by the Senate committee. But on cloth of this count and weight, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, the increase is 13.09 per cent and the value of imports was large—$1,536,802.

The next paragraph, No. 315, embraces cotton cloth, exceeding 150 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling. On cloth of this count, not bleached, valued at over 10 cents per square yard, the increase is 20.89 per cent. The value of imports for the year 1907 amounted to only $6,171.

On cloth of the same count bleached and valued at over 12 cents per square yard, the average increase by the committee amendment is 32.83 per cent, and the value of imports was $1,242,235.

On cloth of this count dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, the increase is 11.20 per cent, and the value of imports for the year 1907 was $2,751,271.98.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it is very evident——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield temporarily for a question.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is very evident to the Senate that the Senator from Wisconsin is physically unable to go on.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish the Senator would not say that. I am able to proceed.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think he is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor, and he declines to yield further.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am very much obliged to the Senator, but I do not want to be put on the record as an invalid.

I call the attention of the Senate now to paragraph 316, embracing cloth exceeding 200 threads and not exceeding 300 threads to the square inch. On cloth of this count, not bleached, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, and bleached, valued at over 15 cents per square yard, the increases are slight.

But on cloth of this count dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 17½ cents per square yard, the average increase is 29.43 per cent, and the year's imports amounted to $1,443,233.

The next paragraph, 317, embraces all cotton cloths counting over 300 threads to the square inch, counting warp and filling. On cloth of this count not bleached and not exceeding 2 square yards to the pound the increase is 62.50 per cent, although the imports for a year amounted to only $358 in value.

On bleached cloth of this count valued at over 16 cents per square yard the increase is 20.85 over the Dingley rate, and the imports of 1907 amounted to only $10,027.55.

On cloth of the same count when dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at over 20 cents per square yard, the increase is 16.78 per cent, while the imports were $118,977.

Paragraph 321 embraces cloth in which there are woven figures, sometimes known as "lappets." On cloth of this character exceeding 50 and not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, stained, colored, painted, or printed, not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound and valued at more than 7 cents per square yard, the increase is 30.81 per cent, although the value of imports for a whole year was only $18.

On cloth of that description exceeding 9 square yards to the pound and valued at more than 7 cents per square yard the duty is increased by the Finance Committee 13⅓ per cent, while the importation in 1907 was only $700.

On cloth of this character and count, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard, the increase is 21.04 per cent, while the imports for a year under the present rates amounted to only $75.

On cloth of this character not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 7 cents per square yard, the duty is increased 38.19 per cent, while the value of imports for 1907 was $68,505.

On cloth of the same description bleached, valued at over 9 cents per square yard, the increase is 31.88 per cent, and the value of imports was $80,837 in 1907.

NO MISUNDERSTANDING OF THESE INCREASES.

On the same cloth dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and valued at over 12 cents per square yard, the increase is 32.48 per cent, and the value of imports in 1907, $220,244.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As I understand, he is speaking of an item on page 39, and the Finance Committee's statement shows that the present equivalent duty is 30 per cent, and under the Senate bill 44.28 per cent. That shows an increase of 14 per cent. The Senator's percentage of increase, as I understand, is about 40 per cent of this 30 per cent. Is that the basis upon which his increases in percentage are computed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am giving the per cent of increase over the existing rate which this bill makes, and I give it exactly as it is computed by the Bureau of Statistics. It is not my construction, and they are not my figures. I assume that the Bureau of Statistics knows how to figure these increases correctly. On the item I have just read the Finance Committee's statement shows that the duty under the present law is 40.83 per cent and under their bill is 54.09 per cent. The difference is an increase of exactly 32.48 per cent.

Mr. JONES. I know; but I want to understand the basis.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator can very readily see for himself. If he takes the ad valorem equivalent given in the Senate bill and the ad valorem equivalent given in the present law, and ascertains the difference, he can soon compute what rate per cent that difference is on the existing duty.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will permit me, the 30 per cent given on the page here is 30 per cent of the full value of the article, which is estimated of course at 100 per cent. Now, then, this increase of 14 per cent is also 14 per cent of that full 100 per cent value. But it would be equivalent to 40 per cent of the present percentage.

I think we ought to understand exactly the basis upon which these computations have been made as to increases. If it is an increased percentage upon the 100 per cent valuation, it would be a certain per cent. If it is an increase on the present percentage of duty, it would be a much higher rate. I think we should understand clearly the basis on which the figures are made. I ask for information, because it has been bothering me all the way through here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have made it as clear as I can to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I understand. The percentage which the Senator calls the percentage of increase is the percentage that the difference between these two ad valorems is upon the percentage as shown here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. Of the ad valorem duty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is right.

Mr. JONES. And not upon the 100 per cent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is the percentage of increase over the existing rate.

Mr. JONES. It seems to me that gives rather an erroneous impression as to the rate of increase, because it gives a much higher rate. It would be better understood if the percentage of increase was given upon the hundred per cent value of the article imported, upon which these ad valorem changes are based.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have given the exact and actual increase. The form in which I have stated it is the only form which would correctly state the per cent of increase, or which would have any exact meaning whatever.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And it does not admit of any possible misunderstanding.

Mr. JONES. If a person understands the basis taken on which to compute that percentage, there can be no misunderstanding; but one man might have in his mind the full hundred per cent value, when the rate of increase would be one, or he might take the percentage that is given here and thus get another rate.

CHAIRMAN OF FINANCE COMMITTEE HAS NOT EXPLAINED.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The table which I shall print and from which I am reading—and reading exactly as it is—gives the ad valorem of the existing rate, gives the ad valorem of the new rates as reported in the bill just as found in the table furnished by the Committee on Finance, gives the value of the imports, and gives the per cent of increase of the duties reported by the Finance Committee over the existing rates. This table I will print in full.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Wisconsin says that the committee have reported some percentages of increases. That is not correct. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator with reference to these various figures, but I will say that the Senator is acting upon misinformation as to the extent of these and as to the character of the report of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Rhode Island has taken occasion every time a criticism has been made of this bill to inject into the remarks of the Senator the statement that it is not correct and that he is acting on misinformation, and that some time or other he will explain it all to the Senate. He has made that promise again and again, but he has never redeemed it or pretended to do so.

I say to the Senator from Rhode Island I am not proceeding upon misinformation, and I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that these figures are based upon the figures furnished by his committee and given to the Senate in what is called the estimates of revenue, furnished, I take it, not to mislead the Senate, but to aid Senators to correct conclusions upon this bill.

At an earlier time in this debate, when those estimates were referred to, the Senator from Rhode Island said they had been

prepared very hurriedly; that there were mistakes and errors in them; that the only occasion for surprise was that they did not contain more errors. I say that was a confession which the chairman of the Finance Committee ought never to have been compelled to make. But this Book of Estimates, the only guide furnished us by the committee to aid us in interpreting the changes in this bill, has been three times revised and printed. It is the business of that committee—it is of every committee—to furnish correct information. Nearly half of the employees of the Bureau of Statistics have been detailed to the service of the Committee on Finance for weeks. I say that neither the committee nor the chairman nor anybody else responsible for the bill has a fair and just right to screen themselves behind errors in the work which they have compiled and furnished to the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The tables furnished to the Senate were prepared, as every Senator at all familiar with the subject knows, by men in the Bureau of Statistics or connected with the Government, upon the importations of a certain year, without reference to any knowledge as to the changes which have taken place in the act and the application of those changes. They do not make any attempt to say what the effect of the changes in classifications would be upon the rates fixed by the bill which is pending. It is impossible for them, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota yesterday. There can be no data under their control or under the control of anyone which would show what precise value, with its application to these various changes, would be had upon importations in the future.

The Senator says we furnished no explanation. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] in one of the clearest and most comprehensive statements that I have ever heard in the Senate explained the application of these rates to the paragraphs. That statement was not only based upon the judgment and information of the committee, but was based upon the information and judgment of all the best experts in the government service. That statement shows that the rates which are imposed by these specific duties which we have recommended are practically 5 per cent less than the rates which were imposed by the Dingley Act. If the Senator from Wisconsin had read that statement carefully, I think he would have been satisfied as to the accuracy of those figures.

I intend to supplement that statement by facts, partly from the importations of last year, partly from the judgment of the men who for years have been passing upon these importations at the custom-house, and I intend to show to the Senate that while there are some apparent increases in this schedule, judging by the importations of 1907, the effect of these changes is a reduction of duties, while there is an apparent increase in some of the items.

SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND IS MISTAKEN.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from Rhode Island will never get any man in the Senate or out of it who will investigate these changes in rates to accept the statement which he has made or the one which was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. I say to the Senator from Rhode Island what he has said to many Senators on this floor—you are mistaken. You never will be able to make the Senate accept your statement that these changes have not increased these rates, unless they accept your statement, as sometimes some Senators are given to, without question and without understanding. The Dingley law as it stands on the statute books to-day is the law of this land with respect to its tariff duties and customs.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not just now.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not for the moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not for the Senator from Rhode Island, or anybody else in this body, because they happen to have a hand on legislation and in legislation with respect to the tariff, to say that that law meant something that the courts determined it did not mean. There was a defect in the cotton schedule of the Dingley law, a defect curable by a single and simple amendment, which will be pointed out and made plain to the Senate. But that defect, that oversight, does not afford a justification for increasing the rates directly upon the bulk of the countable cotton cloths, which increases can be computed mathematically, and also increase rates by new wording, as I shall point out later, in ways that can not be calculated mathematically.

So, Mr. President, I say the Senator from Rhode Island is estopped from rising now, when this bill is half or two-thirds through the Senate, to impeach the information which he has furnished and upon which we have proceeded, these estimates of imports and the ad valorem equivalents, because they no longer serve his purposes. I yield now to the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Dingley Act, when it was passed, imposed the lowest duty of 60 per cent ad valorem upon the entire class of soft fabrics, high-class luxuries, with low count. The court or the general appraisers or both, it makes no difference which, reduced that 60 per cent to the provision of paragraph 304 of the old law, which is paragraph 313 of the present measure. So cloths valued at 24 cents a yard were imported into this country at 1 cent a yard, or about 4 per cent ad valorem.

This bill corrects that by changing that rate from 1 cent a yard to a specific of 24 cents, or 7 cents a yard, if I remember it, which is, on its face, an increase on the plan which the Senator from Wisconsin has adopted of 600 or 700 per cent, and still the existing rate under this bill will be 20 per cent less than the rate which the Dingley law placed upon that very article.

Of course the Senator and his friends can find places of this kind—they are in every law—by which an apparent increase is made. It is to cure the defects. If that is not the purpose of this revision, what is it? I say, the Senate would be derelict in its highest duty if it did not cure these defects, and that it should not be restrained from doing that duty by the objection of the Senator from Wisconsin, which is that he can show an increase of duty in this manner.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE INCREASES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have one of those instances right before me, and it makes a fine illustration of the argument of the Senator from Rhode Island. It is the next item in the table—paragraph 321, cloth exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding 4 and not exceeding 6 square yards to the pound, valued at more than 7 cents per square yard. It was subject under the Dingley law to the low ad valorem of 11.40 per cent measured on the importations of the year 1907. This is seized upon because it happens to show a low ad valorem equivalent at this time as offering an opportunity for an advance, and it is advanced 185 per cent. Now, why? The importation of this cloth under that low duty, which was taken as the basis of this increase, amounted to $5 in the year 1907. That was an awful defect in the Dingley law——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not just now. I will give you a chance to get in when I get through with this statement. There was an importation of only $5 under the low Dingley rate. No industry in this country could have suffered very severely from the competition of the pauper labor of Europe, which only succeeded under that rate in putting into this market $5 worth of that material.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think the amount of importations in any particular year ought to fix the rate of duty? Did he use this reasoning in his vote for a duty on barley?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I rather expected that sooner or later I would hear some such observation as that from the Senator from Rhode Island. It is about the plane upon which the chairman of the Committee on Finance proceeds in giving his instruction and information to the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not want you to interrupt me now. Wait until you get your answer. You are going to be accorded the same kind of treatment that I received from you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will please address in the third person.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I accept the correction.

Mr. President, it rather seems to me that the chairman of this important committee, at an earlier period in this debate, might well have seen fit to present to the Senate the theory upon which all of these advances were made, instead of waiting until the cotton schedule was reached. Now, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] is put forward with a remarkable statement, which I shall take up later, and which I believe it will be possible to show is reasoning in a vicious circle, by which the high rates of to-day are made the basis for higher rates to-morrow.

I do not care at this time, and wearied somewhat as I am, to take up that part of the discussion; but I do purpose to do it, and I am very glad the Senator from Rhode Island has seen fit to call attention to the statement of the Senator from Utah.

You can not justify these real advances over the Dingley rates by pretending that they are only apparent advances. I am just reminded by a remark which I overheard in a rear seat that I neglected to make any response to the Senator from Rhode Island with respect to my vote upon the duty on barley, and I will take the opportunity to do it now.

REASONS FOR THE DUTY ON BARLEY.

Mr. President, when the duty on barley was fixed at 30 cents per bushel, from an investigation which I made at that time, for I wrote that rate in the law of 1890, it was clearly demonstrated, in my judgment and in that of the committee and of the House of Representatives, that that rate was necessary to save the markets of this country and the producers of barley in this country. We were at that time year by year losing the market to the Canadian farmer. Year by year our acreage was being diminished. The imports had increased until the equivalent of one-fifth of the entire product of this country came across the line from Canada. Unless that rate was increased, and increased to that figure, I was convinced at that time—and I have heard no argument to change my mind since—that the farmers of this country would have to abandon the growing of barley; that the entire acreage, something more than 3,000,000 acres, as I now remember, that were devoted to the barley crop in this country at that time, would have been forced into the production of some other crops. The rate fixed on barley at that time is the rate of the existing law.

I listened to the discussion that took place on the Senate floor when the amendment to the barley duty was presented, but I heard no statement in all that discussion that convinced me that it was safe or prudent to change the present law and reduce the duty on that product.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not make the suggestion I did with reference to barley to suggest that the Senator was guilty of inconsistency, but I desired to call his attention to the fact that in the case of one article where there were practically no importations, 11,000 bushels imported and an exportation of 5,000,000 bushels, he did not hesitate to vote for a large increase in the rate over the bill as it came from the House. I assume that he did it sincerely, and I assume that it was a matter of judgment with him and not a matter of local interest.

VOTED FOR NO INCREASE OVER EXISTING LAW.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I voted for no increase of duty over existing law. The Senator from Rhode Island is crafty, adroit, and clever in diverting, if possible, the attention of the Senate and the country from the glaring, the shocking, increases over existing rates which this bill discloses.

But I purpose, Mr. President, to hold the attention of the Senate, if I can, to this bill and to this cotton schedule, and when I have pointed out the increases that are made, I then am going to undertake to show not only that the duties should not be increased over the Dingley rates, but that, upon the principle expressed by President Taft in all of his utterances and in the platform of the Republican party, they should be reduced through every paragraph. I will show that by indubitable evidence with respect to the labor cost in this country and the labor cost in the competing countries.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me?

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for a question. I do not care to yield for a speech.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think we are bound either by President Taft's views upon this question or by the Chicago platform to reduce the duties below the existing law, without reference to anything else?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What an idle question, when I just stated to the Senator, if he had been giving me his attention, that upon the difference in the cost of production, the difference in the labor cost, I will show that these duties should be reduced. Neither the Chicago platform nor the utterances of President Taft warrant the question asked by the Senator. The discrimination which the Chicago platform makes, and which President Taft has reenforced so many times, is that duties shall be based upon the difference in cost of production and not upon what any cotton manufacturer or any other manufacturer says he wants.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator yield to me that I may address a question to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island has stated, and of course with accuracy and sound judgment, that the opinion of the manufacturers who are building up the industry should have weight and influence. Am I correct about that?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have made a great many statements in that connection. If the Senator will refer me to the particular statement he has in mind——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I will.

Mr. ALDRICH (continuing). Perhaps I may be able to answer it categorically, but I would prefer at the present time to deal with the Senator's colleague, who is now addressing the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And the Senator's colleague also?

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; we are all colleagues here. That being true, and of course, as a matter of fact, it has been stated, as it ought to be stated, as President Taft stated in his speeches, that the opinion of the manufacturers who built up the business and were most interested in the increase of duty should have influence, I wish to read to the Senator merely, because it has been read before here this afternoon when the Senator was not here, and it is fair to him to hear it——

Mr. ALDRICH. It has been read, I think, half a dozen times in my hearing.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let us read it again.

Mr. ALDRICH. But, Mr. President, in this matter it is not necessary that I should take the suggestion of any manufacturer. Before I get through with this discussion I intend to present facts as to the difference in the cost of production between this country and competing countries. Of course I shall be very glad to hear either the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Wisconsin in their presentation of the facts bearing upon this case.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not intending to present anything, because I am listening to both sides. These two quotations I was directing the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to because most certainly the person who represents the cotton industries of the country and is more deeply interested, in a selfish way, than anybody else——

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have noticed the peculiar facility on the part of both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Wisconsin to accept the statements of certain people in reference to these industries and these rates without reference to anyone's else opinion; and I assume that the opinion which the Senator is to read from meets his views and the views of the Senator from Wisconsin, or else this interruption would not have taken place.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the Senator's assumption in that regard is just as incorrect as, apparently, the Senator's information must have been upon many other things. The Senator's observation as to what a Senator notices about the effect of the opinions of various men I will leave to the Senate itself to judge of. But that does not deter me, because, in good faith, I want to know the Senator's opinion about this.

I read from the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee the statement of Mr. Lippitt. I did not know who he was until this afternoon, when I asked the question. Mr. Lippitt represented the Arkwright Club, and is the largest cotton manufacturer, or at least is represented to be, and comes from the Senator's own State. I understand he is a man of credibility and a man of some business acumen, and certainly knows about his own business. He says:

> The form of the present cotton tariff is the result of many efforts, and considering the wide variety of products it covers has stood the test of practical operation fairly well. It has been the object of many legal attacks, in the course of which the terms used have for the most part been given careful legal definitions, and therefore should not be disturbed. Some minor features, however, are still in controversy——

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; we will read on—

> and may need elucidation; but the present cotton situation as a whole has resulted in establishing in this country a great industry, widely distributed, employing many people and much capital. It has regulated but not prevented importations, has made moderate profits and reasonable wages possible to the capitalist and laborer, but is not a bonanza.
>
> We ask, therefore, that the present schedule shall not be materially changed, and that cotton manufacturers be allowed to continue the

operation and further development of this important industry under the same tariff conditions that now prevail.

He concludes his statement as follows:

I am not appearing here to ask for an increase in the duties on the cloth clauses of the cotton schedule. I think that while there are importations going on under them, it is reasonably regulative of the cotton trade. The importations are not so large that we feel justified in asking that the duties be increased, but we would not like to see them decreased, as we believe that any decrease would certainly result in very much larger importations and a great deal more of our cotton being manufactured abroad and shipped back as finished goods, as we say.

There is the complete statement I see marked. I simply read it to the Senator and ask what he thinks about that statement of the representative of the cotton manufacturers formally made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

Mr. GALLINGER. It has been read six times.

Mr. ALDRICH. It has been read quite a number of times.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, the Senator is better prepared to reply.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator probably was not in the Senate when I made the statement, and probably has not read it in the RECORD, that the particular paragraphs he refers to were never submitted to any manufacturer or to anybody interested in this business.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is not the question I am asking.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am answering the Senator's question, and it will give the Senator from Wisconsin more time if I enlarge upon it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. ALDRICH. That will be satisfactory, I know, to the Senator from Indiana. I said then, and I repeat, that these amendments were prepared by the committee itself from their knowledge of the defects which had been produced by the courts and by the Board of General Appraisers, or whoever else you please.

Now, I will say to the Senator from Indiana what is absolutely true, to my knowledge, from my long experience in tariff legislation. I venture the assertion that there are not three cotton manufacturers in the United States who knew about those decisions and their effect upon the law. The South manufactures about one-half of the cotton goods produced in the United States. I am willing to venture the statement that there are not two men engaged in cotton manufacture in the South who had any idea about the decisions which I have referred to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It certainly could not have affected their industry seriously if they did not know about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have myself seen industries dwindle and go out of existence on account of decisions made under the tariff act which the men themselves had no knowledge or no suspicion of.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. They never heard of them until they were brought to their attention in a practical way, and perhaps not then, in the loss of their business and the destruction of the industry.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

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

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. If I do not interfere with the other two gentlemen, who seem to be occupying the floor, I yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I beg pardon; that is not an answer. I have not occupied the floor one instant to-day. I did want the Senator's opinion on that question, and now that I have the floor——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has not the floor. The Chair is trying to find out who has. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now that I have the floor——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to yield to me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield to the Senator from Iowa in a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have read it again, and I will ask the Senator this question: Since he has stated that it is because of decisions which might injuriously affect the industry in which these men are engaged, decisions of which the men in that industry absolutely knew nothing themselves, does he think the cotton industry is a languishing industry? If he does, Mr. Lippitt says it is a very flourishing one.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well; I will wait and speak in my own time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish a recognition of the fact that I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire, if the Chair will permit me——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has yielded to the Senator from Rhode Island. Does the Senator from Rhode Island care to claim the floor?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island to what decisions of the courts he was referring.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was referring to a series of decisions which, if the Senator had listened to my remarks——

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did listen, and I took the book of statistics, and also the Senator's statement of yesterday, that these decisions had raised the importations from $2,000,000 to $9,000,000, and I found the speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was devoted to etamines, when the total importations under the paragraph referred to in those decisions amounted to $26,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is entirely mistaken in that statement. It is like a large part of the information which is floating around the Senate. It has absolutely no foundation in fact. There is no way of finding out how many goods were classed as etamines under the original act that were imported last year. The Senator from Iowa, with all the assistance he may have and with all the knowledge he may have, which is very great, can not possibly make any kind of an estimate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There is a way, however, of finding out what goods were imported under paragraph 312.

Mr. ALDRICH. That has nothing whatever to do with the case.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Your complaint was that these etamines had been taken out of the 60 per cent paragraph and thrust into paragraph 312, and that it had greatly increased the importations. I find, upon examining the book of statistics, that the total importations under paragraph 312 were only $26,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa is a very wise man and a very intelligent man, but he, with all his wisdom and intelligence, can not give a correct answer to the statement as to the amount of etamines imported that were admitted at a different rate of duty from what was originally intended; he could not do it to save his life. Any statement made of the character which he has just made is simply misleading and must be based upon misinformation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If I am going to be misleading, I am going a little further. I have examined all these things, and I say to the Senate now that any man with sagacity enough to investigate the statistical tables must know that under the decisions to which the Senator referred as effecting changes in rates, the importations are a mere bagatelle of the cotton-cloth importations into the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had followed up my remarks very closely, he would have found out that——

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The regular order is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. NELSON. The regular order, I think, is a recess at 5 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator is mistaken. A recess is provided for at half past 5 o'clock. The regular order is the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GALLINGER. He has yielded.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah can not proceed.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Wisconsin yielded to the Senator from Utah.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. But he could not yield to the Senator from Utah for such a purpose, except by unanimous consent. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] demanding the regular order is equivalent to an objection. The Senator from Wisconsin will therefore proceed.

Mr. NELSON. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota withdraws his objection, and therefore the Senator from Utah can proceed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his question of order.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator having the floor has yielded twenty-five times to-day to Senators who have made observations. Is it to be understood that he can not do that?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Except by unanimous consent. The Senator can only yield for a question. He can not yield for speeches.

Mr. GALLINGER. But who has made objection?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No one has, until now. The Senator from Minnesota made an objection by a demand for the regular order.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the Senator from Minnesota was under a misapprehension. He thought the hour for a recess had arrived.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has now withdrawn his demand, and therefore the Chair stated that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] might proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. TILLMAN. Under what rule of the Senate is the Chair authorized to state that a Senator can not yield when one Senator protests?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the unbroken precedents of the Senate a Senator can not yield the floor to another Senator, except he may yield for an inquiry; but he can not yield to another Senator for a speech, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. TILLMAN. In other words, you take a Senator off the floor if one man objects?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not know anything about parliamentary law, but I know something about fair play and common sense; and I never heard of any such thing here before.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is out of order.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Chair will please explain, I will try to get in order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will be in order as soon as he takes his seat.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not feel disposed to be ordered to sit down by anybody. The Senate can order me out of this Chamber, but the Vice-President or the President of the Senate can not order me to sit down.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. TILLMAN. In what way?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator has not been yielded to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. I rose to a question of order. I was recognized by the Chair, and I am trying to get some information upon my point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair answered the inquiry.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I protested against it, and I appeal from it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator will state exactly what he appeals from, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. TILLMAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair. If I understood it, he undertook to state that a Senator can not proceed with one man objecting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair ruled absolutely the opposite.

Mr. SCOTT. The Chair ruled the opposite.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Absolutely the opposite.

Mr. TILLMAN. Did not the Chair state that the Senator from Wisconsin could not yield to another Senator, except by unanimous consent?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did so.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then, that compels the Senator from Wisconsin to proceed with only one man objecting; and if one man objects to the Senator from Wisconsin yielding, that compels the Senator from Wisconsin to continue until he breaks down.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It compels him to proceed until he takes his seat; until he yields the floor, most certainly, under the unbroken precedents of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then he would have to ask unanimous consent to continue?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To continue his remarks?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly not. The Senator from Wisconsin is entitled to the floor without limit.

Mr. TILLMAN. Just so; I just understand the situation; but I do not feel, and I do not think, the Senate will ever agree to adopt a rule that any Senator must be compelled to speak on if one man objects. That is what I object to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair held, and the Chair will always hold, under the unbroken precedents of the Senate, that a Senator can not yield to another Senator to make a speech, except by unanimous consent. He can yield for an inquiry; and Senators constantly do so.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, of course he can yield to an inquiry.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly he can.

Mr. TILLMAN. And then continue his speech?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. And then proceed with his speech.

Mr. TILLMAN. But suppose the inquiry involves debate?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That can be stopped at any time by the objection of any Senator.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without any question. Now, if the Senator from South Carolina will be good enough——

Mr. TILLMAN. I have seen this new doctrine broken here many thousands of times in the Senate, and I do not believe that it is the rule under which we have been acting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I appeal from this decision. When you first explained what you meant, I understood you to say that the Senator from Wisconsin could not yield for a question or anything else, but must speak on, if one Senator objected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair——

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, if you will explain——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair stated the opposite; and the Senator from South Carolina appeals.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to appeal from common sense, nor from the rules of the Senate, either.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator has appealed, and the Chair is about to put the question.

Mr. TILLMAN. If that is what the Chair meant, I withdraw the point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The appeal?

Mr. TILLMAN. I withdraw the appeal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina withdraws the appeal, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] will proceed. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] having withdrawn his demand for the regular order, the Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota did not demand the regular order in the sense of compelling the Senator from Wisconsin to proceed, but he said what his demand was—the regular order to take a recess at 5 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair begs to state to the Senator from Texas that he is in error in this, that the Senator from Minnesota demanded the regular order. Then, after the Chair had ruled that the Senator from Utah could not proceed under that demand, the Senator from Minnesota explained what he expected to accomplish by demanding the regular order.

Mr. CULBERSON. What I want to call the attention of the Chair to was the fact that the Senator from Minnesota did not contemplate the regular order in the sense of demanding that the Senator from Wisconsin should proceed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Which he thereafter explained, certainly, and then the Chair announced that the Senator from Utah, the demand for the regular order having been withdrawn, might answer in response to the yielding of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like first to know if the Senator from Utah, to whom I yielded, desires to——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, if agreeable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say that I was under the erroneous impression that we were to take a recess at 5 o'clock; and I called for the regular order for that purpose, not to cut off the Senator from Utah from answering the question of the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands, and the Senator from Wisconsin so understands; and now he yields to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Iowa, I wish to refer briefly to the court decisions, and to state to him that the amount of importations under paragraph 312 does not cover all the importations affected under the court decisions by any manner of means. They cover but a very small part of them; and yet the statement of the Senator from Iowa a few days ago was that upon that particular paragraph there was a 400 per cent increase; but in my speech I showed that the first decision on etamines reduced the rate from 60 per cent to 45 per cent and goods affected falling in paragraph 322, and neither the Senator from Iowa nor any other Senator can state the amount or value of the goods so affected. The second assault was in relation to the completed article and nonhomogeneous fabric and the decision of the court reduced it to colored countable cottons at 30 per cent ad valorem and 2 cents per square yard, under paragraphs 305 and 313, equivalent to 35 per cent, and a duty of only 14 cents per square yard was collected. Many thousand dollars worth of these goods under the Dingley law came in under those paragraphs, and the Senator from Iowa——

Mr. DOLLIVER. At what rate?

Mr. SMOOT. At 35 per cent.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is the exact rate you put on them in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not discussing that question. I am discussing the question that they were intended by the Dingley law to carry a duty of 60 per cent, and through the decision of the court they have been reduced in this case to 35 per cent. The very next decision reduced them to 30 per cent; and the next decision reduced them, as I said, so as to come under paragraph 305, and to something like 10 per cent. The last decision made by Mr. de Vries was the one that changed the classification causing the goods to fall within paragraph 312, which was the Dingley paragraph 304; and the importations under this paragraph do not amount to much. But who can tell the amount of importations under all the other paragraphs?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The truth is that the importation of them never amounted to anything, whatever paragraph they came in under, as the proprietor of any dry-goods store will tell you.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, so far as the truth of the matter is concerned, we do know that they amounted to this much: That the importers of New York spent thousands and thousands of dollars in attorneys' fees for a decision of the court to take etamines out of paragraph 339 and put them into a paragraph carrying a lower rate; and after they had secured the decision changing this class of goods from paragraph 339 to paragraph 322, they commenced another fight to get them in at a lower rate, and then still a lower rate. They were still not content, but wanted a lower rate; and under another decision they received it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, I do.

Mr. DOLLIVER. All of these court decisions put together are applicable to etamines, so called, and vitrages and the green goods that the Senator has exhibited here, the fancy cottons, like tidies and table covers, affected by the decisions—all of them put together, instead of furnishing any reason for changing the Dingley tariff law, as this committee has changed it, in reality are negligible quantities in the commerce of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, against that statement I will put this statement——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Against that statement of the Senator from Iowa I will put this statement, with knowledge: I know that the provisions of the act of 1897 in regard to etamines intended to include all the soft fabrics, fancy fabrics of a low count that were imported into the United States, and I know that that purpose of the Government has been frustrated, and that the law has been emasculated by the men who are here now in this city demanding that frauds upon the Government shall be consummated by the Senate of the United States, not only by this decision, but by half a dozen decisions, to which I will call the attention of the Senate; and that neither the Senator from Iowa nor any other Senator can say to what extent this fraudulent changing of the law——

Mr. DOLLIVER. What does the Senator mean by "fraudulent?"

Mr. ALDRICH. I mean fraudulent in the sense that the intention of Congress has been absolutely destroyed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. By whom?

Mr. ALDRICH. By various people who have had to decide these questions.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Have they decided the questions correctly?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; not according to my judgment. But whether they decided them correctly or not, the effect is what I am talking about; and it is that effect which I propose to ask the Senate to cure. I propose to ask the Senate that this importation of goods, valued at 24 cents a yard, at 1 cent a yard shall stop; and if the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin say, because we put a reasonable duty on them, we have increased the rate four or five or six hundred per cent, that is the effect of revising this law so that a proper and reasonable duty will be imposed upon these articles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, against the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island, I put the figures. All the cotton goods imported into this country last year at the rate of duty of 15 per cent or under amounted to but $74,397.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. There was $9,000,000 worth of goods imported into the United States valued above the specific rate fixed by the act of 1897 from 7 to 20 cents a yard; and neither the Senator from Wisconsin nor the Senator from Iowa can even give the slightest guess as to what proportion of that $9,000,000 worth of goods had been reduced from 60 per cent to 45 per cent, and to rates varying from 4 to 6 to 10 to 20 to 25 and 30 per cent below the intention of Congress, clearly expressed, in my judgment.

Now, it is to cure those defects that I am pleading here in behalf of the laborers engaged in these industries and in behalf of the honest collection of duties. I am asking the Senate to restore the law as it stood in 1897, and not to permit these gentlemen who, by one means or another, have secured the changes, to consummate their purposes through the action of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CLAY. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, and I will yield. The Senator from Rhode Island can stand on this floor and make his declarations without authority as many times as he chooses, but he can not wipe out the work of the department. All the imports under the cotton schedule amount to but a fraction of 3 per cent of the total production of this country of that product.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was aware of that fact.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island to specify as to this indictment which he brings against somebody who has changed the law, as he states. Does he attack the courts?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has asked me that question three or four times.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not recall that I have.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator has.

Mr. TILLMAN. But if the Senator reiterates the assertion and does not prove it, I will keep on asking him until the end of time.

Mr. ALDRICH. If it is any satisfaction to the Senator, I will give him a memoranda of the cases and he can read them for himself and see who rendered the decisions which made these changes in the law and what their effect was. If he will read the speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] upon the subject——

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to be referred by the Senator from Rhode Island to the Senator from Utah. Let him tell me himself.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will give the Senator himself the memoranda as to the cases which I have referred to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Why not print them in the RECORD and let us all read them?

Mr. CLAY. Let me ask the Senator a question there, because it has given me some trouble.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. What was the Dingley rate per yard on these goods selling for 24 cents per yard?

Mr. ALDRICH. Sixty per cent on part of them and 45 per cent on the others.

Mr. CLAY. What change in that rate did these decisions make?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Utah has just said that the first decision reduced the rate from 60 per cent to 45 per cent; the next decision reduced the rate from 45 to 30 per cent, as I remember; and the next decision reduced the rate to about 6 per cent.

Mr. CLAY. Under what theory?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can get the decisions, and can read them.

Mr. CLAY. I do not care to have the decisions read. All the courts could do would be simply to construe the law as to what it meant; but the courts could not change the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. CLAY. And the courts simply held what the Dingley law was. Now, how does the Senator know—here is a question of importance to me—and can the Senator inform the Senate as to what was the intention of Congress in regard to those goods?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I can answer that question. Congress intended by the provisions of the Dingley Act, as I have already said, to put on soft fancy cotton of a low count a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem, upon the theory that that count did not in any way affect the value or the question of value. "Cloths counting less than 50 threads to the square inch" were intended to cover all the coarse cotton cloths that are made in the United States, and the duty was a cent a yard.

These fancy goods did not count perhaps over 50, or from 50 to 100, or possibly from 100 to 150 threads to the square inch. If they were admitted under the countable provision, the duties might have ranged from 20 per cent to 25, or from 25 to 30 per cent, instead of 60 per cent. Of course it was of very great importance to the importers to have the etamines taken out of the 60 per cent clause into a lower clause; and the courts decided that the word "etamines" should not apply to any of the goods, except such as were commercially known as "etamines." It is barely possible—perhaps I should say it is probable—that Congress could have used some more comprehensive term in that connection than "etamines;" but "etamines" were known to the trade at the time, and it was intended by Congress, and so supposed by everybody, that that word did apply to all these fancy goods. There is another decision——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, if the Senator from Rhode Island has concluded.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not desire to annoy the Senator from Rhode Island, but I am anxious, if possible, to harmonize the statement which he has made with the conclusions which I have partially reached. Now, Mr. President, Mr. Lippitt is acknowledged to be a leading cotton manufacturer in New England, is he not?

Mr. ALDRICH. He is a cotton manufacturer of great intelligence.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, Mr. President, what does he mean when he makes this statement:

It—

Meaning the form of the present cotton tariff—

has been the object of many legal attacks, in the course of which the terms used have for the most part been given careful legal definitions, and therefore should not be disturbed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator what I think Mr. Lippitt meant, because I——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH (continuing). Because I happen to know something about the litigation to which Mr. Lippitt refers. There was a contention in the court that another provision of the act imposed a duty of 1 and 2 cents a yard upon what are called lappets and fancy goods, and that that should be imposed as a cumulative duty. That duty was upheld by the courts. I am not sure, of course, whether or not Mr. Lippitt knew about these other matters to which I have referred, but you will find that he says there, in that same statement, that there are some minor matters still in controversy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those are some of the minor things, I suppose, he referred to; but whether he referred to those or not, I say to the Senator from Michigan that, in my judgment, if we want a consistent and systematic tariff bill, based upon specific rates, which do not increase one particle the rates fixed by the House, it is simply a matter of the substitution of specific rates for ad valorem rates in the interest of the revenue; and, as I will explain, I think, to the satisfaction of the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I certainly hope so.

Mr. ALDRICH. I certainly will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Rhode Island correctly, he is not in exact harmony with Mr. Lippitt as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this new classification.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I am exactly in harmony with him; I think I am in harmony with every man who wants the revenue honestly collected and who wants a cotton schedule that will be symmetrical and harmonious in all its parts and that does not raise the rates above those now imposed by law.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator from Michigan, that the trouble with Mr. Lippitt at the time he made that statement before the Committee on Ways and Means was that he was not aware of the new doctrine that the tariff was to be revised upward. If he had been impressed with that idea, his statement would have been more conservative. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am bound to say, in all candor, that I agree entirely with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. I have read Mr. Lippitt's testimony line for line several times, and I do not understand him to urge an increase in these rates, and I do not think that the chairman of the Committee on Finance is under his influence at all. If he had been, he would not increase these rates.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will bear with me——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Lippitt was not in this country when this bill was prepared, and had not been for some time, and, of course, I was not under his influence, but I will say to the Senator from Michigan, with a full knowledge of what I am saying, that the rates in this clause are not increased, and I will show that to his satisfaction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am very glad, Mr. President, to have that statement, and I have great faith in it.

Mr. CLAY. As I understood, the Senator from Rhode Island stated on the floor of the Senate several days ago—of course I never refer to private conversations here, and we ought not to do so—but I understood the Senator to say on the floor of the Senate that while there had been a change in the rates from ad valorem rates to specific rates, the real rates in this schedule were the same as in the Dingley law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Or a little lower and not higher, taken as a whole.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. GORE. I know absolutely nothing about the influence of Mr. Lippitt with the senior Senator from Rhode Island, but I do not think that anybody can cast the weight of his authority into the balance against the authority of the Senator with respect to the passage of the Dingley Act. The Senator has stated here to-day, and has stated repeatedly during the course of this discussion, that no cotton manufacturer was consulted with reference to the cotton schedule. Mr. President, I believe that statement, and I presume that every other Senator believes it. It is an eminently reasonable statement.

But the Senator from Rhode Island had occasion to-day to animadvert upon a statement contained in this celebrated German report respecting one William Whitman. Mr. Lippitt may have had nothing to do with this schedule; but it seemed that Mr. Whitman had something to do with the woolen schedule of the Dingley Act. I send to the desk a brief correspondence between Mr. Whitman and Mr. North. Of course the Senator from Rhode Island was not a party to that correspondence, and he is not responsible for it. I offer it merely as shedding an interesting side light upon the methods of tariff revision in the past, and I offer it as an astounding instance of actual and undeniable impropriety. But I may say that Mr. North, either for the efficiency of his services on that occasion or for the injury to his health, received a complimentary remembrance, amounting to $5,000 in the coin of the realm. I ask the Secretary to read the marked portions of the statement which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read the marked portions as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DRESS GOODS, YARNS, AND TOPS.

78 CHAUNCY STREET, BOSTON,
July 10, 1897.

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

Yours, very truly,
WM. WHITMAN.

BOSTON, *April 6, 1897.*

I depend upon you to look out for my interest in this regard. You know how important it is, not only to me, but to the whole worsted industry of the United States. If there is the slightest danger of any change, I must see these gentlemen before it is too late. * * *

WM. WHITMAN.

BOSTON, *June 2, 1897.*

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

WM. WHITMAN.

BOSTON, *June 9, 1897.*

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

WM. WHITMAN.

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

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

S. N. D. NORTH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 20, 1897.*

It is lucky I was here, and just in the position I am. It has given me a whole day to work on the matter and get it right; and with ALDRICH away there is no one on the committee who knows anything about it. But Allison and Platt trust me, and I expect they will both agree to what I have asked. I went all over the matter with them last evening.

S. N. D. NORTH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 5 o'clock and 30 minutes having arrived, in obedience to the order of the Senate the Senate stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

THE TARIFF.

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 question is on the amendment to paragraph 313.

Mr. NELSON. I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum, if anyone wants to speak; but if the amendment is to be put to a vote, I shall have to call for a quorum.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin had the floor, and of course the Chair would recognize him were he here.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I regret to say that the Senator from Wisconsin is sick, worn out by his efforts and the heat of the afternoon, and he will not be able to proceed with his remarks until to-morrow morning.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask for the question on the pending amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa ask for the floor?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not.

Mr. HALE. Let the pending amendment be reported.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary, then, will report the pending amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Frye	Nelson
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Nixon
Borah	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Bradley	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Brandegee	Cummins	Heyburn	Perkins
Briggs	Curtis	Hughes	Piles
Bristow	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dick	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	Kean	Smith, Md.
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	du Pont	McCumber	Smoot
Burton	Fletcher	McEnery	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Martin	Warner
Clark, Wyo.	Frazier	Money	Warren

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to paragraph 313.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, at the time of taking the recess the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was addressing the Senate, and we all expected him to go on to-night. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has informed the Senate that the Senator from Wisconsin is ill, due to the great heat of the day and the prolonged and unusual exertion to which he was put in speaking for so many hours this afternoon.

I believe it is the unbroken custom of the Senate, when any Senator is addressing the body on any question and even indicates that he is weary, that the Senate, of course, lets the matter go a reasonable time, until he shall be sufficiently strong to proceed. I think in the history of the Senate—older Senators can say—that custom has been unbroken, and that courtesy has never been denied to any Senator. Even this session I recall two or three instances where a Senator upon the other side of the Chamber was addressing the Senate, and one, I remember, on this side of the Chamber, and it was suggested by some Senator—I think in one instance the Senator from South Carolina suggested it—that the Senator had been speaking for two or three hours and was evidently weary, although showing at that time no signs of it, and of course the usual courtesy, which never has been denied, was extended to him, and the Senate then adjourned until the next day.

I myself know nothing about the matter, but on the statement of a Senator here who does seem to know about it, it seems to me the Senate can not break its universal rule of courtesy to continue this matter until the Senator from Wisconsin may have a reasonable time, not an unreasonable time, to continue his remarks. This would be as true of the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Rhode Island, or the Senator from any other State.

I merely suggest this to the older Senators in this body, who have had much larger observation in the Senate, although during the ten years I have been here I have never known this universal custom violated, and, of course, I take it for granted it will not be now.

That is all I have to observe. It struck me as not being quite fair to submit to the Senate for a vote an amendment upon which a Senator was addressing the Senate, when at the recess he still held the floor, and constructively holds it now, when the Senate has the information upon the statement of a fellow Senator that that Senator is not ready to proceed.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, never within my knowledge has the business of the Senate been suspended for two or three days, or for one, to allow any Senator to discuss questions. There are 10 or 12 amendments to this schedule, and we will not be able to dispose of all of them to-night, and the Senator from Wisconsin will probably be here to-morrow morning, and we can go on and vote on these propositions as they come up.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not understand it to be a question of two or three days or even of one day, nor do I understand it to be, from what I have heard—because I must learn about the cotton schedules from what I hear on both sides—to be a question involving merely one amendment.

It has been stated here two or three times by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin, who constructively holds the floor at this moment, but who on account of his indisposition is not present to-night, that the whole question embraced in the discussion arises on the amendment just about to

be submitted. That being the case, neither of the points made by the Senator from Rhode Island would seem to be pertinent, first, because there is no suggestion of a delay of two or three days or of one day; and, second, because all of the questions involved arise upon the amendment now under discussion.

I say this, and the Senator from Rhode Island can correct me if I am wrong, if it is not true, that not only where a Senator says he is indisposed, or information is credibly brought by a Senator in honorable standing on this floor that another Senator is indisposed, but I even recall an instance in my own brief experience where a Senator said: "I desire to address the Senate upon this subject, and am not ready to proceed, but shall be to-morrow morning." The Senate always, so far as my observation goes—I may be wrong—has extended him the courtesy of allowing him until the next morning to prepare. Is not that true? That is not even a question of illness.

Mr. ALDRICH. There are a half-dozen Senators, including the Senator from Indiana, who sympathize with the Senator from Wisconsin about this matter——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me. It is not a question of sympathy. I have the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. And there is no reason why the Senator should not go on and make his speech.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. First of all, because it is not a question of sympathy, and, second, because of the Senator's unnecessary suggestion that I can go on and make a speech. I have no speech to make. I desire nothing but the fullest light upon this question, and nothing but fair play.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me. I decline to yield.

I assure the Senator from Rhode Island, and he knows it in his heart, that that treatment would by me be accorded to him if I was opposed to him, as much as it would be accorded to the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Connecticut or any other Senator on the Democratic side or on our side.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I do now. I yielded first to the Senator from Rhode Island. He rose first and made those observations, which were not necessary.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I rose to say that the Senator from Rhode Island has been promising for four weeks that he would make a statement about this bill, and there being a quorum present, it would be at least a fair suggestion that he proceed to make that statement before a vote is taken on a proposition that involves the principle of the Senate amendments throughout this schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am so anxious to get a vote upon this bill and every feature of it that I am willing to forego any desire to make a speech and to go on and vote now.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This is not a question of the Senator's desire to make a speech. It is a question of good faith with the Senate, entered into here publicly more than ten times since this debate began.

Mr. ALDRICH. I assume I can choose my own time to make a statement. I shall make the statement before the schedule passes from the consideration of the Senate. There are 10 or 12 amendments to this schedule. I hope we may be able to dispose of some of them to-night.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will pardon me, the first question, which far transcends the anxiety of all of us to get a vote upon every amendment and the bill itself, is whether or not we shall accord that courtesy which always has been accorded when it is brought to us on the word of an honorable Senator here that another Senator, now having the floor, is not prepared to proceed from physical reasons. I again remind the older Senators—and I want to be corrected if I am wrong—that that has always been true, even where a Senator merely stated that he was not prepared to go on.

The Senator will recall that in the case of the Senator from Iowa, who was engaged here in an entertaining speech, upon the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina that the Senator had talked a good while and evidently must be weary, the Senator from Rhode Island was the first to accord to him the courtesy of a night's rest.

On another occasion, I think, perhaps, I was the one who suggested it, although another Senator brought it up. The Senator from Texas had been addressing the Senate for perhaps two hours and a half, and some Senator suggested that he had been speaking a long time, under great physical exertion, and immediately the courtesy was accorded to him of continuing the next day. Is not that true?

Mr. ALDRICH. When the Senator from Indiana shall have concluded his remarks, I will speak.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have no remarks. I say the first question to be decided is the question of universal courtesy, which never yet has been broken; a courtesy which, I will say, the Senator from Rhode Island well knows that if it involved him——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just a moment. Then, I am going to sit down. If he was not here, and it was a question upon which I earnestly opposed him, I would feel bound to see that that courtesy was extended to him, and to any other Senator. It is a question of fair play.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; I am through.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it possibly is unfortunate that some of us have been here a good while. I thought it was unfortunate to-day when, in the most courteous manner possible, I asked the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] if I might interrupt him. He was offensive and insulting. I took my seat, and have kept it since.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has occupied the attention of the Senate for two days. The Senate yesterday did what I think it has never done before. It took a recess in the middle of the day to accommodate the Senator from Wisconsin. It seems to me if we are ever going to pass this bill we must go on and transact the business in the usual way. If a Senator is to send word here that he is not well, and we are to adjourn the work of the Senate until he recuperates, a dozen Senators can do the same thing, and we will find ourselves in the ridiculous attitude of not transacting the business that is before us.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is to say merely this—and of course the Senator appreciates it—that the last remark, that a dozen Senators might do the same thing, raises a question of good faith. I would not have made the suggestion had not the Senator from Iowa brought to the Senate the message that I suggested.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And of course twelve other Senators are not going to do that. It is a question of good faith.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to say for the information of the Senator from Indiana that I question the good faith of this proposition, and while I have no——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That raises another question.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; it does.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It does, indeed.

Mr. PENROSE. While I have no desire to make any reference to the Senator from Wisconsin in his absence, I will be prepared to show to the Senate at any time that a part of his professional tactics is to make this pretense of sickness, while he is openly abroad upon the streets consulting with the editors of yellow journals and the agents of uplift magazines.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me?

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that if the Senator from Pennsylvania can show that this particular instance is a matter of bad faith, it raises quite a different question. If he can show that, I shall instantly withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me. But it is not sufficient for the Senator to say that it is a part of a man's usual course of conduct. If the Senator can show that on this occasion that is the case, I have no suggestion to make to the Senate, but he must show that first; and the Senator is not justified, if he will excuse me, in suggesting this, merely upheld by a general course of conduct. If it is true in this instance, that is one thing; and if it is a general course of conduct, it is another thing. The Senator knows that is a fair statement.

Mr. PENROSE. I shall be ready to show at any time that on so many occasions has this practice been maintained as to make any man in his ordinary senses absolutely refuse to be-

lieve the veracity of any statement regarding the sickness of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now the Senator raises an issue with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. PENROSE. I make the statement; and I make it without fear of contradiction, and make it as a statement which will allow the fullest investigation, whether it applies to this particular night or not.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. DOLLIVER addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and to whom?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho, if he has asked me to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay this bill for one moment, as everyone knows, but I seriously protest against these accusations being made against the Senator from Wisconsin in his absence. It is not becoming the Senate, and it is an improper thing to do. The Senator from Wisconsin ought to be permitted to be present when such serious charges are made as involve the integrity of his actions in the Senate Chamber, and we can do no less as a senatorial body than to observe here the ordinary rules which prevail among gentlemen outside of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will occupy the attention of the Senate but a moment. I have made no accusations against any one, and I am not going to do it. I have been here a good while. In the discussion of this bill I have occupied perhaps ten or fifteen minutes. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] saw fit this morning to look in my direction and make an offensive allusion to New England. I rose to ask permission to interrupt him, and he was offensive. I have no disposition to retort in kind. I will not do that. The only thing I want to say is that if we are to adjourn the work of the Senate whenever it is suggested that a Senator is not sufficiently well to continue his speech—I do not say in every instance it would not be in good faith—we will certainly make very slow progress with this bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will my friend the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I sat near the Senator from Wisconsin, and it did not require a physician to see that the man's strength was entirely exhausted. He was hardly able to stand upon his feet, as Senators who sat near him yesterday and to-day will bear me witness. I feel grieved——

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I think I see a way out of this difficulty.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish to interrupt me?

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to interrupt the Senator, if he will permit me.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that we go on with Schedule J to-night. That is the next schedule—flax.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is entirely satisfactory to me. The only point I desired to make was that I thought we ought to proceed with the work of the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from New Hampshire expresses his satisfaction with some arrangement. We have not been able to hear what it is.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggested, in order to make progress, that we go on with Schedule J—take up the amendments to that schedule. It is the flax schedule. To that I think there is no objection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is no possible objection to that course. The only objection was to going on with the schedule on which a Senator had been addressing the Senate and had not concluded his remarks.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President——

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

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi with pleasure.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to know that the Senator from Rhode Island has taken the course he has to go to another schedule, which seems to solve the difficulty. I do not believe anyone here wants to talk on this bill. I know there is no man here who will be more glad to finish it and go home than I.

I want to say a word, however, about the action I took on yesterday, which has been alluded to by my friend from New Hampshire. I was told this morning that it was unprecedented in the Senate. I did not think of a precedent for an act of humanity. I sat near the Senator from Wisconsin and saw the tremendous excitement under which he was laboring, from what cause I do not know, for it does not excite me to speak, but it does him. I saw that he was exhausted; I saw him tremulous as an aspen leaf, and I thought he was about to faint. I heard him gasping for breath. The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] came across the hall and told me he heard him over there, that far away. I did not consider whether there was a precedent or not.

I simply asked for unanimous consent that we take a recess for thirty minutes to enable the Senator from Wisconsin to so recuperate his strength as to enable him to proceed with his speech. I do not regret that that action was taken, and I am very glad the Senator was sufficiently relieved at that time to resume his remarks.

I want to say that, as far as I am concerned, I am the last man to make a complaint about the proceedings of the Senate, for I am deeply sensible of the uniform kindness and indulgence I have always received at its hands. I do not think the cause will be at all facilitated in passing this bill by attempting to evade any discussion or any part of it. I do not charge that anybody is making that effort, and I do want to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island that he was wise enough to allow this schedule to be passed over, in order that the Senator who was speaking on it could complete his remarks. This is the way to secure a speedy passage of the bill, and gentlemen on the other side, and on both sides, will find when we unite by agreement it is very much better than to unite by compulsion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think no one better knows the humanitarian instincts and kindnesses of the Senator from Mississippi than the Senator from New Hampshire. I have been associated with him outside of the Senate. I have learned to admire him greatly, because of those very qualities. I think I can claim for myself a reasonable degree of consideration on that point. But the Senator from Mississippi will recall the fact that after the recess was ended the Senator from Wisconsin came in here, and instead of expressing any degree of gratitude to the Senate for the courtesy it had shown him, practically told us he did not need any relief—that he could have continued his speech; he felt that we had done something that he appreciated in a way, but it was an entirely unnecessary courtesy.

Mr. President, I have no disposition to say another word. I have not occupied much of the time of the Senate. I have regretted that there have been some personalities and criminations and recriminations in this debate which, I hope, will cease. I have no disposition to have an acrimonious discussion with any Senator on either side of the Chamber. It is not my nature. It was a matter of sincere regret to me to-day that the Senator from Wisconsin, who has occupied so much of the time of the Senate, refused to permit me to ask him a question, and in a very discourteous and insulting manner made a retort.

I am quite willing that the Senator from Wisconsin may be shown all possible courtesy; but I only rose to say that I think we ought to go along with the bill, not necessarily with the schedule that was under consideration this afternoon, but with some other part of the bill; and it is very gratifying to me to have the Senator from Rhode Island make the suggestion that he has made, which I think appeals to every Senator present to-night.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before we take up Schedule J, I merely wish to say that I do not want what I consider a mistaken view to go without any protest as to what I think the practice of the Senate has been in such cases. I have never known the business of the Senate stopped and the position taken that no business could go on; that nobody else could speak because it was not convenient for one Senator to speak at that moment. Again and again, at the close of a day, the Senate will adjourn in order to allow a Senator to complete his remarks the next day. But that courtesy is widely different from the proposition that because a certain Senator is not ready to go on all debate must cease on the subject which he is discussing, and nobody else must speak and no other consideration be had. I have never known that done for anybody in my time of service here. Others have had more.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the question was not in the least whether the Senate should not proceed with business. The question was not in the least whether any other Senator should or should not speak. The question was upon a demand for a vote on a pending question, upon which question a Senator was addressing the Senate under the circumstances that have been presented. No Senator in this body will say that he can remember a time in the history of the Senate when a vote was

insisted upon under those circumstances. There is not a man here who has not been willing and more than willing to go on either with the debate or with other business of the Senate. But that was not the question, and that is not the way it is going to be permitted to be ended. The question was whether or not we should have a vote on the question upon which the Senator from Wisconsin was addressing the Senate when an honorable Senator informed us that he was ill and he could not proceed. That question which has been so happily settled to the satisfaction of all will not be permitted to be clouded after it has been settled.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island requests that the Senate now take up Schedule J. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the first paragraph passed over in Schedule J.

The SECRETARY. On page 116, Schedule J, "flax, hemp, and jute and manufactures of," the committee proposes to insert after the subhead a new paragraph, as follows:

330*a*. Flax straw, $5 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph is agreed to. It is agreed to. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert a new paragraph as follows:

330*b*. Flax, not hackled or dressed, 1 cent per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph is agreed to. It is agreed to. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The Secretary read as follows:

333. Hemp, and tow of hemp, $20 per ton; hemp, hackled, known as "line of hemp," $40 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph is agreed to. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The Secretary read as follows:

334. Single yarns made of jute, not finer than 5 lea or number, 1 cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; if finer than 5 lea or number, 30 per cent ad valorem; yarns made of jute not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph will be agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY. I have an amendment before the Senate which I desire may be called up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky offers an amendment to paragraph 334.

Mr. BRADLEY. It is to insert a new paragraph, paragraph 333½.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be read by the Secretary.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest to the Senator to wait until we reach the free list on that item.

Mr. BRADLEY. I did not hear the remark of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. That amendment will properly come up when we reach the free list.

Mr. BRADLEY. No, sir; I beg the Senator's pardon. Jute is one of the items under the free list.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as a new paragraph, at the top of page 117, after line 2, the following:

333½. Jute and jute butts, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, some time ago I called the attention of the Senate to this amendment, which at that time was proposed. Unfortunately for me, at the time I made those remarks the lunch hour was at hand and very few Senators were present. With the consent of the Senate, I desire in a very brief way to call the attention of Senators to the object of the amendment.

In the first place, hemp is an old industry. At one time the article was largely raised in Virginia, Missouri, Kentucky, and other States. First and last, it has been successfully raised in many of the States of this Union, especially, I may say, in Pennsylvania, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Kansas. It is now raised only in Nebraska, California, and Kentucky.

The Agricultural Department has made many tests in the different States, and from a report of that department I find that it can be raised along the Pacific coast, in almost the entire Valley of the Mississippi, and in nearly every State of the Union.

A tariff has existed on hemp, with the exception of a few years, from the very beginning of our Government. The attention of the country was forcibly called to that matter by Henry Clay. The industry increased in development up to a period just preceding the war, until it had grown to immense proportions for that day and time. There were 417 mills in the United States, 50 of which were in New York and 159, I believe, in the State of Kentucky. There were also some in Massachusetts and other States. It was then raised in large quantities. It was found that with slave labor and protection it could be made profitable. There are now only 28 mills in the United States.

After the war, however, labor became uncertain and the hemp industry was very materially decreased. However, it maintained its existence to a considerable extent up to 1890, when jute and jute butts were put upon the free list. It exists now only by reason of the fact that there is but comparatively little of it cultivated, there having been only 8,000 tons produced last year, where once were produced 80,000 tons. So long as the hemp industry is kept within a contracted circle that long it is profitable, because for certain purposes hemp is indispensable. Those purposes are not, however, very general, and it takes but a small quantity in order to supply them. When that market is supplied then hemp comes in conflict with jute and jute butts, and if any great quantity were produced it would find no sale beyond the contracted market to which I have referred.

I want to say to Senators that jute and jute butts are cultivated by labor paid 5 cents a day, while labor in the hemp fields costs $1.50 per day. I want to say, further, to Senators that for a period after the war, by reason of the uncertainty of labor, the hemp industry languished, but in the last few years machines have been invented by which hemp can be cut and be broken, so that no longer is the uncertainty of labor a question. The only trouble now is the free importation of jute.

From 1904 to 1908 the importations into this country of jute and jute manufactures increased from $20,000,000 to $34,000,000, 70 per cent in four years.

Now I want to call attention to the fact that 107,533 tons of jute were imported into this country last year free of duty. And yet Senators tell us that they are in favor of protecting American labor! When you allow this foreign article to be brought in here, produced in the fields of India at 5 cents per day labor, to come in conflict with American labor, and yet say that you are protectionists, I do not understand it.

And while, Mr. President, jute is brought in free, Congress has been especially careful to place a protective duty on the manufactures of jute. The American who manufactures jute is amply protected, while the farmer who produces hemp and flax receives no protection whatever.

That may be protection; that may be Republicanism; but if it is either, I do not understand it. Not only so, but the effect of this free jute is felt by the farmer who raises flax as much or more as the producer of hemp. Two million eight hundred thousand acres of flax were raised last year, mostly in the States of Minnesota, Kansas, Wisconsin, Montana, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, for the seed; and we find that out of 5,000,000 tons of flax straw produced only 300,000 tons of it were manufactured, simply because the farmers and manufacturers could not compete with free jute.

I heard my distinguished friend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] the other day say that he would not vote to make any article free unless it was an absolute necessity of life. I want to talk to the Democratic Senators who announce themselves in favor of a tariff for revenue. I want to ask you whether or not you think that this jute should come into this country free and without the payment of a single cent of tax, while a 1½ cent duty would produce *three million two hundred thousand dollars.*

Senators talk about reducing the wages of labor. I know there are some gentlemen on the floor of the Senate who talk eloquently upon the subject of protection, who, as soon as the question of jute is raised, vacate their seats and run into the cloakroom. Why? They are the very Senators in this body who are for the highest protection on manufactured jute, because it is in their own section, and they are willing to sacrifice the farmer of this country, to injure the hemp grower and the flax grower, but they are not willing to sacrifice the jute manufacturer in their own section.

In the language of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], if there is anything on earth I do not like, it is a "spotted protectionist." This doctrine is right, or it is wrong. If protection is right upon one article, it is right upon all where that article needs protection in order to foster the industry.

I have seen a great many sorts of politics since I have been in the Senate, Mr. President, a great many strange things that I do not understand, being a young man from the country, not acquainted with the arts and sciences of politics, but a simple, plain, old-fashioned Kentuckian. I have seen a lot of things up

here that I do not understand. And tariff, tariff, tariff has been ringing in my ears until I feel a good deal like the man who killed another down in Kentucky. When he was arraigned he was asked to tell his story. He said: "I killed him in self-defense." "Well," said the lawyer, "did he try to kill you?" "No; he did not." "Did he draw a weapon on you?" "No; he did not." "Did he insult your wife or your daughter?" "No; he did not." "Then, what did you kill him for?" "Because he came to my house, when I was behaving myself like a gentleman and not interrupting anybody, and said he had come down there to talk tariff to me. That is the reason I killed him." [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, I do not want to talk anybody to death. I have tried to be as modest as I could. I know that a junior Senator stands mighty little chance in this body. When I came here one of my old friends in the Senate came to me and said: "Be careful, Senator; remember you are nothing but a junior. Keep quiet. If you venture, these senior Senators will take you in out of the wet." [Laughter.] I have heard my mother talk about the bogey man and all that sort of thing, but I will tell you honestly that I have been alarmed ever since I have been *in Washington*, and what I stand in dread of is the presence of the senior Senators in this body. [Laughter.]

There are a great many dangerous things in this world. Automobiles are dangerous things; they are liable to run over you and kill you. Electric cars are dangerous things; they are liable to run over you and kill you. But there is nothing on this earth that can compare in point of danger to a senior Senator when he stands properly on his stilts. [Laughter.]

I want Senators to indulge me while I speak under this state of alarm. It is a strange thing to me, Mr. President, that there is no protection to the farmer in flax or hemp. It is a strange thing to me that 4,700,000 tons of flax straw in your States are burned up and go up in smoke every year because you can not compete with jute.

You want protection for lemons in California. I believe in protecting lemons in California. [Laughter.] You want protection for lumber in the State of Washington. All right; I believe in protecting lumber in the State of Washington. [Laughter.] You want protection for coal and iron in West Virginia and Alabama. All right; I believe in protecting coal and iron. [Laughter.] I believe in protecting everything that needs protection.

Now, I want to know whether other Senators are equally as fair and as honest in this respect. You say you have not enough tariff on jute manufactures; that if you have a duty on jute you must increase it on your jute manufactures. If that is true, increase it. Increase it; that is your business. [Laughter.] But, in the name of justice, do not protect your jute manufacturers when you refuse to protect the farmer from the importation of free jute. If there is anything in this world that is imported into the United States free, that is absolutely a source of disgust to an American citizen, it is jute. [Laughter.] Where does jute come from? Who are the people who make jute? Heathens; yellow men, spotted men, everything on earth but white men. They go out and work in the fields. I had some pictures of some of them the other day. I wish you could see them. They have never found out that the day of fig leaves is past. [Laughter.] And that is the sort of degraded labor that you reward in free America by allowing jute to come to your shores unprotected.

I appeal to the Senate for justice in this matter. It is true I come from the State of Kentucky, but I am not ashamed of that. There is no better State on this earth than Kentucky. Kentucky is like the man's wife was who said that there never was a better woman on earth than she as long as her husband would let her have her own way. [Laughter.]

Why should we not have this protection? What is the reason why we should not have it? Are we a part of this country or not? We pay more internal revenue [laughter] than any State in this Union except two. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator suspend until the Chair suggests to the occupants of the galleries that they are all here as guests of the Senate, and that the decorum of the Senate does not permit demonstrations of either approval or disapproval by such guests. The Senator from Kentucky will proceed.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I hope that the occupants of the galleries will be in order. [Laughter.] I surely do not desire to be the innocent cause of any trouble in the Senate, for I have heard enough of this trouble lately, and I am glad I am out of it. I have not made anybody mad this session. I have not been mad either. I am not going to be mad unless the Senate refuses to give me a tariff on jute. [Laughter.] Then I reserve the right to myself to get mad and to stay mad during the remainder of the session. [Laughter.]

I promised you, Mr. President, when I rose, that I would speak but a few moments. I have heard very many Senators say that and do right to the contrary. I am going to show you that there is one Senator who can keep his word. [Laughter.] I am going to suspend right here, relying upon the justice, the statesmanship, and the Americanism of the Members of this great Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 334.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the paragraph? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have an amendment to that paragraph, in line 6, after the word "yarns," to insert the words "in the gray."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 334, page 117, line 6, after the word "yarns," it is proposed to insert the words "in the gray."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will explain the amendment. We are absolutely in the dark on an amendment offered with no information given in regard to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. This makes the paragraph apply to yarns which are not colored or bleached.

Mr. BACON. I again request that the Chair shall put the question to the Senate on amendments, and not put us in the position of not objecting. We want to get information about these amendments. We do not desire that it shall appear by the RECORD that we are agreeing to them.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator will allow the Chair to say that when the Senator says he makes that request again, the Chair applied it to a single division of the bill, else the Chair would not have put it in that form, though he understood the Senator desired it in that way. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 343.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is an amendment in paragraph 336.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment. If the Senator refers to the amendment in line 19, that was agreed to on the first reading of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph, in line 18. I ask that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered for the purpose of making this amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Secretary will now state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. On page 117, line 18, after the word "number," I propose the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 117, line 18, after the word "number," it is proposed to insert "12 cents per pound and."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I desire to know what that amendment means. Let it be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be again stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 117, in line 18, after the word "number," it is proposed to insert the words "12 cents per pound, and," so that if amended it will read:

If made from yarn finer than five lea or number, 12 cents per pound, and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound additional for each lea or number.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 343—oilcloth for floors, and so forth.

Mr. HALE. I gave notice the other day that I would ask that paragraph 339 be reconsidered in order to offer an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which paragraph 339 was agreed to. Without objection, the vote by which the paragraph was agreed to will be reconsidered. The Senator from Maine offers an amendment, which the Secretary will state.

Mr. HALE. The amendment has been considered by the Committee on Finance.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 339, as printed in the bill, it is proposed to insert as a new paragraph the following:

339. Floor mattings, plain, fancy, or figured, manufactured of split straw, grass, or rushes, or other vegetable substances not otherwise provided for, commonly known to the trade as China and India mattings, containing 90 ends of warp or less, 3 cents per square yard; if containing more than 90 ends of warp, 12 cents per square yard; floor mattings manufactured of round straw, grass or rushes, known to the trade as Japanese matting, if containing 185 ends of warp or less, 3 cents per square yard; containing more than 185 ends of warp, 12 cents per square yard: *Provided*, That invoices of all imported China, India, or Japanese mattings shall specify the number of ends of warp contained therein.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if his amendment makes an increase or decrease over the present law. We could not catch the amendment clearly. I have had some complaints from merchants in my State in regard to paragraph 339.

Mr. HALE. It does not interfere with the common kinds; it is only the larger kinds of matting, the higher classes of matting, which are affected. Otherwise the paragraph is precisely as reported.

Mr. CLAY. There is an increase on the higher classes?

Mr. HALE. Yes; on the higher classes. It is not so much of an increase as it is the development of the industry. I can give the reasons as given here by the experts, if the Senator requires it. It is for the development of the industry, not interfering with the common kinds of matting.

Mr. CLAY. I do not think I care to have anything read to the Senate now. I simply wanted a statement.

Mr. HALE. I will only say that this whole matter, of course, will go into conference and will be fully considered there. I have had the amendment drawn so that it will not interfere in any way with the lower and commoner kinds of matting.

Mr. CLAY. The paragraph, as it stands in the bill, is simply the reenactment of the Dingley law, is it not?

Mr. HALE. I think it is almost exactly or quite the language of the Dingley law. The only change in this regard is in relation to the higher kinds of matting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I, like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY], have received some communications from merchants and others dealing in these kinds of articles, protesting against the increase of rates, and I am impressed that this matting, made from straws and vegetable materials, composes the floor covering for people in moderate circumstances. I do not think it meets the case to say that it is only the finer kinds of matting upon which the duty is increased by this amendment. All kinds of matting made of this material are floor coverings, required by people who are not able to indulge in velvet carpets or floor coverings of that kind. I submit that a duty of the kind proposed by this amendment will add materially to the cost of this kind of floor covering. Under those conditions, I feel it my duty to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Florida is entirely wrong. The amendment does not in any way affect the kind of mattings the Senator has in view. It does not raise the price; and it ought not to raise the price. The constituents of the Senator are not in any way unfavorably affected by this amendment. The amendment was very carefully drawn. I will not, however, take any more time in regard to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Finance to paragraph 338. I notice that an amendment has been inserted in the first line of the paragraph, putting some of the fish nets made of cotton into that paragraph. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that, if cotton cloths of the material out of which those nets are made, are made dutiable at 60 per cent under paragraph 345, it will operate to create a duty of 80 per cent on that very cheap article of cotton manufacture. I do not know whether that is thought desirable or not, but I call the Senator's attention to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not understand the last part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I refer to the cotton cloths out of which fish nets are made.

Mr. ALDRICH. In what paragraph is that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is in paragraph 345.

Mr. ALDRICH. The nettings referred to in paragraph 345 are made of yarn, and not of cloth.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But the word "cords" occurs in line 4.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those are cords that are used for ornamentation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. "Wholly or in part of cotton."

Mr. ALDRICH. As I have stated, those cords are used for the ornamentation of dresses.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If that is so, I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am sure of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 343, oilcloth for floors, plain, stamped, painted——

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that this paragraph be passed over at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent to pass over paragraph 343.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that, if the Senator is not ready; but the committee have some amendments to suggest.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have some amendments to offer, but I did not suppose that the paragraph would be reached to-night. I have not them in my desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No objection is heard——

Mr. ALDRICH. I have two committee amendments to offer. I will propose them and then let the paragraph go over.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendments are in line 6, after the word "other," to insert the word "floor," so as to read "all other floor oilcloth," so that there shall be no question as to what oilcloths are referred to; and then to strike out "except silk oilcloth," in the next line. Those are committee amendments, which I assume are in line with the thought of the Senator from Iowa upon this subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, one of the amendments that I had in mind to offer was striking out the words "and all other oilcloth," as being wholly unnecessary, unless it is intended to include table oilcloth in the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; it is not intended to do that; and for that reason the committee propose to insert the word "floor," so that it will apply only to floor oilcloth.

Mr. CUMMINS. I suggest the word "floor," found in the first line, would qualify sufficiently, I think, the description. However, if the Senator agrees to pass the paragraph over, we can discuss that hereafter.

Mr. ALDRICH. I had an idea that the amendments suggested by the committee were exactly along the line of the ideas of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. They are; but I wish to go further and to ask that there be an additional separation; that is to say, I shall ask that all linoleum under 9 feet in width shall not be taxed the same amount per square yard, for there is so vast a difference in the value of linoleum of the same width, if you please, that it is unjust to attach the same duty to all the qualities of this material.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Iowa prefer to have these amendments go over unadopted, or would he consent to have them now adopted?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection whatever to the adoption of the amendments the Senator proposes, because they cover precisely one of the amendments that I had intended to offer, although in a different way.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, I ask, Mr. President, that the amendments which I have suggested be adopted, and that the paragraph be then passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 119, paragraph 343, line 6, before the word "oilcloth," it is proposed to insert the word "floor;" and after the word "oilcloth," at the end of line 6, to strike out the parenthesis and the words within it "except silk oilcloth."

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether those are increases over the present rates?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; they are amendments to prevent the paragraph from applying to oilcloths other than floor oilcloths; for instance, oilcloths that are used for table covers or for other particular purposes are not entitled to the high rates which are included in this paragraph. But the paragraph has been passed over, at the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa, who has some amendments reducing the rates.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over as amended. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 344, as follows:

344. Shirt collars and cuffs, composed of cotton, 45 cents per dozen pieces and 15 per cent ad valorem; composed in whole or in part of linen, 40 cents per dozen pieces and 20 per cent ad valorem.

The paragraph was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 345. Laces, lace window curtains, and all other lace articles——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. All the committee amendments to paragraph 345 have been agreed to. Without objection, the paragraph as amended is agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. Have all the committee amendments to that paragraph been agreed to?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. They have all been agreed to. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 347, page 121, plain woven fabrics of single jute yarns——

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee has an amendment to paragraph 346. I ask that the vote by which the paragraph was adopted may be reconsidered, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no amendment in that paragraph, so the Senator may offer his amendment without a motion to reconsider.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, I move to strike out the words, in line 7, "nets, nettings."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 346, page 121, line 7, after the word "curtains," it is proposed to strike out "nets, nettings."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendments to paragraph 347 have been agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to have paragraph 347 and paragraph 349 passed over. I have amendments to offer to both of those paragraphs. I thought I had all the data here, but I find I have not, as I did not expect the paragraphs to come up to-night. I should like to have those two paragraphs go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that those paragraphs be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 347 and paragraph 349 will be passed over. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 350, bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics——

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that that paragraph be passed over, at the request of several Senators.

Mr. CLAY. Does the Senator intend to take it up to-morrow?

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I have an amendment pending putting cotton bagging on the free list, which I trust may be adopted to-night.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Mississippi also has an amendment, as have, I think, several other Senators. I do not want to have that amendment considered just now. The committee have not yet made up their minds as to just what ought to be done with this paragraph.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator will consent to the consideration of it at an early day, I trust.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so; yes.

Mr. CLAY. Probably to-morrow?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure about to-morrow. I will see the Senator from Texas before it is taken up and give him ample notice with regard to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the paragraph be passed over?

Mr. TILLMAN. It seems to me that we might settle this to-night, if the Senator from Rhode Island and the committee are disposed to treat the southern farmer as they have treated the western farmer. This cotton bagging is absolutely necessary to the southern farmers, and it is thrown away as soon as we pack the cotton. We have to buy it and pay for it, and then we lose it when the cotton gets to the market, for it is subtracted as tare. The western farmer, who has to cut his wheat and oats, gets his binding twine free, and why should not the southern farmer, who has to prepare his cotton for market, get his bagging and ties free?

I made an appeal to the Senator and his committee in the last tariff bill twelve years ago in relation to this matter. I got no hearing then, but I think his heart is a little softer now than it was a long time ago, and that he will realize that he ought to make some reasonable concession and let us feel that we are not simply discriminated against because we are from the South.

Mr. ALDRICH. I assure the Senator from South Carolina and the Senate that the committee at a very early day will take up this matter and give it very careful consideration.

Mr. BACON. My friend from South Carolina is mistaken in his recollection.

Mr. ALDRICH. My recollection is that the Senate agreed to the proposition referred to by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BACON. During the consideration of the Dingley bill an amendment was adopted in the Senate putting both bagging and ties on the free list, but it was stricken out in conference committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. That means that the conferees of the Senate gave us away, or they surrendered to the House; and they might do it again. It is just a question of whether we are going to have consideration and they will stand by us in the conference, as we have a right to expect. They stood by free binding twine and gave that to the western farmer.

I know I made a very urgent plea—I do not know whether it was a strong or an eloquent one, but I tried to make it so—for the consideration of the item in regard to sacks for wheat, which has been passed over at the instance of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. An immense expenditure is required in the South in sacking our fertilizers. But that has been passed over, and I do not want to consume time. However, I want the Senator prayerfully to consider this business of letting the farmers of the South and the West fare alike.

Mr. ALDRICH. My friend from South Carolina knows his persuasive influence over the committee, and especially over the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator and I have been very good personal friends, and I have made many appeals to him in matters of legislation; but his heart has grown flinty and he has turned that stony gaze on me which left not even a shadow of hope. So I am afraid, unless he will give me his promise; and if he will give me his promise, I will be satisfied, for he never breaks his word, so far as I ever heard.

Mr. ALDRICH. I promise the Senator now that the committee will give the matter careful consideration. If we have to do this at all, we want to do it in a manner that will enable us to go before the House conferees and say that we are going to stand by it.

Mr. TILLMAN. All you have got to do is to ask the Senate for a vote on it, and you will get a unanimous vote, except probably from one or two Senators, whose States are interested in the manufacture of bagging. There is nobody here much interested in keeping the duty on bagging except possibly three or four Senators.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the paragraph being passed over? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 352, woven fabrics——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendments to paragraph 352 have been agreed to. Without objection, the paragraph as amended is agreed to. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 353.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment to paragraph 353 was agreed to on the first reading of the bill. Is there objection to agreeing to the paragraph as amended? The Chair hears none. The paragraph as amended is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, before paragraph 355 is

adopted, I offer an amendment on behalf of the committee as a substitute for that paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraphs 354 and 355 were both stricken out.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask to reconsider the vote by which paragraphs 354 and 355 were stricken out; and I move to insert the substitute which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is not necessary to reconsider. The Senator may simply move to insert.

Mr. ALDRICH. I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to this amendment, as I think he is interested in it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island offers a new paragraph, to be known as paragraph 354, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert in the bill, on page 124, a new paragraph, to be known as paragraph 354, as follows:

354. Istle or tampico, or mixtures thereof with other vegetable or animal fibers, when dressed, dyed, combed, treated, or manufactured in any manner, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That completes the paragraphs of Schedule J.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask now that we go to Schedule N—Sundries.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senate now take up the consideration of Schedule N? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALDRICH. It begins on page 167.

Mr. BACON. Am I to understand that the woolen schedule has been passed?

Mr. ALDRICH. Passed over.

Mr. BACON. Passed over. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over in Schedule N.

The SECRETARY. Page 167, Schedule N—Sundries. The first paragraph passed over is paragraph 419, brushes, brooms, and feather dusters of all kinds, and hair pencils in quills or otherwise, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 417 the committee have an amendment, after the word "beads," to insert the words "and spangles."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 417, on page 167, line 20, after the word "beads," it is proposed to insert "and spangles."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In line 21, I submit a verbal amendment to strike out the words "35 per cent ad valorem."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 167, line 21, paragraph 417, it is proposed to strike out the words "35 per cent ad valorem" and the semicolon.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not understand the amendment. The Senator moves to strike out the words "35 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. LODGE. The amendment is to prevent a repetition. Those words are repeated. It does not affect the rate.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Georgia will look at the paragraph, he will see that that is a duplication.

Mr. BACON. I did not understand that the striking out was due to the fact that there was a duplication of language.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in paragraph 418, in line 10, I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 418 was agreed to. In the absence of objection, the paragraph will be considered as open to amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I have an amendment to offer to that paragraph. In line 10, after the word "rattan," I move to insert the words "real horsehair."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 168, paragraph 418, line 10, after the word "rattan" and the comma, it is proposed to insert the words "real horsehair."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 419 is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, before that is done, I will say that the Senator from Montana has some amendments to this paragraph, and the Senator from Indiana desires to have it go over.

Mr. KEAN. What paragraph is that?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 419. I ask that it be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 419 will again be passed over.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee to explain the effect of the amendment in paragraph 418, which strikes out the words "if bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. ALDRICH. What line is that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Line 13.

Mr. KEAN. If the Senator will look at paragraph 455, he will see it is covered by that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not know whether it is the intention of the committee to make this braid dutiable at 35 per cent, the same duty as hats.

Mr. KEAN. If the Senator will look at paragraph 455, he will see it is covered there.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To leave it dutiable at the same rate as the finished product, it seems to me a little out of the usual order.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I think the first part of the paragraph applies to what he is talking about, at 15 per cent.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That applies to the material not bleached or dyed. You struck out the other. It would seem to leave that material dutiable at the same rate as hats. Braids, if not colored, are dutiable at 15 per cent. The words that were stricken out made them dutiable, if bleached or dyed, at 20 per cent; and the hats into which they are finally formed are made dutiable by the next clause, at 35 per cent. It struck me that it might be a bad thing to have the colored braid dutiable at the same rate as the finished product.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the language as it was before these words were stricken out accomplished the same purpose. It provided for hats, bonnets, and hoods composed of straw, whether wholly or partly manufactured. I think that covers the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. No; I think that would not apply to such braids. The Dingley law provided a special bracket for dyed and colored braids. I do not see why it should be omitted.

Mr. SMOOT. It carries now only 15 per cent instead of 20.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But that bracket distinctly describes braids not colored.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will ask that the amendment be disagreed to. I have no objection to a reconsideration of the motion by which the amendment was agreed to, and to having the amendment disagreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senator's face was turned away from the Chair, and the Chair could not understand what was said.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is in reference to the amendment in paragraph 418, lines 13 and 14. I ask that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered and that the amendment be disagreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none. Does the Senator from Rhode Island ask that the paragraph be passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I ask that it be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph is agreed to. Paragraph 419 is passed over. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 424, page 170, coal.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the paragraph be passed over. It is a highly important paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 427, at the bottom of page 171.

Mr. FLINT. In paragraph 423, line 6, on page 170, after the word "gross," I move to insert "snap fasteners, or clasps, or parts thereof, by whatever name known, 50 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 422 was stricken out by vote of the Senate. The committee have a suggested substitute for that, in reference to button forms, and I call the attention of the Senator from New York to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Insert in the bill a new paragraph, to be known as 422, as follows:

Button forms or covers for buttons, of whatever material composed, not exceeding 3 inches in any one dimension and fit only for buttons, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 427, where the committee propose to strike out the paragraph in the bill and to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

427. Dolls, and parts of dolls, doll heads, toy marbles of whatever materials composed, and all other toys, and parts of toys, not composed of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen or stone ware, and not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to go back for a moment to paragraph 418. I move to strike out the words "not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained," in line 12, and leave all these braids, whether colored or stained or not, at 15 per cent ad valorem instead of 20.

The SECRETARY. On page 168, line 12, strike out the words "not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. And also strike out the words which were inserted a few moments ago by the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Agree to the amendment in lines 13 and 14, striking out certain words.

Mr. ALDRICH. So that it will read——

The SECRETARY. All these articles "suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, or hoods, 15 per cent ad valorem," without reference to whether they are colored or not.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I could not understand that statement.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 168, paragraph 418, line 12, strike out the words "not bleached, dyed, colored, or stained," and the comma, and in lines 13 and 14 agree to the amendment, striking out certain words, as follows: "if bleached, dyed, colored, or stained, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. CULLOM. Reducing it to 15 per cent on all of them.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

Mr. CULBERSON. Was paragraph 424 passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; it was.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 429. Firecrackers of all kinds.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to ask what was done with 428.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Four hundred and twenty-eight was agreed to on the first reading; it was not passed over.

Mr. ROOT. I have an amendment to 428 which was referred to the committee. I do not know whether the committee have considered it.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I think the committee are not yet willing to adopt the amendment, but we will consider it.

Mr. ROOT. This paragraph is still open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 429. The committee proposes to strike out the paragraph and to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

429. Fire crackers of all kinds, 8 cents per pound; bombs, rockets, Roman candles, and fireworks of all descriptions, not specially provided for in this section, 12 cents per pound; the weight on all the foregoing to include all coverings, wrappings, and packing material.

Mr. BACON. That raises the rate of the House, as I understand.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does on certain classes of fireworks.

Mr. LODGE. The higher classes.

Mr. ALDRICH. The higher classes.

Mr. BACON. I suppose there is a reason for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. A revenue reason.

Mr. BACON. Revenue?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; to increase the revenue.

Mr. BACON. I have not time to refer to the tables the committee has furnished us. I notice there is still a difference in the rate on the different classes of fireworks. I suppose the committee has, of course, been guided by some reason why that difference should be made. I should like to know what it is.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee thought this a good subject for revenue. It is not a necessity in any part of the country that we know of, and we thought there could not be a better article upon which to raise some additional revenue.

Mr. BACON. I appreciate that reason very strongly, but the Senator did not answer the question which I propounded—that was, why there is a difference in the different classes of fireworks, one class being 8 cents and the other 12 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have put the bombs and rockets and the higher class goods, which are much more expensive than firecrackers, at a higher rate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 433.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that 433 was agreed to on the first reading, then it was afterwards passed over.

Mr. CUMMINS. What is the paragraph?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four hundred and thirty-three.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have an amendment I desire to offer to the paragraph. I called the attention of the committee to it. I understood it was agreeable to the committee. The amendment I ask is that, after the word "cartridges," in line 19, there be added the words "and cartridge shells, empty."

Mr. ALDRICH. I think there is no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. And there should also be stricken out the word "and," before the word "cartridges," in order to make the paragraph read as it should.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. BULKELEY. The amendment has been adopted, I suppose. I wish to suggest that the paragraph go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut asks that paragraph 433 go over. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That paragraph 433 go over.

Mr. CUMMINS. As I understand, the amendment I offered has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is the request of the Senator from Connecticut that the paragraph be passed over?

Mr. BULKELEY. Yes. I withdraw it if the Senator——

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator an amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. BULKELEY. I want to suggest a change of the rate from 30 to 35 per cent on safety fuses.

Mr. GALLINGER. The House bill was 35 per cent.

Mr. BULKELEY. I brought the matter to the attention of the committee some time ago. I do not know what consideration they have given it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I remember the Senator from Connecticut offered an amendment of that kind, and it has been somewhat considered by the committee, but we have not yet been able to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BULKELEY. I have no objection to its being passed to-night. I will have an opportunity to examine it later.

Mr. PENROSE. I think it a good thing to have it go over, if the chairman does not object. However, I do not insist upon it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it had better go over until the Senator from Connecticut has an opportunity to present his views to the committee.

Mr. BULKELEY. I did not think we would get along so far with the schedules to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph is passed over.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 432. In line 14, page 173, I move to insert "wax and fancy matches and papers, 35 per cent ad valorem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Page 174, paragraph 435——

Mr. ALDRICH. In 434 I have an amendment. At the end of the paragraph I move to insert:

Bed feathers, raw, not manufactured, dusted, or cleaned by machinery or advanced from the crude condition, 10 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 435 as amended, after the word "crosses" in the seventh line, I move to insert "except such as are composed of dog, goat, and sheep skin, temporarily sewed together."

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator if that operates to put that class of furs in the basket clause?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. BACON. By excluding it in this clause?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; it puts them at 20 per cent ad valorem, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. It simply means this, that from China they import dogskins, sewed together, just in a blanket, and under the paragraph as it is now they would come in as manufactured articles or partially manufactured articles. This takes the goatskins and dogskins and puts them in the same rate as if they were not sewed together.

Mr. ALDRICH. It makes the duty 20 per cent instead of 35 per cent.

Mr. BACON. I quite agree with the purpose. I wanted to know how it was affected. To what clause is that class of goods transferred—another paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. The third line of this paragraph, at 20 per cent.

Mr. BACON. It puts them in that clause?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. I ask the Senator what is the rate on the articles that I will mention now:

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, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Is not the present rate 35 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is, I think.

Mr. CLAY. It is an increase from 35 to 50 per cent. There ought to be some reason for it.

Mr. ALDRICH. They are articles of revenue, pure and simple. They are luxuries. Ordinary people do not wear them, and we could see no good reason why people who want to buy these high-class furs should not pay a reasonable duty on them. It is a revenue measure.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to strike out——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. One amendment is pending which the Secretary has not yet reported. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. On page 175, in the proposed committee amendment, at the end of line 7, after the word "crosses" and the comma, insert "except such as are composed of dog, goat, or sheep skin temporarily sewed together."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa desire to offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to move to strike out, in line 11, the words——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Let us dispose of this amendment, and then we will dispose of the Senator's amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to move to strike out, in line 11, the words "but not in part of wool."

I should say I do that because, in very many of these fur garments there appears in some portion of them, either in the lining, in the buttons, or elsewhere, wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. The words are unnecessary. They are taken care of by other provisions in the bill, and I do not object to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was going to say that a garment already dutiable at 50 per cent, which I do not object to, by being carried over into the wearing-apparel wool clause, would be dutiable at 44 cents a pound and 60 per cent, which in many cases would be very exorbitant.

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

The SECRETARY. On page 175, in the committee amendment, line 11, strike out the words "but not in part of wool" and the comma.

Mr. ALDRICH. I accept the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 442, page 176. The committee propose to strike out the paragraph as printed in the bill and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

442. Hats, bonnets, or hoods, for men's, women's, boys' or children's wear, trimmed or untrimmed, including bodies, hoods, plateaux, forms, or shapes, for hats or bonnets, composed wholly or in chief value of fur of the rabbit, beaver, or other animals, valued at not more than $5 per dozen, $1.25 per dozen; valued at more than $5 per dozen and not more than $10 per dozen, $2.25 per dozen; valued at more than $10 per dozen and not more than $20 per dozen, $4 per dozen; valued at more than $20 per dozen, $5.50 per dozen; and in addition thereto on all the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I had no idea that this paragraph would be reached this evening. I do not think it can be acted upon this evening. I suggest that it be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to pass over paragraph 442. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 448, at the bottom of page 178.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the first amendment in the paragraph.

The SECRETARY. After the word "band," in line 25, insert "bend."

Mr. ROOT. I desire to ask what was done with paragraph 445?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 445 was agreed to on the first reading of the bill. It was not passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. In accordance with a previous notice, I offer a substitute for paragraph 444, fixing specific duties on jewelry, instead of the ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island offers a committee amendment to paragraph 444, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of paragraph 444, as printed in the bill, and to insert:

444. Chains, pins, collar, cuff, and dress buttons, charms, combs, millinery and military ornaments, together with all other articles of every description, finished or partly finished, if set with imitation precious stones composed of glass or paste (except imitation jet), or composed wholly or in chief value of silver, German silver, white metal, brass, or gun metal, whether or not enameled, washed, covered, plated, or alloyed with gold, silver, or nickel, and designed to be worn on apparel or carried on or about or attached to the person, valued at 20 cents per dozen pieces, 1 cent each, and in addition thereto three-fifths of 1 cent per dozen for each 1 cent the value exceeds 20 cents per dozen; all stampings and materials of metal (except iron or steel), or of metal set with glass or paste, finished or partly finished, suitable for use in the manufacture of any of the foregoing articles (except chain valued at less than 30 cents per yard, other than nickel or nickel-plated chain), valued at 72 cents per gross, 3 cents per dozen pieces and in addition thereto one-half of 1 cent per gross for each 1 cent the value exceeds 72 cents per gross; rope, curb, cable, and other fancy patterns of chain, without bar, swivel, snap, or ring, composed of rolled gold plate or of silver, German silver, white metal, or brass, not exceeding one-half of 1 inch in diameter, breadth, or thickness, valued at 30 cents per yard, 6 cents per foot and in addition thereto three-fifths of 1 cent per yard for each 1 cent the value exceeds 30 cents per yard; finished or unfinished bags, purses, and other articles, or parts thereof, made in chief value of metal mesh composed of silver, German silver, or white metal, valued at $2 per dozen pieces, 10 cents per piece and in addition thereto three-fifths of 1 cent per dozen pieces for each 1 cent the value exceeds $2 per dozen; all of the foregoing, whether known as jewelry or otherwise and whether or not denominatively or otherwise provided for in any other paragraph of this act, 25 per cent ad valorem in addition to the specific rate or rates of duty herein provided; all articles commonly or commercially known as jewelry or parts thereof, finished or unfinished, including chain, mesh, and mesh bags and purses composed of gold or platinum, whether set or not set with diamonds, pearls, cameos, coral, or other precious or semiprecious stones, or imitations thereof, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is a proposed amendment to paragraph 444?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. It imposes specific duties upon jewelry instead of ad valorem. It is a provision that has been agreed to by everybody concerned, the importers and manufacturers and everybody else, with a view of getting some definite duties upon jewelry. It is largely for the purpose also of increasing the revenue. I have no doubt that it will largely increase the revenue if we adopt it.

Mr. CULBERSON. This is one of those cases where the amendment changes the paragraph so completely, adding so much to it, changing the system of taxation from the ad valorem to the specific, that it occurs to me it ought to be printed and lie over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator that it can be agreed to now, and I will consent to return to it if the Senator finds any occasion to criticise it, or it can be taken up in the Senate. I think there can be no objection to it.

Mr. CULBERSON. I may not have any particular objection to it; but a number of Senators are not here to-night. I would be glad to have the amendment printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. If, I will say to the Senator from Texas, he should desire to have it reconsidered, there will be no objection. I desire to go on as far as I can, as the Senator knows, with the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that, and I am not making any opposition to that.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a pure revenue measure upon the article of jewelry, which ought to pay a high duty, if anything does. If the Senator will permit it to be agreed to, and if any Senator wants to have it reconsidered, it can be reconsidered.

Mr. CULBERSON. Of course I will not ask the Senator to explain it. I doubt whether that could be done without a critical comparison. But I will ask him in what material respect the proposed amendment differs from paragraph 444?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is intended to be the same as the paragraph except upon some kinds of jewelry that are imported under general provisions at a much lower rate than they ought to pay.

In some of those cases there would be a slight increase, but not in many cases. It is the expectation of the committee that it will yield a considerably larger revenue than the present law because it will prevent undervaluation.

Mr. CULBERSON. I notice that the paragraph already carries a tax of 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. Most of the articles are 60 per cent under the bill. It is only certain articles that are undervalued constantly. All parts of the trade have agreed to this amendment as being a proper distribution of the rates.

Mr. CULBERSON. With the understanding that this matter may be reconsidered after it appears in print, if any Senator desires to have it done, I will not insist upon its being printed and go over, but I respectfully submit that an amendment of this importance and of this length, which changes the original paragraph, ought really to be printed before it is adopted so that the Senate can examine it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I gave notice twice that the committee would have an amendment to propose to this amendment. I ask that it may be agreed to, and if there is any objection to it hereafter it can be reconsidered.

Mr. ROOT. May I ask if the amendment makes provision for semiprecious stones cut, but not set?

Mr. ALDRICH. That comes in the next paragraph. The Senator from New York has an amendment to offer to that paragraph.

Mr. ROOT. I have an amendment to offer to paragraph 445.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the next paragraph. I ask that this amendment may be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph as amended is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. LODGE. Paragraph 445——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That paragraph was agreed to on the first reading.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to return to that paragraph for a moment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from New York has an amendment to offer to this paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to perfect certain omissions in it.

Mr. FLINT. I think the amendment of the Senator from New York will cover the whole paragraph.

Mr. CULBERSON. On paragraph 444 the Chair inadvertently stated, I think, that that paragraph was agreed to without objection. Some of us on this side object to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Chair had better put the vote. I think he did put it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did put the vote, but the amendment having been agreed to, the Chair then said, "Without objection, the paragraph is agreed to as amended."

Mr. CULBERSON. The proposition I submit is that some of us voted against it, and some of us, at least, did not intend to agree that it should be adopted without objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the second vote the Chair put it by unanimous consent, as it was simply a repetition of the vote which had been taken. The motion was to substitute a new paragraph for paragraph 444. That was voted on, and having been agreed to, the Chair stated that, without objection, the paragraph as amended would be agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is the point. The Chair stated that the paragraph would be agreed to without objection, whereas we did object on this side, and we do object to the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the question be put to the Senate over again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Texas desires the Chair to put the vote on the paragraph the second time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Upon agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not know that it ought to have been put the second time at all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair was very much in doubt whether there was any necessity for putting it, but, as a matter of form, he did put it.

Mr. CULBERSON. The proposition of the committee was to substitute the proposed matter for the whole paragraph?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That was the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Upon that some of us voted "no."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. The RECORD will show, I think, that the Chair then said the paragraph would be agreed to, without objection. That is the point in the matter. If the vote is put each time, and it is announced carried or lost, there will be no necessity of stating that the paragraph was agreed to without objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair, then, will put the question the second time. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] offers an amendment to paragraph 445.

Mr. ROOT. I wish to offer an amendment to paragraph 445.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The House language was stricken out and the Senate committee language inserted in its stead. Now the proposition is to amend the Senate language, the Chair understands.

Mr. LODGE. By substituting certain matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. By substituting certain matter therefor. The amendment striking out and inserting having been agreed to, it seems to the Chair that the Senate must now reconsider the vote and perfect the paragraph and then readopt it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that it be reconsidered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote will be reconsidered. The Secretary will restate the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, page 178, after the words "precious stones," insert "valued at more than 50 cents per carat;" and in line 9, after the words "ad valorem," insert "precious and semiprecious stones valued at 50 cents per carat or less, and all," so as to make the paragraph read:

445. Pearls and parts thereof, drilled or undrilled, but not set or strung, except in bunches for transportation only, 10 per cent ad valorem; diamonds and bort, coral, rubies, cameos, and other precious stones and semiprecious stones, valued at more than 50 cents per carat, cut but not set, and suitable for use in the manufacture of jewelry, 10 per cent ad valorem; precious and semiprecious stones valued at 50 cents or less per carat, and all imitation precious and semiprecious stones and imitation pearls, not beads, for use in the manufacture of jewelry, doublets, artificial or so-called "synthetic or reconstructed" rubies or other precious stones, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not consent to the provision "50 cents per carat." I will have to understand what that is. I am willing that the amendment shall be printed and go to the committee, but I do not now understand what the effect of it will be.

Mr. ROOT. I will say that the object of the amendment is to differentiate between the cut precious stones and the semiprecious stones. The 10 per cent duty on cut diamonds, rubies, and other precious stones is sufficient protection for the lapidaries in America, because of the high value of the really precious stones, but the semiprecious stones are of very low value, and the 10 per cent given upon cut semiprecious stones is no protection at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the Senator offer his amendment to be printed and we will take up the paragraph. As at present advised, I could not consent to it.

Mr. ROOT. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table, and the paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. LODGE. Before the paragraph is passed over, I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to an amendment which I think is necessary in order to perfect it. After the word "stone," in line 10, I move to insert a comma, and the words "including pearls or parts thereof," and in line 12, after "pearls," to insert "or parts thereof."

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. LODGE. It is simply to perfect the paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. On page 178, line 10, in paragraph 445, after the word "stones" insert "including pearls and parts thereof," and in line 12, after the word "pearls" insert the words "and parts thereof."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 448 will have to be passed over until after we decide upon the duty on hides.

Mr. BACON. I understand that the former action of the Senate has been reconsidered and that paragraph 445 is now open to amendment generally.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I have some amendments that I propose to offer to the paragraph, probably not to-night, if it is going over; but I desire to ask some information of the committee. I notice that paragraph 445, if I read it correctly, refers only to pearls and diamonds which are unset. I will ask the chairman of the committee in what paragraph is there provision made for those which are set?

Mr. ALDRICH. In the jewelry paragraph, at 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. Is that the paragraph to which the Senator has just offered the amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. It retains, though, on articles of that kind the same rate which they now bear—60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. Very well. That is the information I wish. The paragraph which was adopted, which the Senator consented might be reconsidered, embraces the provision relative to set pearls and set diamonds?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; all precious stones that are set in the form of jewels would have to pay that rate.

Mr. BACON. They are in the paragraph that has been adopted?

Mr. ALDRICH. They are.

Mr. BACON. That was the reason why I asked the question. I intend to offer some amendments to the rates provided for in paragraph 445.

Now, one other question, if I may be pardoned. I understand that uncut diamonds are on the free list. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ALDRICH. Uncut diamonds are on the free list. Cut diamonds are at 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. I intend to offer an amendment increasing the rate on unset diamonds from 20 to 25 per cent, and I am also going to offer an amendment proposing a duty on uncut diamonds. I will not do so now, however, as I understand the paragraph is to go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. With the amendment offered by the Senator from New York pending, the paragraph is passed over.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the next paragraph can not go over?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 448 will have to go over until we decide about the duty on hides.

Mr. SCOTT. That is what I thought.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 448 is passed over. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 450——

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 450a, I move to strike out, in line 5, the word "seventy-five" and insert "twenty-five," so as to read "one dollar and twenty-five cents."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 181, line 5, in the proposed committee amendment, strike out "seventy-five" and insert "twenty-five," so as to read:

Women's or children's "glace" finish, Schmaschen (of sheep origin), not over 14 inches in length, $1.25 per dozen pairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Was paragraph 450 passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 450a is the one I move to amend.

Mr. CULBERSON. Has paragraph 450 been adopted?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is only a preliminary paragraph, the Senator will see. There are no rates in it.

Mr. BACON. All those paragraphs were passed over on the former reading without action?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 450a and following are the paragraphs of existing law. I now suggest to reduce the rates on the common gloves from $1.75 to $1.25 a dozen.

Mr. BACON. We, of course, did not anticipate that this schedule would be reached to-night. We were on the cotton schedule this afternoon. At my request, all these paragraphs were passed over at the former reading. It would hardly be competent for us to pass upon the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island now in making amendments which he has doubtless well considered, but which we have had no opportunity to examine.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have stated—the Senator, perhaps, did not catch my remark—that this paragraph 450a and the following paragraphs imposing duties on gloves are precisely the present rates. The House bill provided for quite an increase of the duty on women's gloves. The Senate committee have not reported favorably upon that amendment, but are keeping the present law; however, my present proposition is to reduce below the present law the duty on common gloves from $1.75 to $1.25 a dozen.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let me see if I understand it. The House committee and the House itself, I understand, passed the bill greatly increasing the duty on women's and children's gloves and also on men's gloves. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island, I am trying to see if I understand this matter. The House committee and the House itself proposed an increase over the Dingley rates on gloves.

Mr. ALDRICH. On women's gloves.

Mr. CULBERSON. On women's gloves.

Mr. ALDRICH. Leaving the duty on men's gloves.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senate committee reported favorably an amendment striking out the House provision and restoring the Dingley rate on women's gloves.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is correct.

Mr. CULBERSON. And now I understand the Senator from Rhode Island to propose an amendment still further reducing the present rate.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. CLAY. Simply on one item.

Mr. ALDRICH. On one item, on common gloves.

Mr. CLAY. In other words, the Dingley law on all classes of women's gloves will stand just as it is now, with the exception of gloves at $1.75 per dozen.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not costing $1.75, but the duty of $1.75 a dozen.

Mr. CLAY. I mean where the tariff is fixed at $1.75, you have fixed it at $1.25.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island proposes to reduce it 50 cents.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BACON. To what particular paragraph does it relate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 458a.

Mr. BACON. There are three or four paragraphs here. I really think we ought to see the amendment and be able to compare it with the text.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the Senator would not want to see that amendment, because it is very simple. In line 5, page 181, I move to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "twenty-five" before cents.

Mr. BACON. There is no objection to that, of course.

Mr. ALDRICH. That seems perfectly plain to me.

Mr. BACON. Is that the only amendment offered to any of these paragraphs?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the only amendment offered by the committee to the schedule as reported by them.

Mr. BACON. I notice that paragraphs 450a, b, c, d, and e are all of them amendments to the House bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. They are amendments substituting the existing law for the House provisions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that all the paragraphs from 450, 450a, 450b, 450c, 450d, and 450e may be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee inserting paragraph 450a as amended.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator, in the first place, why is not a reduction made in paragraphs 450b, 450c, 450d, and 450e, as well as in 450a?

Mr. ALDRICH. Because they apply to a different class of gloves, a higher class of gloves, upon which no reduction, in the opinion of the committee, should be made. These are the ordinary gloves, cheaper gloves.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that. I wanted the RECORD to show upon what basis the committee are acting.

Mr. ALDRICH. They are acting precisely upon the basis that a reduction might be made on these cheaper grades of gloves; and, in the opinion of the committee, no reduction can be made safely upon the other grades.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will ask the Senator, Is there any proposed reduction of the Dingley rates in men's gloves?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; men's gloves are very low under the Dingley rate. Those are the gloves on which the glove manufacturers think the rates should be largely increased, and they were increased by the Ways and Means Committee and by the House.

Mr. CULBERSON. At any rate, there is no proposed reduction?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no proposed reduction further than that.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I want to ask if paragraph 339, which seems to be a very important amendment, was adopted?

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] introduced an amendment. It is a very important amendment. It seems to have been adopted in a hurry without any debate. I should like to have that paragraph considered.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Maryland, upon investigation, thinks he would like to move an amendment, I will see that he has the right to move any suggested amendment he sees fit.

Mr. RAYNER. Before the bill goes into the Senate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Before it goes into the Senate.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from Maine says it does not raise the duty upon the lower class of mats, and of course I take his statement. But it seems to me that the amendment is a little complicated; we can not work it out very well. It has never been printed and has never been explained by anyone. I should like to have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. HALE. I said to the Senator, and also to the Senator from Florida, that as far as I am concerned I would look the matter over, and if there should be some amendment to the amendment necessary to protect the lower classes of matting, I would have no objection to it; that I did not seek to reach them at all. So far as I am concerned—and I think I can say for the committee—there will be that opportunity at any time after looking it over. I wish the Senator himself and the Senator from Florida would look it over, to see if they believe there is anything that infringes upon the use of the cheaper kinds of matting.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 450a as amended.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not desire to retard the progress of the consideration of the bill or its disposition, but, as I said, it is altogether without anticipation on our part that this glove matter would be reached to-night. It was passed over before in order that we might look into it a little. I do not know that there is any amendment to be offered, but I would be very glad if the Senator would let those paragraphs go over until to-morrow, the amendment proposed having already been adopted. It may not need any further action; I do not know.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will ask the Senator to allow the paragraph to be agreed to with the same understanding that we had with reference to the other paragraphs.

Mr. BACON. To be reconsidered if any Senator wishes a reconsideration?

Mr. ALDRICH. To have it reconsidered if any Senator wishes it.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island is to strike out paragraph 450 as passed by the House and to insert paragraphs 450, 450a, 450b, 450c, 450d, and 450e.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraphs as amended be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the paragraphs as amended.

The paragraphs as amended were agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the same action be taken in regard to paragraph 451, that paragraph 451 as reported by the committee be substituted for paragraph 451 in the House text.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 182, strike out paragraph 451, as printed in the House bill, and insert a new paragraph 451, as follows:

451. In addition to the foregoing rates there shall be paid the following cumulative duties: On all leather gloves, when lined, $1 per dozen pairs; on all pique or prix seam gloves, 40 cents per dozen pairs; on all gloves stitched or embroidered, with more than 3 single strands or cords, 40 cents per dozen pairs.

Mr. BACON. If I understand correctly, by the use of the term "cumulative" is meant that those are duties imposed in addition to the duty which would have been due if those particular features were not found in these gloves.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right; and that is the existing law. It is the precise terms of the existing law.

Mr. BACON. I simply wish to suggest, if that is really a part of the same subject, that the Senator will consent that we may have the same privilege with reference to paragraph 451.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. That is the same as in the case of the preceding paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 183, paragraph 453——

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over. That is a part of the leather question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the paragraph be passed over. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The Secretary read as follows:

462. Paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen and ink drawings, and sculptures, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; but the term "sculptures" as used in this act shall be understood to include only such as are cut, carved, or otherwise wrought by hand from a solid block or mass of marble, stone, or alabaster, or from metal, and as are the professional production of a sculptor only, and the term "painting" as used in this act shall be understood not to include such as are made wholly or in part by stenciling or other mechanical process.

Mr. LODGE. In paragraph 455 there is a committee amendment. In line 23, after the word "horn," I move to insert the word "quills."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 183, line 23, paragraph 455, after the word "horn" and the comma, insert the word "quills" and a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. At the end of the same paragraph, after the word "thereof," in line 4, page 184, I move to insert:

Combs composed wholly of horn, or composed of horn and metal, 50 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, there is a question that has been somewhat discussed in conversation with members of the committee, in regard to reclaimed rubber. I understand it is understood that that is to go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. There are two different contending interests on that subject, I think. One wants it on the free list and the other wants a duty on it. I will say that the committee will try and adjust those differences, if they can, and report an amendment later.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that on the subject of reclaimed rubber the trade is getting together, and an important communication will be sent to each Member of the Senate setting forth the views about that item.

Mr. ROOT. All that I wished was that the paragraph should be kept open.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the committee are able to reach an agreement, I will see that the amendment is offered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether I understood him correctly when I understood him to say that the Senate would receive a communication setting forth the views of both sides?

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that almost everybody in this business will send a communication within the next day or so to each Member of the Senate, declaring in favor of having reclaimed rubber on the free list.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All interests agree to it.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President——

Mr. PENROSE. I think there is one exception. It may be that the Senator from Ohio will speak for that.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, I offered a day or two ago an amendment, which I think might meet the views of a large part of those engaged in this line of business, to put this article on the free list with crude rubber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 455 has not yet been agreed to as amended. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is nothing pending in reference to paragraph 456. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 462, paintings in oil or water colors, and so forth.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, do I understand that the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Finance would permit further discussion and consideration of the pending amendments placing the article of rubber on the free list or the dutiable list, as the case may be, and that the matter goes over for further consideration?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is with a view that the committee will try, if possible, to readjust the complex views.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That matter has not been put to the Senate. The Chair did not understand that such a request had been made.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not ask that anything be passed over. I am simply suggesting that the committee will report some amendments to this rubber provision.

Mr. DICK. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In paragraph 462, the Secretary will report the first committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance propose to amend paragraph 462, on page 185, in line 7, after the word "and," to strike out "statuary" and insert "sculpture;" in line 8, before the words "per centum," to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen;" in line 9, after the word "term," to strike out "statuary" and insert "sculptures;" in line 11, after the word "such," to strike out "statuary as is" and insert "as are;" and in line 13, after the word "as," to strike out "is" and insert "are," so as to read:

462. Paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen and ink drawings, and sculptures, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; but the term "sculptures" as used in this act shall be understood to include only such as are cut, carved, or otherwise wrought by hand from a solid block or mass of marble, stone, or alabaster, or from metal, and as are the professional.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 13, after the word "metal," I move to insert the words "except articles in whole or in part molded or cast in metal."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 185, in line 13, after the word "metal," it is proposed to insert "except articles in whole or in part molded or cast in metal."

Mr. BACON. What is that amendment, Mr. President?

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

Mr. BACON. No; I should like the Senator from Massachusetts to explain it.

Mr. LODGE. It is simply to exclude the bringing in of castings under this paragraph of articles of metal cast and molded. It is simply to try to make the paragraph cover works of art, which it is intended to cover, and no other articles.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I did not understand him. Does the Senator's amendment refer to all castings—bronzes, for instance?

Mr. LODGE. Anything that is——

Mr. ALDRICH. Anything not a work of art.

Mr. BACON. "Not a work of art?" I did not catch that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not a work of art.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts how far-reaching that amendment is? I ask him for information and not for controversy.

Mr. ALDRICH. Anything which is a work of art would be admitted at 15 per cent. If it was not a work of art, it would come in at whatever rate the metal would bear, whether it was a casting or whatever form it was in.

Mr. BACON. Whatever rate the metal would bear?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It would come in under manufactures of metal.

Mr. BACON. Under manufactures of metal?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. ROOT. Would not all bronzes be cast?

Mr. ALDRICH. They might be, yes; but if it was a work by sculptors it would come in under other provisions free, if it was the work of American artists; or, under this provision, at 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ROOT. I am entirely in sympathy with this amendment and with the cause of the amendment; but I should not want to have any more lead brought in as statues. We once had that done.

Mr. ALDRICH. This would exclude that, of course.

Mr. ROOT. But I should be a little afraid that this would exclude all bronzes.

Mr. ALDRICH. We will look at the amendment and see.

Mr. LODGE. We might withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think perhaps it would be safer to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be better to withdraw the amendment and let the matter be considered further, because there is no desire to exclude anything in that amendment, except ordinary articles of commerce, which ought to come in as manufactures of metal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to inquire whether the proviso at the end of that paragraph has been stricken out?

Mr. LODGE. It has been stricken out, and is provided for on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is provided for in another place.

Mr. LODGE. It is the same thing as in the free list.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair begs to inform the Senator from Massachusetts that he is in error. The proviso has not yet been acted upon. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment is in line 14——

Mr. HEYBURN. Before leaving paragraph 462——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair was having an amendment to the paragraph stated.

Mr. HEYBURN. Before leaving that paragraph, I desire to inquire of the committee whether the language there was broad enough to cover, or rather whether it would include in the castings the artist's work which must be sent to Italy for the purpose of selecting the marble from which it is ultimately to be made, and then returned to this country?

Mr. LODGE. The work of American artists comes in free. There is a different paragraph covering that further on in the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is on the free list.

Mr. LODGE. That is on the free list. It is entirely covered in that.

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

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 462, page 185, line 14, before the word "sculptor," the Committee on Finance propose to strike out the words "statuary or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next amendment proposed by the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 185, line 17, after the word "process," it is proposed to strike out the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That any of the foregoing which are proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, under rules prescribed by him, to have been in existence more than twenty years prior to their importation shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. BACON. Possibly it might be well to determine the question as to whether or not this proposed change is to be made in the law. It is true that the question may come up when we come to consider the free list, but it seems to me, if there is to be any controversy upon the action of the Senate as to this particular amendment, it might as well be postponed until that time. Of course I am very frank to confess that I should desire to learn from the committee how serious this question may be in its results. I do not insist upon taking it up now.

Mr. LODGE. I can explain it.

Mr. BACON. I think I understand that the purpose of it is that all these works of art which have been in existence prior to a certain time shall be admitted free. I know that is the purpose, but as to how far-reaching it may be, how far it will affect the revenue, I think is important to be known. I know that while it is considered somewhat heretical for one to object to anything of this kind, we, at least, ought to be well informed as to what we are doing before we commit ourselves to the proposition.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the law now places a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on all works of art which are included in this paragraph—paintings and sculptures. That is the present law. The House sent over this paragraph placing a duty of 20 per cent on paintings and sculptures less than twenty years old. By their proviso they make paintings and sculptures more than twenty years old free. The Senate adopted that provision of the House, and added to it an extension to other works of art more

than a century old. It was the opinion of the committee that it was better legislation to put them on the free list. The clause as it now stands imposes a 15 per cent duty on paintings and sculptures less than twenty years old. That will be the result if the amendment, including the paragraphs in the free list, are adopted.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. Has the Senator such information as to be able to say what value in property will come into the United States free of duty under this paragraph, if adopted and on the free list?

Mr. LODGE. I think the paragraph in the free list has been drawn with great care. It represents a great deal of labor, consideration, and work. I think it is carefully guarded against fraud, and that the definitions, which it has been always very difficult to get, are accurate and will be sufficient. I can tell by looking what the revenue was under this clause. Of course the Senator understands that this is the old question of free art, which has been contested in every tariff bill since I have known anything about it, and which was adopted in the Wilson law. The Dingley tariff reimposed a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. CULBERSON. Judging from newspaper accounts, the inquiry goes a little further than that. It is stated—I do not know how true it is, but it is immaterial to me how true it is—that the purpose of this amendment is to permit the introduction into this country free of certain known works of art in existence at this time and the ownership of which is known. What I want to know is if this amendment has been drawn with any specific reference to any such question as that?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. Mr. President, that is something I know nothing about, except I know that there are works of art owned by Americans which are in Europe, and which I should be very glad to see brought to the United States. But the amendment was drawn without any reference to that or any knowledge about it, so far as I am concerned, and I have had something to do with drafting the amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts upon what ground is based the discrimination between works of art more than 20 years old and those less than that?

Mr. LODGE. That was dictated to the House, I suppose—as it would have been to the Senate if the House had not put it in—by the consideration of fraud.

Mr. ALDRICH. The twenty-year limitation, to which the Senator refers, does not apply to works of art generally, but only to paintings and sculpture.

Mr. LODGE. Only to paintings and sculpture. I thought the Senator understood that. All other works of art, carvings, and so forth, have a hundred years' limitation. The purpose of that limitation was to avoid the difficulty which happened under the Wilson law, which resulted simply in free art, without any limitations. It was used for bringing in a mass of merchandise as works of art, which were nothing but ordinary merchandise for sale; such things as decorated screens, made in Japan, which are put in front of washstands; little paper shades for candles, and so forth. Those things are pure merchandise. Nobody desires to bring them in as works of art. The twenty years' limitation, it is believed, would shut out that sort of thing.

Mr. BACON. That is an explanation which is quite a reasonable one, but not known to those who had not had the inner information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Page 186, paragraph 465, pencil leads not in wood——

Mr. CLAY. I desire the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island for a moment. Some matters have been passed that are worrying me. I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say to me some days ago that rattan used in the manufacture of chairs was on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; crude rattan—rattan in its natural state—is on the free list.

Mr. CLAY. I find this language in paragraph 418:

418. Braids, plaits, laces, and willow sheets or squares, composed wholly or in chief value of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, osier, rattan—

And so forth—

15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. That refers to plaits, and so forth, manufactured of rattan.

Mr. CLAY. Then the raw material used in the manufacture of chairs——

Mr. ALDRICH. Is on the free list.

Mr. CLAY. I presume it is intended to be included in paragraph 708½, but I am not certain of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is on the free list under paragraph 708½.

Mr. CLAY. What about paragraph 208?—

208. Chair cane wrought or manufactured from rattans or reeds, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. That refers to wrought rattan, and paragraph 708½ to rattan in its natural state.

Mr. CLAY. Then the rattan in its natural state will remain in this bill just as it is under the present law?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no change whatever.

Mr. CLAY. I understand it now, and I thank the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the first amendment to paragraph 465.

The SECRETARY. After the word "wood," in paragraph 465, page 186, the committee proposes to strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "or other material, black, 1½ cents per ounce; colored, 2 cents per ounce; copying, 3 cents per ounce."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I observe that the existing rate on leads not in wood is 10 per cent, and that a small importation has occurred at that rate, realizing to the Treasury about $11,000 a year. I would not be willing to have that converted into a specific duty without somebody being able to state with certain accuracy what the value of these leads by the ounce actually is.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that that will have to go over, because my own papers with reference to that matter are not here, and I did not expect this paragraph to be reached to-night. Perhaps, however, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has the figures; I have them not at present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the materials from which such leads are made have to be imported, and the duty paid on these materials amounts to more than the total amount of duty levied on the completed articles. For instance, a gross of blue pencil leads requires 8 ounces of blue, upon which is levied a duty of 4 cents; to manufacture this into pencil leads requires delicate hand work and extends over a period of several weeks. Ten per cent duty on the finished leads amounts to less than 3 cents per gross. Foreign manufacturers have not been slow to take advantage of this defect in our law, and have established many so-called "pencil factories" in this country, which import the leads and merely incase them in wood.

Mr. President, I have a letter here from the Richard Best Pencil Works, of Irvington, N. J. They are importers of these leads. They incase the leads in wood and sell them, of course, as lead pencils, and claim to be manufacturers of lead pencils in this country. According to the figures given by them, they claim that there is an increase of duty of 1,000 per cent in this particular paragraph.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is what I want to get the truth on.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I am extremely anxious to finish this schedule up to the free list—there are only two or three other paragraphs remaining—and adjourn. So I think perhaps this matter had better go over until another time.

Mr. KEAN. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that the rate is only 40 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. To the next paragraph I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 466, page 186, line 7, after the word "films," it is proposed to insert "including moving-picture films not developed or exposed."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 468, plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers——

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

The SECRETARY. On line 23, after the words "ad valorem," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I notice that that paragraph is marked in the copy of the bill that I have as being passed over at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD]. It is a very important matter to a very large number of people who use farm machinery. I do not see the Senator from South Dakota in his seat; but when notice has been given by a Senator as to some particular paragraph, those of us who have objections to it are disposed to leave the matter to him. I think paragraph 468 ought to be passed over until the Senator is present.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no objection to that course. I thought the Senator from South Dakota was here. He was here a moment ago.

Mr. ROOT. He was here a moment ago.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will be here in a moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD entered the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the committee amendment in paragraph 468.

The SECRETARY. In line 23, after the words "ad valorem," it is proposed to strike out the proviso.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, I simply requested that this paragraph be passed over, because I wanted to look into it. I have now no objection to the paragraph being adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the committee why that proviso is stricken out?

Mr. ALDRICH. With a view of having it go into the general provision in regard to the maximum and minimum rates.

Mr. BACON. I can not hear the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. With a view to having it go into the general provisions recommended by the committee with reference to the maximum and minimum duties, believing that these discriminations, if they exist, can be better taken care of in that way than in the method suggested in the proviso.

Mr. BACON. I suppose the Senator has proper grounds for confidence that the maximum and minimum provisions of the bill will be accepted by the Senate. I myself am not prepared to give my adhesion to the proposed law in that regard.

Mr. ALDRICH. My impression is that when the Senator hears the argument upon the question he will certainly be in favor of it.

Mr. BACON. Possibly that may be true, but I do not think it probable. The suggestion that I would make—and it may not be a proper one; at least it may not be well founded—is that a provision of this kind, which is correct in itself, should not be stricken from the bill until it has been determined that it will find a place somewhere else.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be in conference anyhow, and I assure the Senator that if the maximum and minimum provisions do not pass—and I am perfectly confident that if the bill passes at all there will be some maximum and minimum provision in the bill——

Mr. BACON. I am not familiar with the details of that amendment which has been brought in by the committee; but is there a distinct provision in the maximum and minimum features of the amendment as to all these provisos? Of course we know that there is a general feature in the maximum and minimum which relates generally to discriminations; but is there any such provision in the maximum and minimum amendment as that where an importation is from a country which does not impose any duty upon a similar article the importation shall come in free also? Is there any such provision as that in the maximum and minimum clauses?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is included in the terms of the maximum and minimum provisions, as we have it.

Mr. BACON. It would embrace that?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a further reason why this proviso should be stricken out; and that is, that if it is included the International Harvester Company, or any great plow company, could go over into Germany or anywhere where there was cheap labor, manufacture agricultural machinery in such country and ship it in here free of duty. So, instead of giving the laborer of America a chance to make it in America, they could have it made in a foreign country and shipped into this country without paying duty.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am very frank to say that, leaving aside for the present the simple question of revenue, I think if there is any class of goods which ought to come into this country free, it is the class of goods that the agriculturists have to use in the way of machinery for their crops.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. ROOT. I want to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that if the Senate should not be satisfied with the maximum and minimum provisions as reported by the committee there are quite a number of these provisos in the bill as it came from the House, and the Senate would doubtless adopt a provision in lieu of the maximum and minimum provision imposed by the committee, which would group together these various provisos. So it is hardly necessary for us to trouble ourselves about it now.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing to act upon the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island and the suggestion of the Senator from New York in that regard. I understand that the paragraph is going over. I do not know whether the Senator from South Dakota intended to offer an amendment to it or not.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the Senator from South Dakota withdrew his request that it should go over.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, we were put in an embarrassing position as to a great many of these items by the fact, as previously stated, that we have been altogether without any suspicion that they would be reached to-night. I myself desired to offer an amendment to it, but I am not prepared to do so, because I did not think it at all possible that this question would come up to-night. I think the rate of duty on these harvesting machines and this agricultural machinery, if there is any duty at all, ought to be extremely low.

Mr. President, the matter has been so often brought to the attention of the Senate that I would not be justified in speaking of it at any length; and I only mention it now in view of the possibility that the Senator may consent to let it go over. The farming population of the country, whatever Senators may think in the way of indirect benefit, certainly so far as any direct advantage from the imposition of duties is concerned, do not share in it in any degree whatever as compared with those who engage in manufacturing industries.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator from Georgia to consider the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BACON. What is that?

Mr. ALDRICH. I know it to be true that the International Harvester Company are now establishing large manufacturing plants in Germany, in France, and in Russia, I think, and that it will be possible for that company, if you put the rates too low, to get into this country all their machines at a lower cost to themselves, perhaps, than they could be made in the United States.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the great agricultural class of this country can get their machinery cheap and at the same time even a very small revenue——

Mr. ALDRICH. They would not get it any cheaper, because, as the Senator from Washington has very well said, the International Harvester Company fixes the prices of their machines everywhere.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not only that, Mr. President, but, if I remember aright, I have seen in a government publication that that company gets higher prices for their machines abroad than they get here at home. That is the one exception, I believe, the one notable exception, to that state of affairs of which we hear so much as to the selling of our products abroad cheaper than at home. I am sure that I have at my house a government publication which shows the astonishing fact that this company gets a higher price for its machines abroad than here.

Mr. BACON. I have no doubt of that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 11 o'clock p. m. having arrived, under the order of the Senate, the Senate stands adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Friday, June 4, 1909.